

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 14, 1988

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

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., (Hons.), MJP.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. E. E. Greaves, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, B.A. MA., (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. 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.)

Hon. Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, (Acting Minister 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, MA. Mr. R.

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

P. Byer, LL.B., L.E.C. Mr. D. J.

H. Thompson, LL.B.

Prayers were led by Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, May 24, 1988.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable House that took place on May 24, 1988 be taken as read and approved.

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

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

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 11 months ended February 28, 1988.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 2) Order, 1988.

Hon. Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Public Holidays Order 1988.

The 74th Session of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva in September 1987.

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

The 9th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Port Authority for the year ended December 31, 1987.

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

The Annual Report and Audited Financial Statement of the Transport Board for the year 1985-1986.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cane Gardens, St. Thomas for the purposes of housing development and the construction of the secondary school.

I shall seek leave of this Honourable House to deal with this today in all of its stages.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICES

RESOLUTION RE ACCLAIMING LATE PRIME MINISTER ERROL BARROW AS FIRST NATIONAL HERO AND ESTABLISHING HIS BIRTHDAY, JAN. 21, AS NATIONAL HEROES DAY AND PUBLIC HOLIDAY

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the late Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow, Q.C., was a Member of this Honourable House for the constituency of Saint George from 1951 to 1956 and of Saint John from 1958 until his death on 1st June, 1987.

AND WHEREAS he also served Barbados successively as Premier and first Prime Minister from 1961 to 1976 and again as Prime Minister from 29th May, 1986, until his death.

AND WHEREAS as Premier and Prime Minister of Barbados he presided over governments which introduced important social, political and economic measures for the upliftment of Barbadians and the transformation of Barbadian society, including the establishment of free secondary and tertiary education for all Barbadians.

AND WHEREAS he was committed to regional institutions and integration in the Caribbean and was a founder and original signatory of the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Free Trade Area (CARIFTA), 1967, and of its successor, the Treaty establishing the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), 1973, and served this country and the Caribbean region selflessly and with distinction.

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate that our country should honour the lives and work of our most outstanding citizens as National Heroes.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Honourable House urge Government to commemorate the life and work of the Right Honourable Errol Walton Barrow by acclaiming him as our first National Hero and by establishing his birthday, January 21st, as National Heroes Day and a Public Holiday in each year in tribute to him and to every other person declared a National Hero of Barbados.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the following, was read a first time:

A Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, Cap. 233.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

RE: LATE M.P. - D. D. GARNER

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to move a Resolution asking that this Honourable House extend its deepest condolences to the family and friends of the late Darrell DaCosta Garner.

Mr. Garner died on June 8, 1988, last Wednesday, at the age of 81. His parliamentary career spanned from 1944 _ 1961. He first became a Member of this House in 1944, representing the then Congress Party, and he held the seat as Junior Member for the parish of St. Philip until 1951, when he was defeated. He ran again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1956, successfully, and again became a Member for the parish of St. Philip. He was also very active in Local Government politics, for several years as a member of the vestry and churchwarden as well. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. Garner, after leaving Barbados, resided in the United States for several years. There he came under the spellbinding influence of the late Marcus Garvey, and he became an active member in the movement started by that great man. Indeed, many of the ideas of Marcus Garvey influenced him and had an indelible imprint on his mind and subsequent actions. It was not surprising, therefore, that when he returned to Barbados, he quickly threw himself into the battle of fighting on behalf of the underprivileged, particularly the black underprivileged, because he met social and political conditions in those days which confined the large mass of people to be disenfranchised, to be lacking in economic opportunities, and to be denied to a large extent political and social progress.

Mr. Garner saw part of his task as to fight for the greater enfranchisement of the masses, and at the same time, to direct his attention to fighting for an improvement in the quality of their lives. In this regard, he showed courage and determination. There were not many people in those days who would take the step which he took, and he was part of the small band of pioneers to whom all of us today should be deeply indebted.

Mr. Speaker, he was a very fierce believer in those persons who had self-assurance and who, by their own self-reliance and their own spirit of enterprise, could improve their lot. He was a small peasant farmer in the parish of St. Philip for many years, and I believe that his knowledge of agriculture was phenomenal. Many people not only benefited from the produce which came from his own efforts on his own land, but learnt, as well, from his lessons in agriculture.

In addition, he was a small businessman. He was not one of those businessmen who saw his function merely to earn profit, but he used the profits which he made in his enterprise not only for his family and his immediate friends, but for the larger mass of people in St. Philip. I think that many of us will testify that there are many poor families to whom he not only extended credit, but for whom he did many other acts of kindness.

He was a very vibrant personality, with a strong sense of humour and a tremendous amount of fun and laughter in his life. But he always showed a steady dedication to the cause of the underprivileged.

He became associated with the Barbados Labour Party in 1948, and he remained up to his death a strong supporter of the Labour Party and its causes. He was an outstanding Minister of Agriculture, and will be particularly remembered for his contribution to peasant agriculture.

I recall particularly, Sir, that it was during his term of office as Minister of Agriculture that a great deal was done for fishermen, particularly those who then plied for their trade in sail boats. I think he was instrumental in piloting

measures through the House to make loans available to them to mechanise their boats at the time.

There are other aspects of peasant agriculture to which he made his contribution, and about which, no doubt, honourable Members, particularly those who have succeeded him in the parish of St. Philip, will make reference.

On a personal note, I first met this great man back in the Forties, when he was a member of the Congress Party. I recall that, along with Sir Theodore Branker, Mr. Wynter Crawford and others, he would visit my adoptive parents. My adoptive father was then a member of the Congress Party as well. I would listen, although not always understanding perfectly or properly, to the conversations which they had about events in Barbados in those days, and I feel it a privilege to have gleaned some knowledge from a man who has contributed so much to our island, to the parish of St. Philip in particular, and to the cause of the poor, particularly the poor black people of Barbados.

I believe, Sir, that we are losing a lot of the stalwarts who have charted the course for those of us who now have the honour and privilege of contributing to public life in this country. They fought the good fight with courage and determination at a time when the financial rewards were not as they are today. It called for personal sacrifice, a quality which they possessed in great measure. It called for determination, it called for courage, and it called for conviction.

Mr. Garner possessed all of these qualities, and I hope that now he has passed to the Great Beyond, those young people who are not conversant in the manner we would have hoped they would be with the history of this period, will take the opportunity of his passing, and the remarks which will be made about him in the next couple of days and weeks, as an opportunity to learn of that period. I regret very much that a lot of our history is passing away without a proper record of the achievements of these people.

Darrell Garner was a great soldier, a good fighter, an honest and straightforward person, a person devoted to the cause of the underprivileged and the underdog. Long may he rest in peace, Sir.

I will ask the House to join with me in passing the Resolution which has been laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to second this Resolution before the House, and enjoin the Government in paying tribute to the passing of the late D. D. Garner, as we knew him, or for those in St. Philip, "Big Jacket".

There seems to be some little query, but my information, from his son, is that he was born on January 8, 1908 and he died on June 8, 1988, which would have meant that he was a little over 80 years old. 12.35p.m.

I cannot remember when I first came to really understand D. D., as all of us knew him, but those of us who lived in St. Philip, and in and around the area, would certainly have taken notice of him at the very earliest time of our recognition of the things around us. Having been born in Brereton, which is about two miles from Marchfield, I am certain that from the very first time I rode my bicycle up to Six Roads, I must have taken note, if not of D. D. himself, certainly of the house, which in those days was a very imposing two storey building, right at the corner of Marchfield and the road leading to the pumping station. Certainly if you did not take notice of the house at that time, you would have been sent by your parents to his shop, because that was the time when you had the variety shops in the country, and you could be certain that D. D. sold everything, from sugar to cloth to batteries. He covered the whole ambit, and at some time as a boy, you must have been sent there.

D. D., as we heard earlier, was involved in the Vestry politics and he became churchwarden some time in the early Sixties. We must take note of his becoming churchwarden at that time, because the historians and those who look back at the Vestry politics would know that then you had to be a man owning a certain quantity of land to be able to vote, and for D.D. to have been elected churchwarden at that time, certainly he would have had to be elected with the assistance of some of the white minority in the parish, who were the major land owners, and, naturally, it showed that they must have had his interest at heart, or believed that he had the ability to lead.

But this did not stop him from having very many fights with them. At that time, the Vestry system was responsible for the roads as well as responsible for the cleaning of the district, and one of the head-on clashes that the Vestry had in those days was to try to keep in mind what were the roads that were used mostly by the people and not be side-tracked by the roads leading through the plantations, whose main concern was to convey the canes to the factory. This led to very many disputes, as I was made to understand, between D.D. and the Vestry.

At that time, obviously when he functioned in such a pivotal role, he had to be carrying the fight for the black majority of people in St. Philip, because there were not very many people of his colour who would have been in a position to be heard. One of the things I remember very vividly of D.D. was that on any Saturday you passed his house, there was always a dozen young people there

to see him, obviously in an effort to try to see what assistance he could have offered, either by way of finding jobs, signing passport forms, or seeing what small loan he could have made available to the parents, who, obviously, would have sent them to see D.D.

He was a legend indeed. Between the late Forties and the early Fifties in St. Philip politics, you always heard of Crawford and Garner, and I remember if you went into the rum shops, the literature was not as embellished as it is now; it was a small piece of paper, most likely about six by four, very badly printed, with a photograph such that you could hardly distinguish who it was. But you would see them in all the shops, Crawford and Garner. It became a theme, as with Wes Hall and Griffith. You associated Crawford with Garner and Garner with Crawford, and he represented St. Philip until 1951, when he lost, but he came back in 1956 until 1961.

He became Minister of Agriculture on December 19, 1956, at the first sitting. It is not correct to say he was the first, since Talma was the first Minister of Agriculture. Talma was the first Minister of Agriculture, serving from about January 3, 1956, and D.D. came in and took over on December 19, 1956, when he was made Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

My understanding is that he was a very easy person to work with. The members of his staff got along very easily with him, and one of the things that they said he was very particular and adept at was spotting the politics of any situation. He was always careful to examine the politics of anything before him, and particularly if St. Philip was involved, and I think we owe him the credit. He very quickly established his mark in St. Philip by building a market at Six Roads. Although we do not make full use of it, D.D. made sure that there was some physical building in St. Philip under the Ministry of Agriculture.

He did quite a bit of work for the fishermen. At the time that he was Minister of Agriculture, there was the transition from the row boats to the motor boats, and if you check somewhere, you will see that one of the things he did quite early was to recognise the difficulty of the fishermen to be able to pay the premium. He, therefore, introduced into Parliament a Bill called the Fishing "Industry (Amendment) Bill, 1958, which allowed loans to be made to fishermen to pay their premiums, and they had a 90-day period in which to pay the premiums on their boats. He realised that they had gone into a fairly substantial investment in their boats, and he wanted not only to protect the investment of the owners, but of the lenders, and he saw it fit then to introduce that Bill, - * which was a very far-reaching Bill at that time, if you look at it.

He paid, particular attention to peasant agriculture, and during his period, he made sure that funds were available for irrigation under our irrigation grants. He was very good at that type of legislation.

D. D., as was said earlier on, was a believer in the Marcus Garvey movement. He had a very big picture of Marcus Garvey in his living room. You could not miss it at all. He was a believer in the back to Africa movement, although I am not sure that at that time, if he was given the opportunity, he would have chosen to go, because he was fighting here in Barbados.

After his retirement, he went back to his small holding. He was a good peasant farmer, and he worked there until he became a bit too old and his eyes gave out, and then he lived a very secluded life over the last seven years.

As was said earlier, D.D. was one of these persons who started when we were not remunerated at all, and then, later, the remuneration was very small, and there was a part of his life that makes one reflect that, unfortunately, those fellows who had sojourned at that time, sometimes had very difficult financial times, for which we as a people, I believe, ought to make provision. Luckily, most of them have now passed from the scene.

He gave so much of his life to public service, because you can well imagine being a representative of St. Philip and having the only variety store in St. Philip, what that would have meant by way of his financial losses, because, obviously, most of the people going in there would always end up owing D.D. some money. He was a politician, so he had a combination for financial disaster, in that he was a politician and he owned the only variety shop in St. Philip selling from salted fish, to towels, to lamps, and you can be absolutely certain that if you make a check now, there are still many outstanding bills owed to D.D. So one was a bit saddened in the latter part of his life, when, obviously, he was going through some financial difficulties, that no provision was made at that time to take care of these types of circumstances.

As I said, he contributed a lot to those of us who are parishioners of St. Philip. We would have remembered his battles. We would remember his political meetings in Brereton and Ebenezer, and his ongoing contests with the Weekeses of this world and all the others. I can say he fought a great fight, he lived to be around 80 years old, and we could only hope that his soul will repose in peace. 12.45 p.m.

And therefore, it is with some regret that I rise to second and enjoin the Government on this Resolution.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, I would first like to say that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Philip North, (Hon. W. O. Franklin), covered almost all of the political life of D.D. Garner, so I would not like to go over what they have said. I will therefore confine my remarks to what I knew, and still know, of D. D. Garner as a citizen of Marchfield, St. Philip.

Before I proceed, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that D. D. Garner was a son of the soil of Marchfield, St. Philip, and for those of you who do not know. Reynold Weekes was also a son of the soil of Marchfield, before he went to live in Gemswick, and your humble servant is also a son of the soil of Marchfield, St. Philip.

I knew D. D. Garner from the time I could know anyone. I recall that in those days, most of us who were born in Marchfield, 95 per cent of the boys and girls, had to go to school at St. Philip's Boys' School. In those days as well, there were probably about five or six cars in St. Philip, maybe a bit more, but not many, and on mornings on our way to St. Philip's Boys' School, we would always get in small groups, because all of us kept looking back for when Mr. Garner was coming in his car.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: P. 87.)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: P. 87. That is my first recollection of Mr. Garner, because he would always give one of the groups going to school on mornings a lift to St. Philip's Boys' School.

I then remembered Mr. Garner on the political platform. He had a very powerful and commanding voice, and with his pipe in his mouth, he looked even more commanding. This man looked all-powerful when you saw him, because he was about, I believe, 6 foot 3 or 4, and he would have weighed a lot over 200 pounds. So he was a fairly massive person, but also a very gentle person.

As mentioned by my colleague from St. Philip North and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he was a Vestryman and a churchwarden. And I would like to say now, because this is not something well known - although probably well known in Marchfield - that D. D. Garner played a great role in the fact that, only after two terms at Combermere School, I was given a Vestry Scholarship. So my respect for this man, D. D. Garner is very, very deep.

He was a peasant proprietor and he was a shop-keeper. I believe his first love was the land. He always talked about the land. He was always in the land. Those of us who were growing up in Marchfield and in Four

Roads at that time would recall that almost on every occasion when we saw smoke coming from in the area of Kirtons, we would say, 'That is coming from Garner's lime kiln.' I did not know what it was at the time, but that is what everybody used to say, and I used to say it as well.

I remember speaking to D. D. Garner on many occasions at his home in Marchfield, and, as I have said before, he would always talk about the land. So especially those of us in Marchfield who knew that his first love was the land were not surprised when the leadership of the Barbados Labour Party made him Minister of Agriculture between 1956 and 1961.

Mr. Garner was also a shopkeeper and as my colleague from St. Philip North has said, in those days, you either went at Mr. Garner or you went down St. Patrick's Hill at Miss Christie. The entire parish of St. Philip headed for Garner. I have no doubt that there are hundreds, maybe thousands, of people who up to this day still owe Garner some sort of money or some sort of debt for the credit he provided them with.

Garner was a very considerate person and he loved people, especially the people of St. Philip, Marchfield in particular. At that time, if any person took their daughter to Mr. Garner's house and said, 'D.D. I am looking for a job for this little girl', although Garner's shop might be overloaded with people, he would still take on this other girl to work. I believe that it is because of things like that that he died in what we would consider a not really healthy financial position.

I admired Mr. D. D. Garner. I know the type of person he was, because, as I said, I grew up in Marchfield, and I watched him and I knew what he stood for.

I am deeply sad now in supporting this Resolution.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE (St. Michael North East): Mr. Speaker, my interest in the political life of this country began when I was about 12 years old, and when there were people with the colour of skin of the late Mr. D. D. Garner involved and fighting for the masses of this country, it obviously brought to me some sense of pride and held my interest.

Sir, when I call the names of persons like Wynter Crawford, the late Dan Blackett, Dr. John Wilson and the late D. D. Garner, you can readily understand where my interest in a political organisation was in those years. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned the existence of the West Indian National Congress, and it was the battle that was waged by the members of the West Indian National Congress that held my interest politically in the country. 12.55 p.m.

It is, therefore, from this background that I would like to pay tribute to the life and work of the late D. D. Garner, realising, of course, Sir, that those were the days when compensation for persons being elected as Members of the House was not as encouraging as it is today, even though it is true to say that the sacrifices which have to be made will not necessarily be compensated for even by the remuneration that there is today. I just emphasise that to say that there were persons in those days who made these sacrifices, and if we assess them, we could probably say that they did it because there was an abiding love and regard for the welfare of the people whom they asked for their support.

As the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Hon. W. O. Franklin) mentioned, it is also a bit frustrating that, in many instances, persons who have made these contributions sometimes die in service, some die just after a short retirement, and there are some who live long enough to reflect what has been the recompense for the sacrifices of service that they have rendered to the people of this country. I would honestly like not only us as parliamentarians, but the people of our country, to recognise that it is not only pomp and glory for persons to be called to service and sit in this Honourable Chamber, but it is a sacrifice that is made, and even when we are no longer able physically to be sitting in Parliament and going through the rigours of a political life, some measure of respect, some measure of appreciation, should be accorded to those persons who have gone that route.

I do not wish to be too long, because matters of this sort do grieve you and you can become emotional, and I do not wish to be so on this occasion. I regret the passing of the late D. D. Garner and I pay a very sterling tribute to the life and work that he has accorded the people of this country.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, those of my colleagues who have preceded me have, I believe, said almost all that can be said on an occasion like this about the late Darrell DaCosta Garner.

I met him first in 1948, Sir, when my family moved to the Government Industrial School. He had responsibility for St. Philip, together with Mr. Crawford, as what was then known as MCP, and like all those who have spoken, I was impressed by his presence as a man. He was an imposing personality — big jacket and big knee pant-suit and the hat — he was always adorned in a felt hat, Sir. He had a strong voice, even though I think he tended to speak quickly.

I remember that it was he, in 1948, who agitated for conditions under which the delinquents at the Government Industrial School were then labouring to be

ameliorated. Those were the days of the cow carts. Those were the days when Dodds boys had to work from 7 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the evening in the fields loading canes and loading the cow carts. It was Mr. Garner, with some very clear vision as to the objectives of punishment, who campaigned for a regime under which the boys who had been committed to Dodds would be able to do some set of skills and at the same time receive formal educational instruction. It was he and Freddie Miller, as Minister of Social Services subsequent to 1948, who promoted and implemented a change in the type of regime that there was at Dodds in 1948 when he moved there. And that kind of humane consideration must have been prompted and conditioned by an inner philosophy which was formed from his reading of the works of Marcus Garvey and the labour leaders of the immediate preceding era.

I remember Mr. Garner also in 1959, when I was head boy of Lodge School and was denied an invitation to Codrington High School next door, even though in the previous year, when there was a white head boy, the head boy and the prefects in the boarding establishment, who in 1958 were all white, were invited from Lodge School. Mr. Garner had a son who was at Lodge with me at the time, D. D. Junior, and I was concerned to get a number of wrongs right in Lodge School, and I took this matter up with Mr. Garner as the representative for St. Philip. He, in turn, introduced me to Mr. Frank Walcott one Saturday morning down here in the yard, and that matter was raised on the floor of this House in 1959. But Mr. Garner gave me every encouragement in fighting the system that then obtained at Lodge School under which black boys at Lodge School were discriminated against not only within, but outside the school. Let me just put it like that.

It is strange that in 1951, when a campaign for General Elections was formed on the basis of universal adult suffrage for the first time, Mr. Garner, who had been so committed to the cause of his race, lost his seat. But by a strange circumstance, the hurricane of 1955 was to give him an opportunity to regain a seat in the House of Assembly, which he did in 1956.

The hurricane of 1955, Janette, devastated St. Philip, Christ Church, and the southern part of this island. Mr. Garner, though not in the House of Assembly, rallied to the cause of the people who had been left homeless. — I do not think we had any deaths in St. Philip, but some in Lodge Road — and he mobilised the parishioners and tried to render and obtain as much assistance as he could from the then Ministry that was responsible. I have no doubt that the role and function that he performed in September 1955 played a significant part in his return to Parliament in 1956. 1.05 p.m.

He served as a Minister, as the others have said, for the five-year period 1956 — 1961, and all my colleagues have attested to his contribution to the development of agriculture and the fishing industry in this country.

He was close, as I found out, to his relatives in Church Village. Those in Church Village ran a shop and he, in Marchfield, also ran a shop, and they tended to corner such market as there was of the residents of the Marchfield/Six Roads area, and the Church Village- area in particular.

In the campaigns that I fought in St. Philip North, not in 1981 particularly, but in the two of 1976, Mr. Garner gave me tremendous encouragement and advice, and was a great help behind the scenes. He did not get involved actively, I do not think he spoke on any platforms, but he was always ready at planning meetings, and so on, to give of his advice, and I never forget the one he gave me: "Try and get hold of Church Village. Make sure you have Church Village." I said, 'But Mr. Garner, you can't win just by having Church Village.' He said, "And East Point and Marley Vale, too." I took that advice to heart, Sir, and I think the results in 1976 will show that I won quite substantially in those districts.

He and Mr. Crawford were the political kingpins of St. Philip for many years, and I agree with those who have said that their names will probably be always inextricably joined and indelibly linked in the minds particularly of people in St. Philip. They both rendered sterling service to St. Philip, and I join the honourable Members in supporting this Resolution and in paying respect to the life and times of the late D. D. Garner.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to associate myself with the glowing tributes that honourable Members have made on this Resolution, and I want to extend to his family my own sincere condolences.

As a mark of respect and of passing this Resolution, I ask honourable Members to stand in their places for one minute.

Honourable Members stood in their places in silence for one minute.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move the suspension of the following Standing Orders: 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1988

Order No. 1 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Speaker, from time to time this House is called on to pass Resolutions relating to the amendment of the Civil Establishment in this country, and this arises from the need, from time to time, to give permanence to certain positions which may have been temporarily provided.

Certain posts are provided to carry out the work of public administration in this country, and from time to time, because of a reorganisation, because of expansion in services or because of new responsibilities, it becomes necessary to provide additional posts to improve the work of the Civil Service either in terms of the existing work or in terms of new responsibilities, or for some other good cause.

New posts are requested from time to time, but the general approach is that the posts tend to be provided not permanently at the start, but on a temporary basis, until the ongoing needs of the departments may be established. Therein lies a problem, Sir, because from time to time, with the best will in the world some temporary posts remain temporary for an inordinate length of time. Sometimes the client Ministry might not be able to establish the need for the posts on a permanent basis, but whatever the reason, it becomes necessary periodically for posts which have been provided on a temporary basis to be made permanent depending on the assessment of the needs of the Ministry.

This particular Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order provides for the establishment on a permanent basis of some 400 temporary posts. The last occasion, I believe, Sir, on which such an amendment Order was made in terms of a comprehensive look at the Civil Establishment in this country was in 1986. It became effective from April 1, 1986, and on *that* occasion I believe over 200 posts were made permanent.' 1.15 p.m.

From time to time, Governments have to make these temporary posts permanent, and, hopefully, soon

thereafter, appointments may be made on a permanent basis to those posts of persons who may have been permanent and acting and holding those temporary posts, to give them a greater sense of security in the particular position. This, Sir, as I have indicated, is one of the attempts to regularise existing positions and to give a greater sense of security to the public service, hopefully to improve the efficiency of the operations, and to give the respective Ministries a greater capability in carrying out the business of public administration, which is so vital to this country.

The posts which are being made permanent cover a very wide range of Ministries and departments. I think the information about the spread over the many Ministries and departments is clearly set out in the order, and I will not go through them, because they are available to honourable Members. If there are any queries relating to this particular order, I will be happy to respond to them, or to take note of them and supply the information at some later date.

I, however, wish to draw attention to one small amendment to be made to the order, and this is at page 9 of the Schedule, where there is the post of Permanent Secretary. There is one Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of the Civil Service, which is listed as SI, and that should have been S2:S1. I should point out that there are two categories of Permanent Secretary, one is SI grade and the other is S2:S1. The latter grade spans both of the categories, and I am moving that that amendment be made to the Civil Establishment Order. It is at page 9 of the Schedule, Item 8, under the Ministry of the Civil Service, General Administration.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): The Opposition obviously is supporting this Civil Establishment Order. I believe that between 1985 and 1986, there may have been very close to 500 posts that may have been made permanent. I think they came in two batches. The last one may have been 200, the one of which the Prime Minister spoke.

When I first had responsibility for public administration at the National Housing Corporation, it bothered me that persons working for Central Government or quasi-governmental institutions for many years were held on a temporary basis. I have known persons to have been in temporary posts for as long as ten years, even more than that, and I found it anomalous in 1976 at the Housing Corporation that there were persons there perhaps for seven years who had not been appointed. I made it a ruling, and I expressed my views to the union, that so

long as the employees had had a good work record and had been performing in the position for three years, I would appoint that person, and I took steps to do, that.

I have a very basic philosophy; if you can have an employee on your staff for seven years and you can be paying him or her a wage every month for seven years, that is a known and identifiable cause which you take into account every succeeding year in your planning, and I could not understand why in Government there was this great reluctance to make permanent persons who had rendered service over a substantial period of time and whose work had been satisfactory. So I am glad, Sir, that the Government has now sought to make permanent 400 posts which have been on a temporary basis for a long time, and this is an on-going situation.

I believe that Governments argue that they need a little flexibility, and that is why they hold these temporary posts. I think you must move to the stage where it is almost axiomatic that after you have served a number of years and you serve well - not a long time, three years or whatever — you can expect to be made permanent, rather than having a situation of having to serve for ten years, or as Members on the other side said, be in certain circumstances where you can work for 17 years and not be made permanent. It does not do anything for the morale of the worker, and I am very glad to hear the Prime Minister emphasise that one of the considerations of this order is to give some sense of security to public workers. So we entirely agree with what the Government is doing, having done it ourselves in the past, but also because we think that it is right.

Sir, I just wish to ask the Prime Minister to have an investigation into the Government Electrical Engineering Department. It is a department where workers are very unhappy, and the general public, which has to do business with that department, also has a number of complaints and queries about GEED. I wish to draw to the House's attention one specific matter.

As I understand it, there is a category of worker in GEED who is responsible for the erection of street lights on the highways. It is my understanding that for erecting these street lights, this category of worker is entitled to negotiate a contract price with the department. This is seen as work additional to the basic work. I understand that the Ministry of Transport and Works did, in fact, cause to be paid to GEED the contract price in respect of the installation of lights on Spring Garden, Heywoods, St. Barnabas Highway and Government Hill — at least four places, there may be others - and that after some argument with the departmental heads, a price was fixed, but the workers have not been paid the contract price agreed with the departmental heads. 1.25 p.m.

There is great unhappiness in the department leading to a proliferation of allegations in the department, and whichever Ministry has the responsibility for the Government Electrical Engineering Department, I would ask that the Minister, as a matter of concern, look into this and find out what is the true position. I have certain information I would make available to the relevant Minister with a view to having it resolved. Some of the work has been paid for to some of the men, others of the men have not been paid as some of the original men have been paid, Sir, and there is great confusion and a sense of being hard done by among workers at GEED.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, I have decided to speak on this Resolution, because a perusal of it would indicate that a substantial number of the over 440 posts fall to the Ministry of Health. I believe that on this occasion 176 of these posts fall within the Ministry of Health. It will embrace, for example, the entire Drug Service, a substantial number of posts in the polyclinics, posts in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and posts in the district hospitals. But, Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that when we shall have agreed to this order, there will still be some posts outstanding for which other orders will have to be made.

Some time recently, I spoke publicly and indicated that steps were being taken, as a matter of urgency, to bring this order to Parliament because of the inordinately long time many persons working throughout the Ministries have been working in a temporary state. In particular, I was speaking then within the Ministry of Health, where the morale has been affected by decisions, which were made consciously by the last Government, to freeze appointments, promotions and training in the Ministry of Health. It is not often understood why these things were done — I am told that they were done for economic reasons — but the fact is that many of the people in these departments had reached the point where they began to believe that there was no interest in their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways it would be desirable to be able to speak on this Resolution, not so much as a Minister, but as a person interested in, and professionally concerned with, public administration as a whole. It is not understood very well by sufficient people in our region and in Barbados that the quality of production which emanates from any organisation or enterprise is a function primarily of the management of that organisation or enterprise. And the management in such a situation has a clear, undisputed responsibility to provide the proper environment within which those persons who work, those persons whose duty it is to help produce, can feel at one and part of the organisation.

There is no way to make a person feel alienated from an organisation better than the refusal to make that

person a permanent part of the organisation. And I have to agree with the view, which is expressed from time to time, that there must be some personal reason why persons in the Civil Service have to suffer the inordinate delays in their appointment to permanent positions. There is absolutely no excuse for it, except political. There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for a person to have to work — and I am the one who said it, Sir — for 17 years acting in a post. It is impossible for the authorities in an institution or in a Government not to be aware of the fact that persons are acting for longer than five, seven, ten and, in the instance, 17 years.

Mr. Speaker, I once worked for the United Nations Secretariat, and they had an inflexible, invariable rule that a person served probation for two years, and then, unless there was an adverse report of such a nature as to require a further probationary period, that person was automatically appointed to the post he or she had been recruited for.

When in 1974 the Constitution of this country was amended, the reason for, and the motivation of, the amendment relating to appointments was to make more efficient the question of appointment of people. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and much is said about this, but it will be recalled that the Civil Service itself had pointed out that the machinery for the appointment of persons in the lower grades was too cumbersome and was suffering as a result of a certain centralisation.

The Constitution which had set out originally to secure the employment of people, because it has to be remembered that when Barbados was about to become independent, the most substantial fear of persons was that jobs in the Civil Service should be secure, and hence the Constitution had rigidly imposed certain requirements, which, I think, under the circumstances, was proper. But by 1974, after having worked the Constitution for some time, it was agreed that it was desirable for the kind of flexibility which existed in services such as the United Kingdom, the United States and other advanced countries. It was with the coming of the Barbados Labour Party Administration that one or two persons with responsibility for public administration in that Government took the opportunity of a quirk in the amendment to use the amendment in ways which had not been envisaged.

Asides.

1.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have order, please. Order, please! Order! Will the honourable Member observe that the Speaker has asked to have order in this place.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the two honourable Members wish me talk about things I do not know anything about. I can speak about the things I know about

and I can talk about the victimisation that we preached about throughout this country, and which I have found in the Government, where persons were not appointed on the basis of their political affiliation. I wish to say that whether it is done by the Barbados Labour Party or the Democratic Labour Party, it is unacceptable to me. It is unacceptable to anyone of conscience in this country.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable Member for St. Peter to observe the Standing Rules of this House. I will not say so a second or third time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, Sir, is not an attempt to start a debate, which has been raging for some time, about victimisation, because the record is crystal clear. It does not require any particular research. One needs only check with persons who were appointed in the School Meals Service to discover that the Barbados Labour Party systematically determined that they would not appoint them. One needs only find the methodology and read the files to find that the Barbados Labour Party, at the highest levels, specifically, directly, and absolutely removed the names of persons from PSC5 forms and substituted other people forms. One does not need a tremendous amount of research to recognise that there were hit lists in the Barbados Labour Party's methodology, in which persons who were deemed to be associated with the Democratic Labour Party could not be appointed. And many of the institutions in this country are suffering from a certain kind of inertia brought about by personal terrorism on the part of the Government. No amount of grandstanding and the calling of two or three names will prevent those of us who have a sense of what is just from speaking about the horror which the Civil Service had to suffer under the Barbados Labour Party.

There is a systematic attempt by writing in the newspapers now to obfuscate. They wish to obfuscate what happened. But the facts are there, and the people who worked in the Civil Service cannot be swayed by the odd article here and there.

If we say that we have no sin, we may deceive ourselves, and there may be no truth in us. But we know about your sin. You may be able to point to an instance, or to instances, of unfairness under a Democratic Labour Party before and now. We grant you that. But I am saying that, from the files, we have seen a systematic decision at the highest level of the Barbados Labour Party Administration between the years 1976 and 1984 especially in which you excluded a large segment of this community from participating in the normal administrative system called the Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to put it in the record, because it is true, and a substantial number of them were in the Ministry of Health. It is now necessary for us, if we are to make this country a place administratively where young people can feel that they wish to make the Civil Service a career, to make it very clear that the only requirement for a person to gain better and higher laurels in the public administration is to be competent, efficient, committed and dedicated. That is all that should be necessary, Mr. Speaker.

No one is going to deny that in a system of administration where the decisions have to be made by the politicians, a certain political understanding forms part of that decision making. Anyone who studies the administrative systems of all political systems across the world will admit that those who are comfortable with the decision makers are more likely to be acceptable to decisions makers at the policy formulation level. Therefore, there is room for argument and discussion about who should become a Permanent Secretary, and who should not, in Administration A or Administration B. But there is no room for discussion as to who should become a School Meals worker, or who should become a maid, or who should become a porter. There is no room for discussion whether a person is a B or D to become a general worker in the Psychiatric Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Ministry of Education or any other department. There is no room, Mr. Speaker, I submit in this country called Barbados, for us to be playing the kinds of games which have been played systematically, in which people have to line up, form fours and salute to get an ordinary job as a general worker in this country.

I am not going to be party to it. I have never been party to it, and I will not be party to it now. And I reserve the right to say to the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues that I am satisfied that it was practiced during his time, whether he was aware of it or not. I am satisfied that it is a matter which needs to be aired, and it is a matter on which the political party must come to a conclusion about it so that we can move forward. If he wishes to take on this honourable Member on any particular appointment, I am willing to take him on inside, Sir, with your permission, or outside of the House. But I am not going to be drawn by his parading a name or two across this floor. If he wishes to discuss his personal appointments, that is his business.

What we are discussing today is the filling of posts. The whole Ambulance Service will be made permanent. It is providing an excellent service. It was mostly recruited during your time, but it will remain intact to the extent that they are competent, and they are proving to be.

With the new Accident and Emergency Division of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, we will ensure that every piece of equipment that is humanly possible for them to

have will be made available to them, and all the training that can be put at their disposal will be made available to them. All will be required of them is for them to continue the same level of competence and dedication which I have observed when I have taken the trouble to examine the department and the same holds good for all the other persons in all the other Ministries, but, in particular, in the Ministry of Health. There are a substantial number of people who are giving a high quality service throughout the Ministry, and whenever one has discussed with them, as we did recently in a seminar at the Sam Lord's Castle for Heads of Departments and shop stewards, what are the major problems they face as perceived by them, invariably security of tenure has been No. 1. Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is an attempt to right that wrong, although I accept, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot in the course of one Resolution correct all of the administrative wrongs which may exist. 1.45 p.m.

I recall, as I speak, that an honourable Member, who was the Minister of Agriculture, attempted when he was not a Minister to introduce a Resolution in this House of Assembly designed to have the Civil Service examined in its entirety. Mr. Speaker, you will recall the fate of that Resolution, which time does not permit, nor, indeed, circumstance require, that I recap at this stage. Suffice it to say that the creation of a Ministry of the Civil Service was a recognition of the need by the Democratic Labour Party to have the Service brought within a certain ambit of modernisation, of reform and of efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that, in the reorganisation of the Service, we have been able once again to move training to the levels where people can once again anticipate advancement and career development is instructive as to how we perceive the human resource development for this country.

Within the Ministry of Health, of which I can speak with a certain authority, we are extending the training availability and capability to all sectors of the Ministry. For some considerable time, ancillary services, such as physiotherapy, occupational therapy and other similar ancillary services to doctors and nurses, have not received the same kind of attention as the other two main parts of the health care system. It is obvious that we will have to devote a substantial amount of time and energy to bringing those aspects of health care up to the required levels, for, Mr. Speaker, they are as important, if not, in some instances, more important, than the two main sectors.

I wish, finally, to say a word on the shortage of nurses. I have said outside the House, but I wish to put it in the record, that the number of nurses who are resigning from the Service is nowhere near the figures which have been published. One newspaper published an article

in which it said that somebody had said that the NUPW had said that 25 nurses had resigned in one month. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing farther from the truth. Seven nurses, up to March 1988, had resigned for the year, and during the period 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987, the average would be about 12 per year. That is considerably lower than in the years before, when opportunities in other parts of the world were greater and when people used to leave Barbados. The numbers leaving the Queen Elizabeth service then would have been in the vicinity of 50, 60, 70 per year.

Mr. Speaker, because of the expansion of the health services over the last few years, there is a greater requirement on nursing staff in the polyclinics, in the private clinics — because many doctors are now joining together in what may be called a type of group practice - and in a number of other related areas where the nursing skills are being called into use. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the need for additional nurses ought to have been clear to a blind man on a trotting horse, but it behoved the powers that be during the same period to which I have referred to cease the systematic training of nurses in Barbados. As a result, we find ourselves in a situation in which it is going to require special efforts and circumstances for us to fill the nursing care needs of this country over the next five to ten years.

At the moment, the Community College is turning out about 35 nurses per year. In the class that will graduate this year there is only one male nurse. Were it not for the decision of the honourable Member for St. James South (Hon. N. K. Simmons) and the Cabinet to return to an accelerated training programme for registered mental nurses, we would be in the situation in which there would be more untrained nursing assistants and nurses at the Psychiatric Hospital than there are registered mental nurses. Fortunately, we have had one course that will turn out sufficient male registered mental nurses to at least keep the service at the required level.

Mr. Speaker, for the next few years we have made provision for all those persons who have worked as nurses' assistants. All those who are qualified as enrolled nursing assistants or who have been working for ten years or more as nursing assistants, we have arranged for them to be enrolled at the Community College. Enrolled nursing assistants will be able to take a two-year training programme that will allow them to become registered nurses more rapidly than the normal three year span.

Mr. Speaker, by these attempts I hope to correct the mischief that would have been created when the decision to cease nurses' training was made, unfortunately, a few years ago.

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is saying from his seat that it is not true. I am stating categorically that it is a matter of fact, it is in the record, that the Barbados Labour Party Government decided to stop training nurses, full stop, and it was said on the floor of this House

Aside

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition cannot put me off by sitting there saying it is not true. I was here in the House when the Honourable Billie Miller, as she then was, said to this House that they had too many nurses, and she said it all over Barbados. That is not a matter that is open to question. The honourable Member cannot sit in his chair and give the impression that I am telling the House lies. These are matters which even the current President of the Barbados Registered Nurses Association said publicly just last week. The Leader of the Opposition cannot even be heard to say that he does not know. I am not going to spend any more time with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: For you have only one minute more.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let it be recognised that it was a wrong-headed decision which has landed us into a mess. We are now reaping the results of that wrong-headed decision.

It was not, and it is not, my intention to hark back to that decision and to blame it for all the ills that have occurred. If one attempted to blame the Opposition for the ills in health, we would need two days to list them. Suffice it to say that we have to find ways and means to correct the obvious imbalance in our nursing needs. We have embarked on that step, Mr. Speaker, and it is only a matter of time now before, with the enlightened approach which the unions have demonstrated by their willingness to join with the management in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and in the Ministry, generally, we are able once again to have the required complement of staffing that has always been part and parcel of the reputation and position of the Barbados health service. 1.55 p.m.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of the quality of the nursing services in Barbados that substantial numbers of Barbadian nurses were able to emigrate to the United States and to London with consummate ease. This, indeed, was the case for most of the Caribbean. Today, Sir, in spite of what they say, persons cannot now get into the United States and assume that they will have permanent residence merely because they pursue the profession of nursing. The honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) would be the first to be able to tell us that, that it is not now as easy as it used to be.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this Resolution has come that will see 176 posts in the Ministry of Health become permanent. I expect that not long from now, Sir, as we tidy up the other needs, the persons who will fill them will be announced and they will know.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for your tolerance in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was a very long minute indeed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I fear the hour for suspension has arrived, so I am moving that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock today.

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

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.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the giving of notice of a Parliamentary Question, I am asking that that part of the Orders of the Day at this point be recommitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, that item will be recommitted.

QUESTION RE INSUFFICIENCY OF PLACES AT LAWRENCE T. GAY MEMORIAL SCHOOL

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:

To ask the Minister of Education and Culture: 1.

(i) Is the Minister aware that:

(a) there are insufficient places at Lawrence T. Gay Memorial School for school beginners who live in the areas surrounding the school, and that

(b) the parents of some such children who live in areas around the Lawrence T. Gay Memorial School are obliged to send their children to other primary schools because of a shortage of places at that School, thereby incurring additional costs of transportation for their children and for themselves

in accompanying their children to school, and suffering consequential inconvenience in attending their employment?

(ii) If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister give the assurance that those matters will engage his immediate attention?

2. Will the Minister state whether there is an official catchment area or Zone for children attending primary school and, in particular, the Lawrence T. Gay Memorial School and, if there is such a catchment area or Zone, the number of children in the 4/5 years age group attending the Lawrence T. Gay Memorial School and residing respectively within and outside the catchment area or Zone of the School?

3. If there is no catchment area or Zone for primary schools will the Minister consider initiating such a provision?

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (RESUMED)

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1988(CONT'D)

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, the House was considering the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order 1988.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, it was very fascinating to hear the Minister of Health, the honourable Member for St. Michael West (Hon. ii. M. Taïtt), speak about what he purports to have been victimisation on the part of the Barbados Labour Party Government against persons seeking positions in the Public Service of this country. My mind, Sir, goes back to 1972, when a young postgraduate student at the Mona Campus of the University of the West Indies applied to the Services Commission of this country to be considered for a post, a temporary position, of an Administrative Assistant in the public service of Barbados. That young postgraduate, Mr. Speaker, came from St. Peter. He received a letter from the Public Service Commission of Barbados saying that he should report to the Ministry of Agriculture of his country and work for three months as an Administrative Assistant. The young postgraduate, Sir, did report to the Ministry of Agriculture on July 1, 1972, with a letter in hand from the Services Commission of his country sent to him in Jamaica, but was told on reporting to the Ministry of Agriculture that there was no position there for him.

The name of that young postgraduate student, Mr. Speaker, was Owen Seymour Arthur. I was then a resident of the parish of St. Peter. This was 1972, and I, therefore, say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very fascinated

when I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael West, as Minister of Health, speak about victimisation. I make the general point, Mr. Chairman, because it was no secret that in 1971, that same postgraduate student was involved in what was regarded by the Democratic Labour Party as an altercation with its candidate for St. Peter at the All Saints' Girls' School, when he challenged the then candidate, as well as Mr. Caddie, on the question as to whether, in truth and in fact, the Democratic Labour Party could have been said that they brought about a social revolution in this country, given their attitude to Black Power and the passing of the Public Order Act in this country to suppress expression by black people in this country, particularly black people like myself. 3.05 p.m.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: They can laugh, Sir. But the historical records of this country will show that I had a letter from Services Commissions in 1972 asking me to report to the Ministry of Agriculture on July 1 of that year to work for three months, I reported, as requested by the Services Commissions of this country, Sir, and I could not work. I could not work at the Ministry of Agriculture in a temporary position as an Administrative Assistant under the Democratic Labour Party because I had opposed the Democratic Labour Party in 1971.

I also worked, and it was commonly known, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 as a polling agent on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party in St. Peter. When you put all of the factors together, you can see why I say that I was fascinated by the statements of the Honourable Minister of Health and the Member for St. Michael West, when he tried to convey the impression that victimisation of persons began under the Barbados Labour Party. Those who feel it, Sir, know it. I say that to the Minister of Health, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that he got the job at the United Nations that he applied for.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member would give way: I am having a lot of difficulty, as are all honourable Members, in following the honourable Member.

Laughter.

(*Aside: Give him a break.*)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: When he says that he hopes that I get the job that I have applied for, I am not sure if he understood my speech. I said I used to work, I worked from 1962 — 1965. I am not sure if he understood. It seems as if he thought that I might be applying now. There is no need.

Laughter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, all it confirms is that the United Nations does not have a person in its midst who is tantamount or equivalent to the Minister of the Public Service in this country. I stand on the point. I am thankful that the Minister of Health did not have to be at the United Nations with a person equivalent in nature to the Minister of the Public Service of this country.

Laughter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker the issue we are considering in this House today is of fundamental importance in the administration of affairs in this country. I have, Mr. Speaker, served in the Public Service of this country more recently than any other person in this House. I acted for two years as a Chief Project Analyst in the Ministry of Finance and Planning at a time when I was called on to co-ordinate the presentation of a country's Development Plan, at a time when, Sir, I was called on to offer the best technical advice within my capacity on a number of development projects, and at a time when I was called on to give the best technical advice on a programme with the International Monetary Fund.

I made the point, Sir, that he who feels it, knows it. The question of acting appointments is the most rancid issue that stands in the way of the most efficient operation of the Public Service of this country. There are a large number of persons in this Public Service who have been committed to a process of acting appointments for too long. It is a factor, Mr. Speaker, that reduces people's motivation.

What we are here considering this evening, Mr. Speaker, is nothing new. This is not the first time that an attempt has been made to establish posts. So it is not a question of my praising any particular Government. It is a question of my relating to a general problem of a country which has committed too large a proportion of its young technocrats to function in acting appointments, reducing their motivation, and one of the factors which prompted me to leave the Public Service of this country and to seek employment at the University of the West Indies was the fact that I could not see myself acting indefinitely in a position of Chief Public Analyst in the Public Service of Barbados.

I have to make the point, Sir, by comparison and contrast, that in Jamaica, which was not my country, you had a situation in which young persons like myself could, after serving a short period of probation, enjoy permanent appointment to senior posts in their systems on the basis of merit, on the basis of what they had to contribute, and not on the basis of who had served longer than whom, and who had been sent away on

whatever leave, because in the Public Service, Mr. Speaker, there are various types of leave which can confuse the imagination.

I was acting, Mr. Speaker, for a person who had gone to another area. He had set up a consultancy, and it was clear that he had absolutely no intention whatsoever of returning to his position in the Public Service of this country. But I had to act.

There is a large number of persons in the Public Service today who found themselves in the same position that I found myself in at that time, and whose motivation was seriously reduced by the fact that their career prospects were limited by this monster of an acting appointment. And I think that if we are going to be serious as a House of Parliament, we have, I think, Sir, to put, once and for all, behind us in this country the notion of acting appointments as a hindrance to the career development of the young people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, who does it affect? It affects the generation of people like myself whose parents struggled to put them through university, sometimes to put them through a postgraduate course, to come back to this country to serve, only to find that their careers cannot be developed. What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is not just putting people in a job to give them a piece of change, because too many Permanent Secretaries see it as giving people a piece of change. What we are talking about is the development of people's careers, the development of the human personality. And I wish this House would see this matter in that broadest context, that when we put people in Barbados, particularly the people who have made the sacrifice to go out and train themselves with a view to developing a career in the Public Service of this country, indefinitely in acting appointments, we are stifling the creativity of a large number of people in this society.

I, therefore, Sir, am making that point that I want to see us, once and for all, put behind us in this country the notion of anything such as an acting appointment. I think, Sir, that what should be a standard procedure is that if a person is to be regarded as capable of doing a function, the person should be put on probation for no more than six months, at which time a decision is taken as to whether the person is capable or not capable of doing the job. If the person is capable of doing the job, then, for God's sake, appoint the person to the post so that this person's career can be developed like anybody else. I put that before the House, because we must put this matter of acting appointments behind us once and for all. 3.15 p.m.

In this respect, exactly what is the role of the Ministry of the Public Service in this matter? Because the Ministry of the Public Service.....

(Aside: Civil.)

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Very uncivil.)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: He is so many different people that you must forgive me if I do not know who he is at any point anytime. But I am advised by the persons who know better, Sir, that he is the Ministry of the Civil Service.

The Ministry of the Civil Service was established, ostensibly, to bring about reform in the Public Service of this country. To date, Mr. Speaker, I have seen nothing that would suggest that.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Peter were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I make the general point that one would look for evidence of reform in the Public Service of this country in vain. Any evidence of reform in the Public Service of this country cannot be seen with the naked eye. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Ministry of the Public Service, on its establishment

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order: The honourable Member continues to refer to the Ministry of the Public Service. There is no such Ministry. It is the Ministry of the Civil Service. The Ministry of the Public Service was changed in 1987, and we now have only the Ministry of the Civil Service. That is just to help the honourable Member.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the point of elucidation of the Minister of Health, but he will understand the point that I am trying to make when I put it in its historical context.

In 1986, when the Ministry was established, it went under the nomenclature of the Ministry of the Public Service, and it had within its ranks a State Enterprises Unit that was meant to control waste in the Public Service. But the only unfortunate thing, Sir, is that the functions of that State Enterprises Unit was a duplication of the functions of the Management and Accounting Department of the Ministry of Finance and Planning. So the only demonstrable thing that one can speak of in relation to the Ministry of the Public Service is that it managed, in its bid to control waste and extravagance in the Public Service of this country, to establish a department which duplicated the functions of an already established department within the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

But we have to ask a serious question in this House this afternoon, Sir. Where are the old initiatives and plans of the Ministry of the Civil Service or the Ministry of the

Public Service, however you wish to call it, Sir, in relation to the release of the talents of a large number of well-trained Barbadians who find themselves caught particularly at the mid-management level in the Public Service of this country without the recourse to give the full extent to their creativity? Because that is the biggest problem facing the operation of the Public Service of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to operate as a public servant in two different jurisdictions. I worked in Jamaica, Sir, and the honourable Members of the other side, from time to time, make the most of the fact that I worked in Jamaica at a time when a certain Mr. Michael Manley was Prime Minister of the country. The attitude of the Jamaican administrators towards young professionals in the Public Service is remarkably different to the attitude of Barbados to its young professionals, and if we are going to reform the Public Service of this country, long established values, so to speak, such as the seniority rule, have to be brought under serious scrutiny, because what we have in Barbados is a vertical system by which you move from point to point merely on the basis of seniority, not necessarily on the basis of a capacity to contribute. There are obviously, Mr. Speaker, going to be exceptions to that general rule, but anybody who is familiar with the operations of the Public Service of this country will know that seniority is one of the prime considerations -that determine career development in the Public Service of Barbados. That is a fact.

I am not saying, Sir, that because a man has served long, he is not competent. But the point is that the system, by its very design, has to become more flexible to admit of the fact that there will be persons who will come to the Public Service in this country who should not be forced, necessarily, to go from the position of Clerk, to Senior Clerk, to Administrative Assistant, to SAO, and eventually, to Permanent Secretary, if they can serve long enough. We still have too much of that in this country, that persons have, in effect, to perform a public service 10K, that you have to endure the marathon of going through the ranks. If there is going to be serious reform in the Public Service of this country, that archaic system has to be seriously brought under consideration.

They also have to look at the extent of exposure that is to be given to young professionals in the Public Service of this country. I want to stress that point, because there is a tendency in the Public Service of Barbados to regard young people in the Public Service going abroad to relate to their peers as a luxury.

In 1977, when I was a public servant in the Jamaican Public Service, I wrote a book - I am not boasting, Sir - in collaboration with a university professor, on the basis of the work that I was doing at the National Planning Agency in Jamaica. It was expected of me in the Public

Service of Jamaica to write articles for journals and to have a working relationship with my peers in the rest of the world, whether that working relationship was by way of my attending international seminars or my going to international meetings and things of the kind.

There seems, Mr. Speaker, to be a reluctance on the part of Barbadian administrators.....

(*Aside: Hon. B. M. TA1TT: You are talking about Tom.*)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Not only Tom.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Peter were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I did not mean that offensively. You really do have people who have become accustomed to certain systems. Their horizons are bounded by their professional socialisation, as you would put it. Sir, and they, therefore, cannot depart from the boundaries of their socialisation.

John Kenneth Galbraith, of whom the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. E. A. Simmons) is very fond of quoting, once said that some people grow to love their chains and, with time, come to regard them as wings. 3.25 p.m.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, to come back to the basic point, that the reform of the Public Service is a matter that can no longer be postponed and that part and parcel of that reform is the career development of a large number of persons who are trapped in a situation of hopelessness which they themselves do not control. I really believe that the piecemeal approach that is being adopted to it, particularly as is manifested by this particular Resolution, does not entirely square with the seriousness of the situation at hand. I have to ask of the relevant Minister, Sir, and I think it is the Prime Minister, how many other persons are there who are in acting appointments in the Public Service of this country? What are their relevant disciplines? What are the specific plans of this Administration for the relief of those persons from the position of acting appointments?

It seems, Sir, that, from time to time, it becomes desirable for the House of Assembly to debate acting appointments not so much from the point of view of the proper development of the Public Service in this country, nor the career development of its constituent members,

but from the point of view of a number of other considerations, not least of which is Government's capacity to absorb things like pensions and matters of this kind. I think that we have to begin to elevate this to a higher plateau. We have, Mr. Speaker, to look at acting appointments conjointly with matters such as the widening of the scope for persons, once they have been appointed to positions, to move to higher levels thereafter.

In Barbados, we have a situation in which a person, in order to reach the zenith in the Public Service generally, has to aspire to a position of a Permanent Secretary, or alternatively, in too few rare instances, to aspire to a position of a Chief Technical Officer, which might or might not be at the same level as a Permanent Secretary.

I am familiar with other jurisdictions, as I said earlier, where a person possessed of technical skills could enter a Public Service, but need not have to enter an administrative rank, but be paid for his technical skills, because the system was sufficiently flexible for persons of technical ability to be separated from those of purely administrative capacities. Our system, which forces persons to have to go through an administrative system purely, to my mind arbitrarily discriminates against those persons with technical skills who may have more to contribute to the development of this country at this time.

It becomes, Mr. Speaker, a pertinent consideration moreso in statutory institutions where, for example, a person may have to come in as an economist, but there is only one director of the institution. The question that arises is, how can the institution continue to attract that person's services, pay him for those services and reward him and make him feel a vital part of the institution without necessarily having to appoint him as the director of the institution? It is a very serious problem, Sir.

I have had the experience of working in an institution in Jamaica as a Director of Economics of a very small, a 13-man, technical department, in which we had people, for example, doing one thing and one thing alone, monitoring the price of aluminium worldwide and monitoring the supply and demand conditions for aluminium worldwide. The question is, recognising the value of that person's contribution to the institution, how do you reward him for his services, given that there can only be one director of the institution? The point is that persons like that person have, obviously, to be rewarded on the basis of their overall contribution to the institution and should not necessarily be caught in the net of overall general rules applicable to administrative staff. That is the first point.

The second point is that he has to be given the chance to relate to his peers both domestically and internationally, something that you do not find in Barbados. I spoke earlier of the way in which young people in the

system must be encouraged to see their horizons not only within the small, domestic economy, but as an international horizon, and one has to create extraordinary rewards, sometimes, to hold persons of talent who cannot necessarily reap rewards, but are hoping to aspire to a limited number of posts within very narrow institutions. This is a very important challenge, and it is a very important area of reform which awaits serious discussion by a serious Ministry of the Civil Service if Barbados is to go forward.

I can see no evidence that any consideration is being given to issues such as these. What I see across the land is the continuation of the old situation where persons go into the Public Service in this country and, as soon as they go in, begin to look for a way out. They go into a situation where they may not only have to act in a post for a large number of years, but they may also find themselves appointed in the same position for a large number of years, where there is not a sufficient scope for those persons who come in, Mr. Speaker, imbued with enthusiasm. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will appreciate the fact that he had a few interruptions, and I would ask him to wind up at this stage.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Persons come into the system enthusiastic and seeking to make their fullest contribution to the development of this society, but find themselves trapped in a situation in which, whether it be an acting appointment or a permanent appointment, they find that they are stifled because of the rigours of controls that exist in the system. We must look at the Public Service not just with a view to appointing persons who might have been acting for a long period of time, but if we are going to respond to the Public Service of this country so as to allow it to make the most productive impact on the development of Barbados' society, I am calling for us to change our thinking as to how, first of all, we recruit talent; secondly, how we retain talent; and thirdly, how we seek to develop talent in the Public Service within the context of the best career development prospects that can be made available to the young people of this country.

Sir, the Opposition will support this Resolution, but we still are waiting on Government to give us that long expected debate on the Public Service reform as has been promised.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: (St. Michael South East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution, and I would like to make a few comments on some of the contributions made from the other side.

I find it a little difficult to follow the honourable Member for St. Peter using himself as an example. I do not quite understand the logic of what he was trying to say. If I understand him correctly, he said that in 1972, under the Democratic Labour Party Administration, he had difficulty, apparently, in getting a job, but then he came back in his own Administration, and in his own Administration he had to work for two years and was not appointed, and, apparently, left in frustration.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation: I spoke in relation to the first problem as a problem of personal direct victimisation. I spoke to the second problem as a problem general to the Barbados Public Service, one that existed not only under the Barbados Labour Party, but before the Barbados Labour Party Government of 1976, and it has continued to exist after the Barbados Labour Party has left Government in 1986.

I trust that with that explanation, that the problem of acting appointments pre-dated the Barbados Labour Party in 1976 and now continues after its exit, the honourable Member can find his true course.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I think I quite understand. I think I have powers of understanding. I can understand what he says, but I am taking him through a little logic.

In between those two periods, he said he worked in Jamaica, where he had this fantastic experience of how Government should have operated. The Government he came back to, and was part of, was there for ten years, therefore he, as one of the great planners he said he was, should have introduced into his own party some of those brilliant techniques, to which he was party. That is the point I am making.

I want to get back briefly, to a contribution made by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons). He was very clear to say that when he was Chairman at National Housing Corporation, he as an individual, not in Government - he separated himself from the Government — made sure that appointments were

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order: I also have problems with his understanding. I never said anything about the Labour Party doing one thing and I doing something else. As Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, I had to carry out the policies of the Ministry of Housing. The operation of the honourable Member's mind has suddenly disengaged itself from the context of his speech.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Thomas was very clear to say that he as Chairman of National Housing Corporation directed — I do not know how he did that, because I thought you had

to go through the Civil Service Commission and all that — that people be appointed. I want to remind the honourable Members on the other side that the problem of appointments under the Barbados Labour Party went beyond the matter of appointments.

If you take School Meals and the Home Help Service as two examples, there were people who were working for long periods, especially in the School Meals Department, and there were people who came in and were appointed almost on the date that they came into the School Meals Service, whereas people who were working for years in the School Meals Service and had very good records were not appointed. But they went even beyond that. It is a matter of history in this country that people who lived in St. Lucy were transferred to Christ Church, and those from St. Thomas were sent to St. Peter. These are the facts of what happened in Barbados. So you did not only have a problem with respect to the appointments, you had a problem with the harassment of workers. This is common knowledge to everybody in Barbados, and this happened under the Barbados Labour Party. There was not only frustration under the Barbados Labour Party because the people were not appointed, there was frustration because of harassment.

I want to get to another point raised by the honourable Member for St. Thomas. He raised the issue of the Government Electrical Engineering Department. I want to remind him that under the Barbados Labour Party, a gentleman was brought here from Guyana and put as the person in charge of that department.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Not him, the man before him, a Guyanese. A gentleman with an Indian name — I do not remember what his name is — and I think with Indian hair, too. He was put in charge of the Government Electrical Engineering Department, and it was he who frustrated that department, because the workers in that department had to do all the work for him.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I hear of talk of harassment coming from the other side, "I had to run .him out." If that is not harassment of workers, Sir, what is?

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: My information is that when investigations were carried out, the qualifications of that individual seem to have been in doubt. I think he is now a resident somewhere in the United States. He had to vacate the job. So when you start talking about the problems within the Government Electrical Engineering Department, these are not problems that started in 1986. They are fundamental problems and the frustrations in the Government Electrical Engineering Department started

with that appointment. I happen to know, because I know some of the people who work there and I know of the horrors they went through. Those people in the Government Electrical Engineering Department who had worked there for years had those problems. Those are the facts and you know about them, so when you come into this Honourable Chamber and start talking about problems within the Government Electrical Engineering Department as though they only happened yesterday, I have to take you a step back in history.

The fundamental point I am making is that what is happening today is a philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party to upgrade the appointments within the Civil Service. It is not the whim and fancy of a particular individual as happened under the Barbados Labour Party. Everybody in Barbados knows that to get a temporary job or acting job in the Government Service under the Barbados Labour Party, it had to go almost to the top for approval, and if you came from certain areas within this country, . . . 3.45 p.m.

(Aside: Like St. John.)

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: . . . especially St. John, you could not get a job. That is a fact. This is no hearsay. This is documented and well known. What we are trying to do on this side is to stop that once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make those few relevant points and support this Resolution.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, on this Resolution, which is a very important one, I was a bit surprised, quite frankly, that my learned friend from St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur).....

(Aside: Learned?)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS:..... learned seemed to have been animated by some personal animus today in such a way as to thwart his balance in a way that I have never seen it quite before. I hope that, on reflection, in respect of when he, apparently, was marching with the Barbados Labour Party group against Mr. Barrow's attempt to pass the Public Order Act for certain reasons, he realises that Mr. Barrow was pushing him in his true path, because there he was in 1970, or whenever, talking about the right of black people to protest and to associate together. That was what he was fighting for at the time against the Public Order Act.

Certain remarks made at this time by the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. MORRIS) were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the Record.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I hope, Sir, he understands that Mr. Barrow allowed him to follow the true path for which his career was destined, and, therefore, perhaps he might reflect that Mr. Barrow was doing him a favour at that particular time. Perhaps his animus and his feeling might be misplaced now in looking back, because, perhaps, you were going in the wrong direction, and, perhaps, what was happening at the time gave you the chance to look over where you were going and change.

Using personal experience as a guide to discussing matters of this range and depth can be a very bad guide. I can understand how people think about themselves when they look at a wider question of things like the establishment of positions. I know that the honourable Member for St. Peter has a broader mind to analyse these questions, as he showed as he went on to look at various other areas, but our personal experience cannot be a good guide in discussing these matters, because sometimes they can lead us down some very subjective paths.

Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at establishments, we are looking at industrial relations, and, in particular, we are looking at the industrial relations aspects of the Civil Service. And, of course, we can simplify these matters if we want to, in order to score political points.

This institution that we are discussing today is the largest single employer of persons in Barbados. There are about 22 000 persons in all, if we take the Civil Service and persons in statutory corporations. In the Civil Service itself, they can be broken down into groupings. There are those people in established positions, probably about 9 000, others who are temporary, and those who are casual.

The size of the Civil Service establishment is very important, especially in terms of Government expenditure. A few weeks ago, we were discussing in this Chamber an Appropriation Act, and we were looking at the cost to "this country of an Appropriation Bill, and we looked at the cost to this country of the total aspects of the expenditure that we have to undergo from year to year. One area that would have not been looked at to any great extent, because it is almost taken for granted in these discussions, is that of wages and salaries. I would imagine that that is going to become a very big point of issue when we complete the salaries negotiations. Already, of course, it has become an item for discussion on the political platforms, and we are getting advice from all areas in that direction.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Member for St. Thomas is now an expert.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Are you getting hot already?

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I have not said a word yet. I will be coming to you.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The honourable Member for St. Thomas can be assured that I will be giving him some advice.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: That is the only direction in which my comments will come to you, in the form of advice.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The question of the Civil Establishment is a very important question in this country. Over 50 per cent of Government's expenditure goes in wages and salaries. The question, therefore, of the size of the established labour force in the Civil Service is a very important question.

I believe that Governments, from time to time, have always looked to see what they can afford in terms of an established sector, as against the temporary and the casual, which have elements of flexibility in them. In other words, a government that would want to vary its cost by sacking people at very short notice, as might have been the policy of the last Administration, would keep large numbers of temporary and casual workers. A Government that is concerned with maintaining employment, on the other hand, like this Administration, will very early in its life, in the second year, try to establish almost 450 positions as the start of that particular measure of reform.

So let us put it within the context of the structure of the Civil Service of this country. We are talking about a large body of employed persons, and we are talking about giving this group of persons job security. And job security means income security, the two of them go hand in hand. This is very, very important.

Also understand that there has to be an undertaking by this Administration to continue to review the situation, because you have several people who are temporary and who are casual who cannot become permanent because of the nature of the positions they now occupy within the service. In other words, they might be occupying positions that can never ever become established positions, because they might be tied to projects, and the life of the projects might not be such that the post can

be converted to permanent positions. So there is no intention here to say that everybody who is temporary, or everybody who is casual, *ipso facto* because of this kind of change, must become an established worker. We do not hold out those kinds of expectations, because we are dealing within a particular structure. But whenever it is possible, it must be the duty of this Administration, of any Administration, to transfer from a process of temporary employment into permanent employment those persons who are so deserving, and who qualify for this kind of change.

We hear much about the structure of the Service in terms of flexibility and mobility, how it allows persons to move. The honourable Member for St. Peter was giving the impression that there is a certain amount of frustration among young people who want to progress rather rapidly in the system, and that there are bottlenecks created because persons have seniority within the system. 3.55 p.m.

That is not a new problem. It is not a problem that is related only to Barbados. I believe it is a problem that exists wherever there are administrations and systems. It is not peculiar to the Public Service. The same thing will happen in private enterprise or elsewhere. In my own time, my short time of life so far, I have seen tremendous changes. When I reflect on the ages of the persons who are now Permanent Secretaries in this country, they appear to be relatively young persons. It seems to me that my own contemporaries are holding positions of importance within the sector.

So do not let us look at the system as though we are talking about it 20 years ago. Let us look at it as it is now where persons who graduated from university in our time are now holding senior positions. I can talk about the National Insurance Office, where the top persons are people who came out of the university maybe 14 or 15 years ago. Do not let us look at the system as though it has been consigned in time, it has not changed, it has just hardened in time and has not moved, because that is not true. You will always get problems where bright young men come into a system and feel that they cannot move quickly enough.

Quite frankly, I am a person who has a tremendous respect for experience, and I believe that people who have been assisting for a very long time, and who have moved through the system, have moved through on various criteria. I do not believe they just float to the top of the system. They get there not only by seniority. People speak pejoratively of seniority, but there is a lot to go for seniority.

I am not saying that that alone is very important. But when I hear the honourable Member for St. Peter

many people who believe that because you have a first class honours degree or a second degree, you must get as much money as a director or anybody else.

Those who are *an fait* with things like job evaluation know that there is a spread of criteria that you have to use to evaluate a job or, indeed, a person. If there is a department running, there is a head in Administration, but somebody may go in there with three or four degrees. That person might be very strong in terms of qualifications, but that might be one of six skills that you might be evaluating the position on, and pay. So I can understand a certain amount of urgency in young persons who want to move through the system, but they must not believe that systems that have been established for years were done so by whimsy. They were done so by serious application.

When you talk about reviewing something like the Public Service — and, as I said, you are talking about, let us say, 16000 jobs in several different categories — can you go in for Civil Service reform in a very slap-dash manner¹ It is a very serious matter.

Everybody today is talking about regrading. The kinds of energy, expertise, and skill that have to be put into a total regrading exercise are tremendous, and one has to understand that you need the kinds of understanding from the trade union movement, the Government, et cetera, to start looking at that, and to understand too, that it is not a short-term process. It is a very complex system. What has been happening in recent times is that there have been piecemeal changes, and that approach has caused a lot of bother and concern. When you are dealing with a complex system that has been arrived at through scientific analysis and calculation, and you just start playing with parts of it, you are going to create a lot of imbalances in the system.

It is true that we need Civil Service reform in the terms of looking again at established positions, and in terms of regrading positions, because of changes over time, but it is not the sort of thing that can be done easily. I know it is going to call for some time where the Government has to show the political will to say, 'Look we are going to put this on the front burner. This is an urgent item on the agenda, let us look at it.' You may need to bring in people from outside, ILO experts or whatever, because of certain limitations you might have locally. It is the sort of thing that you have to study very, very carefully.

I am sure this is something that is very important, but I do not want anybody to give the impression that this is the sort of thing that should fall in the lap of the Democratic Labour Party and that you should solve it in

I

with a small company, it takes time. Sometimes you have to pull it out of normal negotiations and recognise it is going to go a couple of years before you can complete it. You might be talking of a complement of just over 100 people, sometimes less. My very expert colleague, I am sure, who does this as a normal thing from day to day, will be discussing this in some more detail. It is not the sort of thing about which we should give the public the opinion that you can just reform the Civil Service tomorrow, or in a week's time, or in a year's time even. It is the sort of thing that will call for a lot of discussion.

I want to look at a very important area, although not in the sense that it is a matter of weight out there. I have in this Chamber heard the Leader of the Opposition, and especially at one time my colleague for St. Michael Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes), raise the question of the role that trade unionists have to play in politics, all within the discussion of industrial relations. I remember there seemed to have been some understanding by the sitting Members in Parliament of the Opposition that trade unionists have a legitimate role as parliamentary representatives of the people.

This is not a question that can be the subject of an academic discussion at any level at all, because industrial relations as a science impinges closely on areas such as economics and law. It is related very closely to a number of disciplines, and, therefore, clearly the economists would not question the role of an industrial relations expert.....

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Should not.)

Mr. R. L. MORRIS:.... should not to be a representative of workers in Parliament, nor would the lawyer, because in the same way that they have a right to represent big business, they would know that the industrial relations expert has a right in Parliament to represent the small people, the workers.

But I noticed that there has been out there on the platform and among writers — I cannot call names like Peter Scott, I am sure, so before you warn me, I will not call his name - my friend Mr. Scott and others, these minions — I would not call Mr. Scott a minion, but there are some others I would call minions — continue to go out there and try to give the impression that trade unionists should not be in the House of Assembly, and if they are there, it means that they are going to work against the best interest of the working class people. I want to spend a few minutes on this. I cannot get heated on it, because it is a matter more of jolly and fun than anything else for me, but I want to spend a few moments on it.

I want to make this very clear, and this is personal. I see myself as a trade unionist, a politician, and also a person who is fervent in the co-operative movement, and I have no distinction to make between them. I am not a trade unionist today, a politician tomorrow, and a co-operative person the next day. I am all three in one. I make no apologies to anybody for that, and I do not put one ahead of the other. They are all part and parcel of me, because they come together in a philosophy, which says service to the people of this country, and for me, the people mean the working class people. Those are the three avenues that I choose to associate myself with, and I hope that the Press is hearing this clearly. I have no apologies to make to them or anybody in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair please.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am a member of the Democratic Labour Party . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not saying it for the Speaker to hear.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Democratic Labour Party, the only party in this country that represents the working class. I am a member of the Barbados Workers Union, with a history of over 40 years, going to 50, of representing the working class. It is the only one that is totally committed to the working class. I say that.

We do not get on with any shenanigans about climbing through windows and that sort of nonsense, and we do not negotiate in public everyday. Nobody from the *Nation* or *Advocate* can call me about any negotiations with Government. I do it where I have to do it. I do not have to go on platforms and talk, because I have the opportunity to sit down in front of an employer and talk. I also have the opportunity to meet with the workers at anytime at Solidarity House and discuss matters with them. I learned at the feet of Gamaliel. Let us understand that very clearly.

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The old-time, antagonistic posture that a trade union has to be at the throat of the Government all the time, or the employer, would be held only by diehard conservatives who know no better. The belief that a trade unionist should not be in politics would be held by those who would have existed before the 1930s, like the Piles and Wilkinsons. Those who reflect that thinking are antediluvian in thought. They cast back to a former time. They are political dinosaurs, fossils, troglodytes!

Laughter.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: They can have no respect from a young generation of people. They will be written off from history. 4.05 p.m.

The ones who get on platforms in Independence Square pretending to be experts, the one that is going to be renamed as Heroes Square, and invite the people of this country, after having spoken on their own part about wage restraint for years, having raised it as a red herring only to hear the Prime Minister say there will be none, because they operate in a rather strange way, they start some nasty rumours in this country and then we have to come and rebut them. And then they get offended when we rebut them.

One came in here, Sir, saying that he was sure there was going to be wage restraint, and then when that was rebuffed, went into Independence Square and told the people after, ten per cent up front and across. I did not go to the meeting, Sir, I do not know who said it. He started out with wage freeze first — listen to his consistency - went to wage restraint . . .

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

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Oh, it is you?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: I want to make it clear. Nobody on this side, neither the honourable Member for Christ Church West, the honourable Member for St. Peter, nor the one for St. Thomas, ever advocated a wage restraint or wage freeze. Not one of us did it, Sir. What we have said is that that Government, headed by the Prime Minister, in October and November last year agreed with the International Monetary Fund that there will be wage restraint in Barbados. I have the document here. We will get to it later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, I am giving Members a fair amount of room to make their speeches, but I do not want to lose sight of the Resolution before us.

Please continue.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Most of us do not have the short memories the Barbados Labour Party Administration has always spoken about, we know what happened between 1976 and 1986. We know the "tighten-your-belt" speeches, we know "the increase is no more than five per cent." Very finite limits used to be set, there was not any question of any discretionary area, they used to say no more than five per

cent. We heard all of the arguments coming from the late Mr. Adams and Dr. Blackman, the ex-Governor of the Central Bank, and they were made very strongly, and as a trade union, we know we had to feel the brunt of the tremendous psychological and emotional pressure that was put on the workers in this country. We had to face that as a daily reality. We have not faced it from this particular Administration.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Whatever you might have read or seen or heard, that cannot be used to guide us and the people of this country. We have to go by the pronouncements of the Administration — and the Prime Minister is quite competent to speak for this Administration — and we have to go by his actions. We will analyse, we do not need anybody to bamboozle workers by telling them that you negotiate industrial relations by looking historically at what the cost of living was over the last two years and futuristically in terms of what is going to happen. What else did he put in? He dropped in the surcharge, heaped everything together in a pool, and then said you must get X per cent across the board.

I know the honourable Member for St. Thomas very well. The honourable Member for St. Thomas will know that we are starting a programme of beautification, he would get word, and when we start he will get up and say, "You know, that was my idea." So he would come up now and say you cannot get less than ten per cent, and if it so happens that the negotiators end up at ten per cent, he will say, That was my idea, I forced the Government and the trade unions to come to ten per cent.' So you cannot beat him; however you go, you cannot beat him. Now he is at ten per cent. He put that as an acceptable minimum, and then his minions in the Press are reporting in today's paper that the Government says four per cent. That is a joke. I am not sure what they are quoting about this four per cent, but that is a starting figure. He wants an end figure of ten per cent and the Government starts out with a starting figure of four per cent, and you are commenting that that is ridiculous.

Like the Prime Minister, I can say I do not know where they will end. I think the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. C. L. Trotman) will have some idea in his mind where he will want to end, but as a believer in the process of industrial relations, the free and voluntary process that we have known in Barbados for a very long time, that we have not tried to interfere with, before and since the Labour Party — we had a rocky time between 1976 and 1986, but we are back to the process of free and voluntary industrial relations — we have no doubt that in a short period of time the total wages and salary bill that will be paid to these persons that we are going now to establish, that will be known.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Resolution because it is doing a very important thing. There are several persons, all of us here, who are looking at statistics. We are looking at names, we are looking at what really are just words. But, in fact, they relate to people, and many of us would know the people out there, the people who the honourable Member for St. Peter said will have a certain sense of insecurity because they are not established.

As the honourable Member for St. Michael West, (Hon. B. M. Taitt) who usually very eloquently speaks on these matters, said, people have been in positions for 15 or 16 years acting. It is not an enviable position to be in. Those of us who have not the difficulty of having to think whether we are established in positions or not perhaps cannot understand the fears that are experienced by such persons who are in acting positions.

A lot of research has been done recently on causes for satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the work place. Surprisingly, things like salary will come No. 4. Persons are not always very concerned about the rate of salaries, it is not the number one concern, the most important thing for most persons is, 'Is my job secure?' It is very, very important. Then, 'How do we relate to each other in this particular place? Can we speak without thinking that perhaps the words that we use will go back to somebody else?' And we live in a regime of fear. 'Can we make a contribution? Are we participating in the human resources effort within a particular place? Does somebody listen to my advice as being meaningful?'

So we have to look again at industrial relations, which is a very dynamic thing. You have to look at that all the time, and a Government certainly that says up front that job security is very important, that we need to establish this as a starting point for discussions, certainly has made a very important point.

I remember going into some negotiations, Barbados Workers Union versus the Government of Barbados — this is some four years ago, Mr. Adams at the time was the Prime Minister — and we had to establish very early that one of the ground rules was that people would not be made redundant as a result of anything that came out of the negotiations. You had to do that, because the background was that a number of public servants had been sent home, and, therefore, you had to set out that ground rule very very early.

I am therefore very glad to see that this is a step. It is not a very big step, because I agree with the honourable Member for St. Peter that is an ongoing operation. It is nothing new, it is ongoing, and I believe that soon we will be hearing that this kind of action is going to be taken in terms of the teachers. Certainly we would not want to think that the workers in the Civil Service have this kind

o! >c-cunty oi tenure, but ii'ui we arc ;40i;!t; u> U've out
our teachers. 4.15 p.m.

I am not carrying any brief for any person, but I have been hearing the President of the Teachers Union calling for a Teachers Service Commission. I know that there is provision for that, and I believe that there needs to be some serious national discussion about the need for such an institution.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Peter speaking about professionals coining into institutions, the mobility for professional as against the administrative, and certainly in the teaching situation this is true, too. You can find that a top-class teacher who wants to teach does not want to administer anything. You might find that a headmaster is in control of his school — a headmaster need not be a good teacher — but you could be the best teacher in the world and you could be getting results, turning out good students and so on, but you are never ever going to get the kind of pay or the reputation as those people in administration, whether they are head teachers, head of department or whatever.

The fact that you are a good teacher means that you are circumscribed in terms of where you can go in the systems. There is no professional movement for a teacher. A teacher is not considered a technical officer or anything like that, or a professional in that sense, but certainly it can thwart very good teachers, who will then leave and look for expression elsewhere. So it is nothing unique to the Civil Service. It is something that I believe you will find in any organisation.

It is also not easily answerable, and certainly administrative changes do not settle these things, because a lot of the problems we deal with are not easily answerable to legal provisions. You have to deal with persons' perceptions of themselves. You have to deal with the opportunities for self-fulfilment within the system, because if you do not find it one way, and you can find it somewhere else, then you might not find the same kind of grousing. And it has to do with the kinds of relationships that you establish within the society as a whole.

I think this is a good move by the Government, and I would hope that they will want to further this exercise on a fairly regular basis, because it can only augur well for the workers in this country. It is only through this kind of satisfaction that workers will produce. They will be able to be productive because they are operating against a background of security and a certain degree of satisfaction.

I thank you, Sir.

and what it gives effect to will introduce some confidence once again in the Public Service, and. that it will be seen by the public of Barbados as an attempt to rationalise and carry out some of the philosophical positions that the Democratic Labour Party has enunciated with respect to the Public Service.

The debate has ranged, in a sense, fairly far and wide. Perhaps for the first time in a long time, the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur) has attempted to be original and has thought up a new way of approaching issues in here. He has departed from the standard form text that he has used time and time again when he speaks. But when he did so, unfortunately he felt it was necessary to localise the issue around his own experiences in the Public Service, and in so doing, he made a comment that is very telling.

He said that the present Minister of the Civil Service should, in a sense, be disqualified from holding that position because he was a former public servant. That equation can be inverted. There is nothing that would disqualify the honourable Member for St. Peter more in speaking in this debate than having served in the position in Government he once held with respect to the department that was responsible for co-ordinating statutory corporations. So people should, as far as I am concerned, try to detach themselves from this kind of personal assessment of issues.

He is saying that one man is not suited because he was a former public servant, but yet, he was suited for public office. He was dragged from the Ministry of Finance and carried to St. Peter as the brightest and best thing that had occurred in Barbados for a decade. He was run as a candidate and he now sits in the House of Assembly, obviously believing, in all modesty, that he has more impeccable and other qualifications for the role which is now his in Barbados. That is an unfortunate approach.

He called in here for discussions on the Public •service. This has given him an opportunity. He talked about victimisation that has been visited upon him, and that when the history of Barbados is written, perhaps that victimisation will find itself written into the history of the country. What I am certain will be written into the history is that he failed as a public servant, and he is now failing as a person who has a duty to exercise discretion and, in my view, a sense of commitment to some philosophy when he is debating in this House of Assembly.

The problem right now with the honourable Member for St. Peter with respect to these positions, and I am only trying to analyse it, is that he fought for two years for the Barbados Labour Party with respect to matters of finance. It was his position in every Budget, they outlined his predictions and everything, and all of a sudden they have resurrected the Labour Party's former leader to come now and take all the glory, and to walk all over Barbados and suddenly herald the economic policies of the Barbados Labour Party.

He is now being treated like a boy. There are pictures on the front page of the newspaper of him carrying a piece of paper to the former Prime Minister to have it corrected. He is now being relegated, as far as I am concerned, to the background. We warned him in here that that is what would happen. It is now happening, and, therefore, only he can take the blame for whatever the consequences are.

The Barbados Labour Party had ten years in which to make some kind of change in the structure of the Public Service in Barbados. A Resolution was moved in this House with respect to the Public Service by a former Member of Parliament, Dr. Cheltenham. The Resolution, as far as I can glean from the debate, related to the establishment of a working group, I think that is what it was called, to examine all aspects of the Public Service. A debate took place in here on that.

The Democratic Labour Party produced its manifesto in 1986, in which we outlined our position on the Public Service, and the honourable Member for St. Peter can find comfort in what we proposed:

"Institute assessment and review procedures designed to ensure that merit and initiative among Public Servants, at all levels, are recognised and rewarded."

"Minimize grievances within the Public Service, by attending promptly to all legitimate grievances." Obviously appointments would be one of these things.

"Enhance the capability of the Public Service Commission to function efficiently and effectively."

The Barbados Labour Party manifesto — I have no quarrel — also dealt with the Public Service. We are all, to some extent, *ad idem* on the kind of.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am *ad idem* with sensible people in Barbados on how the Public Service in Barbados should be looked at in respect of reform. I am not saying I must be the reformist, or we in here must be it. There are other sensible people who, perhaps, could

form a group that would look at the Public Service and determine areas of its efficiency and its effectiveness, and how it will carry us into the 21st century. The Barbados Labour Party takes that position, and we, perhaps, have taken that position, with respect to how we see the function of the Public Service. But the difference is what the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party is and what it practises. It is too sweet, you see!

We know about the 1974 amendments to the Constitution. The Barbados Labour Party had a big philosophy on that in 1974. They carried their big intellectuals all over this country and opposed the amendments, and suddenly this week in the newspaper, one of the prominent writers for the Barbados Labour Party said that the reason they never repealed it is, in effect, because it was too sweet. It gave them too many opportunities to do what they wanted to do in respect of the Public Service and temporary appointments. So I am saying that how you conceptualise things and what you actually do is at very wide and significant variance. That is the real problem with the Barbados Labour Party. 4.25 p.m.

I did not say it, Mr. Ezra Alleyne said it. I am — speaking about him, Sir, with respect to his public function, as a writer of public interest in the newspaper. I do not know if I can refer to him in that sense. He is a columnist in the *Nation* newspaper who writes for the Barbados Labour Party.

All of that walking around Barbados and philosophising, publishing of booklets, carrying on for a year or more about the 1974 amendments, and the Barbados Labour Party's position can be reduced, 14 years later, in effect, to being that it was too sweet, we liked it that way, therefore we would perpetuate it! That is the sum total of what the Labour Party is now reduced to.

There has been a lot of derogatory remarks in this country about the establishment of the Ministry of the Public Service. It has been called the octopus. An attempt was even made in this debate to put it down. Things have been said about it that have never been said about any other Ministry.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But I am telling you what you do not know. It is your Honourable Leader today — he is the leader now, unfortunately — . . .

(Aside: Which one?)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The honourable Member who is absent. I do not like to speak in people's absence, but he is absent today.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, that happens. I knew he was in the precincts.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), who is not in his seat, made a call in this Chamber, on July 25, 1978, and what he was saying is that he had really made the call some 20 or so years before the establishment of a Ministry of the Public Service. Since you do not know about it, I am going to tell you.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a debate that took place on July 25, with respect to the same Resolution moved by Dr. Cheltenham. All the talk about the octopus and all the talk about the damage it would do, this is what he said, and you can carry it back to your National Executive Council and let the Young Socialists and other people know what his position is on issues. It varies so widely from day to day, and he is your leader now!

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The only thing that has been more varied in this debate from what the leader of the Opposition said was the fact that the Honourable former Prime Minister, Mr. Bernard St. John, supported the Resolution and they voted against it later on. Read the debate for yourself and see!

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I cannot believe it!

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You could not be serious about public issues. You could not be serious about the Public Service. You were just grandstanding. This is what he said, and I quote, Sir, from page 1073 of the debate on July 25, 1978:

"Mr. Speaker, the management of the Civil Service itself needs overhauling. Before I was actively engaged in politics, some years ago I delivered a lecture to what is now the National Union of Public Workers - at that time it had another name — in which I said we could almost make out a case for a Ministry of Public Services."

He went on to say in this debate what the critical function of this Ministry would be.

He said he recognised - I want to be fair to him — one danger, which would be:

"....putting too much political influence in the hands of a particular Minister. I think we ought to be able to devise schemes which would minimise this, but would get the other benefits that would accrue from such a structure."

He went on, and the very thing he proposed is what has happened. He said:

"Let me back my general statement with concrete facts to make you realise that my inference is correct. We have an Establishments Division which deals with some aspects of the Civil Service, operated by a Permanent Secretary; we have a Training Division which deals with some personnel questions of training, so to speak, under another Permanent Secretary; and we have a Personnel Division under another Permanent Secretary, and there are not many instances that there is real adequate machinery for consultation between them. But what is worse is that although we have a Training Section, the manner of training is itself divided among three different Ministries, so when you come to deal with scholarships, for example, the Ministry of Education handles some, the Training Division handles some, and the Director of Finance and Planning handles some."

That is what he said. But yet, as soon as the Ministry of the Public Service was established in this country under the Democratic labour Party to carry out the significant reform and the consultations that had been recommended, the Labour Party carried out the most vicious attack that was possible.

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not have time for that element, that kind of personality thing. They also said it was a super Ministry.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: They did not curse the Minister. Do you mean the Minister is a super Minister, too?

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You said it was a super Ministry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member give way? I have allowed all other Members to speak without much interference. I have already made what I consider an appeal for honourable Members to give other Members a chance to be heard. I hope I will not have to intervene any more. Will the honourable Member continue his speech?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the debates are replete with their interventions when I am speaking. I do not mind.

The point is that I am talking about the substance of the Labour Party's complaints, or I do not even know what you wish to call them, in this House of Assembly as distinct from what they practise when they are in Government. And the honourable Member for St. Peter finds himself in a difficult position. He does not know what the philosophy of the Labour Party is, and he, with thousands of others, have that problem. Therefore, when he comes in here, he either has to personalise issues or he has to read the textbooks and repeat the same speech time after time.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a rule in this House that there should not be any repetition. I would not accept that any Member comes in here and repeats himself on any issue.

Laughter.

(*Aside:* Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On different occasions!)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I would abide by your ruling.

Laughter.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is undeniable. On different occasions, the honourable Member has found it necessary to ensure that the content remains the same. Sometimes even the monotone remains the same and there is no difference in the manner in which it is delivered. I represent a substantial number of persons who are of the view that, if he is going to speak, we have heard it already, it is better to hear what comes before or after, sometimes depending on which of the other two honourable Members is going to speak before or after.

The point is that we are talking about the Democratic Labour Party today, after two years in office, carrying out a course of action that led to the establishment of the Ministry of the Civil Service and now coming further to make certain positive moves with respect to the establishment of posts in the Civil Service. I have the record here, I do not have to search for it, because I

asked for it particularly with respect to the Civil Establishments (General) (Amendment) to see how many times the Labour Party did it. I would like them, if they are so courageous, since they like to play to the gallery - I do not mean the gallery in here, Sir, I would not be so offensive, and I know that your ruling would not allow them - they would wish to bring information to the public on the number of occasions on which they have made any such attempts at reforming, or carrying out even the necessary things that are required within the Public Service.

A wonderful debate took place in here on the Civil Service. Obviously, the Member for St. Peter has never read it. That is a tragedy. Spend some time doing that. I do not have a lot of free time, but I found some time. I am certain you have free time; therefore, you should be able to spend some time reading. One of the best things that the Barbados Labour Party did, perhaps, is inviting you to run as a candidate, because we have reduced the Public Service by one person who, obviously, did not have a clue about what was going on in the particular Ministry in which he served.

Laughter.

4.35 p.m.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But he must tell him why he said he does not want to marry a Bajan woman. Tell him that! If you want to get nasty, we will mix it up.)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order! I left the Public Service of Barbados in 1982 and came into Parliament in 1984.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do not be decent about it, man.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I intervene to make a comment.

(*Aside:* Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Nasty! I am going to, curse him this evening.)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable Members to control their language.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking honourable Members to control their language within what we consider good parliamentary language. I hope that honourable Members will stick to that kind of debate.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir.

Since we, as politicians, are required to have a clue about what happens with respect to the Public Service, because these are the instruments through which the policies of political parties are brought into effect, — it means that we should research. A good debate took place and those persons who participated in it are to be commended. The then honourable Member for Christ Church East is to be commended for being courageous enough to debate it, even after being asked by his Prime Minister — the late Prime Minister Tom Adams — on the floor of the House to withdraw the Resolution. But he pursued it, and it succeeded eight votes to six, and the Opposition had to vote with backbenchers on the Labour Party. And they want to talk nowadays about people taking positions of conscience as being something new and different!

That debate took place in this Chamber, and I am saying those persons should be commended for taking the opportunity to speak on it, for analysing critically the Public Service and its performance, and looking at areas of change that are necessary. I have said what the manifesto pledges are. I am saying that the public servants are critical as instruments in respect of implementing what might be called the collective will or the manifesto pledges of a particular political party which has been elected to office. So we all say we need to develop management systems. We need specialisation and we need people who have the ability in these areas. We have a growing offshore sector — the honourable Member for St. Peter will agree with me on this - and there is a need for some kind of specialisation and persons, with some kind of qualification to perform functions within the offshore sector. This is one of the things that Government has to look at.

In the health services, there is a growing need for greater specialisation, and the Public Service therefore has to respond, and it does not respond by itself. It is as a result of policy decisions made by politicians that persons are appointed in positions where there is greatest need, based on whatever assessments are made. But if we are making no assessments at all of what is happening in the Public Service, if the Labour Party says we do not want a commission and we are foolish enough to follow the Labour Party by dismissing a creative suggestion from its own back bench, as far as I am concerned, we will make no further headway with respect to our development of the Public Service and looking at it critically.

Today, more than ever, because of the kind of legislation we have with respect to administration, there is also a need for people to understand their roles more carefully. Because Administrative Law has opened up certain remedies to people which have been there in common law, but certainly are now more clearly enunciated on the Statute Book. Therefore, Ministers have to be careful in the manner in which they exercise their

discretion as Ministers, or make decisions affecting people's rights and responsibilities. The public sector, therefore, in other words the civil servant, has a critical role in terms of advising Ministers on what the pros and cons of a decision are, and ensuring that the Minister gives reasons for those kinds of decisions that may affect a person's well-being or whatever.

We have to review the promotion and appointments procedures. Perhaps the suggestions that have been made by some members of the Opposition, those that are constructive, can be looked at. We can look at the debate on what was said in 1978 prior to it being stopped, and we can consider whether there is valid need for the establishment of some form of commission, working committee, or whatever, to examine the Public Service.

I wish to say something else about the constitutional amendment, because this is a very critical thing. I believe that if there is going to be this continued reference by either former public servants or people who believe themselves to have more intelligence than anybody else in this country, who write in the newspapers with respect to the constitutional amendment, let us have an analysis done of the effects of this constitutional amendment on the Public Service, what the consequences have been, and whether there was any valid justification for the arguments put forward by those who opposed it. Let us look at it, because if it is wrong, we can take it off the Statute Book. But I am fairly certain that, if that assessment is done, there will be no need for that, and those persons who, from their sanctimonious position, are the persons who, very often, when they were public servants, were responsible for making appointments under that very section with no caution at all, will then have to review their own positions, because they would understand very, very clearly that this constitutional amendment has not been as devastating as is suggested. It will therefore silence those shallow critics and stop them from making those kinds of continued criticisms, which, as far as I am concerned, are just pestering people with respect to an amendment to the Constitution which may not have done' any substantial harm since it was introduced.

We are moving into the 21st century, and as the Honourable Minister of Health indicated, and I agreed with him, young people in Barbados would like to ensure that the kind of Public Service that they can aspire to is one in which they will be rewarded on the basis of merit for their performance. I must also say that if they fail, or if they are caught carrying out techniques that are not in the best interest of public management, there must be easier ways to get rid of them, too. That is just my view. I am therefore saying that that is the kind of Public Service that I look forward to meeting, the kind of Public Service that would be able to meet the challenges of the 21st century - the age of information, the age of the computer - and that greater creativity may, as a result of

that, then demonstrate itself, as a result of us taking a serious look at the Public Service and at the relationship between the public servants and politicians in this country.

Young people would like to know, therefore, that in the 21st century the Public Service is dependable, that it is a Public Service that works efficiently and effectively in service of the people of Barbados, that it is staffed by people who feel secure in their jobs and comfortable operating in the system as it exists, and that it is a Public Service in which inefficiency and waste are rooted out at all levels. That is the kind of thing that we should be discussing, the policies, not who get the worse deal in the Public Service, in which country in the world, and what was done under the Labour Party.

We all know, the public servants know, I do not have to go any further than a Ministry and meet two public servants who can tell me of some way in which they were disadvantaged as a result of the practices that were carried out by the Barbados Labour Party in the ten years in which it was in office. It is a simple matter, and it is something that must come to an end, and in two years we have been able to take significant measures in the establishment of the Public Service Ministry and in this particular measure to ensure that the Public Service once again has confidence that there will be some reform, rather than the position of the Barbados Labour Party, which, as far back as 1978, rejected out-of-hand creative advice from its back bench, and nothing was done from 1978 until 1986 with respect to reform in the Public Service - nothing whatsoever.

So I want to ask how it is that, all of a sudden, the Labour Party is able to adopt the position that they can come in this Chamber and can call the names of four public servants, and, through the newspapers, talk about the octopus and make other kinds of, as far as I am concerned, irrelevant criticisms. Anytime you talk of the Public Service in this country, the honourable Member for Christ Church West calls the names of a few public servants, some of whom he may have advised, I do not know. He calls their names as though that demonstrates that an entire Public Service had been demoralised by the Democratic Labour Party. There needs to be something more than that. 4.45 p.m.

The public servants are to be involved, as far as I am concerned, in consideration of matters that relate to their own well-being and welfare. It is as simple as that. It is no point getting up with the attitude that* because you served as the chairman of a board, or you have been in some public office, you must defend it all the time. Look to the future, because if you have children, or if

you hope to have them, they will have to live with whatever changes we are responsible for bringing about in this country today. That is the most important thing.

There is not going to be any overnight revolution with the present crop of politicians, I can assure you of that. It will take time. With the kind of system of government we have, it will not be an overnight revolution. But it does not mean that we have to take issues as important as those relating to the Public Service and trivialise them in the manner in which they have been done by the Opposition. Lift the standard of debate, take it out of your own backyard, carry it to the wider horizons. I think that is the best approach to adopt in the House of Assembly.

Thank you.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN (St. Michael East): Mr. Speaker, I do not seek to prolong what has been a very lengthy debate on this issue, I merely want to make a brief response for the record to an issue raised by the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) with respect to the Government Electrical Department.

He alluded to the fact that, for about the last four years, a practice has grown up whereby employees of that department have been given contractual work over and above their normal duties. My advice is that they have been paid overtime for such work. My advice is also that this practice, when carried out, was illegal, because this contractual work was done during the normal course of duties. In short, these workers drew two incomes, their regular earnings and their earnings from the contractual work. This was an abuse of Government time and it has been stopped.

The issue therefore arose as to whether persons having failed to perform their regular duties while they were carrying out this contractual work, should be paid both sets of wages. The Ministry is at present looking at it.

My own inclination is to pay them, since the institution of the practice was not their fault. It was carried out by ministerial fiat in 1984, and ever since then the workers have been looking forward to this money, blissfully unaware of the fact that infractions of the law were being committed.

I can assure this Honourable House that these malpractices have now been brought to an end, and once the accounts are squared, this particular problem will not rear its ugly head again.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN (St. Michael Central): I wish, Mr. Speaker, in my professional capacity, as well as serving in this Honourable Chamber, to express satisfaction that some initial step has been taken in a matter about which the trade union, the Barbados Workers Union, has for many years expressed very grave concern.

Like many others, I am a believer that the movement of persons from temporary to permanent will establish a greater measure of job security, it will allow for a feeling of freedom from political harassment, it will allow for there being some degree of facility in computing the pensions when those persons reach retirement age, and it will act as a motivator for greater performance by the individuals in their work places.

Over a considerable period, Mr. Speaker, the organisation I have the honour to represent has consistently made demands for permanent appointments, for on-the-job training, for specialised training and for clearly defined systems for advancement. Each of those demands standing on its own is an important demand; put together, they represent what, in my view, and the view of my organisation, would be a prerequisite for the establishment of the kind of Public Service which would be a model for others within the region to follow, and in which persons might consider themselves to be treated in a manner that would lend to advancement for themselves, for the departments and for the Service as a whole.

It is regrettable that, over time, we have not been able to have the number of permanent appointments that we should have looked for and should have liked. As a fact, we have had problems all along. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that we have had occasion, for the sake of argument, when the Government of the day in 1975 had allowed for an arrangement where workers who served in the Public Service could leave the Public Service and could thereafter return to the Public Service and, provided they had served five years, to have the years continue. When some time after that it was recognised that the casual employees were not to be similarly treated, within a couple of years we were making representation for casual employees to be treated in much the same way.

I remember that this particularly came to our attention when the practice was discontinued whereby casual employees, who used to serve driving buses or working in casual work in the Public Service properly, used to go overseas to work in the United States Immigration Service cutting canes or picking fruit, or used to take time off even within the crop season in Barbados to harvest the canes in Barbados. We first realised around 1979 that such workers would have to resign, and that they had no opportunity for being re-engaged within the Service, and ever since that time around 1979, my colleagues and myself - the General Secretary, the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Hon.

E. E. Greaves), more latterly the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Mr. R. L. Morris) and myself - have been concerned with trying to get some- ^ thing done about this. So it was a matter of some great satisfaction when the Member for St. Lucy, then a Senator, brought a Resolution in the Senate to get something done about the matter in 1986, and when, subsequently, the Democratic Labour Party, on its resumption of office, was able to correct the arrangement whereby casual employees who had left the Public Service and who returned to work within the Public Service could have „ their total years assessed for pension purposes, always provided that they completed five years after their resumption and before their retirement.

It is matters of this sort which would lead people to understand and to recognise that the Government, any Government, has a concern with their well-being and with ^ their onward progression, and is concerned not only with keeping them, especially in those areas where there are not the same kind of opportunities as there are in established positions for advancement within their grades.

It has also been a matter of some concern, Sir, that although the workers and this organisation have called for training on the job, and more specialised training, in fact, „, for some period that training was not forthcoming. It must be very demoralising for workers, be it Child Care Board workers or Customs workers, or wherever else those people may be working, to take the initiative to ask their head of department or Ministry to give them training so that they can do their jobs better, to find that that training is not forthcoming because discussions at the level of the Establishments Division are not sufficiently productive, either because the Establishments Division was not able to influence the Ministries or because there was some ministerial fiat which determined that training was not necessary, or was not desirable, for people at these levels. 4.55 p.m.

.*

This discussion allows us at this time again to recognise the importance of training, and to insist that the Government, whatever else it does, must recognise that an untrained worker is a liability and not an asset, and that the workers themselves are very desirous of being trained. If Government hopes to make departments, divisions and Ministries effective and meaningful, training on the job and specialised training must be essential prerequisites for the functioning of those departments. As I said before, Sir, systematised methods for advancement must, of necessity, feature.

I do not want to join the debate regarding harassment and victimisation, although it amazes me that anybody would want to question the veracity of the comments made from this side indicating the discrimination, the harassment and the victimisation which exist. *

My own experiences, as a trade union official meeting with Government departments and with statutory boards, are replete with examples of dismissals and suspensions which were occasioned by no other reasons than political reasons in the period between 1976 and 1986.

I recall, for example, Sir, and I will not spend a long time on this, that on one occasion relating to CBC, I asked a certain chairman of board what was the reason for dismissing a reporter. That chairman was honest enough to say that he did not know, but that he was under instructions from the Minister to dismiss the lady reporter, and that he was sorry. She re-applied for the job subsequently, and I understand she is now engaged again at the corporation.

I think, Sir, that the problem which the Public Service has, and the problem which the Civil Service has, will go much beyond that matter though of discrimination and of harassment. It must be a problem which has to do with communication between the department and the Government that is responsible for establishments matters, and in various other Ministries of the Government. As I perceive it, once a communication is submitted by the trade union movement to the Ministry of the Civil Service, the Establishments Division, the problem has to do with having that department receive that demand or that request, then referring it to the Ministry that is referred to, be it Education, Health or what-have-you, via that Ministry to the division of the Ministry that is concerned, then to wait for replies from the division to the Ministry and from the Ministry back to the Establishments Division. If one is involved in a negotiating exercise and then one has to make a modification, the exercise has to be gone through all over again, with the effect that, in the initial stages, it sometimes takes months after the trade union submits a proposal to the Establishments Division before there is initial contact for discussion purposes.

With the best will in the world, even with the most co-operative trade unions, that must in itself constitute a problem, because it is not fair, nor reasonable, to expect that when workers make demands of a particular Ministry, they must wait for several months before they can have initial contact and their first meeting with the Establishments Division of the Civil Establishments Service to commence negotiations. Once they make a modification in their position and then you have to repeat the exercise, and another two or three months elapse, then we have the occasion, as I perceive it, for disgruntlement, dissatisfaction and all kinds of problems. And though it will not always be necessary to walk around the walls of a particular establishment expecting those walls, like those of Jericho, to come tumbling down, one cannot deny the fact that workers will be well within their rights to be annoyed and dissatisfied, and to feel a great urge to want to ensure that there is

swifter action taken by the Establishments Division of the Civil Service, or by the particular Ministry, or by the Government as a whole.

It would seem to me, Sir, that what, in the circumstances, would be desirable, is to have the Ministries supplied with persons trained in proper personnel management techniques and methods, supplied with guidelines from the Establishments Division of the Ministry of the Public Service or the Civil Service, to have those Ministries authorised to meet the trade unions on matters which are submitted by those trade unions on behalf of workers — to advance the negotiations by that more direct approach, rather than taking the method of having the Ministries refer to one central agency, which central agency has problems, as I will attempt to point out to you in a minute. Sir. That is the first suggestion I would wish to make.

The second point arises from the first one, Mr. Speaker, and it has, to do with having the problem of channelling all the industrial relations and personnel administrative problems through the same source at the same time. Even with the best will in the world, there cannot be any doubt but that there will be problems from having a number of different divisions within the Civil Service — indeed within the Public Service, as the structure now is, as the system now calls for — at the same time, for the same period, make demands for discussions, because the system is that not only must the Civil Service proper, but the statutory boards as well must all get the guidance of the Ministry of the Public Service in dealing with their matters with the trade union movement. I have no quarrel with the guidance that is required, I have only the need to insist that what is required is for a greater number of trained, competent and authorised persons to be in place in the Ministry of the Civil Service in the Establishments Division.

If, for example, Mr. Speaker, we were to visit the other members of the social partnership, if we were to visit the employers' grouping, the Employers Confederation, or well-organised trade unions, we would find a number of officers trained, competent, ready and able to sit down at any level at any time to negotiate on behalf of those members within the social partnership that they are authorised to represent, be it employers or workers. So I am suggesting that, similarly, within the Establishments Division of the Public Service, or within the personnel administration department, there must be within the Public Service a large enough cadre of persons who have been trained in those particular disciplines, for it is my experience that there is the unfortunate history within the Public Service that, very often, only one person seems to be authorised, or to be directed, by the system to meet with the trade unions and/or other bodies, associations, call them what you will - the deputy perhaps only acting in the absence of the main official - to deal

in matters relating to the good and the welfare of the workers.
5.05 p.m.

It seems to me that such an arrangement, Sir, is fraught with difficulties. And the matter is made even worse, in my view, when, as my experience would suggest, once you get somebody who has acquired the skills, the knowledge and the experience, that person then seems to be moved from that position of expertise to another area, and then you are left with a situation where a new person has to come and learn the job all over again, but while he is learning the job, he is meeting with competent negotiators and discussion leaders. That in itself may occasion some problems.

I am not reflecting on any public servant, because at the moment, as we look at those who are there, we find an enthusiasm and a keenness which is very desirable, and for which we compliment the officials. But the point still has to be that wherever we have situations which relate to so many thousands of people, we cannot relegate such a position to a position of secondary importance. Most institutions that are important in this country are concerned with materials management, management of other resources, and therefore it would be important for us to recognise that the resources of the person, the human resources management, must be so important in the perception of a Government that we do not merely have the one person, at the Permanent Secretary's level, who is authorised and competent to deal with the matters, but that he be given a number of persons properly trained, and fully authorised, who are going to be able to sit and discuss the matters of the Public Service and to be able to make recommendations.

This is a matter of some grave importance, because we have got problems in Barbados where departments of Government and divisions within Ministries have submitted proposals and demands to the Government going back as far as 1980. Although we believe that there has been some element of refusal to meet in part of that period, we do not think that it all springs from an unwillingness, or any kind of instructions that may have been given, but that it also springs from there being bottlenecks within the Establishments Division, and from there being far too few persons sufficiently adequately trained and organised to be able to deal with the problems.

Furthermore, there springs to my mind a problem which may very well come from jealousies within departments and Ministries, that a department might feel it has no right to send information to the Establishments Division, or sees no reason why the Establishments officer should make determinations for the Ministry. Against that background, and in those circumstances, it would seem to me to make sense, Mr. Speaker, for us to have a

new look at the control and the management of the human resources factor within the Ministries and the departments.

In such circumstances, I would imagine we might be able, to the advantage of all persons, to advance the goodwill which workers want to have in their jobs and their departments. We might be able to have speedier negotiations, discussions and conclusions, which can only result in there being a better satisfied work force. And a better satisfied work force, Mr. Speaker, can only result in there being greater productivity, greater goodwill on the job, and to overall greater benefits for the entire nation.

I thank you, Sir.

Applause.

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

MORTGAGE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1988

Order No. 2 was called - To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, Cap. 233.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Mortgage Act to provide for the giving of alternative forms of security besides that of a first mortgage. The history behind this, Mr. Speaker, is that in the Ministry of Housing, with the Housing Credit Fund, which is involved in making major home improvement loans to chattel house owners, we discovered that the requirement that these loans to chattel house owners be secured by a first mortgage excluded from eligibility under the programme all those owners of chattel houses who do not own the land. What is even more important is that these persons are also unable to obtain loans from the Insurance Corporation of Barbados because they would not qualify under the Chattel House Act, because the improvements that they are making would be in wall. Therefore, we requested the Ministry of Finance to look at this Act to modify it to make it easier for the owners of chattel houses to get these chattel mortgages between \$8 000 and \$25 000.

The other part of the amendment deals with the fact that, under the Mortgage Insurance Act, the lending was restricted to a two per cent spread, and it meant that the only lending institution which was operating under this Mortgage Insurance Act was the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company. We believe that if that restriction could be removed, many of the other lending institutions in Barbados will be encouraged to lend money to this

income group. That is why we again asked the Ministry of Finance to amend this Act to make money more readily available to chattel house owners.

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5.15 p.m.

On separate motions of Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LANCASTER, ST. JAMES

Order No. 3 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Lancaster, St. James, for the purposes of improving Highway 2A and relocating houses.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval to acquire a total of 18 197 square metres of land at Lancaster, and that total amount of land is broken down in two sections, 6 217 square metres of land to be acquired for highway improvement, and 11 980 square metres of the land to be acquired for relocation of houses, this relocation being caused by the road itself. The relocation process has already advanced to a fairly far state. So I am seeking approval now from Parliament to acquire these two portions of land adding up to a total of 18 197 square metres at Lancaster.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, this acquisition brings into focus some questions that the

Opposition would wish to have answered by the Government. I am sure the Minister of Transport and Works will be in a position to answer some and the Minister of Housing the others.

My first concern is that this road was conceptualised in the period of the Barbados Labour Party in Government that ended in 1986. I was aware in 1985 of the intention of the Government to use World Bank funding to extend and widen this road and straighten it from a point roughly at Warrens to Mile-and-a-Quarter, which, I think, was the ultimate stop.

I do not know the details of the contractual arrangements. But I am, first of all, concerned with how this road is going to impact on my constituency after the realignment. We are concerned that the road might take away some of the playing facility now existing at Bagatelle, and there was also a suspicion that some of the new houses which had been built at Bagatelle in the National Housing Corporation programme might have to go. So I would like to know from the Ministers, when they reply, whether it is safe to assume that, as a result of the most recent alignment, there will be no threat to the existence of the houses at Bagatelle, which are National Housing Corporation's property, and whether the existing playing field north of the Bagatelle housing area will in any way be threatened.

We in the Barbados Labour Party were quite prepared to make alternative arrangements. The playing field facility at Bagatelle, Redmans Village, is not adequate for the needs of that community. It is too small, it slopes, and it cannot really provide the kind of sporting accommodation that is required for such a large community.

Right at the junction of Redmans Village and the road that leads to Prior Park — I always identify the junction by the gentleman who sells fruit on the bank opposite Redmans Village — there had been a fowl farm, I believe, sometime ago, and there is a depression behind. But there is a vast expanse of land, sufficient to accommodate a playing facility for the people from that area, and our intention was that out of the excavated material on the new road, we would fill in the depression, level it, and create the playing facility there. So the little one further north could go by the board, but they would get a better facility a matter of 100 yards away in one from the other.

I am not sure how the alignment of the road would affect the alternative proposal to create the new playing field at the junction there. I do not know if the Minister has the information, but I would be glad if he can indicate what is likely to happen.

Secondly, Sir, when you go further south, the Government has granted approval to the Muslim community to establish a mosque and a burial ground right beside the present Highway 2A. It is at the junction of Padmore Village Road and the main highway. When you come down Padmore Village, you can turn left and go to Warrens, or go right and go to Redmans Village, and immediately in front of you is Welches House, which Frank Worrell used to live at. It was his house at one stage, but now Jimmie Walker from Robertson Ward lives there. It is the piece of land on the left, not the piece of land on the right, which has a large depression and had canes in it up to Saturday, when I was last there. It is the piece of land on the left that is being farmed. 5.25 p.m.

I have had representations made to me, for about four weeks now, complaining about the Government's decision to establish this mosque and burial ground at that site. There are two contrasting districts near the burial ground. On the north of where the proposed burial ground would be is the Welches Terrace Development, well-known to the Minister of Education. I do not think that when he looks down- from his home he will be able to see the burial ground for the Indian people, but certainly the vast proportion of residents of Welches are concerned that when they look down, they will look straight on to this burial ground, and they fear that their properties may be devalued in some way by reason of the proximity of the burial ground to their own substantial developments.

Those in Padmore Village share those similar concerns, but have additional concerns in so far as there is still a measure of superstition, if you like, which bothers people about having to walk past this burial ground late at night after getting off the bus at Rock Hall. The bus does not come through Padmore Village, it cannot come through Padmore Village and go into Melrose, so you would have to get off, and there are no rights along there, and people are complaining about their children walking in the dark, and so on.

These are real concerns of Barbadians, and I am drawing them to the attention of the House. Ideally, the people of St. Thomas and those surrounding districts, in particular, would prefer if the Moslem community was given their private burial ground elsewhere. By Mangrove Pond, by the dump, would be an ideal spot.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In St. Thomas. Mangrove Pond, yes. Let me explain the geography to the Deputy Prime Minister, who was canvassing against me just below Mangrove Pond but does not know where it is. He would know Bennetts, and you turn left to go down to Norwood, you continue as though you are going to Arch

Hall, straight across, and it would be the first on the right going up past the bluff. If you ever noticed it going north, there is a fire lookout. That takes you up to the dump.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Ullyett? No, Ullyett is down in Content. When you pass Mr. Bobby Clarke, Sir, on the hill, there is the dump up there.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, he would not see it. He does not even see the dump, although he may smell it from time to time when the Government is not sufficiently efficient to ensure that these smells do not escape into Arch Hall and Sea View.

Up there is a vast amount of land and this development - it is two acres — the present burial ground that has been

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, whatever they ask for. They could get two acres up there by the dump easily, or elsewhere. This land was bought from one of C. O. Williams companies.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I cannot remember. It may be part of Vacluse lands, or it may be part of Content, but if it is so, it is all in the same group.

This land would be completely off the main highway and the services are up there already, and even though it is up in the hill, Sir, up there is level. Once you get up by the dump, you are on level ground going back towards Central Cricket Club and Shop Hill. It is a vast expanse, Sir, level land, but on top of the elevation. Nobody will see you up there, and it is accessible. You can reach it from the lower road or from off Shop Hill.

I wonder if the Ministry would be inclined to have a look at this permission. Information has come to me that it is not this present Minister of Housing who granted the permission, the late great one himself did it, but I believe that it came to Cabinet.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Representations have already been made to me about this matter, and we in the Ministry have decided to visit the area of Friday morning at 10 o'clock. You will hear more after that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am obliged to the Minister for his response and his obvious sensitivity to the situation. I will try and make myself available, and, perhaps, if the Minister has time, take him over to Mangrove Pond and show him the area out there.

(*Aside:* Let the cameras go and show you like how you were shown at the fire.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Members must not make fun of the severe fire. If they have any idea of the extent of the recent fire that passed over Highway 2A, which we are dealing with now, Sir — it jumped the road — they would not make fun of it, because it started at the bottom of the hill where they were burning something. The Sugar Producers say it was not cow itch, my information is it was cow itch. It burnt, jumped the road, in the absence of the Fire Service, and swept right through Arch Hall, Bennetts, and as far down as Molyneux. It stopped in Sandy Lane, because it had nothing else to burn out but the grass on the coast. It was very dry and very windy, and the Fire Service did not get there for two hours, but I am not going into that, Sir. The village was nearly totally devastated. I believe the message has got through to the plantation people that, in future, care must be taken when permission is granted to burn cow itch.

Sir, I presume that the Minister responsible for Transport and Works will be able to tell us if there is any truth in the newspaper reports that the concessionary financing granted, or agreed to be lent, by the World Bank has, in fact, been withheld. There were reports, but you will see that the Opposition has not made any official statement on this, because we want the facts. We have not got into it and we are asking for the facts.

There were statements in the Press to that effect. If it has not happened, then what I am going to say would be irrelevant. But on the assumption that that concessionary financing has been lost to Barbados, I wish to say that it will be a matter of serious concern to the general public of Barbados.

Only a few weeks ago, not more than two, the Prime Minister of this country complained, like those who had preceded him, that a number of these international organisations, lending institutions, were threatening to graduate Barbados beyond the level of concessionary financing. 5.35 p.m.

If it is — and I say 'if it is', because I do not have the facts, so I can only speak on the basis of hypothesis — if it is the case that Barbados has told the World Bank in so many words that we do not need your money, keep your concessionary financing, we will go on the commercial market and borrow Japanese yen, then that kind of

conduct will be the best possible example to the international lending institutions that Barbados is ripe for graduation.

I say I do not have the facts, and the Government is sitting smugly to give me the facts and I will wait for them. I put it as "if. When I hear the Government's responses, I will be more positive. We will hear what was the rate of interest on the World Bank loan and what is the rate of interest on the Japanese loan.

There seems to be some public disquiet — concern, probably not disquiet — about how the contract came to be awarded to the highest bidder.

(*Aside:* Is that the first time it has ever happened?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How would I know if that is the first time it has ever happened?

Sir, I was in the Cabinet in June 1985, and in May 1986, and the tender for the Northern Access Road was given to the person who tendered \$13 616000, or some such figure. The low bid on the Northern Access Road did not attract the award because it did not comply. Is my memory right? I believe there was another one, I seem to remember, a company called Ephel & Co. that qualified a bid; it might have been on the Bridgetown fishing harbour. It was a low bid that did not comply because they wanted exemption from taxes. I think they were a Norwegian company and were prepared to invoke some old promise of Churchill when Barbados was a colony.

So I only want to hear what are the facts like any ordinary member of the public. I am a little bit sorry I have had to start this and not to wind it up, because I would be able, perhaps, to recall a lot more to memory when Members on the other side prompt me, as they did just now.

I would wish to hear about whether people were invited to tender on the basis of a combination contract or whether the contract was in two phases, (a) and (b). Where do I have all this information? I cannot remember too well; I am getting old. My hair is even like acid wash now — grey!

Mr. SPEAKER: I have only heard your comments. I have not heard the others.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I know that in most of the contracts — the Spring Garden, St. Barnabas, the same Northern Access Road and one or two others, and the most recent one, the Hilton — the tenderer was asked to tender also on a combination contract. As far as Highway 2A is concerned, I seem to remember that there was a split into two phases; you could tender for the road

works or you could tender for the bridges and the culverts, or you could tender on a combination basis. The Government even invited Sintra to tender.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have my own private practice in my own home. I do not mix up with anybody in a partnership. My name is not Cottle Catford or Freddie Hutchinson. They are who are retained by C. O. Williams and all the companies. I represented them once with a man who fell off a ladder. Does that mean I am his lawyer for everything?

We are only asking for the information which the Government has. They are the two leading contractors in Barbados, and in the past there has been an attempt to keep both in business.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Oh, you do not remember?

Do you want some names called?

Sir, we are not getting into name calling, but the Government will have to tell us how it is that this is such a simple matter that it went to Cabinet six times. This contract for Highway 2A was deferred six times. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister carried it to Cabinet with a recommendation.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order: I do not think the honourable Member is representing the facts in this House of Assembly. I never took anything of a contract relating to Highway 2A in respect of the building of the road to Cabinet. The contract was never awarded, or contracted for, in my time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In the recent past contracts have been awarded on the low bid or the combination contract. Presumably, it is now out in the open, and the Minister will be able to tell us who was the low bid on the road works, who was the low bid on the bridges and culverts, who was the low bid on the combination work.

Members feel that I do not have any knowledge of building contracts. Well, look and see what I did to the last Government for Sir Robert McAlpine against the Government of Barbados when we were the Government, and what I am going to do to this present Government in the claims to come up now. The Government wrongly determined the contract, so you have to pay all the law suit expenses on the Post Office. It has to do with that contract.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, it was the BLP Government, but as the successor Government, you will have to pay. It was not the Government through the Ministers. Unfortunately, it was a functionary, who did not function as well as she ought to have functioned, and so the contract was wrongly determined. 5.45 p.m.

Sir, we would be obliged if the Government would tell us who was the low bid on the combination contract, who was the low bid for the road, who was the low bid for the bridges and the culverts. We are only asking for this information, Sir, because it is certainly my memory that the Spring Garden Highway, Northern Access Road and the St. Barnabas Highway contracts were awarded on the basis of the combination bid. If Government has departed from that — I mean, it is the Government — from awarding on the basis of the combination bid, if the combination bid of the Williams firm was lower than the Rayside Group of Companies, Government is entitled to do that. It would be a departure from recent history, but it would be entirely within the competence of the Government to do it, Sir.

On Highway 2A, we are going to support this Resolution, Sir, for the acquisition of the lands and, presumably, the many others that will come as a result of this road construction. We are pleased to support the work to be done, because it all originated in the breast and in the minds of the Barbados Labour Party.

I am much obliged, Sir.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN (St. Michael East): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that this issue has excited public debate, because I believe that there are many, many profound issues that need to be clarified, and clear policies need to be formulated with respect to the tendering process, as well as the award of contracts, in Barbados.

In the instant case, much questioning and uninformed comment have taken place with respect to the award of the contract for the rehabilitation of Highway 2A, which is a part of the World Bank Project that commenced in 1984. It is called a World Bank Project, because, of the US\$19.03 million, the World Bank had agreed to lend to the Government of Barbados \$11 million to assist in work.

At the outset, let me state that this particular project had less to do with road rehabilitation than the thirst for the Government of the day for foreign exchange. A consequence of this is that this project was hurriedly put together, to the extent where the World Bank has written critically on a number of occasions about the quality of the estimates that have been prepared by the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Since that Ministry was required to operate in accordance with the exigencies of the Ministry of Finance, the time frame imposed upon the Ministry of Transport and Works was not of its own making, but it had to march to the beat of the drum of the Ministry of Finance. As a result of this, as I pointed out earlier, there has been a considerable amount of criticism on the part of the bank about the accuracy of the estimates that have been produced by the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Highway 2A, as the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) indicated has two components, one involving roadworks, and the other the repair and building of culverts and bridges. Tenders were invited for bids for these two components separately, and at a pre-bid meeting, upon a proposal made by C. O. Williams Construction Ltd., it was agreed that a combination tender could also be submitted.

The result is as follows: when separate bids from each part were made, Rayside Asphalt Paving Co. Ltd. bid \$6100 036.40 for road improvement and \$4535158.20 for bridges and culverts; C. O. Williams Construction Limited bid \$6 274 442.56 for road improvement and \$4492 154.15. When you add those together, you would see that, on the separate bids, Rayside beat C. O. Williams, bidding over \$100000 lower than C. O. Williams.

In respect of the combination — and the combination is no mystery, it is not a mystery word, it is no special scientific word - all it means is that it is a proposal of a price if the contractor can be assured that both components of the projects are awarded to him. The combination for Rayside would be \$10435 195.20 and the combinations for C. O. Williams \$8 968 848.75.

When a combination tender is submitted, generally speaking, savings are effected because there is no duplication of mobilisation. That is all there is to it. There is absolutely no mystery to it. In that situation, C. O. Williams dropped his bid by over \$1.7 million. 5.55 p.m.

It is instructive to note that the engineering consultants for the project, Mahy Chadderton and Ridley Limited, as well as the quantity surveyors, who are Ferdinand Hart and Leonard, estimated that the cost of executing the project would be \$11 451 164.70. That is the estimate of the consultants with respect to both parts. So the lowest proposal of \$8.968 million varies from the estimated cost of the consultant by 21.67 per cent.

The question was, therefore, was this a responsive bid? Was this a credible bid? Could anybody believe that the contractor could accomplish the works within the

contract for this particular sum of money? Therefore, there was a closer analysis of this particular combination bid.

There were divisions among the technical staff of the Ministry of Transport and Works about this combination bid. The critical view, which I accepted, was that the offer of \$8.968 million contained the omission of key items. There was no dispute about that. All of the items contained in the bill of quantities, which determined the price, were not costed, and it was a substantial variation from the conditions of the tender documentation. It was not based on a similar principle to that offered by the Rayside tender, which fulfilled all of the tender's specifications. In addition, it did not adequately address and price particular items in the tender, which required the contractor to provide facilities over or adjacent to the bridges for the passages of pedestrians while the bridges were being reconstructed, nor did it adequately address the matter of maintaining proper traffic control, dust control, et cetera.

In addition to that, nobody can be in any doubt that the Government of Barbados, in every tender document, makes it unequivocally clear that it does not bind itself to accepting the lowest tender. This is standard, and, frankly, I cannot understand the behaviour of the contractor - but that is something that I will deal with subsequently — when, as an experienced bidder, he must know that every Government reserves to itself this particular right.

There were certain aspects of this case that had to be considered and carefully analysed. A Government has a responsibility to look at the contractor's past performances and determine whether, in its view, there is anything in that past from which an inference may be drawn that the contractor's bid is likely to be unresponsive.

But before that, I will go on to say, based upon the analysis of the omissions of pricing in the tender document, what in fact we had was not a combination tender, but an alternative tender. It is precisely on this basis that the Government of the Barbados Labour Party in 1986 awarded a tender to the said C. O. Williams Limited for the construction of the Northern Access Road, in spite of the fact that the lowest bidder offered a price that was approximately \$1.8 million lower than C. O. Williams.

Asides.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Pardon? This is the information that was before the Tenders Committee, and the Tenders Committee came to the conclusion that that bid was not a responsible bid.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Pardon? Kolas is the name of the firm. One of the reasons why the bid was deemed unresponsive is that part of the answers were written in Spanish. That was one reason given for adjudging the bid to be one of non-compliance. I live with this everyday. I do not have to look at it.

So from that standpoint, it was not a valid bid, it was an alternative bid. As such, the only valid bids that C. O. Williams had before the Tenders Committee and the Ministry were the bids with respect to the separate components, which, when added together, indicated that his price was higher than that of Rayside.

Secondly, as I indicated, we looked at the past performance of the contractor. There are many people in Barbados naive enough to believe that once a man is awarded a contract for a particular price, that is the only price he can be paid. But nothing can be further from the truth - and it is my duty to enlighten the public of Barbados as to what has been happening - and it reveals a consistent pattern in which contracts awarded to C. O. Williams resulted in his being paid a price for the work that is substantially higher than the price at which the contract has been awarded.

We deal, firstly, with the St. Barnabas Road. He commenced construction of the St. Barnabas Road on June 29, 1981. The tender price for that road was \$3 950 484. The final price paid to C. O. Williams for the St. Barnabas Road was \$6 255 318. Let me give you the figures again. The price tendered for the St. Barnabas Road was \$3 950 484. The final price paid to him was \$6 255 318. 6.05 p.m.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the then Financial Officer of the Ministry of Transport and Works recommended that the overrun should not be paid. The then Financial Officer of the Ministry stated that it was too much money. He was, of course, overruled, and the Cabinet of the day went blithely along and underwrote the overrun.

The Northern Access Road! This was the contract that was awarded in conditions of great panic 48 hours before the election. This is the one in which the lowest bidder was \$1.8 million below "Cow" Williams, and this is the one for which the tender price was \$13 616 875 75; the final price, approximately \$17 million.

When this Government came into power, this Government made variations with respect to the execution of that contract which incurred additional expense. Such expenses were relatively marginal and did not exceed \$750 000. The major expense that is included in this overrun, as I indicated some time in November last year when I moved the supplementary in here with

respect to the Northern Access Road, was the item of increased excavations. I am not going into that, I went into that already. It was over \$2.9 million.

The World Bank Projects are divided into two types, those done under what is called Forced Account, that is, done by MTW, and those that are subject to international competitive bidding, that is, those for which tenders are invited. This is the fourth and final item under this particular World Bank Project. C. O. Williams has already got three out of those four projects — I am coming to that later — and it is instructive, Mr. Speaker, to indicate what his performance is with respect to these World Bank Projects.

The first one is a road called Lears to Belle Gully. The tender price, \$1 069 492; the final price he received is \$1 650 000, a cost overrun of nearly 60 per cent. This road was completed in October last year, and if you drive on that road today, what you will see is 24 new patches put there in the last three weeks, and other parts of the road are collapsing.

Not only that, it is a curious coincidence that this particular road was chosen under the World Bank Project, since it undoubtedly enhances the property of "Cow" Williams at Lears. It is an even more curious coincidence, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that another road rehabilitated, at Foster Hall, similarly enhanced the property of this man. And the second phase of this particular 2A, which ends at Warrens, again comes adjacent to the property of this man. These are strange coincidences.

The second World Bank road, Haggatt Hall to Six Roads, still unfinished — they call it Bussa to Six Roads. The bid price is \$2 350 200. To date, the projected price, and still rising, is \$3.5 million, a cost overrun of nearly 50 per cent, and it is not finished yet. The new finishing date is supposed to be the end of the year, and the date on which it was supposed to be completed is June 30, the end of this month. Low bid? What foolishness are you talking!

The third World Bank road, Warrens to Sturges. The bid price, \$1 484 681. The final price, and still rising, \$1.8 million.

This is the record that a responsible Government had to consider. Therefore, a serious Government, a Government that is concerned about expenditure — we hear people talking about expenditure — cannot afford to look at things on the surface. We must go below the surface.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: He is a white shadow.

Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear, therefore, that the record of this contractor indicates that on all major projects he has been unable to finish within the prices bid. There are some persons, apologists for this particular firm, who will rush in and say, 'But a contractor cannot pay himself, the consultants that are assigned to a particular project are those persons who must approve the increased claims.' I will say, yes, that is absolutely true. But I will also add that what we have here is a clear indication of a process which yields cost overruns between 30 and over 60 per cent. And I do not care if the consultants can be as wise as Solomon, one would have to examine any process which yields overruns of such a magnitude, as it is bound to be fundamentally flawed. And when one takes into consideration the fact that the World Bank itself has repeatedly complained about the nature of these overruns, which they believe are due to defective estimates, caused by the haste with which the programme was implemented, then a Government of the day has a responsibility not to be trapped by the appearances of numbers. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in this society we seem to have a number of people all around us subscribing to the view that everything is a number, and as long as you quote the appropriate number, or numbers, that look or sound impressive, then everyone must stand mute with deference to the number. It reminds me of Pythagorean metaphysics, when Pythagoras, around 500 BC, shouted, 'Everything is number, the whole world is number, the basic reality is numbers.' So that once a number is shouted — in some cases the number has to be a small number and in other cases a greater number — one is expected to stand respectfully before this kind of reality. Mr. Speaker, I regard this kind of reductionism as neo-Pythagorean hogwash, and we have, Sir, to look beneath numbers, behind numbers, beside numbers and around numbers, and deal with particular truths.

Let me digress here from the roads for a minute and touch upon the institution called the World Bank. As soon as the Tenders Committee, with its characteristic Pavlovian responses, recommended the lowest number to the Ministry, the Ministry sent the Tenders Committee recommendation to the World Bank, asking - not the Minister, an officer of the Ministry - the World Bank if they had any objection to the award of the tender to C. O. Williams. The agreement between the Barbados Government and the World Bank requires the Barbados Government to inform the World Bank of the name of the contractor to whom they propose to award the contract, and the World Bank would then respond to determine whether the guidelines had been complied with.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, I believe, seriously that just as we have to look at a situation where we pay consultants a percentage of total cost, where if total cost increased, their fees from the project increase, just as we

have to re-think this, because, in my view, in such a situation no consultant has an incentive to reduce cost, we have to look at the kind of people whom we are sending to negotiate these agreements with international financial institutions. I seriously believe that just as there is a potential for conflict in the case of a consultant whose fees are predicated upon the magnitude of total cost, there is a potential for conflict if we send people to negotiate contracts that affect the thousands of people in this society if their careers are likely to take them into jobs in the World Bank.

I have had too much experience in dealing with international institutions. I have seen the strange, obscene and obsequious genuflections on the part of bureaucrats from many countries when confronting international organisations, if they feel that at some time in the future they would like to have a job in that organisation. I say this in all seriousness. I am not casting aspersions on anybody, nor am I reflecting specifically on the integrity of any public servant in Barbados, but we have to face reality. If a man is secretly harbouring a position in a particular financial institution, then he cannot defend his country properly in any negotiations. That is one of the issues that we have to look at when these kinds of neo-colonial agreements are being negotiated.

This issue is not a simple one. It raises all kinds of problems for which there need to be clear and precise policies in the future.

There are many people who believe that when you hear the words "World Bank", it is some ethereal mystifying institution. It is an institution set up by the big powers that control the world. They set up this institution for their own purpose, in the first place, and are now extending it, for reasons of international real politic, to other developing countries.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has about two minutes more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I cannot do it in two minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Asides

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: After the World Bank gave its reply, I received a draft Cabinet Paper recommending the award of the contract to C. O. Williams. This is the point at which I got into the act and started to assume my responsibilities to the people of Barbados.

I wrote the following letter, which I will read out for you, to the World Bank.

"Dear Sir,

Reference to Loan for Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Project, Appointment of Contractor for Improvements to Highway 2A

I refer to your correspondence of 30th November, 1987 to me in connection with your mission to Barbados from 1st to 12th November, 1987. Reference is also made to your Ministry's letter"

so and so:

"of 28th December, 1987 and your telex of 14th January, 1988, which dealt with the award of a contract for improvements to Highway 2A.

"Prior to the award of a tender of such magnitude, the Cabinet of Barbados has the responsibility for examining all pertinent data in order to assist it in making an informed decision. In this connection a memo attached to the abovementioned letter of 30th November, 1987 states that, and I quote:

"the mission has observed that in a number of cases, the cost of road rehabilitation work was 30 per cent to 40 per cent over the contract bid price. Currently roads numbers 5 and 16 are being rehabilitated under international competitive bidding and cost overruns in both projects are in the region of 50 per cent. Moreover, there are significant overruns in time, resulting in the fact that our World Bank programme is about one year behind schedule."

C. O. Williams has projects, World Bank projects, still working on, and the programme is one year behind schedule.

"Also, a tender report has been prepared by the Ministry's Deputy Chief Technical Officer, Mr. Nigel Smith, who is a member of the key staff. A copy of this report is attached for your information. As can be seen, it raises many issues which the Cabinet of Barbados would deliberate upon.

"You have already stated that you have no objection to the award being made to C. O. Williams Co. Ltd., but the Cabinet should have the widest range of options when it gives consideration to this matter in about two weeks.

"It would be appreciated if you would indicate whether you have any objections to the contract being shared by the two bidders or the award made solely to Rayside Asphalt Paving Co. Ltd."

' will stop at this time. When I am winding up . . .

Asides

6.25 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it seems to be the wish of all sides that the Honourable Minister who has just taken his seat should be given time in which to conclude his presentation.

I am moving, Sir, that the Honourable Minister be given an additional 15 minutes to complete his presentation.

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

Asides.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: This letter was dated the 16th February, 1988. I got a telex from the World Bank, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated the 3rd March, 1988. In it they said, among other things:

"We see no reason for a change in the Tenders Committee's decision to award the contract to C. O. Williams." I am sure they mean recommendation, not "decision":

"If a different decision is reached, the bank would not be able to finance this contract and the corresponding portion of the loan may have to be cancelled in line with"

and they quote the relevant section of the bank's guidelines.

There was no serious discussion of the alternatives raised. They dismissed the report of the key staff member as speculative, and dismissed the question of overruns as simply referring to poor estimates.

Even if, as they said, they have no confidence in the estimates of the Ministry of Transport and Works and the consultants, prudence ought to have led them to err on the side of a higher figure rather than a lower figure.

They admitted that there were omissions in the pricing of the quantities in the combination tender submitted by C. O. Williams Ltd., but they did 'not believe that they represented significant figures.

I do not want to get into nastiness. There is a lot I can say about the World Bank and the people in the World Bank and a lot of other things, I will keep it clean for so long as C. O. Williams, his lackeys, apologists and spokesmen keep it clean. If they want to descend into the cesspool, I will easily take a step down in there with them.

Laughter.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: This is a very, very serious matter, and I want to keep it to the issues. There are all kinds of things that went on, the evidence of crass greed and other kinds of behaviour, which I do not want to get into at this point. If I am forced to, I will not shrink from doing my duty to the people of Barbados.

The fact of the matter is therefore this, that I was aware of the fact that if the Government of Barbados chose not to award the contract to C. O. Williams, the World Bank would not be prepared to fund that portion of the loan which was allocated to Highway 2A. That portion of the loan is no more than US\$2Vi million. Those who are shouting about losing US\$214 million ought to be ashamed, because they would ask the sovereign Government of Barbados to abdicate its responsibilities to the people of this country and to sell its sovereignty for a mess of pottage. We would be in a bad state, indeed, if we found ourselves forced to surrender our capacity to act as a sovereign Cabinet of a sovereign nation because we wanted US\$2Mi million.

(Aside: Hear, hear, hear!)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I could never subscribe to that kind of inferiorised and neo-colonial thinking. I hope the people over there do not subscribe to that kind of nonsense.

There is a feeling abroad that if you utter the term "World Bank", you invoke some mysterious entity. It is not an institution run by ordinary men with ordinary brains. They are many of us who feel that, in some way, the brains of a man who was born in a big country are bigger than the brains of a man born in a small country. But a big country does not mean big brains, and working in a big building does not mean big brains either.

So this Government examined the financial implications of expenditure to the people of this country. We asked ourselves whether the bid of C. O. Williams Ltd. was a genuinely responsive bid. In the light of the evidence that I have given to this honourable House there could be no other conclusion but that it was not a responsive bid. 6.35 p.m.

It is an unfortunate state of affairs where any contractor in Barbados finds it necessary to underbid in order to get a contract and then come back and ask the Government to top it up later on. Very often, there is no discussion about the topping it up. Whenever supplementary resolutions come here for topping up contract prices, they are dealt with in a quiet namby-pamby way. But that final price is the real price. It is the real sum of money that the taxpayers of Barbados will be expected to pay. I need to reiterate that a contract price is nothing unchanging like the law of the Medes and the Persians.

It is not a price that a contractor who is successful gets and can get not a penny more. More often than not, that price is topped up.

I had some discussions with a wide number of engineers, and let me say that there is a legal cast of mind that I have listened to in this Chamber for many years, a mind track with certain kinds of procedural encumbrances, in which, once a statement is made by somebody who calls himself an expert, this statement is to be treated with the same reverence as the Ten Commandments. I do not accept any such gibberish, because it is patently clear, if we look at the five major projects that this contractor, C. O. Williams, has had, and the cost overruns that have been registered in all of them, that something, to put it at its most charitable, is fundamentally and intrinsically wrong with the process. Engineers might be brilliant men, they might be honest men. If this is what they produce consistently, then the process is bad, and it is a process in which no confidence whatsoever can be reposed.

But there were other considerations, Mr. Speaker, and those considerations were canvassed in the General Election of 1986. There are people in this country who would pretend that the question of an equitable distribution of resources for black people in this country was never an issue in the last election, and that it is still not an issue now. That is their view, it is not my view. It is a view that I dismiss with contempt, because I regard the centrality of the question of the equitable treatment of black people in this country to be indubitable. And this Government is committed to fundamental social transformation, if nothing else. This Government is committed to correcting past inequities that manifest themselves in the present, and whenever there is an attempt to do this, there are all kinds of black quislings and Uncle Toms who come 'out of the woodwork trying to confuse the people of this country, who are to benefit from a change of the resources.

Asides.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I did not put him there!

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was quiet, composed and peaceful until I started to deal with this issue.

(Aside: Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes, that is true.)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: It is an issue that agitates the people over here, but I am going to deal

with it, because it is a stubborn fact of social and political life in this question in this race. I do not care whom it makes uncomfortable.

Asides.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I am not going to be put off by any black Uncle Toms or stooges or quislings. It is as simple as that.

The drive for social transformation, based upon an equitable distribution of the resources of this country, comes within a historical matrix characterised by the following facts. You laugh at it, laugh at it if you may.

In 1694, a Bill was brought into this Chamber, the 350th anniversary of which we are planning to celebrate some time next year, to prohibit the sale of goods to Negroes.

In 1708, an Act was passed to prohibit the inhabitants of this island from employing a Negro and other slaves in selling and bartering.

In 1733, an Act called for the better governing of Negroes and the more effectual preventing of the inhabitants of this island from employing what they called "their Negroes" and other slaves from selling and huckstering.

In 1749, another Act to prevent what they called Negroes from assembling in huckster shops!

In 1751, there was what they called a law administering very sore backsides — this is what is written into the debates of the Chamber — to prevent black hucksters from associating with white merchants.

I am going right down, setting the scene. Do not tell me this is not an issue. I will fight you or any of you all over there. Any of the Uncle Toms in the Barbados Labour Party, I will fight anywhere on this question. So come forward, come forward and defend the *status quo*! Come forward and defend your massa!

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Defend your colleagues in the Cabinet on it.)

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: No, the colleagues in the Cabinet have spoken. They have spoken, and they have spoken by the tender to Rayside and putting more resources in the black community. This is what the boys in the Cabinet have done. 6.45 p.m.

In 1774 — an Act, the better to prohibit goods, wares, merchandises and other things from being carried from house to house or about the roads and streets in

this island to be sold, bartered or disposed of, and to remedy the mischief and inconveniences arising to the inhabitants of this island from the traffic by huckster slaves, free negroes, and, yes, free mulattoes. Sometimes mulattoes do not believe they belong to that group.

In 1811 - all black vendors to be removed from Roebuck, Swan, Broad Streets and to be reassembled in an area called The Shambles. Do you think removing the people from Swan Street is anything new? This is the 19th attempt in the history of Barbados to move black people from Swan Street.

Eighteen hundred and eighty — the Chancery Court system consolidated plantations into the hands of a small white clique, mostly the Chandlers and their families.

Eighteen hundred and ninety-seven - a Royal Commission recommended that land be divided among blacks. Of course, no such action was ever taken.

Nineteen hundred and five - the Friendly Society Act used to clip the wings of societies which were in possession of thousands of Panamanian dollars by limiting a Friendly Society to buy land of a maximum space of one acre.

I argued with you on your own terms. Since you all live in the neo-Pythagorean surrealistic world of figures, I gave you the figures first. But I am now arguing on my terms. These are the terms of the honourable Member for St. Michael East and the people of St. Michael East, from the black people of Barbados. I gave you your fancy figures, but I am now arguing on my terms.

Against that historical background, we cannot have a situation in which a particular individual believes that it is his God-given right to have all of the major contracts in this country. Already, he has had three of the four contracts under the World Bank Project that were set out to international competitive bidding. He will not get the fourth, because it is against all social justice, it is against all conception of equity in this country.

Not only has he failed to submit a responsive tender, not only has his record of overruns indicated that he will not finish the job at the price that he quoted, but also there is this inescapable fact, the World Bank Project was supposed to have concluded on June 30, 1988. This project was supposed to have ended at the end of this month. The project is now over 12 months late, and it is over 12 months late precisely because of the failure of C. O. Williams Limited to complete on time the three World Bank projects that the company is now doing. Give him a fourth? A major one? And extend the project even further? It does not make sense.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say this from the standpoint of the frugality of the use of our money in this

country, from the standpoint of the appropriateness of the tender submitted, from the standpoint of time overruns and the necessity to save time or face further loss of the World Bank's money.

For all those who are preoccupied with World Bank monies, the only money that the Barbados Government has lost in terms of foreign exchange is two and a half million dollars. The World Bank will pay the Barbados Government the other eight and a half million dollars. For those persons to whom such issues are of transcendental importance, I say that. I know what I consider important. In the second part I argue on my terms, in the first part I argue on your terms.

Lastly, having regard to the oppression, to the deliberate institutional and legal barriers which have been erected to prevent people of a particular race from participating in business, it is our responsibility to this country, a responsibility conferred on this Government by the masses of people in their thousands on May 28, 1986, to break that monopoly of control of Government contracts enjoyed by this particular contractor.

In conclusion, persons like myself who have* fought a lifetime against unjust and unfair treatment can never make the mistake ourselves of being unjust and unfair, and, therefore, whatever the colour of a man is, we must make sure that he be treated in accordance with the principles of fairness and justice. What that means to that particular contractor, C. O. Williams Limited, is this. Fairness demands that that firm loses its preferential position. I will never, never, never be a party to a situation in which that firm is treated preferentially. The only treatment that firm can expect is fair treatment, never preferential treatment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, I have been the representative for St. Peter since 1984, and there have been a number of activities undertaken in my constituency. Among them were the civil works and infrastructural works at Golden Mile. There was also the maintenance work and the rehabilitation work of Highway 1, and there was also the development of a playing field at Black Bess. It happened, by happy coincidence, that all three of "these contracts were awarded to a company called Rayside Construction Limited. So when I come to this debate to speak, I speak against the background of having been a representative of a constituency for three years, going into four, in which the largest part of the work undertaken by Government in my constituency has been awarded to a company called Rayside Construction Limited.

I make that point if only to say this — I come to this debate not to fight a case for Rayside nor for "Cow" Williams, because the record will show that, where St. Peter is concerned, Rayside Construction Limited has had its equitable share of the cake.

Asides.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, we have heard the other side in silence, and I will speak despite the noises from the other side.

We have heard, Mr. Speaker, a large number of points made, some material, others entirely immaterial, and I think it would be wonderful for the purposes of the House for us to recount what are the material points that have been made.

The first point, Sir, is that a contract is being awarded to Rayside Construction Ltd. to undertake the construction of Highway 2A. The second point is that this contract is being awarded to Rayside Construction Ltd. after a recommendation was made by technicians to the Tenders Committee to the effect that the contract should have been awarded to someone else. The third material point, Mr. Speaker, is that the fact that the contract is being awarded to Rayside, is a result, by the Minister's admission, of his having intervened in the situation to ensure, in his judgment, that social justice is done.

A number of immaterial things have been brought to this debate, and I will deal with these before I come on to the material points. One immaterial thing that was made mention of by the Minister of Transport and Works was that this project was started by the Barbados Labour Party because of a thirst for foreign exchange. We can dismiss that.

Foreign exchange voted for a capital project does not become available for Government for any other purpose other than the capital project, so if Government agrees to borrow funds from the World Bank to build a road, it just simply cannot become available to Government to do any other thing than to build a road. So if the Government of the Barbados Labour Party entered this project with a thirst, it was not a thirst for foreign exchange — it was a thirst, Sir, to improve the infrastructure of this country, to improve the infrastructure of people living in St. Peter, in St. James North, in St. James South, in St. Michael and in St. Thomas. No thirst for foreign exchange was a material consideration in this matter.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order: In these projects, what happens is that the projects are executed by the Government, and after the projects are executed by the Government, then the foreign exchange

is paid by the World Bank, or the international funding institution, to the Government of Barbados. It is done long after the projects are completed.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, he has only made the situation worse, because he has confirmed what is, in fact, correct, that when the Government of Barbados goes into a capital development project, it has, first of all, to spend the funds before it is reimbursed by the World Bank. And in spending funds before it is reimbursed by the World Bank, it is, in fact, giving people funds to spend as well on imports, which require that Government must spend foreign exchange up front on projects like these. So a thirst for foreign exchange, as advanced by the Minister of Transport and Works as an argument for this project, is of no validity whatsoever.

Secondly, Sir, he said that this project was hurriedly put together. This project started since 1982—83. This is 1988. Where was the hurry?

Mr. Speaker, a number of other considerations must be reflected on soberly by the House. I have nothing against Rayside, because he has done three major pieces of work in my constituency — as I said, Golden Mile was done by Rayside under the Barbados Labour Party, Highway 1 was done by Rayside under the Barbados Labour Party, and Black Bess playing field was done by Rayside under the Barbados Labour Party, so the honourable Member for St. Peter has nothing against Rayside Construction - but the Minister would have us believe that this contract is being awarded to Rayside for a number of reasons, principally that "Cow" Williams' performance on projects is a bad performance reflected in cost overruns, and that the decision to go with a combination contract was an incorrect decision in all the circumstances.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I specifically deny that it was a combination bid. I call it an alternative bid. I refuted the notion that it was a combination bid. There was an attempt at a combination bid. If you were listening carefully, you would understand that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has made it clear that he has intervened in this matter, and he has told this House that the basis upon which he has taken a decision contrary to the recommendations of the technicians, was the bad performance of the firm with the lowest bid on this project. This House, Mr. Speaker, is to believe, in the absence of additional evidence, that the contractor in question has had a dismal performance where all projects are concerned. The only evidence that has been given to this House, Mr. Speaker, without qualification, is a dismal performance by the company • concerned.

I am going to challenge the Minister of Transport and Works and ask him if in relation to the resurfacing of the Newcastle to Foster Hall road, which was done in 1986 by the same contractor, which you are now saying has had consistent overruns on projects financed by the Barbados Labour Party, it is not true that the original contract value was for \$803 000 and the final cost of the project was \$800 000, a saving of \$3 000.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order: The honourable Member is floundering in his state of confusion. He obviously does not understand what I said. I was at pains to list all of the major roads for which there were overruns. I mentioned Foster Hall, Sir, as one of those three roads that were included in the World Bank Project that were adjacent to the property of "Cow" Williams and enhanced the value of the property of "Cow" Williams. That is the context in which I mentioned Foster Hall.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the impression has been created in this House this afternoon that the contractor whose tender bid was the lower tender bid, was rejected specifically because empirical evidence could be pointed concretely to a situation in which that contractor, without any extenuating circumstances, had consistently shown cost overruns.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order: He does not understand what I said, simple English. I pointed out that the combination bid, so-called, was an alternative bid. It, therefore, was not responsive, it failed to respond to all of the terms within the tender document. Therefore, the lowest bid becomes the two bids that Rayside bid for the components. That is my view of the lowest bid. Talk about yourself, not me. Talk about your state of mind, not mine. 7.05 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Transport and Works if he can deny this evening that as regards the projects which I shall enumerate, executed in 1986 and 1987, savings did not accrue to Government - savings made a difference — as between the contract price agreed to between the Government and "Cow" Williams and the final cost of the work. As regards the Grantley Adams International Airport, a saving of \$2.3 million. As regards the container parks at the Port Authority, a saving of \$35 000; a contract price of \$959 000; the final cost of executing the work, \$924 000. Tent Bay Fisheries Project, Mr. Speaker: the original contract value, \$2.4 million; the final cost of the work, \$2.1 million. Oxnards Heights, St. James, the construction of new roads: the contract price, \$464 000; the final cost of the work undertaken, \$451 000; a saving to Government of \$12 000. The resurfacing of Coach Hill to Newcastle Road, a saving of \$7 000. The resurfacing of

Thyme Bottom: the contract price and the final cost of the project were exact; and the Newcastle Road, a saving to the Government of \$3 000.

Sir, I cite those points because, as anybody who has ever had anything to do with project execution would tell you, there is very often a difference between the initial estimate of the cost of executing a project and the final cost of its execution, not only in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, but throughout the world. There is many a slip between the cup and the lip, and these slips, Mr. Speaker, can very often arise, as they did arise on the World Bank Rehabilitation Project, to which the Minister referred without qualification.

What the Minister should have been telling this House, Mr. Speaker, is that as regards the World Bank maintenance project, in which the contractor, to whom he refers derogatorily, was engaged, there was a change in the concept and the scope of the work as between when it was agreed to between the contractor and the Government and during the course of its execution, and that this explains, Mr. Speaker, the differences between the tender prices which were agreed and the final cost of execution.

(*Aside:* Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: That is not true.)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister should have given the facts, all the facts, and only all the facts.

He should have also said, Sir, that, as regards the Northern Industrial Access Road - I want to illustrate that there can oftentimes be a slip between the cup and the lip - let me show you the facts - as regards the tendering, in relation to the disposal of unsuitable excavating material, the tender price was based on 111 325 cubic metres. That is what the people could see in the tender document and what the consultants at the Ministry thought would have been required. The actual amount excavated was 227 477 cubic metres of material — and Mr. Speaker, this is the Northern Access Road and the Northern Access Road alone — a gap of twice the amount as compared to what was originally specified. The amount of filling as initially conceived of by the consultants and the Government experts on the Northern Industrial Access Road - 199 500 cubic metres. The actual amount of filling required to get the job done, 181 265 cubic metres.

So when the Minister comes to the House, Sir, and draws reference to cost overruns without telling the House what are some of the things which can cause a difference between a tender price and the final price of the execution of the project, he is asking us all to be babes in the woods, and to misunderstand the fact that

two things can happen, Sir, that the concept of a project can change between conception and actual implementation, and that the estimated quantities of the components can be sometimes way off target. It is for the Minister, Mr. Speaker, to tell this House whether it is not, in fact, true that as regards the other World Bank projects on which this company operated, there was a change of concept as between the initial presentation by Government and what the company was actually asked to do.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Haggatts. It was supposed to be a simple resurfacing exercise as conceived, and eventually the company was asked to undertake a large number of additional works, including drainage, curves and a whole range of other things, which obviously, Mr. Speaker, cause a change of concept, moving from a simple resurfacing job to a complete job, as anybody who has seen that road will understand, and leading to a difference between the initial price agreed to and the final cost of executing the project.

I am challenging this Minister of Transport and Works to say if there was not a change of concept. I am also asking him to say as regards the Northern Industrial Access Road, which he is now citing as part of the bad experience of this particular contractor, whether, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the numbers that I have cited as regards things like filling and excavation were underestimated in the initial tender documents.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple thing. All of us in this House have from time to time had to build houses, Sir, and we know that we start with a concept as to how much it may cost to build a house and it ends up costing something else.

I am saying to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has misled this House when he has caused this House to believe that he has rejected this particular company's bid on the basis of its bad performance. When he said that, he should have said that that is based on incomplete information. He should have told the House, Mr. Speaker, about the cost savings on the Newcastle to Foster Hall Road, on the Coach Hill to Newcastle Road, on the roads in Oxnards, on the Tent Bay Fisheries Project, on the container parks at the Port Authority, and on the resurfacing of Grantley Adams International Airport.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as well, on the basis of the information that has been provided by the Minister of Transport and Works, that, logically, a decision on this project should have been taken on the basis of a combination bid. And why do I say that, Sir?

We have a situation in which a Government of Barbados was presented with two scenarios. Road works

and bridges between Mile-and-a-Quarter and Warrens were to be built. We could have had them done as two separate contracts, involving two sets of mobilisation, and each of the two companies bidding said that, in their judgement, it would cost almost \$10.6 million to do that one job, but conceived of as two separate sub-sets of jobs. You asked them the separate question, Sir, if, however, you are to have one mobilisation and to treat this piece of work from Mile-and-a-Quarter to Warrens as one job, how much would it cost? Both said that it would cost less to do the two pieces of work as one job, than to treat the two pieces of work as two separate jobs. It stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, by any logic, that on the basis of the fact that both companies were able to show that there would be a reduction in the cost in having the two pieces of work done as one job, with one set of mobilisation, Government should have understood that a combination contract was the basis upon which a decision should have been taken.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: it was not a combination contract. I will explain it to him one more time.

A contract that deviates from the specification of the tender is an alternate bid and cannot be considered a combination contract. I do not consider it as such. It is your word, not mine.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take the point that the Minister is making. But the essential point that the House must grasp is that both contractors were asked, submitted to Government.....

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir: He makes the point that it is not a combination contract. Then the argument ends, because what is proposed as an alternative contract cannot *ipso facto* be considered. Therefore you have to consider the bids on two component's. Once you take that point, your argument collapses. 7.15 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I take the point as to the difference between a combination contract and an alternative contract. But let us understand the point, Sir, that the contract, if decided upon as a combination contract, would cost the Government of Barbados less money than if the contract was awarded in two separate phases. And if we are, Mr. Speaker, to be the guardians of the taxpayers' funds, the Government, if it were to be presented with a situation in which persons told it that it could do a piece of work in combination at a less cost than if it were to do it in two separate phases, should take the work done as a combination without the need for two sets of mobilisation. That is the point that I am making to the House this afternoon. That, Sir, is the point on which I am standing, that the evidence presented

to the House, Mr. Speaker, argued in support of Government taking a decision upon the basis of the award of this contract as a combination contract, in much the same way that previous contracts were awarded as combination contracts. Mr. Speaker, it stands to reason — why should a Government pay people to do two sets of mobilisation on the same project — and that is the value and the beauty of a combination contract.

Mr. Speaker, it is also very significant, and this is the point to which the Minister has not yet referred, that both contractors were able to show costs of doing the work, whether in combination, or whether on a phase by phase basis, that were lower than the prices suggested by the consultants of the Ministry of Transport and Works. That should tell the Minister of Transport and Works something. Because he said that he came to the inference, Sir, that because his consultants were telling him that it was \$11.7 million, he should award the contract to the highest bidder. But it seems to me, Sir, that the point that should have guided him is that both contractors who were tendering on this project were telling the Government of Barbados that the work to be undertaken could have been undertaken for less than the \$11.7 million that the Ministry of Transport and Works said it will cost, and we have Mr. Speaker, to use judgment in this matter.

I remember Mr. Speaker, that when I went to the Ministry of Finance and Planning in 1981, the initial cost of doing the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour in 1981 was set by consultants at \$40 million, in 1981 dollar terms. The Ministry of Finance and Planning can check it. The cost of doing it today is \$24 million. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that one has, very often, not to take, nor rely solely on, the experience so-called of consultants.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member for St. Peter has not listened very carefully to a point that the honourable Minister made, that the consultants will come in with their big price because the percentage that they get out of it is based on that high price, \$41 million for a fishing harbour that cost \$24 million.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you! Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable Member for St. Thomas for his interjection.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I cannot speak again, Sir, so I had to get a little something for it.)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member for St. Thomas has misrepresented what the Minister of Transport and Works has said. The Minister did not speak in those terms about the consultants purposely pushing the value up. He spoke in terms of when a final check is made as regards

the work, but not as regards an initial cost, as the honourable Member is saying.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Now what have you risen on?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am trying to elucidate....

Mr. SPEAKER: You ^ cannot have two points of order, on a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, you are quite right. You cannot have a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the essential point I am making is that, too often in the past, consultants' prices have been shown to be wrong, because they are not the people who have to go out there and do the work themselves. And when we have a situation in which the two contractors, who have the experience in actually doing the work, bringing tender prices that are lower than those of the consultants, it seems to be no *prima facie* case at all for a Minister of Transport and Works to say that the fact that the consultant's price is higher means that he should accept the higher bid. That is an illogical argument that is both in conflict with experience and at variance with common sense and logic.

What the Minister has said is that his consultants have told him that the price of doing the road is higher than the price that the contractors of Barbados, experienced in building roads, Sir — consultants do not build roads, contractors do — have told him that the road can be built for, and he decided to reject the advice of the contractors, experienced in building roads, to go for the advice of consultants, and by that process of logic, arbitrarily decided that under such circumstances, the higher tender was desirable. I have never in my entire experience heard more flawed logic. What the Minister should have taken account of, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the prices, whether in combination or done on a phase basis by the two contractors, were lower than those of the consultants, who have never built a road. That is the critical point, Sir.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now you are saying consultants should be ignored?)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It comes down, Mr. Speaker, to a very simple range of issues. In this matter, a number of things are material, that a road could have been built in Barbados for \$8.9 million and the Government could have held the contractor to bond, bound the contractor, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that that road to serve the people of my constituency, the constituency of my colleagues from St. Thomas, (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) St. James North (Mr. J. J. Payne) and (Hon. N. K. Simmons) St.

James South was built for \$8.9 million but it has sought through the arbitrary, unilateral, illogical and whimsical actions of a Minister of Transport and Works, misguided by the view that he should accept the recommendations of consultants, who do not build roads, over and above the judgment of contractors, to award a contract that is \$1.5 million higher than what it ought to be. It comes as no surprise — and this is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker - that the World Bank — and the Government wants to laugh off this thing about imperialism, colonialism, and whatever else — it comes as no surprise to this Opposition that people who had to sit down and dispassionately examine all of the circumstances in this matter, including the performance of the contractors under circumstances in which they were asked to do work within specific terms of reference that did not change, and also within terms of reference in circumstances that changed, when all these things were taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker,.....

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir: It is not true that the World Bank had all the information with respect to the past performance of the contractor. It is not true.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister is now opening an entirely different issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which you do not have time for. You do not have time for that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I want, Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude in the last five minutes I have allowed to me

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute more.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can ask for extended time.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, when one analyses all of the circumstances in this matter, the Minister has not, in our judgment, fairly represented the performance of the contractor who he has sought to dismiss as having been cost inefficient, because we can show evidence to establish concretely before this House, Sir, that that contractor, when once the terms of reference were not changed, was efficient and managed to execute contracts in a way that saved the Government of this country, and that it could not, Mr. Speaker, be a decision taken only on the basis of the performance of the contractor, unless the Minister wants to say that he was prepared only to look at those circumstances in which the contractor incurred cost overruns, that he was not at all prepared to qualify the circumstances under which those overruns were incurred, and that he was prepared to ignore all of those circumstances and situations in which the contractor executed work on time and in a manner

that reduced the cost that had to be borne by the taxpayers of this country. 7.25 p.m.

I, Sir, as I said, have no axe to grind in this matter. We in the developing world very often find situations in which any project at all is done even in a manner near to the tender cost. It is very rare. If the other side were to do the analysis, they will find that it is extremely rare, in either the developing or indeed the developed world, to find circumstances in which contracts are done in accordance exactly or even nearly to the tender price. We should be proud that there are contractors in Barbados who can, in fact, bring in work on time and within the contract price, no matter how small it is, because it is something that we are underestimating.

I think, Sir, that the Minister owes the House and the country a full explanation. The facts as advanced are illogical, they rest on a weak empirical foundation, they are shrouded, he resorted to a historical list of Acts that were supposed to discriminate against black people, and all, as I close, I must tell him, as I started by saying, is that when all is said and done, I can establish from my experience as the Member of Parliament for St. Peter that the contractor, whom he says, implicitly, was discriminated against, at least in my constituency did Golden Mile, Black Bess and Highway 1.

I have no axe to grind. My conscience is clear in this matter. It does not matter to me as between Rayside and "Cow" Williams, but we must have the best tender price, we must have contracts evaluated in accordance with the best criteria, and it cannot be properly said that it was done in this particular matter.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have been going a long time. We have gone beyond the time when we would have the dinner break. Therefore, I move that the sitting be suspended until 8.15 this evening.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 8.15 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 7.35p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (RESUMED)

ORDER NO. 3 - COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND RE HIGHWAY 2A (CONT'D)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was not in my place when the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman) began his speech - I was actually attending - as two other honourable Members were — the funeral of the late Mr. Garner — and therefore I rely for my information on notes that have been made available to me, as well as that part of the speech which I heard, and I do not wish for the purpose of this debate to repeat the admirable arguments which I heard advanced here by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. Arthur), nor, indeed, the admirable arguments which I have seen in the notes of the speech of the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons).

There are two aspects of the Minister's speech to which I will devote my attention before coming to the final part of his speech, which is the other consideration, Sir, which I must not allow to go fully unanswered in the debates of this House.

The first point that strikes me as strange is a statement from the Minister in which he said that the World Bank was asked — I am not sure if it was by his directions — as to whether it would agree to the contract being shared by the only two bidders on this contract.

As I understand it, both bidders are local companies, in which the majority shareholding, if not the full shareholding, is Barbadian. Both companies employ a substantial number of Barbadians. Both companies have records of performing admirably on the jobs in which they have been engaged both by Government and in the private sector. Both companies have contributed substantially to the development of the infrastructure of Barbados. In the case of one company, it has performed so well in Barbados that it has now merited the attention of other Governments in the region and is earning for Barbados foreign exchange overseas. I believe that we must, therefore, in discussing this matter, be careful in the allegations which we are making if those will eventually undermine the opportunity of Barbadian companies to tender successfully on international contracts, as has been manifested by at least one of the companies on this project.

If I am to take the Minister at his word, the company has performed, in the Minister's estimation, so badly, that the company is not worthy of the award of a contract.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition prefaced his statement by saying he was not here. I let the first point which he made, which was not faithfully reported, go.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member has notes, he should not try to over-interpret the meaning of the notes that he has. To do so would be to inflict violence on the truth. 8.20 p.m.

I never characterised the contractor as being a good contractor or a bad contractor. I looked at a number of major contracts that he had been awarded, I analysed the bid prices and compared it with the final prices which he received, and came to the conclusion that, if I assumed that the consultants and all persons participating in that particular process were functioning efficiently, the process itself was flawed. I was at pains to indicate that that process was flawed, and, therefore, the tender process could not be relied upon to yield a meaningful recommendation, especially since the figure that the Opposition is promoting varied from the cost estimate of the consulting engineers by 21.67 per cent. I never said anything about the contractor being good or bad.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Minister says he has not characterised the contractor as a good or bad contractor. As I understand it, the performance of this contractor on previous jobs has been of such a standard that the contractor has been thought worthy of being awarded international contracts from which Barbados is earning foreign exchange. That is the point I am making. And what I am saying is that the contractor must have had a proper record to have been thought worthy of being selected, over other international contractors, in the international tendering field.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into this question about overseas contracts. I only know of one overseas contract that he has, and it is a contract in which he is a junior partner to an international construction firm.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: For the Minister's benefit, I do travel rather frequently in the Eastern Caribbean, and I have noticed that Barbadian contractors, including this very contractor, as well as about two others, are today bidding successfully, under both ODA contracts, financed by the British Government, as well as contracts financed under the European Economic Community Lome projects. What I am saying to the House is that, obviously, this contractor must have performed satisfactorily; otherwise, they would not have been in a position to win international bids in the Eastern Caribbean.

Sir, I began on that note because the Minister has said that a telegram, or telex, or communication, was sent to the World Bank asking whether the contract could be shared by both bidders. If this is so, it seems to me that within the Ministry's mind itself must be the assumption

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir: Before the honourable Member goes on again chasing rainbows on another trip that is a fantasy, let me tell him what I said.

I read out a particular letter which I wrote to the World Bank, and the purpose of writing the letter, as I indicated to this Honourable Chamber, was to put the fullest range of options before the Cabinet.

There were three possible decisions the Cabinet of Barbados could make: (1), to award the contract to Ray side; (2), it could award the contract to C. O. Williams; (3), since the contract had two components, it would award one to Rayside and one to C. O. Williams. That is the full range of options, and I therefore wrote the World Bank to find out what their view would be to each option. That was the purpose for doing it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Minister has said what would have been his position had the World Bank indicated that the contract could have been awarded to both of them, in the manner in which he has just set out. What would have been your position if the World Bank had said that the third option, the option of the contract being awarded to both people, in two contracts, would have been possible? Because what I am arguing, Sir, is that implicit in the Minister's statement must be an admission that this contractor is capable of carrying out the contract, or part of it. That is the point I want to make.

The second point that I find strange in the Minister's presentation is the point relating to the communication with the World Bank. I hope I am not misquoting him, but the notes which I have say that the Ministry sent a recommendation to the World Bank asking if they had any objection to awarding the contract to C. O. Williams Construction Company. What I want to know is, would that communication have gone on without the Minister. himself.....

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Again on a point of order: It is really a waste of time for the honourable Member to be speaking about things on the basis of hearsay and notes which are not comprehensive.

I was at pains to point out that an official who deals with the World Bank project sent that communication off, having received the recommendation of the

Tenders Committee, and I did not become involved in the process until a reply was obtained from the World Bank. I was not aware of what was going on.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is exactly what I am saying, so the Minister is a little bit premature. What I am asking is, why is the procedure such that within the Ministry, after the Tenders Committee has reported, whoever be the official that is dealing with the matter can communicate directly with the World Bank . . .

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is the question. Why should that happen?)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: . . . before the normal procedures, which I understand to be the procedures that are followed from tender right up through to Cabinet, have taken place.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order: I can explain. I crave your indulgence, Sir. I believe this debate is designed to clarify certain questions.

The officer concerned, I am satisfied, acted in good faith. He is of the view that it would be better to find out what the bank's reaction is to a particular recommendation in advance, having regard to the embarrassment which the Government of Barbados suffered in the award of the contract to C. O. Williams with respect to the Airport-West Coast Road over the tender of Vincler, then to find that the IADB be told what a sovereign Government had done and force the matter to go back out to tender again. That was his explanation for doing it, to avoid any such repetition of embarrassment.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have heard the honourable Member say that the officer acted in good faith, but I have to tell the Minister that if these are procedures in the Ministry, something must be wrong. He cannot blow hot and cold on it. If those are the procedures in his Ministry, something must be wrong, because in my experience in tenders of this nature, until the matter has got beyond Tenders Committee, usually in the Planning and Priorities, the now renamed Committee, and then to Cabinet, the communication at this level never takes place. 8.30 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, you have to take responsibility for it. It is not simply a question of agreeing.

That is the point I am making.

So, Sir, I am glad the honourable Member has mentioned the other matter that occurred here, Sir, because I am going to bring up that on the other issues

that have been addressed in this debate. But I find that very strange.

Sir, we were told about the greater efficiency that has come into Administration since the magic day of May 28, 1986, and we were told about the magic administration that came into being even subsequent to that date, when the Minister took over his portfolio. Am I being told that it is business as usual?

(*Aside:* Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: No, it is not; otherwise, "Cow" Williams would not have come into it.)

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to talk to that soon.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am going to tell you why it is business in a minute, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Is it business as usual in the Minister's Ministry? What has he done to ensure and to give the House his assurance that that situation will not occur again, and that the proper procedures will be followed?

Sir, those are two of the contradictions that I found in his speech. I want to deal with some others, though, Sir, the first being the question of cost overruns, and I do not want to repeat what the Member for St. Peter has said.

(*Aside:* Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: What contradictions?)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not accept on face value the Minister's listing of those projects that are behind schedule. We have to get many more details than have been given.

Let me give him my information on a couple of the projects and my experience as a traveller on some of these projects. I want to take, first, the Warrens to Sturges Highway. My information is that that project, when awarded, should have commenced on June 2, 1987, and should have been completed on November 30, 1987. Is it not a fact that the Ministry never issued an instruction to commence until October 25, 1987?

Secondly - I am talking about the Warren's to Sturges Highway — the project did not originally envisage the construction of a roundabout at the Welchman Hall

Post Office. Is it not a fact that part of the delay on that project is caused because the Ministry has not even up to today made up its mind as to whether it wishes a roundabout at that junction or not?

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Welchman Hall Post Office area.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: There have been design changes which have occurred on all three of the projects. Let me give you my experience of the project that runs along the Bussa Highway, I think it is Highway 5 going right into St. Philip.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I said I did not want to pursue this area into the realm of nastiness. But there is an area in which, after contracts are awarded, where bids are lower than others in order to get the contracts, there is collusion on a wide scale to do all kinds of things to justify pushing the sum of money back up again. I am going to ask the Cabinet to conduct an investigation into these malpractices.

I do not want to get into the area of dirtiness, I want to keep it clean. But I am warning the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, since he is particularly concerned that the reputation of the contractor is not tarnished in order that he can get work overseas, do not push it! Do not push it!

There is, in my view, a serious subterranean area involving what they call extras. In any event, if every project that a contractor has is changed, there is ground, therefore, for believing that the whole tendering process is fraudulent. If after every project begins it is changed, there is reason to believe that the entire process is a fraud.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I travel on Highway 5 very often. And I have experienced the delays that have been on that project, because

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that certain contractors who were interested in tendering for the rehabilitation of that highway were given to understand that they could not do certain things on the road, and that these decisions were changed when C. O. Williams - I do not want to get into it, but if you force me to, I will, and tell you what I believe happened.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The public is entitled to know. If there is fraud, tell the House. It is nothing to do with me, man. Tell the House.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and if I do not get the information on the floor of the House, I am going to get it at the Public Accounts Committee.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member asked when last we met.

Laughter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Ask the honourable Member if we can yet find the Minutes or anything. Sir. Tell him how many times I have asked for it to meet, if he wants to know when last we met.

What I want to get, is the information on these matters. It is all rights for the Minister to say he does not want to get into an area of nastiness. But the House is entitled to know, if the allegation is that the contractor has been delayed and there are cost overruns, whether the reasons have been that there is inefficiency in the tendering system, whether or not it is because of the deficiency in the consultant's assessment of the project, whether or not it is delay caused by the failure to issue instructions on time, or whether it is unforeseen circumstances.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Or fraud.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Or whether it is fraud.

(*Aside:* Hon. B. M. TAITT: Or all of the above)..

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Or a combination of all of these things.

Sir, I have been dealing with contracts of this nature for a long time. There are all sorts of circumstances that can delay a project. I can only give the House the benefit of what I notice on particular projects, because I am not privy to the Ministry's files, or, indeed, to the consultants report, until they get into the realm of litigation, in which, invariably, in arbitration, one or other of us will see these documents.

It seems to me that, on the Highway 5 project, there has been a fundamental change from what the project started out to be, and that is the point made by the honourable Member for St. Peter. As to the reasons as to why those changes occurred, I am not making allegations at anybody, but *if* there are changes that occurred within the terms of the contract, there are two possibilities - they are either compensated by loss and expense if the contractor can justify his reasons for so doing, or if the contract is properly drafted and the contractor is at fault, there is a liquidated or penalty

clause for which he pays. That is what I want to know. If the contract has been properly drawn, this would happen. 8.40 p.m.

I have no information on the other project, but on those two of the three projects, this seems to be what has happened. For instance, take the Boarded Hall and Lower Greys Junction. For a long time, there was delay in the section from Boarded Hall right down through Watts Village. Then another section in South District was left out for a considerable period of time. I believe there is now Bentley to Carrington left out. I have seen full mobilisation of the contractor on the site. So I must ask, what is the reason for the delay?

If there is delay caused and there is full mobilisation of a contractor on a site, you are paying for every day the contractor has to rent the equipment and keep it on site. Whether he is renting it himself or he is providing it, you are paying a proportion of his overhead cost for his site cost, and of his overhead cost of his main administration, and you are going to pay a percentage of his financing charges for loss of expense. So when you get the cost overruns, it is not, in my view, a simple matter of saying to the House that they are cost overruns. What I am asking for are the reasons for the cost overruns that have been occurring on the projects of which the Minister spoke.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Minister has said *sotto voce* that the process is flawed, and he has *sotto voce* said that he said it standing up here. I did not hear the whole of his speech.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He will bring a new type of contract).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the process is flawed, the House would wish to know the proposals for improving the flawed position that exists.

Sir, the Northern Access Road was started and implemented during the Barbados Labour Party's time and the honourable Member for St. Peter has given some of the reasons explaining why in some areas there have been cost overruns. There is an additional reason.

When there was a change of Government.....

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ... let me go on. ... there was additional works to the extent of \$ 1.9 million, continuing the project to Nesfield.

(*Aside:* Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, not only that — and Greenland).

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Nesfield, both ends, plus a continuation beyond the cement plant.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, part of the additional cost comes from the payment of the sum of \$2.9 million for excavation. Excavation is the main item in the additional cost, and I contend now, as I did¹ when I introduced the Supplementary Resolution relating to this road last year, that with the excavating equipment on the site, the cost of \$2.9 million for going a few feet deeper to get a foundation, a situation in which one was digging up mud, is an astronomical cost. It is equivalent to gorging the Government.

I also do not accept the reasons given for the increased excavation. The consultants at that time stated that there was no known way in engineering devised in which they could anticipate the depths at which they had to dig.

There is another view from engineers on this, and common sense would indicate to me that that latter view is the correct view.

If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was here, he would have heard me say that one of the issues that has been highlighted by this entire episode is the role of the consultants in the tendering process and in the execution of the projects. There is a potential conflict of interest, and it resides in the fact that the fees of a consultant are tied to the total cost of a project. If the cost goes up, the fees go up, and, therefore, there is no incentive for a consultant to reduce cost. That is a matter that has to be looked at and resolved in a way to prevent the Government from spending unnecessarily high consultancy fees.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statement therefore is not an indictment of the contractor.

(*Aside:* Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: An indictment of the process. That is what I said.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If it is an indictment of the process, an indictment of the consultants, one thing it is not is an indictment of the contractor in the process. It cannot be. Because if the specifications which were passed on

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, again on a point of order: My speech was not intended to indict anybody. All that I stated is that at the end that it is a process, in which the contractor is involved, that cannot be relied upon.

For the purpose of the discussion, I assumed, in the face of empirical evidence I have to the contrary, that the consultants were acting at maximum efficiency, and I assumed that we had the best possible tenders committee. If all these elements involved are functioning at their best, if this assumption is made and we are consistently getting cost overruns in the range of 30 per cent to over 60 per cent, then it has to be the process.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the Minister said it is the process, because that is exactly the next point I was going to make. Therefore, in judging his contracts, he cannot look at this contractor and use the fact that there have been cost overruns as a reason for disqualifying him from the contract. That is the point.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: What I can do, Sir, is to reject the outcome of the process as being decisive, as being one that can ensure the best result possible.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Then the Minister's argument is again flawed. Because in the whole process, both contractors would have tendered against a background of a process which the Minister says is fundamentally flawed, including the fact that the basis on which tenders of both parties would have been established would have contained the very flaws in the specifications. What is there that makes the Minister so sure that the award as made would not itself be still part of the flawed process and be subject to cost overruns? That is the point I am making. I do not mind how often they take the point.

The point is we have been able to establish that the Minister is not indicting anyone, taking him at his word. We have been able to establish that the indictment is of the system of tendering because of the manner in which specifications are made and consultants are remunerated. But those are factors that are common to all tenders, not to any particular tender in this case. So I am suggesting to the Minister that those could not be the reasons on which a decision could be made in the matter. 8.50 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He can argue as much as possible that that is a *non sequitur*. It is a logical argument in this case, because there will be factors common to both tenders. You cannot isolate them and say it only applies to the tender of A but not to the tender of B, and therefore what the House would want to ask, is, what is the independent and empirical evidence that would lead the Minister to conclude that by making the award in the manner in which he says it has been made, there will be not the same cost overruns that one has seen on jobs such as this. One has to ask that, Sir.

Sir, I do not believe at all that the decision has been made solely on a question of tenders, on analyses of

tenders and on analyses of past performance. I do not believe that those are the criteria which were applied in this case at all, and I believe that the Minister ended up really, as I said to him as he walked out of the House, putting up the only defence that he could plead in this case, and that is what he calls the other considerations or the Don Blackman - what did he call it, Sir? To use his words, I am not referring to the honourable Member by his name - the Den Blackman factor or something of the sort.

Sir, I want briefly to deal with this other consideration, and I want to deal with it, because when the Minister started to address the issue, he became extremely emotional, understandably.

(*Aside:* Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: And so did you.)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Of course.

He also lost his cool and he started hurling his words all around the place — "quislings," "Uncle Toms". I thought we had moved a long way from that type of pejorative language being hurled at opponents, appealing to raw emotions in situations such as these, in order to, of course, brand one side or other of the House in a particular manner. And although the Minister was careful not to offend the Rules of the House by referring to any honourable Members on this side, he could not resist his usual riding horse, the Opposition party, and that is why I have to put this into the debate.

I am certainly not taken in, not about the argument about the need for social justice in the society in Barbados, that is a different matter. I am not taken in by the manner in which the Government would characterise a particular event as representing its manifestation of the implementation of a particular policy when you look at other ways in which the Government implements other parts of its policy.

The same firm is headed by a person who today is chairman of a major investment area in which the Government is a substantial shareholder, the Pine Hill Dairy. He could only have been there with the consent of the Government. I heard all about "white shadows," but one has to say that the Government in this instance says one thing and does another.

The honourable Member said we are still referring to May 28, 1986. If the person was controversial then, the person would have to have remained controversial within the Government's breast and bosom after May 28, 1986. Let the Government explain why he was then taken fully into the breast and bosom to be considered worthy of heading a major Government corporation, and other directors of the same firm were considered of the

Government's appointment on other statutory boards. The experience is a little different from the emotional benefits that can accrue from these constant attacks.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The position of the Government is that it will be fair to all. This Government never subscribes to any policy of racial exclusivity. There is no policy of racial exclusivity, what there is is that there is no preference.

The playing field is levelled for everybody, and everybody will be treated on the basis of equality. You are arguing against exclusionism, and this has never been the policy of this Government, only fair play.

Mr. SPEAKER: If we proceed on this matter the way we are going, we will have a series of speeches, which is not permitted by the Rules of this House, and therefore I would prefer points of order to be precise and to the point.

I will give the honourable Member five more minutes to conclude his speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to you, Sir. That happens with every speech I make. The honourable Members like the idea of interrupting in an effort to divert me from making the main point.

What I am saying quite clearly to the Honourable Minister, Sir, is that I really cannot accept on face value everything that he has said in this House, and I do not believe for one moment that the Government in any way has any clear policy in this area. 9.00 p.m.

Sir, let us get to the question of equitable distribution of resources. If one looks at the award of all the tenders made under the Barbados Labour Party, you will find that there was no preferential treatment given in these areas. The honourable Member for St. Peter has just cited some of the contracts which Rayside Construction Co. Ltd. was awarded. He cited Highway 1. Let me for the purpose of the record say that he is a contractor whom I have employed. Let me say that former Prime Minister St. John has employed him on his own contracts on more than one occasion. So let me put the position absolutely clear, that this is not an argument from the Barbados Labour Party against Rayside Construction Co. Ltd. and its ability to perform on a contract.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Minister can say, in the emotionalism for which he is known, one is defending somebody. To me, the colours look the same.

As far as I am concerned, the honourable Member has some categories of mulattoes and what not, and when I look along the line, most of them look the same. I am not getting into that area anyhow. Saying *sotto voce* that you are defending A or B - this is no defending of any A or B, white man, black man or anything of the sort.

I do not believe that this Government has any consistency even on the policy that it has enumerated about equal distribution of resources for people in this country, and it is being manifested in more than one way. The honourable Member is saying that he is making the change in this country. Well, Sir, I look forward to seeing all these changes. But if you look right through the appointments which the Government has made to the statutory boards, having given the Barbados Labour Party up and down the length and breadth of this country, if you will allow me to say it, Sir, "hell", whenever the day was passed and the election was finished the Government turned and stood on its head and did a somersault. There are some members of Government who might have decided views on such matters, but the policy as implemented by the Government was not a policy that showed any consistency at all, and, therefore, when I hear this being the only reason, I find it very difficult to accept that as the reason for the award of the contract in this case.

I am saying that, as a matter of Governmental policy, and looking at what has happened since May 28, 1986, I do not believe that they have worked out their act in any way whatsoever. Therefore, I come back to the point, how are we to be satisfied that in the long run, the public of Barbados is going to get the best deal out of the use of its money on a contract such as this one? We will wait and see.

Hon. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to become involved in this debate, but the Leader of the Opposition has this very peculiar and unique capacity to get me to become concerned about statements which he makes, and when the Leader of the Opposition is taking on the position of high morality, I become acutely interested to hear what he has to say, because, Sir, if there is an honourable Member in this House that can discuss the inability of a Government or a person to establish a consistent moral policy, the honourable Member would be that Member. He has that unique capacity.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member would be the first in this House to accept and acknowledge that there is such an item as ministerial discretion. The system of Government which we claim to have is one in which the Cabinet representing the body politic, that is the General Assembly, as an Executive Committee is entrusted with the responsibility for making the decisions. What I have

heard today suggests that if a system is set up which says that there shall be a committee called a Tenders Committee, that that Tenders Committee, by virtue of its having been set up, becomes the executive authority *par excellence* over which there is no other authority, so if that Tenders Committee should make a recommendation, a Minister - and note the use of the term, Sir - dare not "intervene".

Mr. Speaker, I have heard nothing that is more atrocious and assaulting on the concept of sovereignty than that which suggests that a Minister "intervenes" because some committee somewhere makes a recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, it is axiomatic that every tender that is put out in this country states as its last proviso that the Government does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any other tender. The reason for that is a very simple reason, Sir — the Government reserves the right to make a decision based on considerations other than the numbers.

The honourable Members and every other single person in this country has the right to argue that the award of the tender to Rayside is a wrong or undesirable award. Anybody can argue that. That is the system of Government we have. But they cannot argue that the Minister and the Cabinet does not have the right to so award it, and the tenor and the gravamen of the argument is questioning.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order: The honourable Member is imputing foolishness to members of the Opposition. We do not subscribe to that nonsense. The view that he is trying to attach to the Opposition, nobody has said that. I believe everybody on this side at some point would have seen a tender come to Cabinet for Cabinet's decision. Nobody says the Minister cannot intervene. Sir, they will know that Minister Johnson on the Tom Adams Highways business, with all the confusion with the IDE, went up to Washington. 9.1Cp.m.

(Aside: What Tom Adams Highway?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I call it Tom Adams Highway.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Do not let us be sidetracked. I am not going to be sidetracked by any of that, because I am glad to hear that the honourable Member is saying that he agrees with what I am saying now. I can only base what I say now on what I hear. My perceptions

might be very confused, but I have listened very carefully to the arguments put forward by the honourable Member for St. Peter (Mr. O. S. ARTHUR) and, latterly, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I am saying that the conglomeration of thoughts expressed by them have left me in the clear perception of what they said as an attack on the right of the Minister, in the first instance, to "intervene."

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order: Sir, the honourable Member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am getting to the point where Members rising on a point of order must indicate what is the point of order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I have not imputed any motive or sought to put any construction on the Minister's action. I was saying I want to establish a number of material things: Fact one was that the contract was costing too much, and fact two was that a document having been sent to the World Bank by officials, the Minister intervened without attaching a judgment one way or the other to it.

The Member for St. Michael West, Sir, is now trying to read into what I said things that I did not say.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I have said nothing about what they have said, Sir. I was talking about what I have heard. I am saying what I perceive. It may be a failure of my capacity to understand. I am willing to admit that I do not understand as well as you do. I am saying, however, for clarity, so that it shall be abundantly clear, that from the time when the Government is put in the hands of a particular group of persons, whether they be the Barbados Labour Party or the Democratic Labour Party, one of the things which that group of persons is expected to do is to make decisions on behalf of the rest of the community.

The honourable Member for St. Michael East (Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman) articulated three premises which may have motivated and directed him in his approach to the awarding of the contract. He went on further to indicate that it is the Cabinet of Barbados that agreed with the awarding of the contract, and yet, the argument which is being put forward is being couched in the language of numbers — this little piggy is smaller than that little piggy — and therefore there must be some reason that is beyond the naked eye.

We have said, the Cabinet has said, that after consideration, it will not allow the sovereignty of Barbados to reside in Washington, Moscow, London or anywhere else.

(Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Only Tokyo.)

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Or Tokyo. Sir, again he wishes me to be diverted. I am not going to get diverted.

The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken very clearly about his perceptions. The honourable Member for St. Peter has sought to show that small contracts have resulted in one kind of saving or the other, and has by a specious argumentation rejected the larger contracts which the honourable Member used. I am not disputing his right, Sir, to come to his conclusions. I am saying, however, that in coming to those conclusions, he cannot be heard to say, nor can the Leader, that the honourable Member is somehow motivated, nor can he infer that the Cabinet is motivated, by some collective consideration other than those which have been presented to this Honourable House. That is the inference to be drawn, and as a member of that Cabinet, Sir, I reserve the right to defend a decision of the Cabinet.

When this Cabinet makes decisions, it has to be assumed that proper and legal consideration has been given to the matters that came before it. I am not going to be part of any consideration that this Cabinet is motivated by some base consideration other than those which we articulated that allowed us to become the Government of this country. 'Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about these matters.

Mr. Speaker, when you examine this matter in all of its ramifications, the fundamental factor is that there must be clearly etched in the minds, for all time, of every Barbadian that no one in the World Bank, the United Nations or any other agency anywhere can speak for the people of Barbados. The only people that can speak definitively and specifically for the people of Barbados are those who have been elected to speak for the people of Barbados.

How dare some third rate or second rate individual in some agency somewhere speak to a Minister in the Government of Barbados in the terms which they determine that they will speak to a Minister of the Government of Barbados? It does not matter if it is a Minister of the Barbados Labour Party Government. I promise you faithfully that the time would come when, from somewhere, I would defend you. You are young enough that you may be a Minister in a Barbados Labour Party Government. I will defend the rights of the honourable Member for St. Peter. The honourable Member for Christ Church West may not be a Minister again, Sir, but that honourable Member is young enough, and I will defend his position because, in the final analysis, it does not matter which Government is in power, what is important is that the Government of Barbados is making the decision.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It has nothing to do with self-esteem. It is a very serious, fundamental issue. It is an issue which people in Barbados, and especially people in the Barbados Labour Party, do not understand. It is an issue where you have constantly allowed people outside of Barbados to feel that they have jurisdiction over this country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member cannot say that the Barbados Labour Party has not stood up for the defence of Barbados in relation to international institutions. The honourable Member will well recall, Sir, and I do not want to delay too long, that on the award of the Airport to West Coast Highway, the argument which we advanced was exactly that, defending the sovereign integrity of the Government of Barbados. But if the honourable Member would read the columnists of the Democratic Labour Party at the time, he would see that they argued so strongly against us as to undermine that very sovereignty for which we were fighting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member will try to divert me, and I will divert with him to make this point. We did not argue against the principle. We argued against the cost. We argued that you were insulting the intelligence of the people of Barbados to spend \$90 million in the way you intended to spend it. We will continue to argue that, and whether we name it "Tom Adams" or whatever, we will still be steeped in our concept that you spent too much money.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The foreign directors of the Barbados Labour Party foreign policy allowed us to make a mockery of our sovereignty in this region. The honourable Member will not wish me to re-open a debate that was held in here, but the direction which came to the Barbados Labour Party from foreign sources was clear. The deception which the people of this country endured.....

(Aside: You cannot be serious!)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not serious? I am so dead serious, Mr. Speaker! The honourable Member does not wish me to go into great detail. The deception which the people of this country had to endure when foreign attitudes prevailed on this region is something which will not be held to be the finest hour of Barbados and Barbados' foreign policy.

The honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, may, in fact, regale this House with examples of his own personal standing up and argumentation in international forums. At the same time, in his quieter-

moments, he would recall that he stood alone on more than one occasion when trying to bring a certain quietude to the attitudes of the Barbados Labour Party in the face of foreign positions. 9.20 p.m.

I do not wish to go into detail because it does not lend well for the sovereignty of this country for us to be exchanging arguments back and forth each time we change sides. Suffice it to say that, having spent a substantial part of my life in the international arena and knowing how these matters are conducted, I cannot now, have never been, nor will I ever be able to accept that we are to be directed from outside of Barbados in these matters.

The Minister of Transport and Works in Barbados has a right to have a view based on the confidence which has been placed in him by the people of this country and then by the Cabinet. He has a right to have a view on the awarding of a contract of this nature. And when this is fortified by argumentation by the officials in the Ministry of Transport and Works, the argumentation of those officials must be accepted as valid. We have to assume that the officials which serve the two Governments, or whichever Government is in power, are officials of high integrity. And when, as has been clearly articulated here, a consultant within the Ministry itself draws to the attention of the Minister certain facts, and the Minister, in his own deliberate judgment, comes to a conclusion based on those facts, it is the duty of his colleagues, unless they can find some substantial deviation from truth, deviation from morality or deviation from integrity, to support the conclusions which that Minister has reached. Failure to do so, I submit, Mr. Speaker, will result in a mockery of the Cabinet system which we are alleged to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important in the history of Barbados that we do not succumb to specious argument which seeks to suggest that because we put a white man as Chairman of the Pine Hill Dairy, we are inconsistent. The Democratic Labour Party has never argued that white people should be shot, that white people should starve, or any of those things. What we have always argued is that there must be equal opportunity in this country.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: We have never been against white people, but we are for black people as well, and it must not be misunderstood. It is too constantly misunderstood in this country that in order to be for black people, you must be against white people. There are hardly any white people in Barbados anyhow.

(*Aside:* Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Make that point).

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If you all wish to continue with this myth that there are black and white Barbadians who are at each other's throats on an ongoing basis, and if you wish to continue with the myth that in order to be for black people you must be against white people, that is your problem. But nothing can deny the fact that white people in Barbados have controlled the economic system from time immemorial, and that the only way black people will get a chance to participate in the economic development of this country is for them to be given some advantage. This is a fact of life that we have fought for, and that is how we become Members of Parliament. We keep telling people out there that we want to give them opportunity, Mr. Speaker. We cannot give them opportunity if, every time the question arises, we run and hide and duck.

I worked as Minister of Trade, Industry, and Commerce in this country, Sir, and suffered interminably because I sought to provide opportunity for black people in areas where this had never existed. I allowed myself, Sir, to suffer at the hands of ordinary black politicians because I had, perhaps, the raw courage. Mr. Speaker, at that time, at my age, I might have been sufficiently Barbadian illiterate as to take my courage in my hands and forge forth. Within my own political party there were persons who were uncomfortable, to say nothing of the persons in the Barbados Labour Party. But that is par for the course. That is normal in a situation when you dare to rush in where angels fear to tread.

The Barbados Labour Party heaped scorn upon the head of Minister of Trade, Industry, and Commerce and told the merchants in this country that the Minister had come to destroy them. The merchants would have known who to tell. So if they told you, it was certainly nothing new. But the fact is, that arising out of that, there was in this country a large cadre of black people who had managed to become part of the entrepreneurial class.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member is misleading the House. The Labour Party never said they have told the merchants any such thing. What the Minister has not got right is that 400 small black shopkeepers whom he destroyed told us so, that he drove them out. The small, black entrepreneurs!

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That information has been demonstrated not to be true. It was information spoken by David Seale, who has admitted that he was the arch-adviser of the Barbados Labour Party. It was embraced in his column.

(*Aside:* Hon. M. A. KING: They said that last Sunday, too.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: And it was embraced by the late Tom Adams who, behind the Speaker's Chair, brag-

ged on how he manipulated the position of white people in the country and he could tell who was going to win the Government by where the white support is. The honourable Member, who has been described as a white man by the same Tom Adams, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.....

(*Aside:* Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He never described me as that.)

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, he described you in Parliament. It is in the record. He called you a white man, because he understood better than you do the sociological development in this country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member must cite the part of Hansard to which he is referring. He must not get away with something like that. The only time that I have been referred to, Sir, as a white person has been by a Mr. Bernstein when he was campaigning in Christ Church West for the Democratic Labour Party. He said that up in Forde's Road to the black people, and when he got into the white area, he told them that I was one of the supporters of Elton Mottley and was a Black Nationalist, and I had no use for white people. They used both arguments against me. The honourable Member knows that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Assuming that the honourable Member is correct, he cannot erase from the records of this House where in a debate over salaries, when Tom Adams was Leader of the Opposition, he turned and said in this House that he was not speaking of people like Henry Forde. If the honourable Member is Henry Forde, I mean him, Sir. The record is clear. I am not discussing whether he is white or black. I have accepted him as black, Sir. I do not have any problem.

I am saying that it is not true that any 400 shopkeepers disappeared. That is the sort of myth which was put out. In this country, we have a situation where the same honourable Members over there, or over here, who have been trained, can go out into the world and tell the people this is a blue wall, and then some sub-literate person, with a different pigmentation, will tell them, no, it is a green wall. People have been trained to accept that if someone of a certain pigmentation says something, it must necessarily be true, and if you add the word "commerce" to it, you have been taught, and the people have accepted, they know about commerce. They import salt fish, therefore, they know about business, when there are people on this side and that side who have been trained in business, who have advised people in business outside of this country. But you have people who say if you worked in Roebuck Street, you must know about Roebuck Street.

Mr. Speaker, when I was nine years old I worked* in Roebuck Street. I have not made it a habit to speak

this. But Chrissie Brathwaite was my godfather, and I used to work in his shop on Roebuck Street, just as the honourable Member likes to talk about how he worked with Madam Ifill directing the buses. When I was nine years old, I was running a store in Roebuck Street. There is nothing to it.

(*Aside:* He was a good man).

Hon. B. M. TAITT: So was your late mother. She was a good woman.

The point I am making, Sir, is, whether you worked in Broad Street, Roebuck Street, or Swan Street is not important. What is important is that we have a legacy which has been passed to us, and we have a duty to pass it on to our progeny so that, subsequently if we all live to become part of the old generation, we can look at the people who take over from us and feel certain in the knowledge that their decisions are going to be grounded in integrity and morality, and will be bereft of the kind of superficial discussion which passes for serious discussion in many of the living rooms of Barbados.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that attempts to make of this issuing of a contract a larger issue than it actually is, can divide this country unnecessarily. The Government has made the decision. The Government will live by the decision. And if it comes that the Government must die by the decision, such are the vicissitudes of this business we are in. But I support the decision on the grounds that have been advanced, and as a member of the Cabinet. I will not resile from it because the Opposition and the newspapers will now come and suggest that we have somehow done something that we ought not to have done and there is no health in us. 9.30p.m.

The fact is that from the World Bank, we are talking of US\$2.5 million. We are going to collect a substantially larger sum in revenues. We will pay for Highway 2A, because Highway 2A is to be used by Barbadians first and foremost. Our children and our children's children, and your children and your children's children, will use Highway 2A, so if we are called upon to pay for it and to retain our sovereignty and our sanity, we will so do.

We ought to be proud of the fact, finally, Sir, that there are two Barbadian companies that can be engaged in a controversy, that there are two Barbadian companies, one black and, as they say, one white. When we reach the point where we can have a black Barbadian company that can vie for a contract of this kind and we can have argument not as to whether they can do it, but whether they should have the contract, that is an indication and a vindication of the Democratic Labour Party's policies

which we set out upon in 1961. But I will be more generous than that - it is a vindication of the black people of Barbados who embarked ever since 1951 to find a destiny for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in this very debate we are seeing the fruition of that quest we set out on in 1951. There is more to come, there will be more debates of this kind, but let those debates be grounded in some other high quality or some other high issue of morality. Do not let it be a question of \$1 million or whether we should pay US\$2.5 million and give up some gift from the World Bank for which we have to pay anyhow.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my intervention is tinged with some emotion, but I am not sorry that I feel emotional about it. I regret that, because the standard of debate requires that we be without emotion. But then, as a politician and as a Member of this Honourable House and this distinguished gathering, I feel able to be emotional about an emotional issue, and so I say that I will support this measure before the House and I will support the decision which the Cabinet has taken in its right as the sovereign Executive Committee of Barbados.

I thank you.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PROUTE ST. THOMAS RE PLAYING FIELD

Order No. 4 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Proute, St. Thomas for the purpose of developing a playing field.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, the Government is in the process of acquiring 12,482 square metres of land at Proute Village, St. Thomas for the purpose of providing a playing field.

We had started compulsory acquisition proceedings there, but then the Cabinet of this Administration asked us to negotiate with the owner in order to acquire the land by private treaty. We spoke with the owner, and, in fact, we have come to an agreement on the sale price, but certain documents which we requested from the owner have not been submitted, and therefore this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament to acquire the land by compulsory acquisition at Proute Village, St. Thomas.

The playing field will accommodate the residents of areas like Applewhaites, Strong Hope, Proute Village and Clifton Hill.

With those remarks I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, the playing field will accommodate the residents of Clifton Hill, Strong Hope and so on. Let the record show, Sir, that the playing field has been accommodating the residents of those districts ever since 1986. Sometimes you have to say what you do, otherwise people will distort history, like somebody called Douglas Leopold Phillips.

I went and had a look in 1985, from Applewhaites to Clifton Hill, for an area for a playing field for the people from Clifton Hill right back down to the junction with Applewhaites. The only piece of land that was available was off the main road in Proute fivehundred the houses on the left hand side as you go up to Walkes Spring and Clifton Hill, and a playing field was established there.

My regret is that in the last 18 months the playing field has been crying out for completion and attention from the Ministry responsible for Sport and the National Sports Council, and the interest that has been shown by those two bodies in the proper establishment of the playing field has been less than satisfactory. It is still bumpy, there is still an area which is prone to flooding — and the rains will soon come — which needs to be filled in. We have all this extra rubble about now with the roadworks which are in progress, and a couple of loads could be put in the back of the houses and fill in the depression to prevent flooding and prevent the problem of mosquitoes when there are heavy rains.

In particular, the field needs to be properly dressed, levelled and the depression, of course, filled in with mould. Even though it is serving some purpose at the moment, it is not, in fact, being put to optimum use, because there are still things to be done.

The Acting Minister will obviously be able to tell us whether in the Government's capital development plan for this year any money is set aside for the final works to be done on that playing field. It was bought from the Shipping and Trading group of companies, which own Walkes Spring Plantation, and this application is only completing *ex post facto* what has already been in existence. 9.40 p.m.

I would only, without seeking to delay the House, make a plea for the Ministry to have a survey done of the needs of that playing field. I am not going to press the Government for any pavilion at this stage. I think we

have to be responsible in demands for these recreational facilities, but some work needs to be done. I do not think it would cost more than probably SI5,000, if so much, to fill in, level, grade and properly organise the playing field so that the groups who play there can look forward next year to entering the BCL competition in cricket.

There is a volleyball club which does very well, Raiders Club, but they want to move to establishing a full football team and cricket team, and so I am asking for some work to be done in this financial year by the Government.

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

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ORDER, 1988

»

Order No. 5 VMS called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Public Holidays Order, 1988.

Hon. M. BARKER-WELCH (St. Joseph): Mr. Speaker, the Arawak Cement Company Limited has made representation to the Ministry of Labour to be included in the list of the exempt businesses under the Second Schedule of the Public Holidays Act. It has based this request on the fact that the manufacturing of cement is a continuous process, going on seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and that frequent shut downs are impracticable. The union in the latest negotiations with this company had envisaged and agreed that this company should ask for exempt status.

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

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

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CANE GARDEN, ST. THOMAS RE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND A SECONDARY SCHOOL

Order No. 6 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cane Garden, St. Thomas, for the purpose of housing development and the construction of a secondary school.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Mr. D. A. C. Simmons) is getting a lot of things done.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks Parliamentary approval to acquire 160,809 square metres of land in

St. Thomas. Only 394 of the houses that are being built by the Venezuelans at Husbands can be built there, so we needed another location to build the other 102 houses. One part of the land, 94,989 square metres, will be used for housing development, and the other 65,816 square metres will be used for the St. Thomas Secondary School.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, I am not getting a lot of things in St. Thomas, do not let them fool you. The playing field at Proute, that is a Labour Party project. The burial ground at Padmore Village is a DLP project. It is offensive to my constituents. Let them bring it.

On these lands which are being acquired under this Resolution, the Minister can find something in the files from me. When I was Attorney-General I wrote to the Ministry of Housing about these lands.

I want to get an identification of the site first from the Minister. There is a road which is partly in my constituency and partly in that of the honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Brathwaite). It runs through the development known as Cane Garden. There is a popular little shop called the "Ideal Spot" in Cane Garden, where the honourable Member and myself sometimes meet and would have a little drink.

East of that road running through Cane Garden, it comes off Canewood. When you come through Canewood, instead of going straight on to Jackson, you turn right and there is a Cane Garden housing development there. This is where the "Ideal Spot" is.

East of that road is some land which, from my observation, is not good agricultural land, running back towards the plantation and the quarry at Cane Garden. I had suggested to the Minister of Housing in 1985 that that area be opened up for housing development and that we transfer the police station. As you go through that road, that would bring you on to the Bridgefield road, the left is already fully developed with houses, but the right hand side of the road as you go towards St. Thomas has this vast expanse of bad lands, because the top soil must be a foot and there is a quarry very near to this development. I have been through it a couple of times, and if you walk on it, you will see that the top soil is very thin.

I thought it would have made a good area for development of services like a police station and a fire sta-

tion, and you could have house spots and the type of house like the Venezuelan house there. Where the school is going is at the bottom of Shop Hill, on the other side of the road from the factory development, BRC and Winifred Enterprises and so on. I am pleased that there is going to be some development for housing in St. Thomas, but I wish, Sir, not because it is my idea, but because I think it makes sense in terms of a total development, the Government to consider doing a total development at that area.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is right down at the bottom of Shop Hill. When you come to the bottom of Shop Hill and turn left and take the first right, you are on the land. Welchman Hall, Sturges, Bridgefield, Hopewell, Shop Hill right through to Hillaby and St. Andrew, traffic from all these areas meet at that junction, and it seems to me to be an area that lends itself for further development.

We have heard much of the St. Thomas Secondary School, which the Democratic Labour Party has always advocated. It is their project. I am not rejecting it, I am saying that the idea is a DLP idea and I am taking no credit for that.

My concern is not whether there is a school in St. Thomas or not, my concern is that the construction of this school was announced in the Press to start on March 31 this year. The honourable Member representing the Government as liaison officer in Canada went, for the second year, to the St. Thomas Mixed School at Christmas, and in dispensing his gifts of money - it is all in the paper, he gave \$250 - said it was to start this year. 9.50 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. To give a school money? I just gave Welches some.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One hundred and twenty to buy some books. I am not as wealthy as Mr. Rock.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I gave trophies, too, in addition to the money.

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He announced, Sir, that the Minister of Education had assured him that the school in St. Thomas would start on March 31. That is published in both newspapers.

(Aside: Which year?)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This year!

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is what he told the headmaster of St. Thomas Mixed School.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Why does he not keep quiet? Keep quiet! And he told the Rector at St. Thomas, and all the little children, who will be looking forward to going to this secondary school that they would be starting on March 31.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We are going until 10.00 o'clock. That is a proper time to stop.

This is not a World Bank school, because Members will get further upset, Sir, when they learn that the Barbados Labour Party planned and had the agreement of the World Bank for the establishment of a new primary school at Farmers, St. Thomas to take in the catchment area of Turner's Hall, Porey Spring, and so on, Sir. That was to have started this year. So we will have a new primary at Farmers and this new secondary at the bottom of Shop Hill.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, I know that. This Government accepted the World Bank Project, so there is no doubt that the primary school is going at Farmers.

What I want to hear, Sir, and did not hear earlier this year in March from the Minister of Education, is how soon is the primary school going to start at Farmers and how soon is this school going to start at Shop Hill. You are acquiring this land now, the one at Farmers has been acquired a long time ago, and this is a Government of great efficiency.

(Aside: Hon. B. M. TAITT: True!) Mr.

D. A. C. SIMMONS: So it says!

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: So it believes, but no one else believes!

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I wish to hear, Sir, since you are acquiring this land and you have already acquired Farmers, what is the programme of planning. How far is it advanced so that the public can know when to expect actual construction of those two schools?

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Sir, before you put the question, in this matter, which is now being started by compulsory acquisition, I have been acting on behalf of a mortgagee. Therefore, I must correctly declare that interest, and I now so do.

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

(*Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, is he not answering? I am going to lick you on Sunday night!*)

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker I think I hear a threat. Sir, to lick you Sunday night, Sir,.....

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: coming from the other side.

(*Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS. Yes Sir.*)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: And he says, "Yes, Sir."

(*Aside: Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir!*)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: He is going to lick you Sunday night. And he says, "Yes, Sir."

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am withdrawing any imputation of physical violence to any of my friends on the other side, Sir. But I intend to share some verbal lashes Sunday night, ...

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: to the Minister of Education. Welchman Hall. Let them set up the tape.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We seem not to want, Mr. Speaker, to go home this evening. But it is my intention at this point, Sir, to move the adjournment of this House until Tuesday, July, 5, 1988, at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday, July 5, 1988 at 12.00 o'clock noon was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 10.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, May 24, 1988.....	2587
---	------

PAPERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD	2587
-----------------------------------	-------------

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 11 months ended 28th February, 1988.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 2) Order, 1988.

Hon. Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH.....	2588
---------------------------------------	-------------

The Public Holidays Order, 1988.

Instruments adopted at the 74th Session of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva in September, 1987.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	2588
--------------------------------	-------------

The 9th Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Port Authority for the year ended 31st December, 1987.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN	2588
--------------------------------------	-------------

The Annual Report and Audited Financial Statement of the Transport Board for the year 1985-1986.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	2588
--------------------------------	-------------

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cane Garden, St. Thomas for the purpose of Housing Development and the construction of a Secondary School.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON.....	2588
-----------------------------------	-------------

Resolution re Acclaiming late Prime Minister Errol Barrow as first national hero and establishing his birthday, January 21, as National Heroes Day and Public Holiday.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE.....	2599
---------------------------	------

Re the insufficiency of places at the Lawrence T. Gay Memorial School.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	2588
-------------------------	------

A Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, Cap. 233.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

SPEECHES RE LATE D. D. GARNER, FORMER M.P	2588
--	------

Hon. H. deB. Forde, 2588; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 2589; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 2591; Mr. Brathwaite, 2592; Mr. Simmons, 2592; Mr. Speaker, 2593.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.....	2593
------------------------------------	------

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER. 1988	2594
---	------

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 2594; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2594; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 2595; Mr. Arthur, 2599; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 2603; Mr. Morris, 2605; Mr. Thompson, 2610; Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 2615; Mr. Trotman, 2616.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT)

ACT, 1988.....	2618
----------------	------

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 2618.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT LANCASTER, ST. JAMES RE
HIGHWAY 2A

2619

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 2619, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2619; Hon. D. G. Blackman, 2622; Mr. Arthur, 2629; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 2640.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PROUTE. ST. THOMAS RE PLAYING FIELD 2645	SUSPENSION 2599, 2634 ADJOURNMENT..... 2648
Hon. H. A. Blackman, 2645; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2645.	Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2648; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2648.
PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ORDER, 1988 2646	SPEAKERS IN THE ISSUE
Hon. Mrs. M. Barker-Welch. 2646.	ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter) BARKER-WELCH, Hon. Mrs. M. (St. Joseph) BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BRATHWAITE, L. L. (St. Michael North East) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central) THOMPSON, D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, C. L. (St. Michael Central) WEEKES, His Honour L. A. (St. Michael North West)
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CANE GARDEN, ST. THOMAS RE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AND A SECONDARY SCHOOL 2646	
Hon. H. A. Blackman, 2646; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2646.	