

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 - 91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st January, 1989

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. on Tuesday, January 31, 1989.

PRESENT

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.), M.P.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., EdJML, (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blacknman, 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. N. K. Simmons, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. H. A. Blackman, B.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.M.

Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc. (Econ.)

Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)

Hon. C. V. Walker, (Minister of Education and Culture)

Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, J.P.

Dr. E. A. Simmons, M.D.

Hon. W. W. Hall, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. A. Neblett, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is in session. We will have the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, January 17, 1989.

MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the Proceedings of this Honourable Chamber of the meeting that took place on January 17, 1989 be taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I second that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections or amendments, let those Minutes stand confirmed,

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the months of September and November 1988 as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1987.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$344,940 from

the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1988-89 Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988-1989 No. 14.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the answer to Question No. 90 is now ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am to state that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 96 asked by the Member for St. Thomas is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant Order of the day.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE RE ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my intention, Sir, at this time to move the suspension of a number of Standing Orders in order to facilitate the business of Government in the House of Assembly today. Before I do so, however, I think it is important, Sir, that this House should advert to some matters which are necessary for it too. I am referring specifically, Sir, to matters which pertain to the visit of Her Majesty The Queen to Barbados. Now the House has already been informed that Her Majesty will be visiting Barbados during the month of March and on the programme, Sir, is a visit to Parliament on March 10th. It will be necessary for this House to pass an Address to Her Majesty The Queen and to do so we have to prepare this Address. I am going to move, Sir, that this House appoint a Select Committee. I am also going to move, Sir, that the following Members constitute this Committee: The Hon. Members for St. Lucy, St. Joseph, Christ Church East Central, and the Hon. Member for St. Peter which name, Sir, has been given to me by the Leader of the Opposition under the chairmanship, Sir, of His Honour The Speaker. That Sir is my motion.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The date of Her Majesty's visit to Parliament, Sir, I am corrected, is the 9th March, not the 10th. The motion stands still, Sir.

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

The question that those several persons mentioned be appointed to the Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I now move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the following Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting: Standing Orders 6,, 16, 18,20,42(5), 43 and 44, Sir.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

ORDER No. 3 -To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider grants of sums of money for the service of this Island.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move that you do now leave the Chair, it has become necessary for us to appoint an Acting Chairman of Committees for today's sitting. I therefore move, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East be appointed Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Honourable Member has sat in the Chair and acted as Chairman of Committees before, so I have no difficulty seconding this motion.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr, DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

Mr CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89, NO. 13 HEAD 10 - GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this section of the Supplementary Resolution for \$9 170 235 relates to Head 10 - Governor-General, Subhead 1, and it is for a total sum of \$69 462 broken down as follows:

Object No. 6 Travel	\$ 662
Object No. 10 Supplies and Materials	10 000
Object No. 11 Maintenance of Property	3 800
Object No. 24 Purchase of Vehicles	55 000

Those are the components of the supplement for Head 10 - Governor-General.

The main item here, Sir, is for the purchase of vehicles. The number two State car which is an Audi 100 - it is deemed that that should be changed and another car is being purchased, and the \$55 000 is to facilitate the purchase of that State car. The new car is to be a Volvo 740 OLE and it is to replace, as I said, the Audi 100.

The other items are relatively small sums, Sir. Supplement to the travel of the staff attached to the office of Governor-General, for supplies and materials the cleaning of rugs and carpets and that kind of activity. There has been increased use of the funds under Entertainment and there has been a heavy demand on the supply and replacement of household items such as glassware and other items.

Under Maintenance of Property, as I have indicated, it is necessary to clean some of the carpets and generally to carry out the maintenance that is necessary in keeping the residence up to acceptable standards.

I believe if there are any other questions which members may wish to ask I will be happy to supply the information if it is available at this stage.

I beg to move that Subhead 1 under Head 10 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.35 p.m.

HEAD 13 -PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE - SUB- HEAD 4 - \$1 334 SUBHEAD 7- STATISTICAL DEPARTMENT \$10 268

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 13, a supplement of \$1 334 is required and this sum is required to supplement the provision already made. It is in respect of the salary for a temporary post of Secretary in the Division and there are other ancillary expenses related to that.

The amount of money provided will not meet the expenditures for the end of the financial year and I am

requesting this Honourable Committee to approve this small supplement under Subhead 4.

For Subhead 7, the Statistical Department — again a supplement" and a sum of \$10 268 is required for this department This is in respect of certain activities of the Statistical Department in the preparation of a new Household Budget Survey and the funds are required to pay the overtime and the additional work required for that particular exercise.

I beg to move that Head 13 for the separate sums of \$1 334 and \$10 268 stand part.

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

The question that Head 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 14 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT, TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, Subhead 1 relates to Personal Emoluments. This Subhead is used to pay for its staff for acting personnel within the Ministry and to pay some other allowances as well.

This amount of money that has been provided by Parliament of \$26 574 at the beginning of this financial year has been exhausted by the end of September/October and there are still other commitments on the vote and it is estimated, Sir, that we will require a further \$13 036, to be precise, for this vote for the remainder of the financial year.

Under Object No. 10, Materials and Supplies, again, Sir, we have a similar problem where materials that have been supplied have been paid for and that vote has also been exhausted and it is necessary to supplement that Object.

Object No. 25 - Plant and Equipment - the amount provided at the beginning of the year was \$29 755 and it is now necessary to supplement this item by over \$5 670 for the purpose of purchasing a photocopier and a stand for the Administrative Section of the Ministry of International Transport.

The Ministry has now been divided into two sections. One section is at the Port Authority Building and another section remains at Herbert House and there is quite a bit of photocopying done by both sections of the Ministry. It is, therefore, necessary for the Ministry's section at Herbert House to be provided with its own photocopier so as not to retard the work of the Ministry.

I move that Head 13 Subhead 1 stand part.

Then, Sir, there is Subhead 3, Airport Management Services where the sum of \$1 433 133 was provided at the beginning of the year which was not quite the amount that had been provided in previous years.

The reason for this was that it was planned by the Airport Management Section that all those private individual persons and companies at the Airport that use the services would provide their own utility services. That has not come about and, as a matter of fact, Sir, we have decided not to bring this about because we create all kinds of difficulties.

It is, therefore, necessary for us to supplement the vote by \$350 529 and, at the same time, those other persons who use the services will be charged for what services they use. They will be paying that money back into the funds.

Subhead 4 - Maintenance and Development Unit - \$37 300 was provided in this year's Estimates and we are now seeking a supplementary of \$18 921.

This vote is used to cover the cost of postage, car park tickets, rental of land and uniforms. At the end of September, which is half year end, that is a financial year, the expenditure was \$39 016 and leaving a small balance in the vote.

The reason for this, Sir, is that invoices for uniforms and car park tickets that were ordered in the previous year came in late and had to be paid for out of this year's allocations. It is, therefore, necessary, to supplement this item.

Subhead 5 - Air Traffic Services - we are seeking supplementary provision of \$37 979. 12.45 p.m.

The original amount provided, Sir, was used to meet the cost of telephone charges, electricity service, runway and taxi lighting, flood lights, navigational aids, sub-stations and related air traffic operational areas. By the end of September, Sir, \$80,979 had been spent and there was only a balance of \$7,021 in the vote which was not enough, Sir, for the service of this item for the rest of the financial year. I propose, Sir, and it is estimated that we would need another \$37,979 for that purpose.

Under Sir, Immigration - Utilities \$47,938 was provided in the Current Estimates for telephone, water, electricity charges for the Immigration Department at the Wharf. At the end of September, Sir, \$41,358 was spent, leaving a balance of \$580. It is estimated, Sir, that an additional sum of \$16,428 will be required for the remainder of the financial year. The expenditure in this has been a bit heavier than normal because of the relocation of the Immigration Department from the top floor on the Wharf side where the office is located to the ground floor.

Supplies and Materials - Sir, at the end of September, as I said, there was a balance of only \$841.00 in this vote. A claim has come in for \$1,340.00 in respect to special stationery supplies for the use of the Immigration Department. It is estimated, Sir, that the expenditure is roughly about \$400 a month and it will require for the remainder of the financial year an additional \$2,500.

Operating Expenses - Sir, the Ministry - that is the Immigration Department - was informed by Central *• Purchasing that this amount of money was required for the payment of passports supplied to the Immigration Department by the Central Purchasing Department during the last financial year. No provision was made for it, Sir, in the last financial year and therefore the money had to be paid out of this current financial year. It is necessary, therefore, to seek a supplementary of \$112,086 in order to supplement this Subhead.

3*

Subhead 8 - Telecommunications Unit - There is a sum of \$112,000 which was provided in the Current Estimates to meet Barbados annual contributions to a number of organisations. Sir, this amount of money of \$10,160 is required to further prop up the amount of money that had already been allocated, principally because of currency fluctuations. I move, Sir, that these several Subheads of Head 14 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is ...

^

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to ask the Minister a few questions about this Ministry. I start at Item 25 in the Addendum. The Minister concedes that the Ministry is now operating from two locations - Herbert House and the Port Authority Building. We understand on this side the circumstances giving rise to this dichotomy because he was moved out from his single location at the Pine when he was Minister of Transport and Works, and for ^ a period of time may have been sitting under a tree for all we know, but he had no office, no fixed place of abode as a Minister.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I wonder, Sir, if now the Minister has had a year to settle near the Port if his Ministry has any plans for the rationalisation of the accommodation for the Ministry. I do not think that it makes for smooth «* coordination of the delivery of services to have the Ministry split up as it presently is. But I am glad to hear the Minister saying worse than that, that it is bad. I am at a loss because the Development Plan in Chapter 15, the four pages devoted to this very important Ministry, do not betray any vision for the planning of a Department which would house itself in one building and be more rationalized. I am left, therefore, to believe that during the planning period of 1993 Government does not intend to house this Ministry and its operations in one central location. At the same time, Sir, ^m

without going into any great detail - I am trying to restrict myself within the bounds of the Resolution - I believe that the House deserves to know at this stage what are the latest developments in respect of the operation of the gantry crane. It was commissioned in 1987 October.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, the Minister can say that he is not dealing with it today. It may be touchy, but I am going to ask the question, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Unless you rule me out of order, Sir, I say that the public of Barbados want to know why \$6 million worth of crane has been lying down idle at the Port ever since October 1987. The question of the public interests is being dealt with in a very scandalous way, Sir. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the comments from the other side by the Minister that we have Rules in here is a reflection on you, Sir. So ask him to shut up and listen to me in silence. That is the Rule, that when one Member is on his feet the other Members must listen in silence, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am imploring Honourable Members to stick as closely as possible to the confines of the Ministry.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. This Resolution deals with the Port Authority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It does not deal with the Port Authority.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And I am saying, Sir, that it is...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member is out of order in seeking to deal with matters of the Port Authority under this Resolution. The Port Authority is a statutory corporation. There is nothing in here relating to **the** Port Authority, absolutely nothing with the Port Authority. The Honourable Member, Sir, is out of order. I am so submitting, Sir. I am so submitting... the Honourable Member is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I made the point that the Bill does not require any reference to the Port Authority.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I accept your ruling and disagree that we are dealing with a Bill, Sir.

We are dealing with a Resolution. You will agree-with me now, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution does not cover the Port Authority.

M. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It says Subhead 1 - General Administration. The General Administration of the International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and I am presuming that the question of the physical accommodation of the Ministry and the running of the Port...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as I am concerned..

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas is questioning your ruling. You already ruled, Sir, and he seeks now to go back, Sir, to argue the point but deals with Administration because in the mentioning of Administration he can bring in the Port Authority Building despite your ruling. The Honourable Member is again out of order. I so submit, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling that this particular matter does not cover the Port Authority. You may proceed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You have been very obedient, Sir, and I will abide by your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Proceed, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Let us turn the page then, Sir. Some months ago I had occasion - Page 2 dealing with Immigration, Sir - in here to be critical of the Immigration Department and I must say, Sir, with his usual frankness and candour the Minister then agreed that the Department was not functioning to its maximum capability. 12.55p.m.

What I want to know is if in the succeeding months the Minister is satisfied that there has been any improvement in the functioning of the Immigration Department, because there are still complaints. If the Minister wants me to identify some of them, I will give him some examples.

For example, the responses to applications are not timely. I hear a number of legal practitioners who act on behalf of applicants for various matters of status complaining that they are not getting responses from the Ministry. I have a personal example. In 1986, May, I was asked by a gentleman from England, who is an international

director of several shipping companies, exempt insurance companies and so on, about the possibility of his coming to Barbados with a view to using Barbados as a base, since a lot of his directors' meetings were held in the States. He had two options, Barbados or the Seychelles, but he found Barbados could be more convenient because of the four or five hours' flight to America.

He was prepared to buy a house on the St. James coast and prepared to pay \$1 million for it. All the papers were prepared, full resume, C.V., whatever, and sent to the Immigration Department in May 1987. To this day the Immigration Department has not even so much as replied to say that they acknowledge receipt of the application. I have not heard one word. Now, we know that there would have to be security checks and so on, but it cannot take all this time for them to say we have received the application of Mr. X.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There are other examples, Sir, from other lawyers. If the Minister wants me to give him a list of names (applications) I will do that, Sir. I am not blaming the Minister, Sir, because I know that people are too wont to blame Ministers for every little peccadillo or problem in a Department. All I am saying is that I believe the Minister knows that there have been problems and I want to know from him, since he agreed with me last time that there was a problem, if he is now satisfied that some movement is being made towards the better administration of the Immigration Department.

Those are the two points I wanted to make, Sir.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I normally would not have made a contribution to this debate were it not for the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas made some references to the Immigration Department. I know that this is the pre-lunch time and we have to be careful what signals we send.

It is very interesting to hear the Honourable Member talk about a particular millionaire who applied to the Immigration Department in 1986 and has not heard anything, but one has to look at the Immigration Department itself.

The Immigration Department is going through a period of cleansing. The Immigration Department before 1986 was a horrible place where all sorts of irregular things used to go on, like other Government Departments, and I think the whole of Barbados knows about the graft and corruption that existed in the Immigration Department before 1986. Let us put things in their perspective.

Now, there are problems in the Immigration Department, but I am concerned not so much about one

millionaire who is going to buy a house for \$1 million in St. James, I am concerned about a lot of Caribbean people from St. Vincent and from St. Lucia et cetera who have problems in Barbados because when they come here they spend ten years; they have children; some of them eight, and nine years old, some eleven years old who take the eleven plus examination and find it difficult to get into secondary schools because after being here for eight or ten years they have no citizenship and therefore there are problems with all kinds of manoeuvrings, and sometimes these children end up at private secondary schools and their parents who are poor have to pull their pockets and pay for them.

I think this is a serious problem, because we know in a system like Barbados the millionaire can take care of himself. We know that that is the kind of system which we live under, so what concerns me about the Immigration Department is more so how we treat our own Caribbean brothers and sisters. That is not to say there are not problems other places, but I think that we have to look at the people who cannot take care of themselves.

In the constituency that I represent there are young kids who at times find it difficult to get into primary school and at times find it difficult to get into the Government secondary schools without paying and I would like to see the Immigration Department set up some sort of system where it can take care of those kinds of people. As I said before, that is not to say that it should not take care of the other problems, but we need to look at the depressed people first and be always mindful of them.

I want to repeat that the Immigration Department was a horrible place. I do not have to mention what went on, because I am quite sure that the Honourable Members on the other side, if they have all these case histories of lawyers about what is going on now, I know that they know about the graft and corruption that went on in the Immigration Department before[^] because they have the case files. I, as a medical practitioner, having to fill out the application forms, the medicals, for people, sit down and listen to the histories of what went on with some of these people who applied thirty and forty times, with Immigration Officers taking money from them under the counter. I have experienced that, so I can speak with authority. I know about that too.

It is a sad day in the history of Barbados when you sit down and listen to those stories, so do not let us come in here and try to give the impression that the Immigration Department was functioning beautifully and now all of a sudden things have gone wrong. They are doing a clean up programme, and Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party helped to foster the corruption that went on in the Immigration Department. You know that as well as I do, so do not let us try to paint the Immigration Department as some organisation which is disintegrating.

vMr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Now I have to get up. I was for a period of time a Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the Honourable Member rise?

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

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I withdraw that, Sir. Some Ministers, obviously not all Ministers. I am subject to make a mistake. Some Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party, present members not included.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I still have to be on a point of order. We are making an allegation about a limited number of people. The people who were Ministers of the Crown under the Barbados Labour Party must be easily identifiable. The fact that a member or two of this House are excluded does not prevent people being libelled in this House under the guise of privilege. If the Honourable Member knows any dishonest Minister he must be prepared to go outside and call the name and not hide under the privileges of this House. And I submit it is a gross abuse of the privilege to label people who are easily identifiable as being corrupt. 1.05p.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the Honourable Member knows who we are talking about, if he wants to hear about corruption and that is going to become admissible in this House, he will hear about corruption in the House today but the Honourable Member must be very clear. I do not think it is proper for the House to do that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member may proceed.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I said that not all Ministers and I said that in my office I receive information daily when I fill out forms. That is what I said and I cannot stop people from telling me what they tell me. If somebody brings information to me, I receive that information and if the Honourable Members are so replete with all the documents and all the information...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have not heard your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would not have to rule on that because the Honourable Member did say "Ministers of. In the second place he determined that there were "some Ministers." Now, if a Minister or other Ministers in my view are found by any person to be guilty then, I think, that the term "Ministers" will cover it. He did not say all the Ministers and I do not think that any member is in a position to determine what the other person had or had not done.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is all right, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East...

Hoi: .. M. TAITT: On a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says "when he starts to talk about corrupt Ministers over here "I want to tell him if he knows of any corrupt Ministers over here and talk about them now. Do not let this *sotto voce* thing go on. If you know of any corrupt Ministers on this front bench talk about them now today, this present moment. Do not worry to let anybody go out saying that you say something that could be even remotely suggestive. If you know about them talk about them now. Do not worry with that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East may continue..

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I am going to wind up but I just want to say that I am a little bit bothered in this Honourable Chamber. When we identify the Immigration Department as a problem area which, indeed, all Government Departments, and all departments have problems, like all families have problems, but I am a little bit concerned that when we identify 4:he problems that we identify the problems from that side only in terms of millionaires who want to come in. If there are problems, let us identify the problems. Let us categorize the problems.

My concern as a representative of a constituency is that there are a lot of people in my constituency who are disadvantaged by some of the problems within the Immigration Department and I know that this Government will look after those problems.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr, Chairman, I thought that the level of the intelligence of the Honourable Member who just sat down would have been such that he would have understood the point that I was making. It had nothing to do principally with the fact that the man was a millionaire and that Barbados lost a lot of business.

It had to do with the Department not extending the usual courtesies that one expects of a Government Department if you write any of the others. I write all the other Ministers on that side and I get a reply from them, the letter acknowledged, action being taken. The Minister of Immigration, if I write him, I get a reply from him. I was dealing with the Department of Immigration. I thought he had understood that.

The Minister knows of another case of a Caribbean national, one of the same Caribbean people that he is talking about, who held a very high position at the

Caribbean Development Bank who has now gone abroad to represent his country as a High Commissioner. An application was sent in from him since last year, 1988, January. Not a word has been received from the Immigration Department.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You want to hear some of them? Why should I do this? I will not be led astray about the argument about corruption and the throwing of allegations.

I heard allegations coming from the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East about Ministers being corrupt and he sought to exempt some and leave some others with the taint. That is not good enough. It is not good enough for any one of us...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order.

Sometimes we get into argument that is not worthwhile: The Honourable Member, whether he was right or wrong, did say that some - first he said "Ministers", then he said "some Barbados Labour Party Ministers - helped to foster." Those were the words he used. I do not think he actually accused the Minister.

I think the Leader of the Opposition responded as he should and raised the questions about the mention of the word "Minister" but his actual words were "helped to foster". I do not really think that we need to go down this road, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have been defending in Courts all my life and I going to defend today because I am not satisfied with allegations about people who have held high office being written into the records and left. It would be easy for us to make allegations but we are not going to do that.

If I had to come with facts, I would remind the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East that it was in 1976 that one of his present Ministers, then not a Minister, helped to foster the defeat of the Democratic Labour Party in 1976 by taking money from Sidney Alleyne on a cheque which was displayed. I do not know if anybody called anybody a white mouthed fowl from Black Rock. I am not getting into that or who they are referring to. They are not referring to the Minister of Health.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He would be a leghorn. You would not speak of him in those terms so we are not going to talk about allegations. We will bring examples such as the one I just brought, so if we are going down the road, Sir, we are going down.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I expect the Honourable Member to stick to the confines of this Resolution as he has stated the Head dealing with the Immigration Department.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. You do not want me to?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want you to look at the Head which you of yourself identified.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. I am dealing with that, Sir, but I had to respond to the allegations of corruption in Ministers of the Crown.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And you have responded. Mr.

D. A. C. SIMMONS: And gave an example.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is nothing new? And then you all went and raked him up and brought him back to sit down in Cabinet with you all. Nothing new.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You said madam?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member proceed.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Before our time, Sir, in the Immigration Department when it was then run by policemen, there were at least two senior police who were identified and who had to leave the Immigration Department, one from St. George and one from St. Michael for corruption.

You know what they used to do when the Democratic Labour Party was in power? And let me say, shortly after the Barbados Labour Party became the Government, yes, for a time after 1976 until they were found out, they used to sell passports to foreign people and they were stamps which were found among their possessions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "They" meaning who?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The two policemen who were - well, they are no longer policemen, they have gone - former policemen who were then carrying out Immigration Officers duties. I am not going to call their names in here but we know and two had to be sent home. 1.15p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Two of them had to be sent home because they were found to be engaging in corrupt practices.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Which one, Goring?

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Branker? Branker went home and Goring.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see, Sir. So let us be clear about it, that there has been corruption and the potentiality for corruption among functionaries and operatives in that department long before the Barbados Labour Party and at a period of time during the Barbados Lac Sur Party, and when the persons were found out, they were dealt with. That does not mean that that will bring it to an end because it is a department where there can be temptation and the officers have to have the highest integrity and personal moral codes to deal with the problems of temptation.

But I had not gone down that line when I first spoke. I was just dealing with the problems of the administration or maladministration in a department. If you open a can of worms, I will deal with it. A word to the wise, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have to reply to some of the comments because I think the Honourable Member too, he accused me of not understanding what he said about administration. But he does not seem to understand what I am talking about. I am saying that his concerns...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I want to admit, Sir, I have great difficulty in understanding anything he says.

Laughter.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: The point I am making is that I am saying that when we are talking about the Immigration Department, my concern is not only about one or two millionaires. My concern is about Caribbean people. And let me make this point that I did not make before. We have a situation where people from St. Lucia and St. Vincent spend fifteen years and twenty years here, the Immigration Department goes and picks them up, tells them that they

have to go back home and come back in and assures them that when they come back in that they will be here permanently. And when the people get to the airport, tell them they have to leave in three weeks. That is the thing I am concerned about.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: So you do not seem to understand what I am talking about. I am talking about our own brothers and sisters, the way we treat them. My problem is not with millionaires who can take care of themselves. My problem is about people who cannot take care of themselves. And that is what I think that we as a Government of the people have to address ourselves to, the underprivileged who cannot take care of themselves.

The point I am making is that the Barbados Labour Party is always seeking about the welfare of the millionaires, not the poor people v/ho matter. That is the philosophy I am talking about.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in this House I have heard this Head being debated for many years and I have heard allegations of graft and corruption being levied against various ^people. I intend to speak a bit about that before I sit down.

But what I essentially want to make is this point, Sir. When the Barbados Labour Party took over the Government in 1976, we found that we had on a policy level to make very substantial changes in immigration policy. The House will probably recall that at the time of the by-election in the City of Bridgetown arising out of the resignation of Mr. Elliott Mottley at that time, the issue of giving to Caribbean citizens who had lived for a long time in Barbados the right to become immigrants of Barbados was raised as one of the main talking points in that by-election. There were several of these Caribbean citizens, I do not know that any of them at all were millionaires, who were then residing within the environs of the City of Bridgetown. We also discovered that there were also several Caribbean citizens who had come in here to assist with the cutting of canes and who resided in constituencies essentially in the rural areas, St. Thomas and elsewhere, but some of whom had established liaisons with Barbadians and were residing in the suburban areas of our country.

I represent a constituency which has a large number of citizens who had come from St. Vincent, Dominica and St. Lucia and to a lesser extent, from Grenada. The Labour Party as a matter of policy and because of the strong stance that it has always taken in Caribbean affairs implemented its policy of giving amnesty to Caribbean citizens who had resided in Barbados for a period of three years prior to the by-election in the City of Bridgetown.

I am informed that about 3 600 people were eligible and had their status regularized. There are still some whose status has not yet been regularized, some of whom reside in my own constituency. But the policy framework under which the department was to operate was clearly set out and I would believe that within Cabinet documents the same policy framework will be seen.

Now, Sir, what you have had, and there have been complaints in this area, is that since there has been a change of Government, there has been a much - contrary to what the Honourable Member may think - more stringent approach to Caribbean citizens who have been coming into Barbados or who have resided in Barbados for some period of time. If the Honourable Member would look at the statistics, he would see that the statement which I am making can be borne out by the statistics. And I want to say in particular, you have had the policy being administered in such a way that persons who have been here sometimes for upwards of seven or eight years, even when they have got seven and eight years, and I can give the Minister some of the letters from my own constituency, persons who have been here for seven or eight years and who some of them have established clear connection with either other immigrants or in some cases, citizens of Barbados and have actually had children from the union that those - I have a few names in my own constituency - I have had to, either they are given work permits, and they are not given immigrant status which I consider not to be a correct policy, or some of them are given visitor status, they cannot work, or some of them are told that they have to go out and seek to come back into the island.

Now whenever a case has come to my attention, I have either sought to get the case reviewed by the review procedure that has been set up, or I have raised it directly with the Chief Immigration Officer whom I must say has always responded in an understanding way. When he is bound by legislation or by policy, he will tell you that there is nothing that he can do.

Now, Sir, those are the areas I wish that the Honourable Member had addressed. Now there is a way to get around that. Sometimes the persons have gone abroad and when the liaison and the union has been as good as a marriage the male or the female as the case may be has gone out of Barbados and married the person and come back into Barbados. I do not think that they should be made to go to that degree.

So that when we speak in here on these matters, as the Honourable Member for St. Thomas will speak, we speak from a position where in relation to the Caribbean, we always showed a preference for Caribbean citizens who had reasonably strong cases for a permanent connection with Barbados. 1.25p.m.

I know that the legislation was changed that after you have had immigrant status you cannot within two or three years after that time get permanent status. You have to have five years. You cannot do it within two or three years.

Now you might have had seven years previous to that and they send you straight into immigrant status. But it does seem to me that it is possible with the discretion which Ministers have in some instances to go straight even to the position of citizenship.

I have had a situation where within not even my constituency but in a joint constituency of Christ Church West Central. This gentleman was a seaman but his family has lived here, his children have lived here, he has been married here for many years and he has been going and coming for upwards for fifteen or so years. When he applied, he is being told you now have to go back to some status that is less than that of permanent residence or even of citizenship. Now those are the policy areas I would hope that we will address.

Now Sir, I said that a large number of persons were added to the roll. The problem presents itself to many of them graphically when it comes to the Common Entrance Examination and their children have passed to go into schools. The Honourable Member adverted to that. That is a problem which each one of us, if you have these people living in your area, realize. Sometimes the application has not been made because the parent assume that they did not have to make the application. Again, in my experience if you take up the cases you have to apply for the Student Visa to await the processing of the application. The area in which I object is where you may be told that the child cannot, get into a school at all until such time as the Immigration procedure of Student Visa or otherwise is processed. I have never found anyone at the Ministry of Education being difficult on such matters or indeed I am talking about the functionaries at the Immigration Department being very difficult on matters such as this. They will put out the letter of the law.

I believe what is needed are clear policy directions to deal with those interim situations so that you are not getting a series of different interpretations as to how to deal with the matter, Sir. The Honourable Member made a general allegation about graft and corruption, Sir. When we came into power, those allegations were not only in the air but those allegations were proved by some of the files that were there. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas referred to some of them.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What did we do about them? We did quite a lot about them and we also set up procedures to deal with them where any reports were made that they went straight to the Public Service Commission so that they could be dealt with. That is what you want.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We put the allegations in their true position. But the Honourable Member knows that one of the reasons why we insisted that every Work Permit application and every immigrant application had to be published in the Official Gazette - and it is still now being followed by this Government - was so that the public at large will be given information as to what applications were there and people could easily give any information they wanted about whether or not there was corruption anywhere. That is the policy we implemented. We also implemented the policy of reviewing Immigration applications by a committee which has been headed from time to time by various persons to make sure that the applications were looked at properly. I myself have always favoured a position of a proper system of appeal just as you get in Canada, United States or elsewhere on these areas where you are coming for an immigrant status. I do not mean someone who may be a transient through the country. Even in the United Kingdom legislation such persons do have limited rights of appeal that could be tested in the court. I have always favoured that and I think that there are grounds for improving the legislation along that line. But when it comes to allegations being hurled in the air, I would believe that if the Honourable Member has, as he thinks he has, any information, he should have exposed it in the House and it could be dealt with than to expose it outside of the House, as I said, when I took my intervention in this matter, Sir. He should have exposed it then.

Everything was done by the Labour Party Government during our period of time to ensure that that Department would function and function properly and to ensure that everything was done above board. The Honourable Member must know this.

Now Sir, I want to raise the changes that have been implemented at the airport. The Government has reverted to the position at the airport where the immigration cards of outgoing passengers are now dealt with at the main airlines with whichever air carrier is dealing with the matter. But the Immigration Officers are still concerned that they have to play a function and a part in this matter. They still have to collect the cards. I do not know whether it is for statistical purposes. Nothing is wrong with that. If the Minister will wait, I will tell him what is wrong, though. No, I will tell him what they are concerned about and they also have to check the information for its accuracy particularly in relation to security questions that will arise. The Minister knows that. Some of the information is relevant not only for the statistics but some information may be relevant for security purposes, and there is a complaint. The Minister knows that within the Department that the time lag during which they have available to check this information that sometimes the aircraft is already in the air.

Asides

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, the Minister could brush it aside. The aircraft is already in the air and there can be no proper check of the information.

Asides,

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You cannot take them off the aircraft if they are already up in the air. What the Minister needs to do if he is improving the system is to ensure that the new system, if implemented, works properly by establishing the proper liaison between the check points at Immigration and otherwise. It is riot working. He knows that too.

Asides,

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The other point Mr. Chairman, Sir - I am glad that in Opposition we have got the real power that we tell them not to work. If the Honourable Minister of Health believes that, he will believe anything.

Asides,

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: And you have been doing it too. The other thing - you have been doing it too according to my information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask the Honourable Member to address the Chair?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I have not yet - I am not saying that I will not do it. I have not as yet, since I have become the Minister responsible for Immigration, appointed one single Immigration Officer under the Act that they put on the statute books or any other Act that gives me that power.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Tell him that he does not even know what is being done in his department. Has he found out that at the very airport that people have been appointed, sent up for temporary posts by the Minister of the Public Service himself, and placed into positions that this Minister does not know? I am not surprised that he does not know,

Asides,

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ... at the airport. He knows that. Sent up by the Minister of the Public Service himself, making appointments in senior positions at the airport.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member rose on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, is misleading this Committee. The Honourable Member knows that if the Act gives the Minister responsibility for appointing that no other Minister can appoint. If he is talking about other posts - he raised the question about Immigration Officers. The Honourable Member got up and said that he has not appointed an Immigration Officer. He then proceeds to suggest that because somebody else may have been appointed in another post that the Honourable Member does not know what he is doing. 1.35p.m.

That is misleading the House. The Immigration Officer is the only officer that can be appointed by a Minister, all the others are appointed...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You ought to be ashamed of yourself. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that, Sir.

AsideSi

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to request Honourable Members...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet but they have determined that because you are Acting Chairman they are going to behave in a particular manner obviously, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I object to that, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is imputing improper motives to the Opposition, Sir. We want to give you our wholehearted co-operation in difficult times today, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will both Members take their seats? Just let me make this point. I believe Honourable Members must appreciate that Members, whether they are on a point of order or whether they are in their substantive speech, must be heard in silence and therefore if I am entertaining a point of order or entertaining a Member in his speech, then, I would not wish the kind of interruption that I am getting presently.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West may proceed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, in the light of your magnificent statement I would not wish to continue.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. We have rules of this Chamber and the rules of this Chamber only allow persons to speak for 15 minutes in Committee of Supply. Of course you can come back another time. The

Honourable Member started to speak at 1.20, Sir. It is on the records. More than fifteen minutes have gone, Sir. I am just drawing Your Honour's attention to that rule.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask the Honourable Minister to conclude his point of order? Let me say that there were some interruptions and I will give the Honourable Member two minutes to wind up.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I think, Sir, you seem to have really learnt very well from the Honourable Member for St. George South. I hope you will follow him in many other examples.

Laughter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I believe if there is one person in here who does not want anybody to follow that example, whatever it is, would be that Honourable Member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has not identified it. The Honourable Member will continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is no point of order, Sir, because the Honourable Member is hoping that enough follow that example that he might follow the example of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Where does that come under the Head we are discussing?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I want to wind up this segment. The Honourable Member has taken the point. I am saying that what you really need is a proper system of co-ordinating the changes so that the Immigration Department can function properly together with the airlines. The objection is not to the change of policy, it is to the implementation of that change of policy, and if the Honourable Member is being fed correct information he will find that Immigration Officers have expressed to their Union dissatisfaction with the manner in which the policy is being implemented at the moment.

I think my time has expired. I will come back, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments in relation to particularly what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I am speaking now as Chairman of the Immigration Review Committee which, as you know, is provided for in the legislation.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition would have us believe that the Review Committee - of course, you know that it is much tighter in the application of the law, because we have not done anything regarding the change of

the law, we only apply what is there on the Statute Book, and as far as I know that law was mainly put into operation and legislated by the Barbados Labour Party.

When it comes to citizens of the CARICOM region, the Caribbean region, the Committee has adopted a fairly lenient approach to this matter. All the problems which have been identified where we have a Caribbean citizen, particularly a mother, who has a child born in Barbados, invariably that person is given status. There was a time when we did have a delay because we wanted to get an opinion from the Attorney General on a particular point: We got that opinion, and as far as I am aware all of the applications which were sent to the Review Committee we have dealt with.

Our last meeting was held, I believe at the end of the first week in December, and we cleaned off the entire slate, because up to that point we had no applications before the Committee, so that we had got rid of all of those, and those persons who qualified under the law, particularly those who had children born in Barbados, have been given status, as far as I know. They may be some others who have applied, which are now pending and which will come up before the Committee, but we have dealt with that.

As I have said, we have adopted a fairly lenient policy towards people from the Caribbean, but it must be borne in mind that there are a number of people who do not qualify, who have not been here for any length of time, but who want to get status and who would want to bring all sorts of pressures to bear on the Committee and on the Government to give them status, and we have adopted a very clear position on this. I do not think there is any doubt in anybody's mind about the policy which has been followed.

Now, if the Honourable Member is saying that there is need for a change in the legislation, maybe that is a point which could be looked at, but I do not think anybody is in any doubt about the policy which we are pursuing in this particular area.

He did make mention of the fact that we should look at legislation in Canada and look at what Canada is doing, particularly in regard to work permits and immigrant matters. Let me say this, that there was a committee that was set up during the administration of the Barbados Labour Party to review this whole question of work permits and immigrant status. I represented the Barbados Workers' Union in those days on that committee and the guidelines which were formulated and which are still in use were essentially guidelines that were drawn from the Canadian experience, but I would want to, however, sound a note of warning.

This country, even although we would want to adopt a fairly liberal policy as far as immigration matters are concerned, we still have to recognise that we are not

Canada. Canada is a country that is thousands of times bigger than Barbados, it is a country which needs immigrants to develop it and if we try to follow a policy which is pursued by Canada, we will soon find ourselves in a position where we are flooded with people. As a matter of fact, I am sure that there are persons from all over the Caribbean and all over the world who make enquiries and who indeed apply to have permanent residence here in Barbados. We therefore have to pay some attention to this. It may appear and if we are a little stringent in the application of our provisions, but we have to pay attention to the fact that this is Barbados and in the final analysis it is the people who were born in Barbados who must have the prior claims to this country, so that even although we may want to pursue a liberal policy, we have however to take these things into consideration.

I think we have to be very careful about using Canada as an example, for the reasons which I have mentioned. For example, in Canada I understand that there are people who "are coming out of some countries who, once they invest in Canada above a certain amount of money, they can get status. 1.45p.m.

People have been buying up property and causing property values to rise and are now causing problems and concerns from Canadians living in Toronto because of the fact that people have been buying properties at fantastic prices and forcing property values up. All of these are matters which we have to take into consideration so that I hope, therefore, that one...

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

I am impressed by what the Minister is saying as Chairman of the Review Committee. I forgot to mention something in my speech and I would be grateful if he would address it as Chairman of the Review Committee.

I think there should be a provision or a procedure whereby applicants for review could appear in person before the committee so that you could see the person. Very often you have to act on the basis of a letter from a lawyer or something like that.

I hope I have not thrown the Minister off his feet.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: In making the point that that is a problem which is being experienced in Canada which I was talking about that is the whole question of property values and this type of thing. From our point of view here in Barbados, as I said, we have to be careful on that.

In response to the question which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has raised, we have, from time to time, allowed persons to make appearances before the committee. As a matter of fact, there are a number of

lawyers who appear with their clients. I know of no less than about four of them. They have called and asked if they could come before the committee with their lawyer and we have said "by all means, do so".

The last meeting which we had one person was supposed to turn up with his client but he did not turn up. We have had appearances before the committee and this is a departure from what used to obtain in the past so that we are accessible and we would want to try to give as fair a hearing to anybody who applies and I think this is but fair but I cannot give any guarantee that once you appear before the committee that the person might get a favourable reply to their application. I think that in all fairness that people who have a case and who want to have a case reviewed that we would give them as much hearing as possible provided that it is not used as a delaying tactic to make sure that they stay here long enough to get the time which would qualify them to stay.

Thank you.

Aside:

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Well, not necessarily not finally. It is coming on to lunch time so it is time that I should, at least, say something. We soon have to break for lunch. I do not know how long it is going to take but let me say here now because you are going to make them again after this.

Mr. Chairman, I was appointed Minister responsible for Immigration on November 1, 1987. I was aware long before that and with my concurrence that I would be the Minister responsible for Immigration.

It is sheer ignorance to state that I was summarily despatched to any place whatsoever. It is equally sheer ignorance for persons just to read and pick up things that they have heard without getting at the facts to state that there was a time when I had no office. It is also ignorance to state that. Whatever quarter it comes from it is ignorance because it is untrue.

I have always had an office. I have moved now to another office in which I remained for a year. I remained in an office in Herbert House where a former Minister under the Barbados Labour Party also had an office and that department was also divided into two.

The Honourable Bernard St. John, when he was Minister of Trade and Civil Aviation at the same time had two Administrative Sections in his Ministry. He had one in the office which is now occupied by the present Minister of Trade and he also had an office in Herbert House when he was Minister responsible for Civil Aviation. He spent two days, went across to the other place every week and spent

some time there in his office, so do not bring this kind of nonsense into this debate as though we have jumbled something for the first time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I object to that, Sir. I do not think anybody in here spoke nonsense today. It is a reflection on the Chair for allowing nonsense to be talked.

** Aside.*

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Why does he not behave himself. I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I hear the point of order?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He himself is getting on very ignorant, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member understand that that is a direct accusation to the Honourable Minister.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I withdraw it, Sir. You did not ask him to withdraw his comments about ignorance, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I hear the point of order:

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He began his speech and he accused people of being ignorant of the fact that he was moved from Minister of Transport and sent down there, Sir, without any office for at least a week butting about. That is a fact. Let him get up now and deny that and call that double ignorance. It is the truth though.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is not double ignorance. It is quadruple ignorance. I went to my office every day.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: How do you mean "where"? At Herbert House. Because you hear people talking foolishness? You have people who rake up rubbish which they put into ignorant columns calling themselves ignorant names and you would go and digest the rubbish you pick up out of columns in newspapers? You know different from that.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is the position, Mr. Chairman. I have been the Minister. I have been at my office every day so long as I was in this country. That is the

end of that except I said that even under them it was divided into tiVo. In fact, currently now it is divided into three and I take the point made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

The point is and this is the point. In fact, we have to look and see if we can consolidate the various administrative sections of my Ministry because we have a section of the Ministry at the Port Authority Building. That is where I am at the moment from November 1, 1988.

We have a section of the Ministry, as I said before, at Herbert House and the Accounting Section of the Ministry is at the Airport but it also ties up with Government's policies, and not only policies, but ability to provide sufficient accommodation for the Ministries and the problems that we have, particularly since the problems at the Marine House. That is one of the difficulties so we have to get accommodation for my Ministry as well as for some other Ministries that have been forced out of Marine House like the Ministry of the Attorney General.

One section is at the old Windsor Hotel and one section of it is still at Marine House. These are some of the problems that we have to work on and in this respect I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. He acknowledged that not all he says is foolishness. I see he is bowing.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Minister is having something kind to say, Sir, poor fellow.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Now, Sir, some time last year the same Honourable Member spoke about the Immigration Department and I agreed then with the Honourable Member. In fact, what he has said on this occasion about the Immigration Department in terms of positive statements which might have been considered negative like not receiving acknowledgements from the Immigration Department, I believe that to be the case as well.

Since speaking with the Honourable Member I held a number of discussions with the Chief Immigration Officer and I sought and I showed ways which, in my opinion, there could have been improvements in the administration of that department. 1.55p.m.

I believe there has been some improvement, as I understand it, in that department since then. I am not myself satisfied that we have reached the standard of efficiency that that department should reach. I do not like to hear that persons make applications to the department and a year has gone by, and nearly two years have gone by and not only has there been no decision, there has been no

acknowledgement. So therefore that tells me that there is something still fundamentally wrong in the department.

And when I join with honourable Members in talking about the Department, my hope is that those persons who hear and understand what we are saying might attempt to do something about it.

The Department has had its problems. There were serious physical problems in the Immigration Department. We have had to move from the top floor of the particular building in which it is housed, to the ground floor of that building and carry out some works to the top floor. The intention had been and still is, as far as I am aware, to remove the Immigration Department back to the top floor as soon as renovations are completed.

Be that as it may, Sir, I think the problem could be restructured administratively, so that we can provide a faster, better service to the public at large.

I will now have, Sir, to speak about the Airport. As from January 1 this year, the Immigration desks in the departure area, have been removed reverting, Sir, to the position that had been up until about 1977 when it was not necessary to go through any Immigration when one was leaving the country. There had been complaints about it, complaints about the hold-ups in the long lines and so on that had existed before. Yes, it is true that that there was a time when no one went through the Immigration Department prior to departure.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Maybe so. I like the Honourable Member travelled countries not so long ago, without going through Immigration when we leave. When you leave the United States of America, you do not go through Immigration.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Heathrow, yes. In Heathrow one does. But one does not go through the Immigration Department. And I would imagine in a place like the USA where the miscreants, I assume, are far greater than in our own country and the opportunity for leaving that country is far greater than here and if they can do it, I do not see why we cannot do it ourselves. Even so, when immigration desks were there, it was still possible for persons who may not have wanted to leave the country to leave - even though the immigration desks were there - and did leave.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: And they did leave.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Let me say this, Sir, people do not easily take to change. People always for some reason or another resist change. Change is not always bad. But it takes a time, Sir, to get oneself accustomed to a new set of circumstances.

I do not understand why the Immigration Officers should resist not having to work at a desk at the departure lounge.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: They do not want to work - Cabinet made that policy - they are told do not work the departure lounge and they want to work at the departure lounge. This is something strange to Barbados now in a way that they want to work. People normally do not want to work.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I think they want to give trouble rather than not want to work. They want to give trouble. I think that is what it really, truly is.

We were not dismissing anybody. We were not sending anybody home. All we are saying is the immigration cards will now be collected by the respective airlines and we want you to collect them. In other words instead of sitting at a desk all day, just waiting for passengers to pass by and you check out their cards, all that is required for you to do now is to leave the comfort of your seat in the Immigration Department and go to the airline, and collect these cards. It need not wait until the airline has left or is about to leave. I see the passengers take what they call, the passenger representatives anyhow at the various airlines, leaving their departments and walking into the Immigration Department, into the Customs Department, on to the tarmac. Is it too much to ask of Immigration Officers to do just the opposite, to walk in the opposite direction and go to the same place from which people come towards them? Is it too much to ask?

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: People are being facilitated.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Precisely. Why should they line twice? And I want to repeat what I said on a point of order earlier because there are some persons who have been resisting it. I spoke to the Immigration Officer and I told him. I can say what I told him. I said those persons who are resisting it, I think we need now a change of command at the Airport in terms of faces. Let us transfer some to Bridgetown and some from ...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It should be done regularly, on a regular basis. Precisely. It should be done on a regular basis. It should be rotated on a regular basis. People should not go to the airport and expect that they can sit up there all the rest of their time, that they work in the Immigration Department and cannot be transferred to their home base. For their own development, they should learn other aspects of Immigration work. And I have told them that. And for their own development, they must expect that there are times when they will be transferred to Bridgetown and people from Bridgetown will be transferred to the Airport. And this should be done on a regular basis from the Supervisor down. I have made that clear to the Chief Immigration Officer and I also told the Supervisor that. He came to see me and I told him, I believe for your own development, I believe that you should come into home base and learn something new about the Immigration Department.

Let me say here again, I have authority under Laws passed during the regime, when the honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition was the Attorney-General. I have authority to appoint and therefore to "unappoint"...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: ...or disappoint Immigration Officers. It is not a power that I will use lightly. I want to make this clear, not facetiously...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: ...nor illegally. But if it ever came to that, Sir, if I ever have to use it, it will be used. I am not making any bones about it, with respect to whoever is offended with it, the union or whoever else might be offended, I have that power, I will use it. Make no mistake about that. 2.05 p.m.

There are problems, Sir, in the Immigration Department...

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That you gave me and use it That will be settled too. There are problems in the Immigration Department. There have always, Sir, been problems in the Immigration Departments. I do not like, like the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, for persons who have been residing in Barbados for years - mark you, Sir, most of them have been here illegally...

Asides. •

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Still illegal. But I have sympathy, Sir, for those persons who have spent some time

in Barbados that they should be asked to leave the country as soon as they are found out. I do not like some hounding down that is being done. I do not like it. Now I can understand the reasoning of some people. Some people are as patriotic or more patriotic than I am and they feel that their country is being defiled, desecrated, or being badly used and if they have a little authority, they are going to try and use it. We are still, Sir, a choice spot in the Caribbean for a number of persons from the other territories. That is fine. That is flattering. It is very flattering to know that persons from let's say, economically depressed territories, or otherwise who find Barbados a desirable place to live in, but we have to be careful how we do it. We cannot, like I have seen on a file in recent times that came to my hand, where an individual in August 1984 applied for citizenship and in five days that citizenship was granted - in five days in August 1984. It leaves one to wonder. But Sir, I think that we have got to treat, Sir, all those persons who make application to Barbados in the same way and with some compassion and firmness. As the Honourable Member for St. Lucy said, we are not an immigrating country. We are not like Canada. Sir, we have limitation of size, limitation of jobs, and limitation of services. All these limitations, Sir, we have got to think of when we are trying to accommodate other persons who want to come and live among us.

Sir, I believe this is a convenient time for me to stop.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Would you like to ask one question then?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We could probably dispose of this Head before the Committee rises for lunch. But I want to draw to the Minister's attention that those persons at the airport, who are on duty all night, sometimes flights are delayed and, in fact, they go on at seven, I think, and come off at seven or eight in the morning. Those are the 12 hour shifts. They are not supposed to be asleep during the time, but they need proper accommodation and the complaint is that the physical conditions at the airport are such that if in between nights there is a long wait and they have to sleep or take a rest, there is sometimes only one or two beds for them. Is there any proper accommodation there? Has the Minister looked into that problem?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That has been so for a long time.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I take the Minister's point, Sir. Some changes are being made physically. We are trying to make greater accommodation, Sir, for Immigration Officers right within the Immigration Hall and work is going on at this point in time. Right at this moment, Sir, work is going on up there. Sir, I do not want to - anyhow,

Sir, at this point I move, Sir, that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m. this day, Sir.

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

The question that this sitting be suspended until 3.15 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative, without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.15p.m.

ONRESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

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

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, this is a request for some \$8 519 300 by the Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development.

Under Subhead 1, we are asking for \$18 006 as follows:

Object No. 6 Travel - \$ 3 173

Object No. 7 Utilities - \$5 888

Object No. 10 Supplies and Materials - \$1 000

Object No. 11 Maintenance of Property - \$7 945, of which \$6 000 is to reimburse the Salvation Army which has spent that amount of money on the repairs to the Feeding Centre at Reed Street.

Under Subhead 3, the Labour Department, we are asking for \$13 300 as follows:

Object No. 7 Utilities - \$4 500 Object No. 10
Supplies and Materials - \$800 . Object No. 11
Maintenance of Property - \$2 000 Object No. 26
Professional Fees - \$6 000

These professional fees, I should explain, are to pay for advice on the renovations to Verona House, which needs very badly to be renovated.

Under Subhead 6, the Welfare Department, we are asking for \$21 199 as follows:

Object No. 6 Travel - \$ 10 395
Object No. 7 Utilities - \$10 804

but under the same Subhead we are asking for \$2 309 180 for assistance to persons as follows:

Welfare Grants - \$1 264 914 Assistance in
kind - \$640 996 Educational Assistance -
\$403 270 a grand total of \$2 309 180.

Under Subhead 12, Child Care Board, we are asking for a supplementary of \$2 476 380. This is because of the fact that we have had to bring forward over the last two years, outstanding commitments to . various firms totalling \$513, plus the fact that we have had to pay \$73 000 as arrears of salaries and wages due to the restructuring of the points at the bottom of the scale.

Subhead 14, Youth and Community Development, we are asking for a total of \$49 000 as follows:

Object No. 6 Travel - \$ 4 000
Object No. 7 Utilities- \$20 000
Object No. 10 Supplies and Materials - \$5 000
Object No. 12 Operating Expenses - \$20 000

Subhead 15, National Conservation Commission. As you know, tills is a block vote and we are asking for \$3 632 235 which is principally to pay wages for the persons who came in the special programme.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking that Head 39 stand part.

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I welcome Head 39 for a number of reasons, but first of all in so far as it gives me an opportunity to clarify a particular matter which would seem to have indicated that very recently I said in St. Peter that the Government should not spend money on home help, that the Government should not spend money on housing welfare.

A statement was carried in a section of the Press on the occasion of my opening a sports club built by the people of French Village in St. Peter to the effect that I, the member for St Peter, said that the Government should not spend money on home help and the Government should not spend money on housing welfare. I want, Sir, speaking as the Member for St. Peter, to elaborate my position as regards public expenditures on community- development and* welfare.

It is my view that the efforts of community groups must be supplementary to the efforts of the State in relation to the delivery of welfare services. I do not believe that we can build a serious society in Barbados if the fulfillment of every welfare need is seen as a responsibility for the State, and I absolutely do not apologise for believing that it is part and parcel of community groups to be involved in community self-help, and in that respect, Mr. Chairman, I was commending the people of French Village for not waiting on the Ministry of Sports but for working as a group of people to erect a club house independent of State subventions.

I made the point, Sir, which I would want to repeat today, that I also look to community groups as well not only to build sports centres in Barbados or club houses in Barbados, but also to assist in looking after the aged, the indigent and the poor in their communities. I see the need for it as stemming from the fact that it is in the final analysis still the responsibility of the family to look after families, and in a sense, in the final analysis it is still the responsibility of communities to look after communities. 3.25 p.m.

I know from time to time we will have to come to the House and vote funds and, also, to supplement funds to undertake welfare functions and community development functions, Sir. We must never believe in Barbados that there is not a role for community organisations in the dispensation of welfare functions.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will find within his Ministry my letter that I wrote when I was the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, but written as the member for St. Peter, to the effect that I would very much like to see a situation arising whereby part of the funds that we vote in the House under this Head 39, Community Development and Welfare, could be earmarked as a subvention to be channelled through community councils and community groups that would enable community organisations to provide voluntary labour and enable us to get a bigger bang out of the welfare funds that we vote.

I feel as strongly about it now as I felt about it then that there are a large number of community organisations in Barbados which would be glad to have access to the material to which they can contribute voluntary labour to

make sure that the old person who has a few sheets of galvanize that need replacing does not have to wait in a long line at the Ministry of Labour, Community Development, or whatever else in order to get those simple tasks attended to.

I thought I would want to make that clarification that I did not call for a cessation of public spending on the delivery of social services in this country but that I was urging a case for community effort in this respect to be supplementary to the efforts that Government is making to improve the lot of the disadvantaged in this society.

That, however, does not absolve me of the responsibility as Shadow Minister of Finance from raising questions as regards the extent of the supplementary that is being sought and, in many respects, Mr. Chairman, the same consideration that I want to raise in this[^] particular instance falls within the same context of the consideration that I raised on the last occasion when a supplementary which amounted to almost 40% of an original vote came to this House.

Why is the House putting itself to this particular kind of problem? Why are we year after year given to the practice of putting up in the initial Estimates amounts which are less than the funds provided for in the previous financial year without showing where a programme cut is going to be effected so as to rationalise a decrease in the subvention because the reality of the situation is that the Estimates of Expenditure that were brought to this House and approved by this House in March of this year contained provision for grants to individuals, provision for child care, provision for the NCC which were substantially less than the amounts that were voted last year whether up front or by way of supplementary.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am putting to the House that it is a matter of false budgeting and false economy for the Government to profess by way of its presentation in the Estimates a substantially reduced subvention to these critical agencies, knowing full well that no programme cuts are intended and knowing full well that, sooner or later, we will have to be brought back to this Chamber to vote supplementaries that are in excess of 30% of the amounts that the House approves and I am saying that the time has come when this false budgeting must stop. We really must stop it. We cannot come back to the House to vote supplementaries of 30% and 40%.

The purpose of a supplementary, Mr. Chairman, is to meet contingencies or to meet new programmes which have developed during the course of a financial year, or to meet, in my conception of things, those increases in expenditures that can be justified on the basis of increased prices, or can be justified upon the basis of an expansion in the

programme that really does not cause the programme to fall outside the limits of its initial conception but when we start dealing with 30% and 40% supplementaries something obviously has to be wrong with the budgetary system.

we are being asked to approve today, Mr. Chairman, is a situation in which the Child Care Board is to get a supplementary which is tantamount to 40% of its initial subvention, that the National Conservation Commission is to get a supplementary which is 1/3 its initial subvention, that it was granted \$10 million in the Estimates, we are asking now for \$3.6 million which is fully 1/3. The Government was in a position to know in March that last year the National Conservation Commission was given \$15 million and the point of false budgeting obviously has to be ...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ... which I opposed and I opposed it then, if I must remind the Honourable Member for St. John on the grounds that it was the Democratic Labour Party which said that it would never have a crash programme in this country when a certain Mr. Junior Rock, a former unsuccessful candidate for the constituency of St. Thomas, urged on the occasion of his defeat that the way the Democratic Labour Party should solve unemployment would be to have a crash programme entailing \$15 million expenditure per year to employ a large number of people and the Democratic Labour Party at that time said that it was without the limits of planning of the Democratic Labour Party to have a crash programme or a beautification programme entailing the expenditure of \$15 million. You have to be consistent.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The said candidate for St. Thomas, Mr. Chairman, made the point that a large number of persons should be employed with the National Conservation Commission which they would agree to be involved in debushing, which is happening now, to be involved in beautification, which is happening now, and when you put all together, Sir, it amounted in his mind, and it amounts to my mind, and it amounts to the minds of a large cross-section of Barbadian people to be nothing more than a crash programme.

The essential point is that the Democratic Labour party cannot at one stage say that they will not spend \$15 million on the National Conservation Commission on such a purpose and then come and ask this House to justify the expenditure of \$15 million of expenditure for precisely the purpose that they said were not going to expend it on.

The essential point, Sir, and I will not be distracted by the members of the other side, is that we have to take objection to this type of budgeting and it raises a related question.

We have, in the course of the last few months, approved a large number of supplementaries. Week by week this House is approving supplementaries that amount in some instances to 30% and 40% of Government's total initial subvention.

Last year the Democratic Labour Party was very critical of us in the sense that they sought to hold us responsible for the overspending that took place and, Mr. Chairman, there are some times when you cannot see, because you are not in possession of the full picture. You can sit down and agree to the \$3 million here, the \$1.5 million there but, at the end of the day, we end up with a financial situation that is entirely unmanageable. 3.35p.m.

I need therefore, Sir, to ask of the Government, as we propose to exercise a judgement on these particular supplementaries, what really is the position that faces the country today as regards Government's expenditures and what, Mr. Chairman, is the position with Government projects that it is likely to face between now and the rest of the Financial year?

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But if we cannot discuss it, Mr. Chairman, on what basis are we as a serious Committee of Supply going to take a decision to commit almost \$10 million of public expenditures, unless we can get...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Minister, Sir, is agreeing that the Government is in point of fact going to collect \$100 million more.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: One hundred million dollars more than it was supposed to collect.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The argument, Sir, is that it does not make sense for Government, and it is contrary to stated policy of the Democratic Labour Party, to allow expenditure to rise merely because its revenue performance is greater than that which might have been projected by Government financial advisers and accepted by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister was very clear in his Budgetary Presentation that he was going to hold Government expenditure in line as a matter of policy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to complete his speech.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, would feel more comfortable in taking a financial decision on a matter entailing almost \$10 million of supplementary expenditures, some of which, Sir, represent 40% of the initial subvention, if I could get a feel as to exactly what is the kind of ballpark situation that faces Government where its expenditure is concerned.

* We must be a responsible Committee of Supply. And it bothers me very profoundly, Sir, to have to sit and adjudicate on supplementaries, Mr. Chairman, which obviously cannot be justified by reference to increased prices, cannot be justified by reference to an increase in expansion in the programmes entailed. And therefore, Sir, I should be obliged if the Government could be more forthcoming as regards an argument, Sir, that is worth putting, I should be obliged, on behalf of this Opposition to know what are the reasons for Government's over expenditure in these particular matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Prime Minister.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I should like to set the mind of the Honourable Member for St. Peter at rest. He need not bother. There is no way in which this Government will in terms of its expenditures be reckless or be unconcerned about fiscal prudence.

I am by nature a very cautious person. Very cautious. If you ask me to spend money, I think twice, three times.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And if I am that cautious about my own finances, you can rest assured that I am very much concerned about the public finances.

Now first of all, let me point out, there is no expenditure of public funds that this House does not approve in one form or another. And secondly, you have now admitted that I was quite clear in the principles underlining the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. I was quite clear in setting out the principles.

We are on a programme to rectify a situation in which for a number of years, current expenditure exceeded current revenue by unacceptable amounts. And right now, I am predicting that this Government whose financial policies the centres of opposition have been highly critical of...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... this Government has been able to turn around that situation, and if everything goes according to plan during the remaining months of this year, we are predicting that we will have a small surplus on current account, including these supplementaries. I have put all of those into it.

Applause.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: And I can with these supplementaries.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am like you, you know.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We use the computers too.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not shouting loudly. This is not loudly yet.

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: With those projected supplementary increases on the existing lay-outs or outlays, I am predicting that And I can speak with this sense of confidence because now in this country, I am the most experienced Minister of Finance the country has had, alive. I will check the record for Mr. Bernard St. John.

So I...

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Do not look at me, man. You do not have any experience in this. Do not look at me.

Laughter.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But let me put it this way in all seriousness. We make certain projections. We wish as a matter of policy to have our revenues at a level that will sustain the services that are desirable for our country and also to increase the necessary resources, so that in the Public Service and in the economy generally, we will be able to get growth in that economy. Now it is very difficult to rein in expenditure. It is not an easy task, but we have been working at it. And I can say now also that for the first time in the history of this country we have had greater compliance with Land Tax payments than ever. Greater compliance at that level. And that is in accordance with the policies that we have laid down. We have said that from existing taxes, those who have to bear the incidence of the taxes, there are people who bear their incidence of the taxes, and we are instituting measures in the revenue collecting centres to ensure that the appropriate tax is paid by those who are subject to the taxes. And we are getting

voluntary compliance in the revenue collecting centres. So it is not only in terms of the revenue, but we have been aiming also to hold down expenditures where possible.

Now there are some big spenders in Government and you yourself know that, when you were a junior Minister or holding a junior position, they never thought fit to put you into a more senior position. They never thought fit to do that.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But we are looking across at you.

Laughter.

3.45 p.m.

Asides.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are willing to exchange information so that there is better understanding of the public finances. You yourself know that there were Supplementaries brought in by your Government when you were there. You were not able to tame it. We have been looking at certain measures which will ensure that there is a programme and there is a budget. We are not saying zero budgeting. But we are trying to get the greatest efficiency possible and down through the years this has been said but we have not been able to achieve it. We believe that by the method that we are using now we are attempting to get the best possible assessment, because when we come for a Supplementary we have to seek to justify that particular Supplementary and the Ministry has to justify the request for the Supplementary and there is a technique in all of this. It is going to give us information on the base on which we will be better able to judge the overall requirement of the Ministries down the years. But there is no sleight of hand or anything like that.

When I say that we are shooting for a small surplus on Current Account, as I have said before, "Mark my words and read my lips".

Aside.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, I can quote. That is what I say and we are trying to set in place the public finances and the economy of this country on the kind of base that will enable us to carry out the programmes that we wish to carry out. If we have to come for Supplementaries for the Ministry of Employment, Labour and Community Development to carry out its work in the southern parishes, in the central parishes, or in the northern parishes, we will come and justify that. We will come and justify it. It would not be hidden anywhere. The information is available to the

Honourable Member. Don't give the impression that it is not available. Because the Estimates come out in this year or the next year and it gives the approved Estimates, and it gives the actual expenditure in the particular year. So you are able to assess that. But you must understand one thing. You had your chance. This is the time of the Democratic Labour Party, the only Democratic Labour Party in this country...

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: ... and no pretenders are going to prevent this Democratic Labour Party from carrying out the task which the electors of this country has given it to carry out. We have been successful to date, very successful to date in the management of the public finances and in the general level of economic activity contrary to the attacks from the centres of opposition.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Those who are not comfortable inside of the Democratic Labour Party as it sets out to achieve its objective, let them go. We say go. We say go!

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The only trouble is that the 3 of you out there better beware.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: 54,011 - that is right. The two parties in this country - there are two great parties in this country. I attribute the word "great" only because of historical accident.

Laughter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But I would say this much and the Leader of the Opposition knows this from his study and participation in political life in this country. There have been many attempts in the past to have third parties. They have risen up. You hear about them for a week or two and then they are no more.

The Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party will continue to seek to represent the interest of this country. We have a two-party system. It does not mean that there are only two parties because at my reckoning there are about ten or eleven or more in the United Kingdom. There are more than two parties in the United States or in Canada. You should know that. You know about - including the "loony party".

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: So when it comes to representation of the interest of the people and the management of the public finances, this is a story of success at this particular point. We have had to take some unpopular decisions, but I am happy to say that this Cabinet and this Government, and this Party has stuck to its task and the people of this country are the beneficiaries. We are not going to allow any vaulting ambitions to destroy the work that has been done by this Government down through the years and we will continue to do into the foreseeable future.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that at this stage the public finances including the Supplementaries projected down to the end of March can be contained and those that have been passed already. I am not talking - we have to talk about wages. But we will come, no not know.

Asides.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am under the control of the Chairman and you are not going to get me to talk about anything that is not here. I am simply replying to the point that you made. We are looking very carefully at each particular Estimate of the Ministries including that Ministry, the Ministry of Community Development which is doing an excellent job in beautification of this country. I like how you try to cover all bases. You say they should spend the money. Then they should not spend the money. They are doing work throughout the country and it is a tribute to the work that the Government is doing. We will have other Supplementaries as well and we have had others for Health and elsewhere and there is no Ministry, therefore, that will not have the funds within reasonable limits to carry out a programme that is satisfactory. So the Member for St. Peter please have no fear on those particular grounds. If we need a supplementary as we are doing here today, we will come and we will give the reasons and the actual expenditure for the year will be shown so that you can use that in whatever way you will use it. But remember we have the final reply.

Thank you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say a few words on this Resolution. I should like to pick up from where the Honourable Member for St. Peter left off regarding the first part of his presentation. During that presentation, Sir, he pointed out in reaction to an article, and it is perhaps unfortunate that he reacted to the article rather than thought it his duty to come here and state as a matter of principle where he stood on the question of community development. 3.55 p.m.

It is always a bit dangerous, I have found, to react, in my very limited experience so far in this House. If you react to 90% of what you see attributed to you in the newspaper, then you will never be able to get ahead to discussing the positive things and you are probably more minded to set out his philosophy regarding community programmes and the attitude that Government should take towards the funding of community groups and the partnership between self-help and the State, and that is desirable.

The latter part of his speech is not unusual. The Opposition voted against the Appropriation Bill. I cannot see how you can vote for any of these supplementaries. You should divide on all. It cannot be fair for you to vote against the initial appropriation and then not vote against these supplementaries. You must vote so that the NCC workers know that they are not to be paid, you must vote so that the Ministry of Employment and Youth Affairs must know that the public servants who carry out these functions that he lauds should not be paid and should not receive the benefits. Vote against them. That is your right as you did during the appropriation, and if you did not vote for the appropriation, I would expect that you would not vote for any of the supplementaries as a matter of principle. That is one of the economic principles that I think should be gleaned from the speech given by the Honourable Member for St. Peter a few minutes ago.

Now, Sir, my comments really do not relate substantially to that, I want to address the matter of grants to non-governmental organisations as made by the Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations. These grants to these non-governmental organisations or national organisations...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The reference is to non-profit.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, well to the extent that the Child Care Board is quasi Government, what I am really speaking about is not the specifics of non-governmental organisations. I am talking about grants that Government makes to institutions, then, if that would satisfy your discerning eye, Sir.

These organisations play a very important role in our national development. For example, the Government, through the Ministry of Agriculture, gives a grant to the 4-H Foundation or Movement, the Government gives a substantial grant to the Barbados Youth Council, and I have heard in recent times, the Minister of Youth Affairs has appealed and begged the Youth Council to give him a programme of activities. As far as I understand, the 4-H Movement, as it presently is organised, is in shambles, and all of these organisations are receiving Government funds, the people's money for which we are accountable, and yet at the end of the day, I do not think that they are required to give an account of how they spent this money or whether it is reaching the needs of the community as a whole.

My position, Sir, is very clear. The Youth Council, the 4-H Movement, the Boys' Scouts Association, any of those institutions is not entitled to this money as of right simply because people believe them to be national organisations. They must demonstrate by their programmes or by the Government's constant monitoring of their activities that the money that Government gives to them is being well spent.

Now, Sir, for example, in some of these organisations 90%, if not all, of the money is spent in administration, perhaps paying a Secretary, I do not know what other kinds of things, buying paper and that kind of thing, and I believe that the programmes of the organisation never receive the kind of funding that is necessary.

I took the position against my parliamentary colleagues. I know they do not agree with me on this, but I believe that there should be some decentralisation of expenditure in relation to community activities. The same point that the Honourable Member for St. Peter is making in a way. He is the best judge as the Member of Parliament, perhaps of the organisations in his constituency, that is, so long as he is using an objective yard-stick, that are making a contribution. Each of us in a way has a clear picture of the institutions and the organisations in our constituencies that are providing yeoman service or making a contribution, and therefore we should be able in my view to make some input in relation to having these organisations assisted, whether through whatever mechanism, through the constituencies, or through whatever decentralised mechanism is available.

I know that this is not the age of decentralisation, and the age of Local Government went through the door years ago, but I still believe that if perhaps we turn our backs on that kind of thing that we may not be giving support to those organisations which are ready and willing to take up the challenge in relation to some of the services that Government may provide in the area of community development.

To go back, Sir, just for a minute to the question of the Youth Council. I remember, Sir, back in the 1980's the subvention for the Youth Council was stopped for reasons which apparently related to their philosophy, the fact that...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes. The former Minister of Youth who was in the Other Place stopped the subvention because he did not like the fact that some members from a left leaning group, the Workers' Party, and one or two other leftist organisations became members of the Barbados Youth Council - Ricky Parris and St. Clair Gittens - and that particular Minister removed the subvention and practically destroyed the Barbados Youth Council's financing and the financial base of the Youth

Council, and it was this Government, for the information of those who may not know, that restored as far as I recall the subvention to the Barbados Youth Council, and it was this Government that provided the support services that they now have. I believe they have the uses of an office at the National Cultural Foundation at West Terrace.

I am not saying that subventions should be taken away for those reasons. I do not care who is running the organisations - leftist, rightist, third partyist, fourth, fifth or sixth partyist, whatever - the persons who are running the organisations have a duty to account to us, because we are the people who have a duty at the end of the day to account to the public for the manner in which their money is being disseminated among organisations and groups throughout the country.

The fact of the matter is that they must earn the subvention. It is not a matter of right, and I believe that when a lot of these organisations carry out their programmes they must carry them out with the view in the back of their minds that they are earning the \$40 000 or \$30 000 in some cases or whatever that the Government is giving them to carry out those programmes, and they must justify the payment on that subvention or grant by the kinds of activities that they carry out.

Now, Sir, the only other two points I want to make relate to the National Conservation Commission. Last time a supplementary came before the House, as I said, we requested an additional \$10 million to continue the beautification programme, and I remember on that occasion we challenged the members of the Opposition to look around them and see the work that the National Conservation Commission has been doing and then tell us whether they believe the \$10 million had been wisely spent or has not.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter has not said whether he believes the money is wisely spent or not. I challenged him then to tell me whether the money should be spent at all, which means, should the people be sent home? Should the programmes come to an end? Whether it is too much money to spend on beautification or whether in spending the money we should do other things. 4.05 p.m.

I asked him those three questions. I remember it very clearly because I felt it was an assault on over the nearly one thousand workers at the National Conservation Commission who, if we took the foolish advice of the Opposition, would today be unemployed and a lot of them are people from my constituency for whom I will stand up.

There are a lot of people from all over Barbados who are employed by the National Conservation Commission so if it is a crash programme, tell us what is wrong with it. Are we spending too much? Is it badly spent? Then, perhaps,

the members of the Opposition, in their folly, will be able to receive some enlightened answers as to the usefulness of the beautification programme.

It is there for all to see. Perhaps, it is one of the major things that is there for all to see in terms of Government's expenditure relating to the payment of salaries and wages. You cannot help but seeing the workers of the National Conservation Commission at work. You cannot help but seeing the number of new parks that have been opened, not only for the benefit of visitors but for the benefit of Barbadians and if we cannot enjoy something in Barbados who is to enjoy it and that is why I must take strong objection to the position that the Shadow Minister of Finance took on it.

There are too many women with young children at school, babies and so on who would have no job tomorrow if we were foolish enough to take the very silly advice that has been advanced by the Opposition in relation to the National Conservation Commission.

What the Opposition is basically saying is it is a crash programme. We do not believe in crash programmes. Stop it. Send home the NCC Workers and...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, No. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas cannot say he said that. That was never your position. You and he were at loggerheads on it and at the end of the day you did not know how to vote and the Honourable Member for St. Peter abstained and you supported it. You would not be foolish enough not to support it because you were one of the people who said that the Government, as far as I recall, should be employing an additional 300 people in the NCC so you were not the person who was against it, so do not come with that.

I remember the Honourable Member for St. Thomas said in that debate that he was the person who called for an additional number of persons to be employed by the National Conservation Commission.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: How many? Five hundred and forty eight. Thank you. Five hundred. Can you imagine that? Five hundred people and yet the Honourable Member for St. Peter did not care about those five hundred people. All of them should be sent home because it is a crash programme and, fortunately, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas supported it and that is to his credit.

I remember the following money Resolution that came he said, "I am wearing the belt now" and the Honourable Member for St. Peter started voting for all of the

supplementaries on that occasion but he abstained. He was not sure what to do.

How could the Honourable Member for St. Peter tell the public of Barbados that nearly one thousand in one shot should be unemployed the day after a Resolution comes in here for \$10 million?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Suppose we were not reckless in the manner in how we conducted our public affairs. You may call it a crash programme but for the persons who are employed in the National Conservation Commission, they are doing something creative with their hands that is visible to the average Barbadian, that is enjoyed by the average Barbadian, that is enjoyed by people outside of Barbados and that enhances this country and I am in full support of it.

If the Opposition is saying that the people should be sent home, say it. Do not be afraid. It would not be the first time you have said people should be sent home and it probably would not be the last. Say it and vote against the Resolution and then, at the same time, go down in Independence Square and tell the public workers call for as much money as they want from the Government. That is the kind of recklessness that we have to put up with. It is not reasonable. You cannot conduct public affairs like that and that is my view.

I am in full support of this Resolution subject to the reservations expressed with regard to the subventions to the non-profit organisations.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, as representative for St. Michael South East I have no alternative but to overwhelmingly support this Resolution.

But, let me start by saying something. I find the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party quite interesting. A few weeks ago in this Honourable Chamber the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made the point that this House should be at one in its philosophy when it talks about the development of areas for poor people in this country and he said then that when we are looking at housing, etc., we must see things like housing as not only an area where we put people in to live but that area should have recreational facilities. Now, I want to know how you are going to provide recreational facilities and the kind of facilities that a young and developing country should have without providing the money for these sorts of areas.

I had the opportunity over the past week to spend a lot of time with the representatives who were here from the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries and the European

Parliament and every one of the people that I spoke to-made me proud to be a Barbadian because they all complimented Barbados about the beauty of this country, not only the sand and the sea but the tidiness and the cleanliness of Barbados.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: In comparable terms I must disagree with the Minister of Health. We ourselves, because we are so clean, tend to see the little spots that are left over but when you travel you recognize how clean Barbados really is and this is a point that all of the participants who were here made about what is going on in Barbados and there is no doubt in anybody's mind that over the past two years there has been a transformation of the flora and the fauna in Barbados. Barbados is a new place.

When you drive along the highways and if you come into the constituency of St. Michael South East, you will see the most beautiful park in the whole Caribbean so I have no alternative but to speak on this and St. Michael South East is not the only place in Barbados that has a beautiful park.

Asides.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Look at the beauty in St. Peter. We have refined it. We have made it beautiful and dosed it up, a place that people now want to come and see but I want to make a comment that I think is very, very relevant.

Up to this morning before I left home constituents of my area called me to let me know that in the area of Regent Hill NCC has left some stuff lying down there for the past week. People are now very concerned about the cleanliness in which they live and I think this is a credit to what is going on in Barbados.

A few weeks ago, some little boys and girls, nine and ten years old, called me, I was going through the park, and they said, "Look, there is a bush growing between our houses" and when we in this country can get little children to understand that where they live should be clean it is a credit to the kind of programme that we are carrying out and I want to say something.

You are talking about giving money to non-governmental organisations and the development of communities. Let me say to you that in the constituency of St. Michael South East in the next few weeks we will be opening a novel project. We will be opening the Marcus Garvey Library. It will be the first Library in Barbados primarily with black literature, with other literature as well/ and that Library has already been built out of the contributions of local Barbadians, not depending on any Government funding. Not one cent of Government money has gone into that project. 4.15p.m.

The constituents of that area have come along, they have done the plumbing, they have done the tiling, et cetera. The point I am making is this, the same point that the Honourable Member for St. Peter is trying to push: that we in the communities have got to get up and work if we are to better our own country. We must not sit back and believe that everything must come out of the hands of Government. But if Government gives the right direction then the citizens will respond.

But the answer is not to come in here and to oppose money every time it is needed for people. Because you can also send negative images to people. And when responsible people in this country come in and say we are voting against the Appropriation Bill or we are voting against the money so that the beautification programme is not carried on, it gives negative images, especially to people who support them because they feel it is right to boycott these kinds of projects. And it is a fact that we have people who work in those areas - I know you do not like to hear it because it is the truth and it grips you. I know more about psychology than you. And I know when you respond in a certain way what kinds of things are going through your brains. So you better be careful how you respond.

Asides.

Laughter.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I know when I see you nervous and jittery what is happening, the message is getting over to you, because you are sending the wrong images. If you have this country at heart you must participate in it. You must not boycott everything that is going on. And that is the part that the Barbados Labour Party is playing. There is always an excuse for not taking part in something Barbadian. Every time you have not got an invitation. If you are a Barbadian, you do not need an invitation to attend a conference.

Aside.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: You do not need an invitation to participate in the beautification of Barbados. If you think that it is good, stand on principle and say that it is good.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I said, as the Representative of St. Michael South East, we have to speak on a Bill like this because we in that area have been the participants and those of us who doubt it, any day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday, come into St. Michael South East and see young people enjoying benefits equal to any that I have seen in the world. You come up there and you see what community participation is all about.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those words, I support this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this debate is a very important debate, if only because it underscores the bankruptcies of the Democratic Labour Party's policies and the extent to which the Democratic Labour Party is prepared to engage itself in deception.

Members on the other side, Sir, ask me why I would want to vote against a supplementary of \$10 million for the ^{**} National Conservation Commission? Last year, \$10 million. Why would I want to deprive Barbadians of jobs?

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And they put it, Sir, to unthinking people, as issues that are to be swallowed and accepted by unthinking people.

But I have this evening, Sir, to remind the Democratic Labour Party of the fact that I contested a general election in this country where the question of mandate was being fought. And the Democratic Labour Party then was putting the case that we in the Barbados Labour Party, Sir, were guilty of overspending. And I must remind this House, Sir, that when we were accused of overspending, we were spending \$5 million on the National Conservation Commission.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I will go further, Sir. The Democratic Labour Party also went to the people of this country and said that as a Government, employment creation should not come through the Budget, through Government expenditure but as a matter of philosophy, Sir, as a matter of economic policy, increase in jobs in Barbados, Sir, should come from the private sector. Those were put to the people of this country, as a matter of ^{*} principle and a mandate was sought by the Democratic Labour Party from the people of Barbados to curtail expenditure and allow increase in job creation to come not from the public sector but from the private sector.

I am therefore then, Mr. Chairman, to sit idly by and watch a Party which accused us of over-expenditure for spending \$5 million on beautification as well. Beautification did not begin with the Democratic Labour Party. We were spending \$5 million on beautification, but we were ^{*} overspending. And I am to approve and agree with a Government which has accused us of overspending for spending \$5 million to agree that \$15 million should be spent in the course of one year. I am to do that. And the Member for St. John cannot understand what is the principle in the matter.

The principle in the matter is that you sought a mandate from the people of Barbados to make sure that no more than \$5 million was spent on programmes undertaken

by the National Conservation Commission. You spent last year fifteen. This year you are going to be spending thirteen. Where has there been the reduction in public expenditures on public sector job creation that the Democratic - Labour Party promised the people of this country? That is the point of issue.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: We spent five.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have little less interruption, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And that, Sir, is the point of issue.

This, Mr. Chairman, Sir, is not a public sector oriented job which was supposed to be the blueprint for economic advancement for Barbados. This, Sir, is not a private sector job creation programme. This is a public sector job creation programme.

We in the Barbados Labour Party lost an election on an issue that you in the Democratic Labour Party could find a way of reducing public expenditures, of reducing the extent to which the public sector would have to be called upon to create new jobs.

And you must not now expect me to support you when you have to come and eat your own words. And I would say to the House, Sir, that this kind of increased expenditure by the Democratic Labour Party is in a sense, Sir, an internal admission that its policies have failed. It is an admission, Mr. Chairman, that it is now left to the public sector to be an angel of employment creation if the Democratic Labour Party can have the morality to recognize that there is nothing wrong with public sector job creation, that there was nothing wrong with the Barbados Labour Party creating jobs in the public sector: if it can have the morality to come to tell the people of Barbados that we as a Government in the context of a developing country must see public capital works as grasping opportunities to carry forward this country than being something wrong and wicked, as the people of Barbados were made to believe was the case when we were in office then perhaps I could find it in my heart to support you. But you made it appear to the people of Barbados that if we had capital projects, we were wicked because the Government should not be involved in job creation. You made it appear that unless it was the private sector which was in the forefront of development then there was no development taking place in Barbados. And you cannot therefore have your cake and eat it. And that is the point of principle on which I stand on these matters.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That is the point of principle, Sir. That less than two or three short years ago, a Government that was Spending \$5 million on national beautification was criticized for over-expenditure. And a Government now wants to be congratulated for spending \$15 million, Sir.

I heard the former Minister of Finance say that there has been a substantial departure from the content of the beautification programme that was conceived of when he had a role to play in the management of the financial affairs of this country.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: In many respects, Mr. Chairman, this beautification programme so-called is devoid of any lasting benefits. There are areas, Sir, such as the St. Michael South East where we were led to believe, the public of Barbados was led to believe, Sir, that a park was being done as a community effort. And it turned out, Mr. Chairman, to be a park constructed not as a community effort...

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: but at the expense of the taxpayers of Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: And I am saying, Sir, that this is part of the deception, that what we are involved in here, Sir, is a deception by the Democratic Labour Party. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East is very fond in this House of getting up and portraying the impression that he and he alone has a social conscience and that he and he alone is concerned about community development.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could the Honourable Member wind up in one minute.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: One minute, Sir?

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I will have to come back.
4.25p.m.

I am not surprised, Sir, that it has turned out that the Errol Barrow Memorial Park which was put to this House as a community effort has been constructed with public funds. In the forty-five seconds that are left to me, Sir,^v I want to know now how much public funds were spent on the Errol Barrow Memorial Park and I also want to know, Sir, as well how much public funds now are intended to be spent on the Marcus Garvey Memorial Library that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East has

promised us will be an effort that will be put together entirely on the basis of community funds, and I shall be back, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister. .

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to put the Honourable Member for St. Peter at ease. Obviously, he was not here during the last election at all. If he believes that the Barbados Labour Party lost the election because of expenditure, obviously he was dreaming and they will lose again if he continues in that vein because he has lost touch with reality or for any other reason.

I tend to agree with him that we should have a lot of these projects community based. But there are some problems with community based projects. One, they take a hell of a long time to be finished. We have a project now in Deacons Farm where the youngsters down there are renovating the community centre because some youngsters from that area destroyed it. It is now fifteen months in going, for my liking too long. We are trying to turn over the Bath Study the Ministry of Housing and Lands has given us for community groups. Some want money to help prepare them. Some want to put in the labour but they cannot come up with a good mix. So that it is not as easy as to say to hand over these things to the community. Another problem is this. When you hand it to the community, which group is going to take control of it? That also is a serious problem, because some people believe that when they renovate a community centre they have the God given right to that community centre. But we believe that the total community should have a right to it. These are some of the problems you have to seek out. It is not as easy as saying people in French Village have repaired something and therefore they will run it. I will tell you that I was involved in one of the first community group efforts at Maple. Some people believe that Maple playing field is Maple. So I know the problems that we have with those things. It is not as easy as it first appears and we have to set down some guidelines for the use of these facilities once they are done by the community.

Of course, the question is that when the leader of that particular group goes, because most groups in Barbados tend to fall by the wayside after the leader goes. You can look at any group at all in Barbados. There is no continuity for some unknown reason, or when that age group moves out the group goes by the wayside. Government cannot sit down and say okay, when that group goes it will continue. We have to make all those safeguards.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: So these are some of the problems which we have to look at. But I would like to inform, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Peter about

something the Prime Minister had to say. This is the first time in a very long time I believe that civil servants can feel happy knowing that they can pay their creditors. In the past, what would happen is in December you would get...

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: I am playing with time. You will get a notice from the Ministry of Finance in December saying hold strain. Don't do anything until April. Now under this Administration we can pay every creditor. Well, when you are running your house and you do not put down something for a rainy day, you will find that the house will soon leak. So do not bother with that. Commonsense will tell you that.

Now as far as beautification is concerned, I do not want to repeat the fact that you did not vote for the \$10 million last time and, therefore, would have sent home a lot of people in St. Peter from working. I do not want to get into that. What I want to say to you is this. That we have a programme on stream now which as from this week we are going to every Government housing development including Bonnetts.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: No, West Terrace is not a Government housing development. You people down there work for enough money that you should look after yourselves. I know you will look after your problem.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: We are even going into Maynards very soon. Because, you see, we realise that it has a psychological benefit for people, I am seeing the results of cleaning up the housing areas. People tend to believe they are living somewhere special now. Even their behaviour has changed and part of the beautification campaign is to put a play park for children in every housing area, because we found out that if we have proper and well trained wardens in these parks then the behaviour patterns of the children can improve tremendously.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: No, they will not be child molesters. So Mr. Chairman, I thought I would just clarify one or two of the points made by the Member for St. Peter. As far as the Member for St. John is concerned, I think he knows that I have expressed my concern about giving money to non-Governmental organisations....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN- There is too much talk across the table.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is here. You can now ask him *sotto voce* if what I said is not true.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. We cannot take seriously these recent proselytes to the % cause that the lowest bidder should be awarded the contract, when at the time they were in Government they created an enormous hullabaloo for the award of a contract to a man whose price was over \$3 million. Look at the record. Let the scribes and the propagandists come and see it. Over \$3.3 million.

What is interesting about this whole business, Sir, is that this was done against a background of an estimate made by Proctor and Redfern, the Consulting Engineers of the project for the civil works of the project, the actual road building and so forth, that it would cost the Government \$48.6 million, but in the mad competition which ensued one found that the contractor, Sintra, which in its first bid quoted the amount of \$40.7 million, in the second bid dropped its offer to \$36.9 million, and C. O. Williams in the first bid dropped his offer from \$45.8 million to \$40.2 million for doing the same work. 4.45 p.m.

This reveals what anybody who analyses bids or road works within the Ministry of Transport and Works knows that there is a consistent pattern of low bids to get contracts and it is only later in the day that this Honourable House has to debate supplementary Resolutions to pay the contractor the real price.

Now when this sum of money, part of which is allocated to civil works, is paid to Sintra, Sintra would have collected \$42.5 million but that is not all, Mr. Chairman. Sintra now has another claim in addition to this to the order of \$12 million.

The reason for dividing these claims and not bringing them both at the same time has to do with the fact that within this particular claim there are financial obligations that the Government has which it must pay within a certain time frame and if that period is exceeded, then interest will accrue.

The other claim which is based on matters relating to the interpretation of the contract, delays and so forth, may be negotiated for an indefinite period. In other words, it appears at this point in time that at least \$6 million of that claim will be accepted which would bring the contract price up to \$48 million which the consulting engineers initially estimated. Based upon the tender price, therefore, the Government of Barbados is faced with underwriting an overrun of almost 33 V3 per cent.

People do not like to call these cost overruns but I call them overruns and the financial institutions call them overruns. Any time a project is budgeted for a specific sum

of money and it exceeds that sum for any reason whatsoever, the financial institutions which pay the money to finance part of the project call it overruns and so do I.

It is a concept which the people of Barbados believe. It is a concept which reflects consistently that people are awarded contracts and at the end of the day they are paid more than the price for which the contract had been awarded. That is what I call an overrun. At the end the facts are incontestable. A is given a contract for X number of dollars and at the end of the day he is paid X plus 30%, plus 40% and sometimes as high as 60%.

Now, according to the conventional wisdom of engineers in the building business, overruns in the region of 10%, sometimes 15% are allowable but when overruns go beyond that level, then it is time that policymakers who have to ask the taxpayers to shell out this money look very carefully at these things. It is obvious to me what has happened in this particular case.

The engineers estimated that the civil works would cost \$48.6 million. The bidders tried to outbid each other by going in lower. The Government of the day fixated upon one contractor and pre-occupied with his interest and his interest alone, and having a subservient and colonial outlook, genuflected and prostrated itself before the Inter-American Development Bank and allowed them to do whatever they wanted.

This Government is not possessed of individuals with the colonial mentality and that is why in the recent past we have taken decisions that flew in the face of what was just and correct and what was in accordance with commonsense.

Now, before I sit down, Sir, there are certain things I have to say about this road.

This Government has made a decision to accord an official name to this road. The substantial date or the date of substantial completion of the project is today. The contractors have indicated that as from today, January 31, the road will be ready for use by motorists.

I have not seen it officially. I have only got it indirectly. When I see it officially and I issue the appropriate ministerial fiat, then it would be proper for motorists to use the road but unofficially, the date of substantial completion of the road is today.

Substantial completion does not mean that the contractors will just disappear. They are residual things that they have to do in the area of springing, landscaping and so forth and it is hoped that all of these tasks will be completed by the end of March. 4.55 p.m.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: ...unless (a) they can return to the Ministry a financial statement and (b) a programme. I am not and I will not be spending money on non-Governmental organisations unless I am satisfied that they are being run properly. I do not want to call any names of organisations but I hope they understand. All organisations would understand what I am saying. There are some who will not hold Annual General Meetings for three years. There are some that will not submit financial statements. «» There are some that will not present programmes for the year and expect that Government will give them money. I say that is finished. I do not intend to do it at all. They will not get any money because I believe we owe a duty to the public of this country to indicate to them that their monies are properly spent. A word to the wise.

So with those few remarks by way of clarification, I ask that this Head stand part.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988-89 No.
12 ITEM A - \$5,654,322

Item A was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$5,654,322 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the. Estimates 1988-89 Part II-Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1988-89 No. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: This is a request to this Honourable House, for a sum of money to supplement Head 84, Subhead 6 which is the Airport to West Coast Highway. The Ministry of Transport and Works is requesting \$5,061,945 for structures, utility and housing relocation expenses, foreign currency conversion charges and the sum of \$592,377 for Professional Services.

On September 25, 1984 the Government of Barbados entered into an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank for the financing of the Airport to West Coast Highway. The estimated cost of the project was U.S. \$44.5 million...The Inter-American Development Bank agreed to finance the project up to U.S. \$24.5 million and the Government of Barbados U.S. \$20 million, approximately U.S. \$90 million being the total. 4.35p.m.

Tenders were invited, two sets of tenders in fact. The first set of tenders proved inconclusive as a result of the fact that the tenderer to which the Government of the day was sympathetic, namely C. O. Williams Limited, was not viewed with favour by the Inter-American Development Bank.

In these days when people are bandying about all kinds of figures and we hear statements, true or false, being made of contracts being awarded to the highest bidder, it is instructive for me to read out for the record of this Honourable House what kinds of bids obtained in the first set of tenders". MacAlpine bid at \$48 739 205, Rush and Tompkins \$38 076 914, Sintra \$40 781 839, Vinckler \$44 970 967, C. O. Williams \$45 856 872. One would see that the bidder that was supported by the then Government was the second highest bidder.

As a result of a failure to reach an agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Bank, there was a second set of bids, and again for the record of this House and for those whose recent preoccupation is with tender prices, I will read again the prices that were quoted. Nello L. Teer Company \$36 954 562 93, Rush and Tompkins International \$39 213 874, C. O. Williams \$40 240 898 25, Vinckler \$44 871 629 40. I have a correction to make. Nello L. Teer was \$43 783 568 and Sintra was 43695456293.

It is a matter of the historical record that the IADB favoured Sintra Incorporated, the contractor which ultimately was awarded the job, and the then Government of Barbados favoured C. O. Williams Limited, whose bid price was \$40 240 000, over \$3 million more than Sintra.

The entire Government was mobilised to pressure the IADB into agreeing to award the contract to C. O. Williams. A ministerial lightweight, who was completely innocent of diplomacy, unschooled in the art of negotiation, was despatched to Washington, and to this day the populace remains baffled as to why, according to the myth makers within the Barbados Labour Party, the architect of the big road, as they call it, remained firmly rooted in Barbados, the late Prime Minister, Mr. Tom Adams. One wondered why he did not send his junior Minister who was more acquainted with the arcana of these international financial institutions than the mediocre gentleman who was despatched to Washington. Not even the Minister of Foreign Affairs was sent along to assist, admittedly the most incompetent Minister of Foreign Affairs in the history of this country. It is well known. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition were here he would certainly agree that that gentleman was by far and without doubt...

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Tull! Public opinion in Barbados was aroused and strident appeals were made to the patriotism of Barbados to support this local contractor. v It is Samuel Johnson who said, in my view correctly, that patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels. Nevertheless, strident appeals of patriotism went forth and the people of Barbados were made to feel that this event constituted some kind of political Armageddon, a battle against financial institutions to end all battles against financial institutions.

The road will be named in three parts. This is not strange, this happens in many countries where you have long streets. The area from the Airport to the Graeme Hall Roundabout will be called the Tom Adams Highway. That is the area which the apologists can claim with some justification is the unique contribution made by the late Prime Minister of Barbados.

The Airport to West Coast project is a modified project of the spine road which appeared in the Development Plan of this country since 1969. And Phase 3, the area Graeme Hall to the Airport is that particular phase which the late Mr. Adams took the initiative in extending. That part, the Airport to Graeme Hall Roundabout will be named for him.

The second part from the Graeme Hall Roundabout to the Warrens Roundabout will be named for another late Prime Minister, Errol Barrow. That will be the Errol Barrow Highway.

And the last part or the first part from Warrens to the June * on of Highway 1 will be named again for a late Premier, the late Dr. Hugh Gordon Cummins. Up to the junction of the University Drive will be named for the late Dr. Cummins.

Now of these gentlemen, I would only like to make reference to one, and that is the last named one, Dr. Hugh Gordon Cummins. Dr. Cummins in my view is a greatly under-estimated political figure. Dr. Cummins is a man I knew personally from around the year 1957 and much more closely around 1958 when I sat on the National Executive as the youngest member of that body of the Barbados Labour Party representing the Barbados League of Young Socialists of which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas was a member, and at the time I was his mentor; but sometimes students go astray.

Laughter.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: And I have always found that Dr. Cummins was an extremely fair minded man. There are two particular incidents involving myself and the late Dr. Cummins which stand out in my memory. It was at a meeting one night when a certain professional who had just joined the Barbados Labour Party from a conservative organisation and reeking with the mustiness of conservatism...

Laughter.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: ... entered that organisation and proceeded to berate me and call me names for expressing a point of view that I believe was representative of young people in the country at that time. And when a protest was registered by me Dr. Cummins, unlike a lot of leaders that I know chose the side of correctness and sharply reprimanded the professional. It

was the year 1959 and in Barbados at that time not many persons in that position would have been prepared to anger a well established professional for what I was then, a working class youth wallowing in obscurity.

The second incident that stood out in my mind was when I resigned from the Public Service in 1960 and I owed the Public Service for a correspondence course the princely sum of \$120.00. And when I went to a certain Permanent Secretary who shall now be unnamed, he was brusque and told me that I would have to pay back every expetive cent before I left Barbados.

Laughter.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: A Permanent Secretary. I went to Dr. Cummins and explained the situation and in short order, Dr. Cummins saw that the - correct and humane thing was done. But that is my own subjectivity.

I believe that Dr. Cummins in his own idiosyncratic way furthered the cause of working class people in this country in a significant way. A man who went to the poll on seven occasions and was rebuffed and still went back each time to serve. And there was no material gain to be had from serving. And it was an era in which fellow professionals were ducking about from public service and taking soft and comfortable jobs. Dr. Cummins was prepared to make sacrifices and offer himself to the people.

The first entire political meeting I have ever listened to was the 1951 election campaign at St. Giles Boys' School, as it was then called. It had Dr. Cummins as a speaker together with many of the other outstanding Barbados Labour Party speakers at the time. All of the other speakers including the late Sir Grantley Adams made speeches that had the crowd cheering ecstatically. But it is only recently that I reflected on the fact that the only speech I ever remembered the content of was the speech made by Dr. Cummins. The others I suppose made brilliant speeches. They had the people shouting and laughing. But the only speech I ever remember the content of was that of Dr. Cummins.

He was the first man who it is I heard utter the name of Marcus Mosiah Garvey. He said Marcus Mosiah Garvey, and who is in my view the greatest black politician of the Twentieth Century, Marcus Mosiah Garvey. And Cummins proceeded - I did not know who Garvey was at the time. That was the first time I ever heard of him. And I subsequently learnt that Cummins was a member of the United Negro Improvement Association, part of the Garvey Party. I understood clearly then why he would have made the kind of sacrifices that he made.

And then Cummins continued to make a speech which in today's world, which is considered to be more enlightened, would have been considered to be a, black power speech. Cummins' entire speech dealt with the problem of black people in a racially divided Barbados and the steps that had to be taken to uplift those people. I salute the late Dr. Hugh Gordon Cummins for this reason. 5.05 p.m.

The revisionist historians that are found in Barbados would portray him as a mediocre man who operated as a political after thought. I have said before that I reject historiography which treats social complexities as things that can be encapsulated in the life of a single man.

If we go to England - leave Barbados alone since emotions get fired when we are in Barbados, leave Barbados - would the life of Winston Churchill include the views of passivism? No, the life of Winston Churchill obviously could not include the things he fought against except in some tangential way. In Barbados we find this tendency among people to talk of individuals as if during the course of their lives they embraced and encompassed everything that went on in a given society. Would we have ever had an immigration programme to the United States of America and to the United Kingdom without the incessant proddings of Wynter Crawford? Crawford did not introduce the programme himself, but Crawford repeatedly raised the question and after being ridiculed for raising the question eventually those who ridiculed him became persuaded that there was merit in his proposals and that is precisely how we have to see the life of a man like Hugh Gordon Cummins not based upon preconceived criteria but standing by himself in his own niche and making his own peculiar contribution.

The notion of Hegel that a leader is some Psyche, a world spirit, a spirit of the times, is in my view mystic nonsense. That led Hegel almost lyrically to describe Napoleon Bonaparte as a Psyche, or a horse Mach - the spirit of the times or riding a horse, I felt constrained under the circumstances to give my reasons for supporting the Government's decision to honour Dr. Cummins in this way who is often a forgotten man even forgotten by his own party. Many members of his own party have swallowed hook, line, and sinker all the false propaganda about him and passed over him in silence because they are embarrassed to talk about him. It is, therefore, not surprising that it has fallen to the Democratic Labour Party to pay this outstanding leader this honour.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, moving on to a more mundane level, the roundabout which is located where the new highway, the A.B.C. Highway, intersects or rather more specifically the Errol Barrow Highway intersects with Highway 4, that highway will be called the Norman Niles Round About and named for Norman Niles who spent most of his life in that particular community and made invaluable contributions in his own unostentatious

way to solving many of the problems of people who live in that community - Belle Gully community, the Rouen community, and the Tichbourne community. These communities will be gratified to know the Government is honouring this outstanding community philanthropist in this way.

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution do now stand part.

Applause.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I second that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Government has today announced the naming of this highway and really reduced it to the A.B.C. as the Minister indicated - Adams, Barrow, and Cummins - because there were some rumours abroad that the Government had had in mind for the Queen to get involved in the naming of this highway. I would like to say that the Opposition was prepared to make this a very unpleasant controversy if the Crown were involved in it other than in a purely ceremonial way. I am grateful that the Government has shown maturity in recognising in a tangible way the contributions of three leaders of Barbados, two Prime Ministers and a Premier, and indeed it is also heartening to the Leader of the Opposition and myself who knew Mr. Norman Niles personally and had long associations with him and recognised his contributions to the field of law and the field of public utilities - He did serve on the Public Utilities Board for a number of years - that he has been remembered also by the naming of a round about in his memory. It is always difficult if one is in Government and one has the opportunity to bestow honour on persons to make those gifts to persons who are members of family or so closely connected to the particular party because there is always the risk in a limited society like ours, prone to rumour, prone to mischief, of an accusation almost of nepotism. That is why the Labour Party when Tom Adams was the leader of the Labour Party found it difficult to pay even greater tribute to the work of Sir Grantley Adams. He was Tom Adams' father and it was difficult for the son to promote the father and not be accused of doing something that was indecent. 5.15p.m.

Similarly, in relation to Dr. Cummins, the Labour Party did in fact name and renovate the almshouse at St. Thomas which was converted into the District Hospital and called it the Gordon Cummins Hospital, and it is still so called.

In debates in here in the past I have eschewed any reference to Dr. Cummins, and indeed to another very, very prominent Barbadian who is still with us, for the simple

reason that they are my godfathers, or Cummins was and this other one is, and I find it difficult to speak about these things, but in so far as the Minister of Transport and Works has made reference I have to put something in the record also about Dr. Cummins.

I am told that he saved my life. I believe that to be a fact, because where there is the roundabout now opposite where Life of Barbados is building their building at the top of Rendezvous and Sargeants' Village, there was a house on the other side of the roundabout where I was born and where I lived, just below "Lyrias", the Tappins' property and all around there was Tappin's Land. Apparently I had diphtheria as a boy of about four or five. I certainly remember Dr. Cummins putting something in a spoon in my throat, but my parents assured me that he saved my life.

He had been a very close family friend, because I suppose all members know that my father was one of the early stalwarts, in his own quiet way, of the Barbados Labour Party and he was friendly with Dr. Cummins, Sir Grantley, Sir Hugh Springer and persons of that vintage, or⁻¹ in particular Sir Frank Walcott.

In 1959 I was chosen as 12th man for Barbados in a match against then British Guiana, and Dr. Cummins called and asked me if I would, on my way to practise one evening at Kensington drop in at "Gothmarc", the name of the house in Bank Hall, for he had a present for me; and I went and he gave me a cricket bat.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, it was a Stuart Surridge, Everton Weekes and I got a few runs with it too.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But I remember most distinctly, and I wish to support the Minister of Transport on this, his recognition of the worth of black people and his desire for their development was never given the fullest expression, perhaps because he was a very self-effacing type of person who never pushed himself.

In 1960 I was Head Boy of Lodge School and there was a problem. The boarding establishment was then entirely white. The Headmaster was Mr. Newsam, who would be the classic example of a mulatto. There was a lawn above the boarding master's house on which only the white boys could play tennis. I challenged that and incurred the wrath of the Headmaster, but I followed it with another shock, because fortuitously in the same year the Headmistress of Codrington High School, Mrs. Carter, chose not, as had been the custom in the past, to invite the prefect body of Lodge School to Speech Day, because there was a black Head Boy in place.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, I did not have to make a speech. The time before that Ronnie Hall was the Head Boy. He and Lonnie Wedderburn went with all the white boys at Lodge School to Codrington High School and they were ignored for the whole ceremony. They were not offered even a glass of lemonade. I complained to my father about it because I felt that a number of us who were black prefects were snubbed deliberately on the grounds of colour, and we went to see Dr. Cummins in Bank Hall. He was very sympathetic to it and he gave us a piece of advice which I followed. He asked us to put the matter before the now Sir Frank Walcott who was a member in here.

I went and had a meeting with Sir Frank down here one Saturday morning before the House was to meet the following Tuesday and gave him all the facts. It was exposed in this House of Assembly and it was carried in the Advocate newspaper.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Advocate is a newspaper.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I say it is a newspaper, and it was a newspaper then. That led to an amelioration of the racial situation at Lodge School to a certain extent, and it also led to the development of basketball at Lodge School, because one of the things that we decided as a black group to do was if we were denied the use of the lawns for playing tennis we were going to develop basketball and we started playing basketball right in front of Newsam's house, much to his annoyance. But those were the days when Barbados was a little different. Those were the days of Lodge, when Lodge was really the hotbed of racial prejudice among secondary schools in Barbados.

In 1957 I met the Minister of Transport and Works, not as any mentor, we were all part of a movement, and I am proud to say that those of us who took those steps - Senator Miller, Senator Tull, the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works and myself - we used to come down to Roebuck Street, and very often at the Community School in Passage Road, at the corner, we used to meet there sometimes, and we had our first groundings in democratic socialism and we were the first of the young people in Barbados who paved the way for others to follow now in the League of Young Socialists and no doubt in the Young Democrats and so on. I was about seventeen at the time. 5.25 p.m.

The Minister and I have always been close. He would admit that I met him at Paddington Station when he arrived in London to do his law and went up to Finsbury Park with him when he went to take digs.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not going to say that I was his mentor then. I was his shepherd and we had some good times together particularly at the West Indies Student Centre on Friday nights arguing politics, the staunchest defender of the Barbados Labour Party, and I believe secretly now.

We had arguments, Sir, about cricket. I was a Weekes man, still am. He was a Walcott, could not believe that Frank Worrell deserved what Barbadians were trying to foist on him but that is for another debate.

I am sure that the Minister himself has had to do with the recommendations of these names and deep down that is really the BLP inside him coming out.

I was shocked once in my political life by the Minister and that was the unfortunate day when he came out of the Cabinet. I say, "came out of the Cabinet" and I saw him on television the night going across into that office over there for the Leader of the Opposition and I remember seeing Mr. Barrow on television and I have always said that when Mr. Barrow laid his hand like that across his eye a big one was coming and he said to the television operators when they asked him about the Honourable Member for St. Michael East joining the party he said, "He has never left us" and he wiped his eye and I have never heard the Honourable Member make any retort to that but I knew that that was one that the Dipper was bowling with the arm because the Honourable Member, until he officially left in 1986, was always a member of the Barbados Labour Party. That was one he pulled on us so that we are grateful for what is being done in terms of honouring these past leaders.

It is a pity that during his lifetime Dr. Cummins was so pilloried and derided by members of the Democratic Labour Party that his image then and after death faded. I remember the meeting in 1956 at Empire pasture. I was 16 years when I went to hear the Democratic Labour Party on Cummins and the present Minister of Foreign Affairs delighted in calling him "monkey nuts" and "Nurse Cummins" and all of that, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could the Honourable Member conclude in one minute.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. I will have to talk about that later on, next time.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to touch on a number of matters that were raised by the Minister including the attitude of the Barbados Labour Party towards the awarding of the contract to this particular project and I will advert, as well, to the whole question of the name of the road but I really do feel that the Minister

who is so very fond of accusing people of historical revisionism can really today be charged with having been involved himself in historical revisionism.

The truth of the matter is that there was a dispute surrounding the award of the contract in the first instance to a Venezuelan company called Vinckler and the issue then was the issue as to whether the contract would have been awarded as a combination contract in which case it would have gone to Vinckler or whether it would have been awarded in separate phases in which case other contractors would have qualified.

I think, Sir, it is a matter of historical record as well that on the occasion that the former Minister of Transport and Works went to Washington to discuss aspects of this contract, the issue at that stage was not issues between the award of the contract to Sintra as distinct from C. O. Williams, but the award of contract to Vinckler as distinct from C. O. Williams. The former Prime Minister Tom Adams was still alive.

I need to say that, Sir, because on the assumption of office, the former Prime Minister, Mr. Bernard St. John, who like Dr. Cummins is a very maligned person in this country, took a very clear stand in this matter.

In this particular matter he said, as a matter of BLP policy, that the contract would have been awarded as a combination contract and that it would have been awarded to the lowest bidder and at no stage, therefore, Mr. Chairman, following that particular clearly enunciated policy by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Bernard St. John, and I must repeat, that it would be awarded as a combination contract to the lowest bidder, was there any controversy on the question as to whether or not it ought to have been awarded to Sintra.

It was awarded to Sintra without at all any consideration as to whether C. O. Williams should have gotten it although his bid price would have been \$3 million higher than the bid price of Sintra and I think that we ought to state that for the records because it is a fact.

Harold Bernard St. John went on the records as saying that it had to go to the lowest bidder and it was awarded to Sintra precisely because, Mr. Chairman, his bid of \$36 million was lower than the bid of C. O. Williams, as a matter of policy. It was, therefore, very unfortunate that the Minister should have sought to convey the impression that the Barbados Labour Party tried to award this contract to C. O. Williams when, in point of fact, Sintra was the lowest bidder. The facts, Sir, are there.

I would acknowledge that there was a controversy in the first round as regards whether it should have been awarded as a combination contract as distinct from various phases. There was an initial controversy but the policy was

clearly stated and the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, la policy that this particular Government would do very well to follow as regards their contract for major road works.

Mr. Chairman, we can spend a lot of time dealing with the question of the name of the road but I will come back to that but I will not this evening allow the public debate as regards the name of the road to cause me not to put on record that this is a particular development that will be of tremendous benefit to this country long into the future and I want to say, Sir, that this particular project has, perhaps, been the most maligned project in the history of Barbados.

We have had from the other side the argument put vigorously and with great ferocity that it was money badly spent. 5.35 p.m.

But today, Sir, the public of Barbados in general, is of a mind that the benefits of this project to the people of this country are well worth the expenditures on it. And we must not let that point, Sir, go unrecorded.

And I could only therefore, Mr. Chairman, urge that the potential that this particular development raises for the people of this country, should not go abegging because of an indifference on the part of this present Administration, as regards taking the necessary steps to capture its full potential.

The Prime Minister was good enough, at the opening of a particular private sector development in the immediate vicinity of this project, to cite the fact that that particular area has been transformed. And I trust, Sir, that this, in some respects represents a change of heart on the part of the Democratic Labour Party in relation to the value of this project to Barbados. Members on the other side, Mr. Chairman, including the former Prime Minister of Barbados, the Rt. Hon. Errol Barrow were extraordinarily hostile towards the Barbados Labour Party for having built this project. And in many respects, Sir, even before this project started, there were elements in the Democratic Labour Party who would have caused the public to want to be disassociated from it as a public exercise.

And perhaps that brings me, Mr. Chairman, to the essential point that I feel within me that I should make in relation to the name of the project. Mr. Errol Barrow, himself was opposed to the construction of this project, Sir. And I am saying, Sir, that as far as I am concerned, it is a .travesty to call any part of this Highway after Mr. Barrow, precisely because he was so entirely opposed to it. If we want to find some other way of honouring Mr. Barrow, let us do so, and in acknowledging his contribution to Barbados' development, let us do so by associating his name with activities, ventures or developments with which he himself wanted to identify.

The Honourable Members on the other side can oppose ~> taking a position on this matter. I do not mind. I expect th^t you will as well. But I am saying that Mr. Errol Barrow was opposed to this particular project. He did not make a secret, Mr. Chairman, of his opposition to it. And I do not know who else would want to speak with the mind that ; -u speaking of. But I am saying, Sir, that as far as I am concerned, it is a travesty to associate his name now in memorial with a project that he did not believe should have been undertaken.

And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I understand that of course, it does not now fall to the Opposition at this time to change the names that the Honourable Minister, obviously with the consent of Cabinet has settled on. But I can only say what is in my mind, that I think it is a travesty and that there are many various ways in which Mr. Errol Barrow's memory can be properly recorded.

And the little politics that is involved in it, Sir, I am conscious of. I am very political. I am a politician as well. But yes, it minimizes the facts of this case by having Tom Adams on one side and Cummins on the other side and interposed with the late Errol Barrow. I understand the politics as well that perhaps the Barbados Labour Party can be embarrassed having it put abroad that we do not recognise Dr. Cummins and that it falls to the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, to recognize Dr. Cummins. All these things, Sir, are involved. I am speaking as I see it. I am not mincing my words. I understand that all that is the politics that is involved.

But as regards the name, Sir, I believe that there has been no political creature in the history of this country, who has ever been more maligned for any particular public development than Tom Adams has been for the construction of this highway. None other in the history of Barbados! None of them! And as far as I am concerned, Sir, I knew very personally, in a very personal way as his Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance the strain that he endured on the weekend that he died when the Minister of Transport and Works at that time was in Washington negotiating with the Inter-American Development Bank in relation to the particular contract as between Vmckler and COW Williams. It is not generally known, but I shall say to this House that on the Friday before Tom Adams died, Sir, he cleared his office at the Ministry of Finance. And on the Monday, the only things that were left were the notes of the correspondence with his Minister of Transport and Works concerning the negotiations that were taking place in Washington. This was a project, Sir, in which he took an interest that was extraordinary.

And I remember, Sir, sitting as a Chief Project Analyst in the Ministry of Finance as well as a Parliamentary Secretary at meetings of the Planning and Priorities Committee of this country and observing the

detailed care and consideration that the former Prime Minister, Tom Adams gave to the planning and development of this particular project in the face, Sir,,of the stiffest ever opposition afforded any public figure in this country as regards the expenditure of public funds. .

And the Government has decided, Sir. We on this side cannot alter the facts as they now stand. But I really feel that for the record that my position, as regards calling a part of it Errol Barrow, a part of it Gordon Cummins, but in the hearts and minds of the people of this country, who knew what Tom Adams went through to have this project done, Sir, it will always be Tom Adams Highway.

I am obliged to you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am glad to be part of a House of Assembly just twelve years before the Twenty-first Century where we could have the kind of debate, which up until the remarks of the last Honourable Member seemed headed and which I hope will still continue to head for a permanent record of achievement for the young who have now come to be the middle aged who can remember and who have managed to achieve some of the things that were perceived by the men of yesteryear.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas said that he was grateful that the Government of the day had seen it fit to take the step which the Honourable Minister has outlined in the naming of this road. And he did not say that from any position of partisanship. I think when one listened and analyzed the statement which he made, one recognized that when he spoke of the history of when he and other of his Labour Party colleagues were young, seventeen and eighteen, that they had certain experiences. And so when he expressed gratitude I think he recognized that the present crop of Democratic Labour Party Ministers have the capacity to make the kind of decision which is now being placed before this Honourable House.

I am therefore saddened that the Honourable Member who just spoke, chose to take the debate into a spur of a direction in order to burden himself of what properly is his personal view. I do not hold his view against him, except to say that he is mistaken in the particulars. No one who lives in Barbados, who has lived in Barbados beyond the age of fifteen and who has been here consistently, and who is familiar with the information, can fail to remember such phrases as the ring road.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No public officer in Barbados...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: ...who has ever been part of the planning process in this country...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: ...can fail to remember the phrase the outer ring road.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The concept of opening up the area from what is now Bussa to Warrens has always been part of the political discussion in public administration in Barbados. And any part of the Governor Mt that has been observing the process will not only be able to look at the concepts, but can look at the actual drawings. The newspapers in Barbados, if one could go back in history, would be replete with information of persons writing letters to the newspaper, persons discussing the Development Plan, which was supposed, I think it is some fourteen years in existence, a Development Plan which was supposed to go to the courts according to the Town and Country Planning Act. 5.45 p.m.

The Honourable Member is saying that he took it. All of the concepts about a ring road which is a concept that is in many ways alien to Barbados which is something which anyone who has lived in North America knows that the concept of town development is an inner road and an outer ring road. It is therefore most distressing to hear anyone who has never heard of the term "spine road". Every child in Barbados has heard the phrase "spine road" as the politics went back and forth.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Minister in the Democratic Labour Party's Administration from the year 1971 and admitted I was young but I was not so young as not to be able to remember and I have participated in defence of the Democratic Labour Party's policies and in attack of the Barbados Labour Party's policies from 1971 to the present. But there has never been any need to defend the concept of the road from Top Rock going all the way through to Warrens. The person who articulated that the most is a man for whom that section of the road is being named and that is the basis on which the decision has been made to name it Errol Barrow. Now when an Honourable Member, albeit wet behind the ears, delivers of himself the kind of philippic which the Honourable Member for St. Peter - the next thing the Honourable Member for St. Peter will be saying is that we caused Tom Adams to die. The gravamen of his statement is that Tom Adams was under so much stress on the weekend that he died. The stress according to the proposal which comes before me as I hear it is that we attacked him so mercilessly on this road that the stress killed him.

Mr. Chairman, since we are discussing the history, let us say that what we said was "that the state of the country at that time". That is what we said and that is what we stand by that the methodology which was being used by the

Barbados Labour Party in its proposal for large projects, while "calling on the people, the ordinary people, was to suck salt. That is what the Democratic Labour Party defended then, that is what it attacked the Government for, and that is what it stands by today.

It is most frustrating to hear someone who has been described in the terms that he has been described before coming and attempting to place this debate in a perspective that the late Right Honourable Member for St. John ought not to be named as part of this road in some defence of a brutal attack on the late other Prime Minister. I believe that this is a noble act. I believe it is a noble act by this Government. It is not the custom in Barbados for Governments in power to pay any obeisance to, recognition of, or condolence to persons who have passed or even who are alive. It was the decided policy of the Barbados Labour Party as a Government to ensure that no one, whether his lame was Douglas Leopold Phillips or any relation thereto, should live or anyone who was dead should be remembered.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, it was. It is not the policy of the Leader of the Opposition. That is why you left them. That is why you left the Cabinet. It was the policy. Who have you honoured? But I do not understand why the Barbados Labour Party feels bound and I absolve the Honourable Member for St. Thorpas...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member was going quite well before he started to raise his voice...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: All right. I will lower it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...Because he does not remember that we honoured somebody called Dame Nita Barrow.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You do not remember that ...the late Prime Minister's sister. We did not do anything for Grantley. We did it for Dipper's sister.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I did not know that the Labour Party gave out the honours. I beg your pardon. I did not know. I apologize. I did not know the Labour Party used to give out the honours. I thought the honours used to be given differently. But I withdraw the part which give any imputation that they did not give any honours to anybody at all. But he knows what I mean, the Honourable Member knows what I mean, Sir, and you know what I mean, Sir, and even the ones who are alive will try to ensure that they were - not you, the Barbados Labour Party.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Who re, nmended Sir Edwy Talma for Knighthood?

Asides.

M^T). A. C. SIMMONS: He left from here as a Dem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know that two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: For what it is worth, Sir, I will not be diverted. Let it go that the Honourable Member's speech not be contaminated by his interventions now, Sir. What he has said is part of the guidance of my speech now and therefore I do not wish to respond to what he is saying now.

Page 9-2, Sir, of the Development Plan 1973-77, *Barbados Development Plan 1973-77* Page 9-2 under the heading "Ring Road" and I am going to read it:

"The need to provide a proper by-pass road to enable road users who want to move from south to west coast and vice versa and to other parts of the island to do so without having to pass through the town and its immediate environs was mentioned in the 1969-72 Development Plan. For this purpose it was proposed to construct a Ring Road, connecting up sections of existing roads and also building new stretches of road to enable traffic to by-pass Bridgetown in an effort to ease the congestion in the urban areas. Progress was not as satisfactory as planned and this work which was started during the last plan period will continue. It is intended to re-design, widen and improve the entire length of St. Barnabas Road. Plans for the construction of the section between St. Barnabas Road and Highway 2A near Warrens will be completed. An amount of \$755,000 will be spent on this project during the Plan period."

This is the document, Mr. Chairman, Development Plan 1973-77. The Prime Minister of the day was the late Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, the late Errol Walton Barrow. I recommend that anyone who says that he was a planner in the Planning Committee of the Barbados Labour Party Government who was a Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance should get the Development Plan and read it before he delivers of himself the kind of nonsense which he stood up in here today and uttered. 5.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if he is going to project himself in that manner, I said with the kind of nonsense, Sir, and I have proved it. The Opposition can say what it likes *sotto voce*. I am saying what I said and you heard me say it. He cannot tell me *sotto voce* what to do. You think because he is

sitting there today you can tell him what to do? Do you think he is your client? He is Chairman of this Committee. Do not worry to tell him that I said he spoke nonsense. I am saying it. He will stop me if I am wrong. But he is not to come in here in any mealy mouthed way and try to give the impression that people do not know. He must not do it. He must not come in here and get up and try to give the impression that no one was more pilloried than Tom Adams. Tom Adams pilloried more people in his lifetime than he could ever have been pilloried.

In 1975-76 the same Tom Adams, in the spirit of politics, lambasted the same Ring Road, and the Honourable Member for Christ Church West must know that. He said the Ring Road was a nonsense. I do not wish to spend time discussing the negatives of Tom Adams, that is not the issue. We are honouring him and we have the courage and the guts to name part of the road the Tom Adams Highway, because we recognise that that part of the road belongs to his concept and his Government's concept.

In the same way, we recognise that we could honour Gordon Cummins in the part from Warrens to Hinds Hill and University Drive, which cannot be said to belong to anybody in particular, but those of us who were young and who remember Gordon Cummins can remember aspects of him as have already been highlighted and it is unnecessary for me to repeat them. Suffice it to say that anyone who lived within a radius of two miles of Tudor Bridge cannot fail to be aware of what the doctor stood for. He has delivered most of the babies in that entire area.

\

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Because he was a leading paediatric. There is no question that most of the people in Barbados living in that area were delivered by midwives, and whenever the midwives got into difficulty they sent for Dr. Cummins. So apart from the fact that he saved the Honourable Member's life, he saved the lives of a large number of others, and he is gratefully remembered by all the people around Empire Club, the Eagle Hall area, the Bank Hall area, Dash Road and all those areas, and Your Honour you are fully familiar with the work of the late Dr. Cummins.

But the political game in this country, was one in which adversary politics was the nature of the beast. How can anyone not recognise that the adversary relationship of politics in this country requires people to attack people in the other political party or to attack their policies? I hardly knew anything about politics, but I knew that Dr. Cummins was a man who was attacked by Sir Frank Walcott, but the two of them lived next door.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will conclude, without going into any great detail, simply to say that I think that the decision to name the highway the ABC Highway is one with which most Barbadians will live. I hope it is one with which all Barbadians will eventually live and to accept, because it is good for the country that the Democratic Labour Party can honour two Barbados Labour Party Premier/Prime Ministers during its term and when the time comes for the other party, no doubt they will honour the others, whichever party it is.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, you have been sitting there for a long time and I think Your Honour deserves a break.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this sitting be now suspended until 6.15 this evening.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 6.03 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When the Suspension was taken, the House was in Committee and to that it now reverts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON SUPPLY

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I need some clarification, when the Minister replies, as to the figures that he gave. I understood that the Sintra tender was \$36.9 million. This \$5 million is over and above the \$36 million?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Of that \$5 million, part will be used for foreign currency conversion and another part goes for Highway and housing relocation. At the end of it, having regard to the contingency, the money that Sintra has already drawn down, it will put Sintra in the position of already getting \$42.5 million for civil works.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: And that \$42 million excludes the outstanding claims for \$17 million?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Twelve.

I am a little sorry that the Minister indicated a figure of \$6 million. I do not think that he should ever indicate to these contractors what is a likely figure for a negotiated settlement but that is not a matter of any great moment. I just think it a tactic in negotiating that you should not let them know at what level you are prepared to settle so that eventually the road would end up costing a lot more than Williams tendered for and, indeed, all of the other contractors after the second tender.

Now, Sir, I want to make some observations about the road. I have not yet driven the whole length of the road but having regard to the number of collisions that there have been on the roads, I think that Government must give some careful thought to so marking the junctions of the road that users are well aware well in advance that they are coming to a junction.

Now, let me explain, Sir. Take, for instance, if you are coming from Lears to Belle, there is a junction before you cross the highway to get to the Belle Pumping Station. The "STOP" sign is too close to the junction. When you are on it you see "STOP" and this happens at many of the intersections.

I would like to suggest to Government as a matter of policy that the "STOP" signs at the minor roads connecting to the major highway should be at least 150 yards to 200 yards from the junction and that they should be so illuminated that at night when you are driving you can see from the reflection of the headlight some kind of reflecting paint on these signs that would give you fair and adequate warning that there is a juncture at which you must stop.

Most of the collisions, so far, seem to have been at junctions. There was one that I dealt with only three weeks ago where the road bisects the old Lowland Road and it caused a little difficulty as to who was right from who was wrong but, I think that we would be going a long way if we give as much information to the driver before he gets to the junction that there is a stop coming up and we paint the junction sufficiently clearly that everyone knows that you must stop there and give way to traffic on the highway because I presume that the traffic on the highway will, in future, have the priority of right-of-way and these are little things that I do not think, Sir, would cost a lot of money and can be done to enhance safety on the highway.

Now, in addition to that, Sir, I was going to Oistin's Court yesterday morning and I thought that I should travel on the new highway.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: May have been driving at 60 or 80 kilometres. I do not think I was speeding and I am not going to get into the argument as to whether 60 is an adequate speed or 80 kilometres an hour. That is something, I think, that experience will tell us. Perhaps, we are wise to start at a slow speed until people really get familiar with the highway and I do not find any fault with that limitation of 60 at the moment.

But, there were turnings all off this road after you pass the roundabout at Graeme Hall and, really, I was not sure which one to take to get to Oistin. I saw a turning. It was paved and I followed that and I came out in the back of the complex at Newton, all through some rocky ditches and so. That was no road. I was driving behind the factories in Newton and I think we have to sign-post the turnings very specifically so that everybody knows, and with reflecting paint so that at night you can know where to turn.

Sir, I did not have a chance to speak in the other debate but I am sure that we, a couple of weeks ago, all expressed unanimous concern at the propensity that there is among the public to litter roads and even this new highway.

I support the Minister of Health who made the plea two or three weeks ago, Sir, for users of the highway to be more litter conscious.

This highway, after you leave the airport, for most people using that highway, this is going to be a first impression of Barbados and if we want to maintain the thrust in tourism, if, indeed, we want, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East said earlier, to leave a lasting impression on the minds of visitors that Barbados is a clean, tidy and orderly society, then we have to have the political will to tell the public of Barbados what we expect and the time will come when legislation will have to be passed and policed to ensure that we keep Barbados in a certain state of cleanliness and this is where the NCC comes in, Sir,

I was quite distressed some weeks ago at the roundabout which is now the Norman Niles Roundabout, I think, below Haggatt Hall, just below where I live. It was overgrown with grass to such an extent that if you were passing and keeping the roundabout on your right, coming from Haggatt Hall, you could not see over the roundabout to the other side of the highway.

The NCC - I presume it must have been the NCC - MTW then... There was a group of workers there. The first morning I saw some activity and I counted seven people on that roundabout cleaning it. It might have been MTW. The second day no-one was there and that roundabout was not properly cleaned until the Thursday afternoon. I have it diarized. I wrote it down in my diary.

Now, that really is a classic waste of Government money, four days, or three days because they were not there on the Tuesday, to clean a roundabout, seven people with hoes and so on and that is where we get waste in Government. That is nothing to do with a Minister or even a Permanent Secretary. That is to do with the supervisory staff and I do not know what we can do.

I do not know what we can do because they must be aware of the public concern. The public out there is talking about it. There are calls for greater productivity, and a better utilisation of time and yet that was a situation of four days. 630 p.m.

So I hope that the Minister, Sir, by way of policy guidelines can impress upon the people in his department to be more productive. All of us have sympathy with work in the hot sun. We do not have to hammer that. We know. None of us wants to do it. None of us likes to do it. But if people are being paid to do a job and their concerns about the hot sun are being recognized, where they are being given time and people are sympathetic to the problem, at least when they are working they must give us a fair day's work.

Sir, I feel that these major highways should be beautified. I have seen it in overseas countries and most impressively in Mauritius where the main highways, in the centre of the highways, they cultivate poinsettia and bougainvillea. So you get a very colourful view as you drive along the major highways in Mauritius.

Now there are certain of our highways where a little planting would enhance the beauty of the highway in the centre, like up there opposite Towels for example, or in the St. Barnabas Highway. Those areas.

In Mauritius also at the edges of the road, next to the canefields, they have a lot of bougainvillea, variegated colours of bougainvillea. I do not know if we can do that. But I am sure we have the talent to conceptualize ways in which we can beautify our highways,

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. The NCC...

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see where he has me now, Sir? I was operating at a different level. It is true, Sir, that in November, 1986, I made a call for NCC to employ 540 people to ease the unemployment situation, after a number of workers had been sent home. And I drew it to Government's attention, Sir, that even if we started with a minimum number of 20 per constituency, I know I was not going to get any, but 20 times 27, Sir, is 540 I believe. Is that right?

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. Sir, I said to the Government that they should have a programme where each constituency should be asked to put up 20 people for work in NCC to do the beautification and so on. The Supplementary Resolution came in November, and persons have been employed I believe now, over 1 000. I still am not satisfied that the deployment of these persons is working to the best advantage of Barbados.

I know that the Honourable Member for St. John was quite comfortable in what he conceives as the good works that NCC has been doing.

I am submitting, Sir, that I think they can do a lot more and a lot better. There was a time, opposite Wonder Bakery, where you could find 10 or 12 people, all in a cluster on mornings just doing a little of the land, Sir. And this is a problem that has happened out there. Close to the road perhaps for 8, 10 feet to the side of the road, the grass is nicely cut and it is well kept. Immediately as you stop, you have the tall brush.

I think that if you are going to do a job of cleaning, clean it with the permission of the owner. If it is not Government land, get the permission to knock it down. But at least I think it would reduce the eye sore or the attempt to camouflage that we see on some of these roads where a piece of the immediate grass is clean and a little to the right or left of it, you see very unsightly grassy, bushy conditions.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In this regard, Sir, I have to make a plea once again. Welches and Warrens, parts of Spring Farm and Porey Spring, a back road leading from Vacluse to Dukes, these are all areas that are in a terrible state Sir. With the bush, the grass and the trees hanging over the road. Particularly in the Warrens and Welches area the residents are threatened by prowlers - Welches and Warrens Terrace. The NCC people have not gone in there at all. I have become resigned, by virtue of my status on this side, Sir, not to expect any of these favours. But I am on my knees now, Sir. I am begging, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I had promised not to suggest this, but I would like to suggest that the workers of the NCC, I had promised to hold this one up my sleeve, but I am going to say it, Sir, the workers of the NCC should be deployed in terms of parishes. If we need to bring on another 200 and we are going to spend the money....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. I am going to make the point. We have to be concerned about employment too - I know you can find another 200 people out there who are willing to work.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you can have...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. He is not opposing this...

Laughter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The member for St. Peter is not opposing this at all. What the Member for St. Peter is opposing is that last year, at the time of the Estimates, you knew the numbers and the cost of the programme and you came in here and deliberately underestimated the amount of money and now you come with this Supplementary, when you would have known. But we are not talking about that.

What I am suggesting, Sir, is that let us say, you have 40 employees per parish, and perhaps if you can get them, people from NCC in St. Lucy, St. Thomas working in St. Thomas, St. Peter working in St. Peter and so on. And if necessary, as we had to do at the Housing Authority in my time to ensure that the rented housing areas were beautified and gardens looked after, we had a competition, and we used to offer monetary prizes to the best kept house, best kept interior, best kept exterior, best kept gardens and so on. 6.40 p.m.

If you have a competition between the people who are working in these various parishes as to which parish is being kept the best, perhaps you will get more productivity and the programme will be better organised. But it seems to me that if you have 40 people deployed in St. Lucy you can then organise your supervising in St. Lucy systematically with the representative and the residents of St. Lucy as to which area to tackle first and so on. I believe that we will get better value for the money than we are presently getting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member should conclude.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is only a suggestion, Sir, and I would like the Government to consider if there is any worth in it at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like in supporting this Resolution to commend my

Government for having had the maturity to name the road as they have done. That road - although to hear the Honourable Member for St. Peter talk - one would think that we pilloried the late lamented Prime Minister Tom Adams because of the road and that that contributed - he did not actually say it but insinuated that it contributed in some way to his demise. We at that time were opposed to the building of that road and I still am of the opinion that it was an untimely set of money that was commissioned for that road. Now a road is not something that when you get into office you can throw it away. So we had willy-nilly to continue with that road. But at the same time it would be very good if the young Member for St. Peter, the Honourable Member for St. Peter would look up the facts and find out what he has. I do not know if he heard, because he went out of the House, but he would have heard that the late Mr. Barrow had ideas for the roads long before he came on the scene. Now one of the features of that road is that \$45 million was spent on the acquisition of land and at the time the Democratic Labour Party objected to the money they spent in that way. Now that the road is *a fait accompli* and the Democratic Labour Party Government has seen fit to name it very appropriately, I can assure the Member for St. Peter that in the same way that the other roads in Barbados are kept by the National Conservation Commission for which he is now disputing the use of the money that we are resolving to get for it, we are going to keep that road in the same way in which this island is beginning to look, and that is very beautiful. It is amazing now that we have done such a good job so far on the roads that we are now getting advice on what more we can do. But at the time when we wanted the money to do it, it was all a lot of debate on whether or not we should use up the money for that. I, for one, and on behalf of a whole group of women of this island, because the N.C.C. workers compose of thousands of women who otherwise would not have means of support... This money that is being requested by our Government is very well spent and part of it will go to the beautifying of that stretch of road.

I agree with the Member for St. Michael South East because I, too, have been told by some of the members of the ACP/EEC grouping how wonderfully kept our roads are - the beautification programme - and, in fact, some have been asking how did we manage to do such a thing. It is to our credit that Barbados is taking on that sort of look and I am sure that any suggestions that are relevant to this beautifying will be taken in good faith by the Minister who is in charge of that beautification because no effort is being spared to make those roads beautiful.

Also, I would like to remind the Member for St. Thomas that he mentioned the fact that some people were laid off when we first came in. If I remember rightly, those were people who were hurriedly taken on in a month or two before election who did not have any security of tenure. They were taken on temporarily and they were let go. So I

would just like to make that point clear. I am very glad to hear that he is suggesting that we even get a few more to make the roads of Barbados what they should be.

I know that I am straying a bit here but I would like to advise those who have not seen Bathsheba yet to go and see what it looks like because of the National Conservation Commission and I am sure that by the end of a year or two the same highway that we are talking about is going to be a thing of beauty.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. .Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Honourable Minister.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to something which...

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: No, no, no. The Minister of Transport will wind up. I just want to respond to some of the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas re: N.C.C. and to point out some of the problems which we are facing. I think you will know that by and large our staff, our technical wing is weak because in Barbados we have not got the expertise as we should have for something like that. Mainly the people are agriculturalists, who have been converted into horticulturists and this is one of the problems, so that we have to keep on training. Saturday alone we had a training programme for our operators, because we have found that they are not well versed with the equipment they are using and as such they are destroying it rather quickly. Added to that is the fact that we are using a lot of domestic equipment and not commercial equipment and only this week I think we put in an order for something like \$53,000 worth in commercial equipment. Your domestic lawn mower does very well one hour a Sunday morning. But when you have to use that same equipment five hours a day for five days, it will last for a week or two. So we have to do that.

As far as the overgrowth is concerned, we are now trying to import a piece of equipment, because one thing with beautification is that if you do not maintain it, it will grow very quickly especially in tropics. You cut down and in two or three weeks time after a heavy rainfall it is twice as bad as it was before, so you have to maintain. But in certain areas what we are doing to alleviate the problem is to have a piece of equipment which can cut shrubs of about four inches thick. Cut them back let us say ten feet in a sort of hedge shape probably three feet to the areas like Welches and Warrens where the Honourable Member is talking about. That is what we will do with those areas so that that might solve that problem.

I just like to say on the highway, the highway has not yet been handed over to N.C.C. although we are having discussions with MTW. Because when we work for other

Ministries, we expect to get some money from those Ministries. One of the problems in Government, as you know, is that when Ministry works with another Ministry because it is all in Government some Ministries think that they should not pay that Ministry. As a result, you find yourself in financial difficulties. So we are having negotiations now with MTW and we are going to pay MTW what we owe them from the Child Care Board and Welfare and we are going to pay them from our Supplementary. But we are negotiating with MTW and the Ministry of Housing and Lands that when we go into the housing areas that we charge them for what we are doing. If not, we will find that our money voted to us will go down and we will not do anything.

We are also at this present time having discussions with persons who want to maintain roundabouts because we think that we should let them know what standard we hope they would reach in the roundabouts. So they will call in the firms who have written to us asking to maintain the roundabouts and give them some idea exactly what we want because they must follow some sort of pattern. We must not allow everybody to do what they like. I think there are about seven roundabouts and we will call in those people and say well look, let us sit down and discuss. You know what he is doing, etcetera, etcetera so that there is no problem.

Under the highways, what we are trying to do is a very simple exercise really. We want to go about ten feet back at a maximum which is reasonable in Barbados on either side of the roundabouts if it is allowed in the sense that there is land there. If there is land there, we will go ten feet back and then we will beautify it with shrubs. One of the problems we are finding is that a lot of people are tying their animals or loosening their animals to run wild and they are destroying some of the shrubs. That is why, by and large, you have noticed that they have planted oleander. Oleander is the only shrub which the animals will not eat. But they will eat bougainvillea, poinsettia, snow on the mountain, ixoras, everything that you put there. So that is why by and large you noticed that they only planted oleander which is monotonous, but at the same time we have little or no option. In some areas what we have tried to do is to hold the animals. But that is an ongoing process and that is a problem. I am not quite sure what we are going to do about it. We only ask people to at least tie their animals if they have to go out to graze and tie them away from what we are trying to do.

As far as deploying workers, the same thing comes back - the question of maintenance. Now once you put workers in the area you have to put certain facilities for them as well. I believe that wherever workers are they must have toilet facilities. At the present moment we are spending \$57,000 in toilet facilities, for chemical toilets. Now that is a lot of money to spend. 6.50 p.m.

What I am saying to you is that it is best to have not 20 workers, but many more workers, so they can use the same facility. If not, you find you might have to have 100 chemical toilets, which might probably go up to between \$97 000 and \$100 000 a year, which is a lot of money again. I am not quite sure how we are going to get around that. I think myself sometimes, it would be good to buy the chemical toilets and probably let another Ministry, the Ministry of Health, clean them or something, because they would have the equipment. I am not sure, but it is something we have to look at. I think one of the toilets cost \$3 000, but we pay something like \$5 a day for a toilet, which would be something like nearly \$1 700 a year. So if you are going to put another \$1 700, it will last another five or ten years and you might save, but then the maintenance of them as well is something else, which we are not very good at, I guess.

So that we are working in parishes, but it is a question of drawing the roads too. Supervision is a problem. We complain daily about people working in bunches. Some supervisors are very good, others are hopeless, and it is only a matter of, I suppose in a process of time, training, getting rid of some, putting in people, before you get the right thing. What we have done, we hope we can get some of our senior people to go up to Canada or America to do some short courses. We are hoping to bring somebody down also to help them, because shaping trees is something which we are looking at now.

A lot of people do not realise that in the bigger countries, the trees do not usually grow that way, you have to shape them that way, and we are looking at that. I had hoped that last November I would have got somebody from CIDA to come down, but I understand he cannot come before November this year. So again that would be another course.

By and large, I thought I would explain these things to the Honourable Member, so that when you go into Welches or Warrens, you can tell them that the equipment is on the way. What one piece of equipment can do, probably 50 men cannot do. Here again it is a very technical piece of equipment and very dangerous. When I was having discussions with a gentleman from England, he was saying to me that it might be best to send the person to England for two weeks to train them, rather than let them do it here.

Aside.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Well, we will send them to Maycocks and by St. Lucy's Parish Church. Down there is a bit beautiful, as you will appreciate, and we are in Bonnetts as well, so we are taking care of everybody. The Leader of the Opposition, members of the Opposition, members of the Government, we are taking care of everybody, but everything cannot be done at the same time, it is a matter of timing and scheduling.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me just remind Honourable Members that we are dealing with Head 24, Subhead 6, Objects 23 and 26.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, just a few words. I should like to express my support for this measure and particularly to hail the announcement by the Minister of Transport and Works regarding the naming of the Highway as a mature decision in keeping with the words used by some of my former colleagues who spoke before.

When this project was in its conception stages...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Does it have something to do with my poise? When this project was conceived, and we have had various positions on how the project came about, its inception, its subsequent development under the Barbados Labour Party and so on, the Democratic Labour Party took some objection to the expenditure of that sum of money on a project of this nature.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter should not, in my view, prepare for this as the rod that as politicians will end up beating us continually. We have had a lot of talk about how much strain people were under because of this project. It is part of the warfare, the everyday life of politics that people will be under strain for projects that they think are important. You have to fight for things you want in politics. This is not any garden of people sipping tea and somebody pontificating and everybody agreeing.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But that is what I am saying. I am really shocked at the position he took from that point of view. If it caused strain, even if it caused a sacrifice in life, that is part of the nature of politics. If you believe in something, you work towards it. There are people who will curse you for it, there are people who will attack you, but that is part of what you are into. If you cannot stand up for it, natural forces will get rid of you or supernatural or normal forces will get rid of you, or you will just pull out. So that we cannot come in here and make it appear that because a project, which we now see perhaps to be looking good, or looks attractive, that all of a sudden we must come in here with praise and lament the fact that somebody had to fight for it. Thank goodness the Labour Party, and if they say Tom Adams fought for it, that they all fought for it. If that is going to be your position, that is what you should be saying today, not lamenting the fact that it had to be fought for and that somebody may have suffered because it was fought for.

Sir, the project has been hailed. Only recently I was reading an article, I believe it was by a gentleman who goes under the name in the newspaper of R. A. Crawford, as opening up the interior of Barbados, as though we are dealing with Rupununi Savannah or the Trans America Highway in South America. The interior of Barbados has suddenly been opened up, thanks to the foresight of the Labour Party. That is foolishness, but that is the kind of thing you will get. The Labour Party has been so anxious to have their cake, as the Honourable Member for St. Peter would say, and eat it at the same time with respect to this highway, that they want to seek the praise, say it killed a man, name it after the same man and do everything on it. What is the sense of us carrying on with this kind of foolishness? It does not make sense.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, almost I should say. The strain of building this highway almost killed a man. Obviously the Honourable Member for St. Peter does not realise that he is flagellating himself and all of us if he continues down that road.

The point is that people have been walking around in Barbados with this idea that partisan decisions are wrong decisions. The decision to take Barbados into independence was partisan. We look back at it now as a tremendously important decision. Okay? The decision to build that highway was also a partisan decision. The decision to have Errol Barrow Day was in a sense a partisan decision. Because the Labour Party agreed with it does not make it non-partisan or bi-partisan. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition likes to use the expression bi-partisan as though if you have bi-partisan support the whole of Barbados agrees with you.

There are times when only people who make foolish decisions in this country are politicians and there are other times when the people who make foolish decisions are civil servants and we disagree with it, and there are other times when we as politicians together collectively believe that the people are foolish. That happens, but there are times when politicians take that position. They stand up and feel that decisions they have made, are correct and everybody else in the country who may not agree with it is wrong. So let us not get into this kind of scenario where we are in the end preparing a way for people to beat us as politicians and to get on "Gutterperk" and "Tell It Like It Is" and quarrel when you do not have anything planned for Errol Barrow Day, and after you have it say you have too many things planned, and say you should not put Errol Barrow's picture on the \$50 note, and then somebody calling in and saying the whole highway should be named Tom Adams Highway. That kind of rubbish is wasting time.

I think that we have come to a mature decision here with respect to the naming of this highway. We came to a

mature decision with respect to the Errol Barrow Day, and I believe that our supporters should perhaps - well, the supporters of the Labour Party. I wish to say that because I know it to be so - should perhaps have more sagacity, or instead of going out to Branch meetings and talking rubbish about.... anyway, that the members of the Labour Party should try to educate their own members that this so called concept of comparing the role of Errol Barrow and Grantley Adams and Tom Adams is rubbish. It is a waste of time. 7.00 p.m.

It is a waste of our energy so that when you read an article by Mr. Lawson Bailey saying that the decision to have an Errol Barrow Day is partisan and, therefore insecure, I have never read such rubbish in my life. For that matter, it means that the decision to name this highway the Tom Adams Highway or after a politician is partisan and also would be insecure but that is the kind of debate that is taking place in the society and it will be fuelled by the comments that the Honourable Member for St. Peter made.

You will be surprised the extent to which people would take your remarks that Errol Barrow's name should not be linked in any way to the highway and, perhaps, because Tom Adams made such a massive contribution, only his should be linked, will now be touted by ignorant people calling in on "Guttaperk" and all kinds of things and wasting people's time and at the end of the day, we will be no better off. Now, Sir, that is one thing.

As I have said, Sir, I believe that if you want your policies to be successful, you have to pursue them even in the face of stiff opposition.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter said historically, and I wish to say that he is rewriting history when he says that the highway was one of the most controversial projects and received the stiffest opposition.

There were five or six projects that the Democratic Labour Party initiated. Prior to their initiation, they were attacked viciously by the Labour Party. After their initiation, they set up a Duffus Commission to look up people for it and at the same time, we did not set up any commission to look into any highway and the Honourable Member for St. Peter would give you the impression that because Tom Adams had to fight to get money to build the road, a- something, that that was historically the biggest task that he ever undertook and that Barbados should be eternally grateful because he did that but, in the end, it caused him so much strain, he nearly died. That kind of rubbish is really not, in my view, assisting us inside Parliament nor on the outside. It is historically wrong and apart from that it is also intellectual nonsense, in my view, to take that position.

Now, Sir, with regard to the other comments that have been made, I wish to say that I should like to lend my voice

to the concerns about the number of road traffic accidents. I do not know if it has anything to do with lighting, because I do not know how many of the major accidents take place at night.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas has pointed out some of the problems that can be alleviated by proper illumination, but a lot of these accidents are taking place during the day. If not most of them, nearly all are taking place during the day and it therefore has something to do with people's perception about the highway, that it is a fast lane between the west coast and the airport, not a normal road but it is some kind of a speed track. People do all kinds of madness nowadays.

On the Spring Garden Highway now it is common fear for you to pass and see somebody parked on the Spring Garden Highway in the middle of flowing traffic and, therefore, I believe that we have to be very careful about people's perception about the role of this particular highway, because it has become, in my view, a tremendous problem.

In my own constituency there is a park, Lemon Arbour, coming straight through Four Roads into Pool and it is amazing the speed at which people pass through there and how many people have died on that road too. I really have great fear about driving on this highway if the attitude of people is going to be that it is some kind of fast lane. If you are slow, take the Black Rock Road instead of Spring Garden or take the back roads instead of going on the highway and on the highway everybody is just doing madness and that is one of my major concerns.

I should like to support the Resolution and give my full support, also, to the decision for the Government to name the highway as it has done.

Thank you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to address only two matters which have arisen in this debate.

The first relates, of course, to the value of the highway to the economy of Barbados. I believe that sometimes it takes men of vision to see beyond the immediate and in the construction of this highway and the proposal for its continuation one has seen the visionary outlook of, certainly, the late Tom Adams.

I subscribe to the view that he was pilloried for implementing this idea in the way that he did but he stuck manfully to the defence of it and it has not taken long for people to recognize how valuable it will be to the economic development of Barbados.

We may argue in here as to what aspects of this highway was conceived by either himself or the late Prime

Minister Errol Barrow and exactly when the first proposals for sections of the highway to be so constructed were formulated.

I do distinctly recall that just prior to 1971, there was a discussion about two ring roads, an inner ring road which would have passed through my own constituency and obliterated a good part of the Rockley area and that...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: A spine road. The inner ring road would have come from up Jemmotts Lane, go through Martindales Road, come down Roebuck Street through Country Road and linked up.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...And linked up with Dayrells Road, right through Rockley New Road and it was referred to before the Williams Committee which enquired into the Development Plan for that time as the inner ring road/spine road, if you like to call it in that manner.

There was also a discussion of an outer ring road which stretched from part of Rendezvous Hill, Top Rock to just before Warrens.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Near to Warrens, not exactly up to Warrens, but the overall conception of what was until now referred to as the Airport to West Coast Highway was a conception that was refined and extended by the late Tom Adams.

His vision as well encompassed not only linking that road back to Spring Garden, but continuing the road from Warrens right up to Mile and a Quarter and eventually linking up the Mile and a Quarter Road to the Northern Access Road.

He always spoke at great length about the contribution which Hadrian had made to the development of the highways in Britain and I remember him in the Planning and Priorities Committee, as it then was, on the platform and within councils of the Barbados Labour Party, giving his vision for a Barbados in which there were main roads which could bring us very quickly into the subsidiary roads. 7.10p.m.

Eventually the long-term plan was to retire some of our subsidiary roads to cut down maintenance. I remember this very distinctly. And no doubt, this was one of the reasons why the Barbados Labour Party clearly said that in a project such as this which was associated with the late Tom Adams, the Labour Party would see that it would bear his name. Now there is no doubt that the Government has had a change of heart. There is no doubt they have, since we have articulated publicly our position on this matter. And since I think there is a strong feeling within the

country, and people must recognize this that Tom Adams is deserving of recognition on a national basis. There is that feeling within Barbados. We might have disagreed with him in our particular ways at times. But in the minds of Barbadians he has made, as others before him have made, an extremely significant development to Barbados.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have one complaint about the manner in which we are going about honouring our national heroes, it is because we have not by and large taken a broad-based stance on these matters. I believe for instance that the announcement tonight would have caught the families of one if not of all of these persons by absolute surprise. And I believe that no consultation has taken place with the families of one, at least one, and I believe, all three persons after whom the highway is now being named.

And when the Honourable Member for St. John speaks and he hears me talk about a bi-partisan approach to various matters, it is not because I am jejune and do not believe that politics is to some extent about partisan stances and partisan attitudes; it is because I firmly believe that there are areas of this country's life in which there needs not be a divisive approach on some issues. And I consider that the honouring of national heroes happens to be one such area. And in this House I have clearly articulated the view which I hold and which I consider also to be the view of the Labour Party that the sooner we can move to a national committee to deal with issues such as this, we will not have the divisiveness which sometimes creeps into the debate and which misleads, in my view, some of our supporters into thinking that these matters should be matters of great division between the political parties.

Earlier this evening, the Prime Minister spoke of two great political parties. I am very glad that he was magnanimous and big enough to acknowledge in those few words the tremendous contribution which the Barbados Labour Party has made in its 50 years, as I have acknowledged the contribution which the Democratic Labour Party and its Leader Errol Barrow made, not without at times criticizing the mistakes which it has made as well. And they have in turn criticized what they conceive to be our mistakes. But do not be angry with Labour Party people if they get the impression that it is not always on our feet that the boot must squeeze. Because I have heard statements as well from the Democratic Labour Party both before and after the last Election that would make the public believe that we never made one inch of a contribution, that Tom Adams is the worst person who lived in the history of this country, that he did not make a contribution as well.

And one must begin to acknowledge that the man made a tremendous contribution to Barbados. He was like anybody else, human, but his contribution is there for all to see.

Now, Sir, I want to move on to another aspect of the road and perhaps the Minister will help me, the Minister who introduced the Resolution will help me on this position.

The Minister made a visit to my constituency some time ago when complaints reached him particularly from the Franklin Development area in my constituency, about the dust which was affecting the constituents. I myself have written letters to the contractors on behalf of some of those constituents making claims for compensation for the injuries which they have suffered. No cases have been filed so the matter is not sub judice and I can therefore speak about it.

The reaction has been to pass the matter on to lost adjusters and very little progress has been made. The dust problem is no longer prevalent in Clapham, Sergeant's Village but we still have the problem of compensating people for the nuisance created, the inconvenience created, and I trust the Government will not be settling the claims with the contractors until such time it is satisfied that all the persons along that highway who were affected adversely receive proper compensation. And the sooner that this is made quite clear to Sintra the better it will be. Otherwise we will find that later, when Sintra has gone, people are still litigating matters, and Sintra is producing all sorts of expert evidence to prove that it had nothing to do with their operations in the area. Since they have substantial resources to hire experts, I have no doubt that my poor constituents will be at a loss to match them in what they are doing.

The Honourable Members spoke as well, Sir, about the beautification of the highway and particularly the Honourable Member for St. Thomas spoke about some of the problems of markings on that highway.

I want to cite, in addition to those that he has adverted to, a very misleading road mark. When you get to the roundabout at Warrens and you are turning left to go up Hinds Hill towards the University, there is a mark in which you are directed to turn to the left and if you turn there to the left you just go into a dead end off the road. And it is misleading people. I think the Ministry of Transport and Works, before final completion occurs, because there has only been substantial completion, should ensure that all of these matters are properly attended to by the contractors so that our road marking signs would be perfect.

I recognize that the Government Information Service has been running a series of programmes telling people how to use these main highways. I do not believe that on this highway we have had the number of accidents in the short time the highway has been partially in use, as occurred during the same period of time on the Spring Garden Highway. But it seems to me that we will still have a long period of teaching people how to use roundabouts properly and how in general to be careful on a highway that calls for

a certain degree or level of speed as is permitted on the highway, Sir.

I drove on the area from Warrens to Haggatt Hall, the Norman Niles Roundabout behind a vehicle that cared to go no faster than about twenty miles per hour. It is as disastrous to misuse the highway to go so slowly, as it is equally disastrous to exceed the speed limit at a tremendous rate. You can cause a lot of accidents and a good deal of frustration. I think that we owe a duty to ourselves to get accustomed to using these fast highways.

I should also like to use the opportunity, Sir, to ask our citizens, corporate citizens, youth groups, service clubs to adopt a roundabout. There is no reason why this should not be done, subject of course, to their having the right to use it for some controlled form of advertising. But it is a great pity to see some of the roundabouts, some of the older roundabouts and some of the new roundabouts being left as though they are mere grassfields rather than beautified, as we would like to see done in our island.

I do not intend, Sir, to repeat some of the arguments advanced by other Honourable Members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just two minutes left.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: It can now be seen that this highway will eventually be beneficial to Barbados.

I would just tell the Government to watch the spiralling of land prices which are occurring. The Government itself owns a substantial portion of land on both sides of the highway having acquired some of it. And I think one must be careful that as commercial enterprises extend their areas of operation that we are not fuelling our inflation in land development. The Government should not, in my view, alienate or get rid of, too quickly, the choice spots which it has on a permanent basis. But if it is proposed in any way to allow private enterprise to operate to look at the sort of legal arrangement that will over the long term, by long term lease or some other thing maintain the freehold for the public of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I believe and I know I am right in saying that I organized the first public meeting on this highway up in Lodge Hill in 1984. 7.20 p.m.

I did it against the background of the knowledge that it was the Democratic Labour Party that had originally proposed the large sections of this highway for construction. But I did it, Sir, because in my view at the time and in the view of persons that I represent in Lodge Hill that section of the highway - I am specifically referring,

Sir, that section leading from Warrens to University Drive - would have caused extreme hardship and dislocation to persons living in that area. I had been petitioned by persons living in that area. I wrote the Prime Minister on this particular matter. I even suggested a rerouting not that the highway should not be built at all, but that that section leading from Warrens to University Drive should be rerouted in a way which would cause the least dislocation among persons living in Lodge Hill. That is history, Sir. That is history,

So let us look at it against this background. It is a fact, Sir, the Development Plans of 1973-77 as indeed the Development Plan of 1972 make reference, Sir, to these ring roads. There were two ring roads as we heard earlier proposed. There was one ring road leading from Jemmotts Lane by the St. Patrick's Cathedral as what is now the old hospital, leading up Jemmotts Lane across Martindales Road right across Halls Road down Roebuck Street across - Country Road down Passage Road. That was the inner ring road. There was also a spine road which was different. That spine road led from Top Rock passing under the escarpment by Rendezvous Hill, following that escarpment as it ran right down and passing near Neville Osborne's home but on the southern section of it, passing through what is now West Ridge, passing through Dalkeith and destroying numerous houses on its path, passing through, Sir, Culloden Road and Culloden Farm, sections of Culloden Farm and eventually finding its way into Bay Street. It is that section of the road that is called the spine road. There were investigations set up under the laws and under, Sir, the Presidency if you like, Sir, of Sir Denys Williams as he is now, but Denys Williams then, and I think we all agreed that in fact the proper thing was done to abandon the spine road. The spine road was abandoned.

The inner ring road we did not think it necessary at the time, although it was not formerly abandoned as indeed the spine road was, but the inner road was not abandoned. It was just left in abeyance. But the outer ring road, Sir, was never abandoned. It was not left in abeyance. What happened to the outer ring road is that we were overtaken by the oil crisis in the early 1970's and we were unable to build the outer ring road as it was then leading from Top Rock. As a matter of fact, a small section of that road was built in advance and that small section was that road that passes between what is now B.E.T. and the Courtesy Garage. There was no road in previously. That small section was constructed. The intention, Sir, was to have the whole road, to widen the St. Barnabas Road all the way right down and cross the Friendship gully, pass through the Belle and go as far as Warrens. That was the proposal and plan of the Democratic Labour Party. That is why, Sir, we believe that it was not inappropriate that that section of the outer ring road should bear the name of the Prime Minister at the time in whose regime it was proposed.

Any Town Planners of the day can enlighten the Honourable Member for St. Peter. Lenny St. Hill, Mr. Luther Bourne, and Mr. Richard Gill could enlighten the Honourable Member for St. Peter. The facts are all there. What did not find favour with the Democratic Labour Party was that section that led through Lodge Hill. It did not find favour because we felt at the time it would have caused problems for the people living in the area; nor that section leading from Graeme Hall to the airport because we felt, Sir, it was unnecessary because there were lots of roads leading from the airport as well as it would have made impotent large sections of agricultural lands stretching between Graeme Hall and the airport. Because that is exactly where it would pass and through no residential areas as indeed the one in Lodge Hill would have done, but the one between Graeme Hall and the airport would have been through nothing but agricultural land and would have rendered impotent, if you like, tracks of agricultural land between those two points.

It was, Sir, those two sections of road that the road from the airport to Graeme Hall as well, Sir, the section from Warrens to University Drive which were the proposals in the time of the Barbados Labour Party when Tom Adams was Prime Minister. They may very well have been his proposals. I do not know. But they were the only two original ones that originated, those two sections. The section from the airport to Graeme Hall, the section from Warrens to University Drive were the only two sections. We felt therefore, Sir, it was proper that the Barbados Labour Party should get the credit for those two sections of road that originated with them. Therefore, we decided to name one section under one Prime Minister and the other section under a former Premier for whom little or nothing was done by the Barbados Labour Party although he was a Barbados Labour Party Premier. We felt too that that same section from Warrens to University Drive could probably have been named after the former Premier who had suitable land holding in the Lodge Hill area where even now, Sir, several members of the family of the late Hugh Gordon Cummins still reside, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Do you have substantial land holding up there? Tell him so. Tell the Leader of the Opposition that. Tell him that. It is he who talked about you not me ... the Leader of the Opposition. Now you respond to him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have less cross talk please?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are still members out there who reside. I am happy to say that I am glad to have them as my constituents, at least four of them of the five, as my constituents. I am very happy to have them, Sir, very, very happy to have them there and I

am equally, Sir, happy to be able to be part of a decision to name that section of the highway after a Premier neglected by the other side.

Now Sir, there are problems as other Honourable Members have indicated on that highway and I too would like something done about it. The main problem that affects my constituents is that as a result of the building of the road a large development has taken place in the Hinds Hill area and it is called the Husbands New Development comprising mostly of persons who had to be resited because of the building of the road. 7.30 p.m.

There is a large number of children living in that area who are students at the Eden Lodge Primary School, and to get to Eden Lodge Primary School, they have to cross that highway, Sir. The highway is crossed by those children at a point on a road that is now divided into two that used to be called Pipers' Avenue. I am going to ask the Ministry to have a good look at that section of the highway and delineate some crossing, make it safe for young children - because Eden Lodge Primary School takes children from five years till eleven - living in those areas to be able to cross the highway in order to get to school.

I have heard persons here talking about turning to the right, turning off the highway and so on and so forth, and having reflective lights and so on, but I think this particular one is very important, urgent, critical and I am asking the Honourable Minister to look into this aspect of it and try to find some way in which those children can be made safe while they cross the highway in order to get to school.

It is not only for the children, Sir. Traditional shopping has been done in that area by persons who live over there, and we have to build other shops now where they are. Some have already been started, but until that is done persons have to cross the highway in order to do their shopping. All that, Sir, is important.

Finally, Sir, I am beginning to notice that the shoulders are becoming overgrown with some tall grass. I think that we should try and make this highway a place of which we can all be proud and make sure that the grass and so on are removed from the highway in time.

That is my contribution, Sir.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the first point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Peter relates to an assertion on his part that the issue between Vinckler and Williams in the first tender was whether Williams submitted a combination offer and Vinckler did not.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I do not understand what He meant then. If that is not the issue, I do not know what it is.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, if the Member will give way, on a point of elucidation, my argument was that as regards the controversy surrounding the award of the contract to Vinckler, bids were taken both as combination bids as well as for phases of the road, and there was a predisposition in support of awarding contracts to COW Williams, if the Minister remembers, on the basis of his having been more competitive than Vinckler in relation to certain parts of the road on the understanding that the road was going to be done in phases.

There is no question at all that Vinckler would have been more competitive if the road was done on the basis of a combination contract, and as a matter of elucidation, Sir, I just bring that to the Minister's attention, and that the controversy therefore that arose was only in relation to whether it would be awarded as a combination contract, or on the basis of separate contracts.

I trust that with that elucidation the Minister would grasp the point, Sir.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Thank you for the clarification. The stubborn fact still remains that Williams' combination bid was nearly a million dollars higher than that of Vinckler. In fact, Vinckler's sole bid was a combination bid of all of the parts.

Aside.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Yes. That was the sole bid. There were three parts, Part I, Part II and Part III. The only bid Vinckler made was in respect of all three in combination. I have the information here. Whereas Williams made bids for all of the parts individually and the parts in combination with each other, I and II, I and III and II and III, and then he made the final combination bid which was higher than that of Vinckler.

Now, faced with that fact the Government of Barbados tried several manoeuvres. One was to make the proposal to have two parts of the road awarded and then one part at a later date. If that were done, Williams would obviously have got the contract, since no such limited combination bids were made by Vinckler. When those attempts failed, the Government of Barbados sought to introduce another factor, that is the notional tax, holding that the foreign company was at an advantage in that it would pay no tax as distinct from the local contractor. This notional tax would be deducted from the local contractor or added to the foreign contractor, in which case it would be weighed against the foreign contractor and in favour of the local contractor.

This continued right up to the second tender, in an attempt to set the field for the second tender to ensure that the local contractor would have started off at this advantage, until the Minister of Finance, Mr. St. John, decided to throw in the sponge.

What, as I pointed out and will repeat, is interesting about the figures in the second bid for both Sinira and C O. Williams, the two major competitors in the second bid, is that both bids were substantially lower the second time around than in the first offer. I think in the case of Sinira by nearly \$4 million and in the case of Williams by nearly \$5 million for the same work, and therefore if any credence were to be given to the engineering consultants' report at all, then one would be bound to predict that what is happening today would have taken place, namely that we would have had to come back for a supplementaiy in order to pay the full extent of the cost of the civil works, and therefore the simplistic knee jerk response of going for what appears quantitatively to be the lowest bid is pure and -utter nonsense. 7.40p.m.

It is pure and utter nonsense and the entire history of road works, the awards and ultimate figure that has been paid by Government demonstrates beyond peradventure that it is nonsense to operate as a basic principle that one automatically goes for the lower bid and I mention that to illustrate that this is a classic case in point.

You went for the lowest bid, admittedly on your knees, after you had been driven to your knees by the Inter-American Development Bank and, in the end, we are faced with an overrun in the region of 33¹/3%. That is what, I believe, we will end up around. At the present time it is nearly 20% so we are well on the road to a 33 1/3% overrun.

The second point relates to an issue raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas with respect to low productivity on the site of the round about at the intersection of Highway 4 and the Errol Barrow Highway. That is the Norman Niles Roundabout.

The problem with productivity of workers at MfW, according to our latest studies, is largely a problem of supervision. Within the supervisory grades at MTW, there is a plethora of individuals whose talents lie in political manoeuvring and the Ministry is attempting to improve the quality of the supervisory staff by requiring persons if they are to be given a certain level of responsibility to take examinations.

In the past, supervisors rose to increasing levels of responsibility based upon political favouritism. We are seeking to substitute a system of objectivity in which the persons promoted would have necessarily first demonstrated a capacity to understand the work that they are doing through an examination.

The first examination results are in and I am afraid that a lot of the politicians on the staff at MTW might be terribly disappointed so, I believe that an answer... ,

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. I am asking if the Minister failed the examination.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It does appear to me...

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: The Minister is only one of the politicians on the staff.

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time for this Resolution has expired.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Unfortunately, for some of the other politicians, it is this politician who determines what happens after the examination.

The question that Head 84 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 1. PARISH

BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1989

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: .Mr. Deputy Speaker, thesis a bit of history to this. In 1986 when Parliament re-enacted the Parish Boundaries Act, it was stated then by the then mover of the Resolution, that is, the former Right Honourable Errol Barrow - what he said was that what we are asking the House to pass today can only be a temporary measure and he further went on to say that it is highly probable that in the redefinition of parish boundaries which would not be done under this re-enactment but on subsequent re-enactment which we hope would be completed before two years time.

Now, Sir, it is now about two years since we have been working on a new Parish Boundaries Act. From the time, probably, of settlement Barbados had parishes. The Parish Boundaries Act that was repealed in 1980 was an Act that was passed in 1912 defining the boundaries in accordance with Parsons Map.

The boundaries of Barbados if one were to look at the map of Barbados, will show that these boundaries of the parishes have been delineated by straight lines. The effect of such delineation has been that in some cases a house traverses two parishes. 7.50 p.m.

You can find perhaps the living room-in one parish and the bedrooms or kitchen in a different parish. What we believe, Sir, to be not a very satisfactory position. As a matter of fact, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he did speak two years ago in 1986 on this particular matter, he himself adverted, Sir, to that very problem. And it was stated, Sir, during that Debate in fact that it would be the intention of any new redefinition of boundaries to use physical divisions rather than just straight lines so as to obviate the problems that have occurred as a result of the old delineations.

And the physical divisions that we are attempting to use, Sir, in this Bill and as shown on plans which have been circulated are roads, gullies, waterways, in some cases too, Sir, even a culvert I believe has been used. There are certain times when we found it difficult to use any such physical feature to delineate the boundary and then what we used were monuments, we erected monuments, a monument on one place and a monument in another place and the straight line between those two monuments would in fact constitute in some cases, not many, parish boundary lines.

We believe, Sir, that this is a considerable improvement on what obtains at the moment. We have tried and tried hard to keep as close as we possibly could to the old parish boundary lines. We feel that delineations are necessary because the old ones are really out of date. To just give an example of what was described as the description for the parish of St. Michael. It says, Sir, here on St. Thomas and St. James and this is the description: "From Ridgeways corner tree to the north end of Piggott's house to the sea, a straight line".

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: But where is Piggott's house today and where is the tree? Where is the tree, where is Piggott's house?

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: So these were the kinds of descriptions, Sir, that we have had here, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I do not know where the tree is...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: St. George or St. Joseph.

*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The last described line continues straight to a stone set up between the lands of Forte and Hooper...

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: ...on the south side of this. Now, Sir, this is really getting a bit ridiculous. And therefore, Sir, we believe that it would be necessary for us to carry out this exercise.

I want to make it clear, Sir, what is Government's intentions. I have read where the Leader of the Opposition has been concerned about certain matters. I have given the Leader of the Opposition some assurances which I am giving here today because there is nothing that we have to hide in this particular matter. We have no hidden agendas. None whatsoever. No hidden agendas.

Yes, we can and will include in the Bill itself a clause permitting the Bill to come into effect by proclamation. The Leader of the Opposition says that is necessary. We can do this. As a matter of fact, we believe it is an improvement of the Bill.

And we can also look back, Sir, at some of the boundaries, like the one in St. Thomas, and we can make some adjustments to the plan as we have here in order to take into consideration...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can or will?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Pardon, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Did you say can or will?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Will, Sir,...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: ...let me say this, Sir.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is not for me, Sir, it is not for the Government.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is entirely a matter - I am going to recommend, I want to recommend here now, Sir, on this Second Reading, it is my intention to recommend that this matter go to a Select Committee of the House consisting of Members of the Opposition and Members on the Government side including the Backbench.

Asides.

Laughter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: And it is also our intention, Sir, to post up in various parts of Barbados in every single parish, copies of these plans showing the old boundary lines, showing the proposed boundary lines, as well as showing, Sir, the descriptions of the boundaries so that they can be followed. In every single parish. It is our intention to post these plans so that the public at large can familiarize themselves with it, and if they want to, they can make representation to the Select Committee before the work of the Select Committee is completed. And any representations made by the public will be taken into account.

We have decided, Sir, that say, in the parish of St. Michael to place the plans at four different points and there are four post offices, Sir, the post offices at Cheapside, Eagle Hall, Brittons Hill and Welches.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The post office at Cheapside which is the main post office in other words, then the post office in Eagle Hall, the one in Welches in St. Michael and the one in Brittons Hill. Those four post offices, Sir. In Christ Church, Sir, it is intended to place it at the post office at Worthing, the post office at Oistins and we would also like to post it somewhere in the area of Sargeants Village at one of the supermarkets if we can get the permission, Sir, of the owners of the supermarket to post it there. We have decided on those locations because we believe that those locations are generally used by the public at large. In St. Philip, Sir, also at Six Cross Roads. In St. John at the police station or the station at Four Roads. In St. Joseph the police station at Horse Hill. In St. George, the St. George Post Office, as well as the Market Hill Supermarket, if we get that permission. In St. Thomas, the post office at Welchman Hall. In Belleplaine the police station. In St. Lucy the police station at Bentham's. In St. Peter the post office. And in St. James, Sir, at that post office.

And, therefore, what I am trying to say is that we are giving the widest possible publication of our proposals so that the public at large will have them, and because we have been accustomed to having parishes in Barbados. They no longer have the same significance as they had when the Act was passed in 1912 because of the abolition of the Vestry system. But it is still very necessary for postal purposes, for jurisdictional purposes of the courts and other purposes including still under our Laws, vehicles are required to be licensed in areas where people reside, the parishes where people reside.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I recommend and commend this Bill to the House. I have stated, Sir, our intentions as regards making amendments to the Bill, I have also stated

the intentions, Sir, of sending this Bill to a Select Committee which I am proposing to do.

At this point, Sir, I move that the Bill be read a second time. And at an appropriate time I should like to propose the names of persons who would constitute the Select Committee to which the Bill would be sent.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am going to second this Bill and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in view of the assurances given by the Leader of the House and as a result of discussions that we on this side have had with the Government, we are not going to delay the Second Reading of this Bill unduly, Sir.

I just want to make a couple of points. So that the Opposition understands the Government's position, Sir, I should like to articulate it as briefly and succinctly as possible, Sir. 8.00 p.m.

Barbados had always been divided into parishes, 11 from Parsons Map and probably even before that, Sir, but certainly from the 20th century. Because of physical development and the division of the island into constituencies the Barbados Labour Party deemed it necessary to abolish parish boundaries. The Democratic Labour Party pledged to re-introduce parish boundaries and so delineate the various parishes. I do not have any quarrel with that in principle for the reasons advanced by the Minister just before he sat down - for legal jurisdictional purposes, for the purpose of registration of vehicles and certain aspects of the Health legislation and so on.

Where I think we did have some concerns in terms of the delineation of parish boundaries, were where we recognised that certain districts traditionally before the abolition of the Parish Boundaries Act had been accustomed being in certain parishes.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, I am not dealing with the constituency boundary. I am dealing with the parish boundary, Sir. For example, Arch Hall had always been part of St. Thomas. Diamond Corner had been part of St. Peter. Lammings had been part of St. Joseph. St David's Church where I was christened in 1940 had always been in Christ Church and one or two others, Sir, that I cannot remember out of the top of my head right now. When we were presented with the map of the redrawn parish boundaries, those anomalies showed up and still appear on the map and some of them seem to be arbitrary delineation. For example, at a point before St. Thomas Church but after Arch Hall the boundary went West, then

turned north and turned back so as to bring St. Thomas Church into the parish of St. Thomas. Now Bagatelle is in St. James.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member, am I to take it that we are not going into details on this occasion?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This is a second reading. I am dealing with the details in so far that I have explained the principle that we were concerned about, Sir, that is that the parish boundaries, though necessary, had been so redrawn as to create anomalies.

Now there was a further problem in relation to electoral or constituency boundaries because, as I understand it, those boundaries ought by law as far as practicable, and I use that phrase advisedly, Sir, to be drawn in such a way as to harmonize with parish boundaries, as I say, where that is practicable. You would have problems in Christ Church and St. Michael.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to appear to be interrupting your speech. But I was made to get the impression that we are not dealing with constituency boundaries now. We are dealing strictly with parish boundaries and this is a different matter. So perhaps the question of constituency boundaries will come up on another occasion. I do not know if you want to blend them into this discussion, but you can proceed. But I just want to set that guideline.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is true that people who live in St. Joseph according to this may vote in St. Thomas. But you said I cannot talk about it, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to make you misunderstand what I am saying. The debate today is on parish boundaries. As I understand it, there is a commission dealing with constituency boundaries which is separate and the debate which is presently before the House does not touch that area at all and, in fact, we will be interfering with the Commission's duties if we go into a discussion at this time on the constituency boundaries. If I am wrong, you can correct me. But that is the way I understand it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well now, Sir, if you say that, Sir, I am going to sit down, Sir, if you tell me that you are prepared to give up your powers as Deputy Speaker, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am just saying that if what I am saying to you - I am not making a ruling.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Oh!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The way I understand it is that we are discussing parish boundaries and not constituency boundaries. If you understand it differently, correct me.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. I am saying that the two are interrelated, Sir. That is all I am saying, that the two are interrelated, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can proceed. I do not want to interrupt you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not going into any great detail, Sir. I was only trying to explain the principle that the parish boundaries do not necessarily form the constituency boundaries. It cannot be, Sir, because ...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, they did at one time. But now that we have twenty-seven seats and eleven parishes the division is not possible, and what I was coming to is the point that the Minister made in his opening that as far as possible Government tried to find a natural boundary in a highway or some identifiable feature close to the old boundary. The same is not true when you look at the constituency boundaries even though some highways may in fact form the boundaries of constituencies. The point that I was going to make is that, since we are going into Select Committee, I am not going to develop. But in going to allocate persons into parishes to which they have been unaccustomed we have to be careful of the sensitivities, but we have the assurances of Government on this, Sir, and I am not going to press this matter because ...

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, because of the assurances that we have had from the Government and the details we can work out in Select Committee, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is necessary that I speak before the Leader of the Opposition because I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has created enough confusion in the minds of persons on this matter that if he speaks again it may add to the confusion before some clarification is made. It is true, Sir, as you intimated to the last Honourable Member that the interrelationship between parish boundaries and constituency boundaries has been such, over time, that one can get mixed up in discussing them. Therefore, if a political person discusses numbers in the House in relation to the passage of a Parish Boundaries Act and putting the population on notice that he or his party is going to be vigilant, the first and obvious conclusion one would reach is that some attempt at gerrymandering via the parish boundaries was imminent. 8.10p.m.

Indeed, according to the report, the Leader of the Opposition allowed the population in the country to believe that this particular Bill before the House was somehow related in a fundamental way to the electoral boundaries.

Sir, the Chairman of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission in a previous occasion, speaking specifically to the public in his capacity-as Chairman, said that he was waiting for the enactment of the parish boundaries before he and his Commission would deal with electoral boundaries.³ The Constitution of Barbados is very clear in its allocation of responsibility where the Electoral and Boundaries Commission now has very clear responsibility for recommending to the Parliament the delineation of constituency boundaries. Both the Democratic Labour Party in a previous administration and the Barbados Labour Party when the Parliament was responsible by itself for the setting of constituency boundaries have liberally crossed parish boundary lines in the delineation of constituency boundaries, because the principle that has informed constituency allocation has been the numbers living in a prescribed area and not the parish in which the area falls. That has been the principle ever since we had single member constituencies. That is the principle which has been reached and indeed the Constitution is specific in that it directs the Electoral and Boundaries Commission that the constituency shall, not may be, shall be 10% to one side or the other of an equal number of constituencies for the total population.

It therefore came as a shock and a surprise to me when I read in the newspaper what the Leader of the Opposition was alleged to have said about his vigilance and his party's vigilance about the constituency boundaries. That is a matter which cannot be taken lightly, because the Leader of the Opposition is no neophyte in the articulation of the law.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just want to caution that I am not going to entertain any discussion on constituency boundaries and I think I should mention it now while you are on your feet so that subsequent speakers will of course be guided by that particular caution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is why I am skirting the issue, Sir, and not getting involved in a deep discussion. That is why I am taking the position I am taking, that we want to say that this is in fact about the boundaries, and it needs to be repeated that the boundaries we are discussing here are the parishes of Barbados. There used to be eleven. There is no proposal to change them from eleven. We are not introducing new parishes. There will not be a St. Henry, nor will we name a parish after the late Prime Minister. We are not attempting to gerrymander the parishes, so any headline story about gerrymandering could only be a figment of the imagination of somebody, or, Sir, a machination for a different end. We cannot do anything with the parishes except remove the foolishness which my colleague alluded to in the descriptions, but what is really fascinating is that the Labour Party that abolished them altogether, this Labour Party, in the face and in the teeth of opposition from this Democratic Labour Party, abolished the parish boundaries completely. They have lost all moral right to discuss parish boundaries in relation to anything. As far as they are concerned, Sir, we have one parish, indeed

no parish, and in fact they have left the law for the period in between when they abolished the parish boundaries and when we restored them in 1986 very doubtful.

I would make bold to say that there may very well be decisions that have been taken in the courts in Barbados which could have been challenged on the grounds of jurisdiction, because jurisdiction in this country has been determined on the basis of parish, and if there is no parish there can be no jurisdiction. If you commit an offence you have to commit it in a particular jurisdiction, and if you committed that offence in the jurisdiction of a particular Magistrate, as I understand it when the matter is brought before the Magistrate it has to be established that it happened in a particular jurisdiction.

I do not know how they were able to, but clearly the lawyers who practise law found a way to deal with that on both sides, and it is perhaps not for me to question the legal luminaries as they proceeded with their respective bits and pieces of work, but the fact is that the Barbados Labour Party did it with their eyes open. They did it in spite of the fact that we drew it to their attention. They abolished the parish boundaries, so it does not fall well from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition or any Honourable Member from the Barbados Labour Party to talk about the parish boundaries in relation to electoral matters or any matters.

But even so, Sir, he was very careful, from what I read, to say that he was not relating what he was saying to anything that happened in the past by any other administration, so let us draw a veil on what has happened in the past and let us therefore deal with what we have today.

We are, thank God, able to say that we are going to a Select Committee, as we have heard, and the Select Committee will hear evidence and hear from all persons who have a vested or esoteric or any other kind of interest in parish boundaries, and they will have to be redrawn, retouched, instead of going down this road, go down the other road based on the give and take of discussion within the Committee, and at the end of the day, we should have boundaries with parishes that are recognisable and recognised by all and sundry, and we will have been restored to a position of legality that is at least pure.

That is the basis of the decision. And beside that, Sir, having opposed the abolition of the parish boundaries, we had made a commitment to bring back the parish boundaries and we did in 1986 and we committed further to make them palatable. My colleague read one of the descriptions in the old Act. It would take too long to read all of them, Sir, but here is another one. For St. Joseph here is what it said: "On St. Andrew, from the boundary of St. Thomas in Taitt's land..." that confirms since 1912, so you know if Taitt had land in 1912, the family was well represented back down there. St. Andrew. "To the south east

corner of Mallards Land, to a cherry tree on a hill, a straight line, from thence to a stone erected on a chalky hill" (Chalky mount?) "near the sea and to the sea a straight line." This was the description for St. Joseph, and there are many others. #

St. Peter. "From the sea through the centre of Maverick's Mill, Greaves House, now Oxford, Rupert's Fort-and to the sea a straight line." Clearly no one can follow these if we simply re-enacted them, and it is exactly what we have done, and so we are trying to draw these ** lines. 8.20 p.m.

Let me say that although the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is an eminent and distinguished surveyor, and the Honourable Member, the Deputy Prime Minister is a well known and distinguished luminary in Land Law, and there are some other Honourable Members whose geometry, might, at least be about "O" level, not a single ** Minister had any hand in determining where the lines should go.

We have technical people, presumably, competent, technical people whose responsibility it is and was, to advise on where were the best places to draw these lines, so that the initial maps which had been circulated, could not have smacked of any gerrymandering of any kind unless the surveyors and the other technical people had some interest in gerrymandering land for one parish.

I do not think that you get any special dispensation for taxes, if you live in one parish as opposed to the other so I cannot think of any reason why anybody would want to gerrymander a parish so I hope that when this matter is finished in this Honourable House today, and we take it to the Select Committee that it can return to the question of technical and rational allocation of our land space and be removed from the unfortunate area which the Leader of the ^ Opposition took it when he spoke in his capacity as a politician at a place where what is said is not always informed by logic, reason or truth.

I hope that we will be able to discuss the parish boundaries rationally and in the context that we said they should be discussed when we brought the Bill in 1986.

I am grateful to you, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, parish boundaries were last discussed in this House on September 30, 1986 when the then Right Honourable Member for St. John moved the Second Reading of a Bill entitled "The Parish Boundaries Act, 1986". He was really stating as parish boundaries those boundaries which had been shown on a special map drawn by Captain Parsons and at the time when he spoke, I delivered what I considered to be a very detailed speech, both on the historical aspects of and the need for, and the significance of parish boundaries. ** 44th

For the benefit of the Honourable Member who has just Spoken, I would refer him to the Hansard Debate for that date and particularly my speech which began on page 177. Had he taken the opportunity to read that speech, as well as to research the question of parish boundaries, he would not have delivered himself of the confused statement which he made in which he accused me of creating confusion in the minds of people, because I think he would have come to some clear view of the significance of parish boundaries.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

The Honourable Member is doing a very strange thing. He referred to page 177. He then refers to my speech and he then refers to confusion and seeks to suggest that I somehow misrepresented what he said at 177.

I referred to what he said in the newspaper, Sir. As you know, Sir, I could not have said I was speaking about a newspaper article, but everybody knows that he is reported in the newspapers, the front page, as saying that he is going to fight something to the death so he should not try to confuse the issue further. I know what he said at page 177.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is, obviously, not celebrating. Not one word of what I said at the St. George South meeting of the Barbados Labour Party do I withdraw at all; if the Honourable Member would just wait. I would ask and I believe it is absolutely correct what I said and if the Honourable Member would read the editorial...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two members on their feet.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Now that the Honourable Member has put it on the record that he does not withdraw it, Sir, he said that we are coming with the parish boundaries to gerrymander. That is the inference of what he said and he said that he does not withdraw it?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member can jump up on fifty points of order. In this House I would just crave the half of an hour that I have to speak and if he wishes to hear the points he will just wait and hear the points, and perhaps, he will learn something, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will see to it that you are heard so you do not have to worry about him.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now, the first thing that I am going to recommend to the Honourable Member is to read the article which appeared in the Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, Volume 38, No. 2 for 1988, which sets out succinctly a history of parish boundaries and the significance which they hold for Barbados.

I do not want to delay the committee with the history of parish boundaries, but I have to do so for the purpose of an argument which I am going to make a little later.

In 1629, William Tufton divided Barbados into parishes. Barbados then was divided in six parishes along the southern coast of the Island, going to St. Lucy and the reason why that division took place, was to enable people to better administer certain administrative affairs and, also because they were copying the parish concept which had originated in the United Kingdom.

The purpose of the parish was to administer certain local affairs, poor relief, maintenance of order, maintenance of highways. In those days we did not have the sophistication that we have now and the manner of drawing the boundaries was very haphazard. Very soon one of those areas dropped out and St Andrew replaced St. Thomas as the sixth parish.

Honourable Members would know in those days that the parish of St Michael stretched to what is now known as St. George and St. John and the redrawing of boundaries did not take place for some time except that some new parishes were added and by 1641, 1642 we had eleven parishes.

Now, Sir, the maps in respect of these parishes came about during a period of time, the most significant map of which was Mayo's Map done somewhere in the years 1717-1721. Later a Mr. Captain De Barrillier drew his map and finally, we came to the position where the map as drawn by Parsons was promulgated as the official map setting out the parish boundaries of Barbados.

It is significant that some of those maps even show wrong points, particularly in relation where the parish of St. George meets the parish of St. Michael in the Hansom area. What has happened through the years, Sir, that with the change of the systems of Government in Barbados and the abolition of local Government finally, the parish has lost its significance in the Laws of Barbados and in the day to day usefulness in Barbados.

Before licences were designated and administered on a parish basis because the money from the licence fees were used for local parochial purposes. That is no longer so. The Vestry paid a prominent part. That is no longer so and if today you examine the Laws of Barbados you would find that the concept of parish has very little significance at all to us.

We are looking back at an historical era of some significance without ourselves sensibly rationalising what we are seeking to achieve. 8.30 p.m.

And indeed almost a final blow was struck to parish boundaries when each parish ceased being a parliamentary constituency returning two people. Now that is a fact, Sir. Indeed Mr. Campbell, the Editor of the Journal, and I will make the Article a document of the House, Sir, Mr. Campbell the Editor of the Journal put the matter even better than I can put it. And this is what he says:

"Parish boundaries had a special significance when each parish was a Parliamentary constituency. When the law was amended to create additional constituencies, parishes were inadvertently abolished. In due course this was discovered, but the Government was in such a hurry to remedy its mistake that the Act which did so again made the boundaries shown on Parsons' map the official boundaries.

Incredible as it may seem, the parish boundaries on the maps now published by the Government of Barbados are not identical with those on the Parsons and Mayo maps, which appear to agree with each other. On the Mayo map the boundary between St. James and St. Thomas approximately due north to a point immediately to the south of the road from St. Thomas's church to Holetown; at that point, described by Mayo as 'Maverick's corner plumtree', it changes direction to the north-east. For reasons unknown, current maps carry the north/south line across the road for a distance of about 300 yards before the change of direction to the north-east. The error is of no practical importance because nobody lives in the small area of land involved, but it is indicative of the present lack of interest in the subject at official level."

So that what you will see is that if you examine the Laws of Barbados, parishes now play a role in following limited areas to some extent in relation to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate court. The Honourable Member is mistaken if he believes that if you follow the parish boundaries that jurisdiction in the Magistrate court follow those parish boundaries exactly. It is not so at all. There are some areas of Christ Church...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: which come into the jurisdiction in St. Michael.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir. Sir, I at no point in my speech indicated that the jurisdictions were coincident.

What I indicated is that if there are no parish boundaries at all, as was the case with the abolition of the parish boundaries, then there was no point of reference for the jurisdiction.

I at no point attempted to suggest that they ran one coinciding with the other.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The only other significance of parish boundaries, Sir, and this is with respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I can illustrate it from the Law, in the Representation of the People Act some constituencies are delineated at some points by where parish boundaries meet.

Asides.

, Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the point I am making, Sir. Now the point I make, and if the Honourable Member has on a thinking cap he would understand the point, if the parish boundary meets here at the moment in St. James, St. Thomas, and therefore the designated line in the Representation of the People Act is this point, when people on this side of the line are for all purposes now in St. Thomas vote in St. Thomas and on this one in St. James. If however it is shifted this way by the Parish Boundaries Act without anything more, what we are doing is changing the constituencies in the process without the proper process of allowing the Electoral and Boundaries Commission to pass....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With great respect, you are taking the exact course 'that I was trying to avoid. We are dealing here specifically with parish boundaries. And as soon as you introduce this whole question of voting, you are going to create the impression that it interferes with the work of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not creating any such impression, Sir, with respect, Sir. What I...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would prefer, I would really prefer if we stick closer to the question under discussion in relation to the parish boundaries.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am saying that a change of a parish boundary has certain ^ effects. It has effect of expecting the designation of jurisdiction in the Magistrates' courts where it crosses and it affects the constituency boundaries as at present delineated. And that is the point I was making to the Honourable Member.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, if the Honourable Member says that without more, it will in fact mislead because, Sir, the Electoral and Boundaries Commission has a statutory responsibility that must come into play by a particular time. And therefore to merely leave that information there without any more is to mislead. He is not talking to lawyers. If he is talking to lawyers, they will understand. When he is speaking to the public in the way he does and he leave out a part, it is my contention, Sir, that he is misleading. And therefore, Sir, my point of order is that he would be misleading the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to appear to be interrupting the Honourable Member's speech but it does «.

occur to me that if you mix a discussion on constituency boundaries with a discussion of parish boundaries, some confusion can arise.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I respect Your Honour's ruling on matters. But let me make this point clear, Sir.

I am developing an argument of the implication of this legislation as it affects other things in Barbados. And I am entitled to talk about the implications of the legislation as it has an effect on other Laws in Barbados/That is all I am doing. The Honourable Member knows that too. And I am saying that it has an effect not only on the Magistrates' Jurisdiction Act but it will have an effect on the Representation of the People Act in particular the Schedule of the Act which designates existing constituencies. That is what I am saying. And I am saying if that is done without more and the Act came into being without more, then in those circumstances we would have inferentially changed constituency boundaries. That is the point I have been making.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member could say what he likes, Sir.

Now before the debate started I left the House to attend a meeting of one of the constituency branches of my Party but I wanted to know how far we were going to get in the debate and I was informed, and that is why I came back into debate at this stage. Before I left however I had spoken to both Honourable Members on the other side who had spoken in this debate, and I had been given the assurance which I take very seriously that (1) the Bill would go to a Select Committee and (2) the Bill will not be promulgated without a section for bringing the Bill in by proclamation. Because I consider it important. And if the Honourable...

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You said that. I got those assurances before hand. And the Honourable Member has repeated them. That is why the measure is not as controversial as it would be.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Were it not for those assurances it would be. I can assure the Honourable Member it would be very controversial.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me again...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member must understand that, Sir.

I am not backing down on anything I have said. The Honourable Member must understand that I have been too long at this game watching* constituency boundaries and parish boundaries.

Mr. DFPjTY SPEAKER: We are not playing games in here you I .ow. With great respect, I just...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not come in to play games, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER ... want to indicate that while you were absent...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: With respect, Sir, I do not play games in here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: the Honourable Leader of the House did give us those assurances.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know, Sir. That is what I am saying. But I am entitled to repeat for the purpose of the record and for the public out there that I got the assurances before the debate started.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member must understand that. So I want that quite clear, Sir, the position absolutely clear.

Now subject to those assurances, we are prepared to take...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. What does he mean, he wants to tell the public that he got die assurances before? The assurances were not something that were given in mitigation of anything. They were the normal assurances that are given from one side to the other. What is it about you want to assure public that you got them before? Of course you got them before because that is what we do ail the time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You did not get it...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sorry, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What I want to make clear, Sir, is the Opposition's position. Were it not for those assurances, we would debate this Bill longer. You have to understand that.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He has to understand that. If he does not understand it quite clearly, I would repeat it again in the debate.

The position is, Sir, that I have said before that when it comes to matters of this nature, I would like to move them to a certain level. I have said that in the Debate here I am deeply conscious that the Laws of Barbados provide for an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. After all, it was my Party that amended the Constitution to ensure that these issues are moved beyond partisan politics. And the reason why I made the statement on Sunday is because I want to ensure...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What statement...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: that the Commission performs its business to the House, Sir.

, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: is this?

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The one to which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West referred, Sir. And therefore I want to ensure that the Commission is able to do its work unfettered by Parliament wittingly or unwittingly passing legislation which we have not looked at for all of the inferences. And that is one of the reasons, Sir. I do not apologise at all for anything that I have said. I am glad that it has resulted in the Government understanding our concerns which are legitimate concerns that any Opposition ought to have about these matters and which we have a public duty to bring before the public if we are concerned about them. I am not just sounding off for the purpose of making noise. I take this duty very seriously, Sir... 8.40 p.m.

I trust that when we get into Committee any problems that have arisen can now be discussed in a sensible manner so that we can eventually see the necessity for this legislation.

Now Sir, I believe myself that the best way which one could have approached this problem was to, as I have said before, look at the whole legislation and see what necessity, if any, is there for a Parish Boundaries Act at any stage. Had our laws all been on computer and we could have got the references to wherever parish boundaries occurred, we would have found ourselves in a position that we will see how to deal with the problem and not merely bring the legislation because we have not studied the problem in its true historical development. Perhaps this is a matter to which the Committee itself will advert and I trust that the Honourable Member will find himself open to suggestions on the Select Committee when we are dealing with this matter.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I sat down when I introduced this Bill, I gave such assurances. I gave those assurances, Sir. I do not understand the reason for continually repeating these assurances. Sir, if we want to be honest, let us be honest in here. The Electoral and Boundaries Commission has the power and authority to ignore anything at all that we do in here, anything whatsoever. So do not come and say that this has * implications for constituency boundaries when in fact they have legislative authority to ignore what we do and to go ahead and draw the twenty-seven constituencies as they see best giving due recognition of the powers that reside in the Representation of the People Act and the Constitution indicating that the constituency should be equal as far as possible in numbers give or take a 10% one side or the other. That is all they need to do and they need not be affected at all in any way whatsoever with what we do in here. Let me give you an example, Sir. The only constituency that is now coincident with a parish boundary is St. Lucy, no other constituency, Sir. I do not want to get into that...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Even though I do not want to interrupt, I was trying to discourage discussion on it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I agree with you, Sir. I am just merely, Sir, trying to respond to what the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition has been saying. So do not try and give the impression that this has implications for the Commission. It does not, Sir. It does not have implications for the Commission. It can ignore it completely and draw the St. Lucy constituency somewhere in Mile-and-a-Quarter if they want to do. That has no such implications.

Asides

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. The Commission makes a report.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Precisely.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We only have a delay in power over and then the Minister can do as he likes with the boundary later on.

; Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister cannot do as he likes. It has got to come to the House. The Minister cannot do as he likes and that is misleading the House. There is no Minister that can come after the Commission has reported and the House does not accept it. There is no Minister that can do as he likes. If the House does not accept it, the Minister can make his recommendations and come back to the House again. So I feel, Your Honour, Sir, that we should try to avoid this because we are going down the wrong road and we have

been led down the wrong road. For what reason, Sir, I do not know. But I respect, Sir, Your Honour's wishes and I will now pull back that position, Sir.

I would now like, Sir, at this point to ...

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I would like now, Sir, to nominate the persons, Sir. I have already made my responses to the Honourable Member. I have already moved that the Bill be read a second time and that is the position as it stands at the moment

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Sir, that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and that the following, Sir, be the Members of the Committee: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, the Honourable Attorney General and Member for Christ Church West Central, the Honourable Member for St. Philip North, and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East and I am told, Sir, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas along with the Honourable Member for St. Michael North under the Chairmanship of His Honour, the Deputy Speaker.

Asides

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am advised, Sir, that the Chairman of Committees will be the Chairman, by our Rules, of this Select Committee as proposed, Sir, by myself.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that those persons be on the Select Committee.

The question that those Members form the Select Committee on this Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF BENEFITS) ACT, 1989

Order No. 2 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to validate and continue certain benefits enjoyed by Gulf Stream Industries (Caribbean) Limited which were granted otherwise than in accordance with the Fiscal Incentives Act.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill, as indicated is a Bill to validate certain benefits enjoyed by Gulf Stream Industries (Caribbean) Limited under the Fiscal Incentives Act. The fact of the matter is that at the expiration of the company's tax holidays on June 30, 1986 the Industrial Development Corporation recommended to

the Minister that the company be granted an additional two years. However, the IDC subsequently drew to the Ministry's attention the* fact that the Corporation's recommendations regarding the company's tax holidays should have been granted for three years terminating in June 1989 instead of June 1988. In fact the IDC had made an error in its recommendations.

During the period since 1986 as is customary, the Industrial Development Corporation reviewed the performance of Gulf Stream Caribbean Limited and its value added performance. It qualified for additional time and we are taking therefore the opportunity to have the time extended for the fiscal incentives. At least the Minister has no power to do this retroactively. We have to come to Parliament with it and this is basically what we are seeking to do. So in short, we are therefore - at least it was recommended that the period of time which should be granted to Gulf Stream would extend beyond 1989. What we are seeking to do, is to have this extended until June 30, 1991 because the company has performed and met the criteria which has been laid down. The sales, for example, for the fiscal year 1985 to 1986 grew by 38% over the previous year and the sales for 1988 reached \$5.86 million compared with an estimated figure of \$5.7 million. 8.50 p.m.

We think, therefore, that the opportunity should be taken to embrace the performance and ensure that the expiry date now for the extension should end on 30th June, 1991.

I therefore beg to move that this Bill which would validate certain benefits enjoyed by Gulf Stream Industries (Caribbean) Limited under the Fiscal Incentives Act be read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWATTE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 90 reads as follows, Sir

To ask the Minister of Education and Culture:

1. Is the Minister aware that, at the Welches Primary School in St. Thomas, the staff and pupils are experiencing severe discomfort and inconvenience by reason of the following defects in the school building:
 - (a) leaking roofs,
 - (b) a ceiling on the point of collapse,
 - (c) windows about to fall off,
 - ¹ (d) faulty and insanitary toilets,
 - (e) an office door about to fall off,
 - (f) a lack of oscillating fans in a hot building,
 - (g) an unfenced playing area, and
 - (h) a rotten floor immediately above the Head Teacher's office?
2. Is the Minister also aware that the said school is designated as a hurricane shelter and, in its present physical condition, is thoroughly unfit for such use?
3. If the Minister is aware of the aforesaid defects, will the Minister state what are Government's proposals for remedial work and how soon it is proposed to commence work?

I have no objection to it being laid, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Okay, give it then.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to Question No. 90 is "The Welches Primary School which has been designated as a hurricane shelter is being repaired."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Any supplementaries?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. Question No. 96, which reads as follows:

To ask the Prime Minister:

1. Will the Prime Minister please state whether it is a fact that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has incurred losses in its current financial year at a rate of \$300 000 per month during the first four months of the current financial year?
2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Prime Minister explain the reason for or cause of the said losses?
3. If the answer is in the negative, will the Prime Minister state what, if any, were the monthly losses of the said Corporation?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, and with the concurrence of the Honourable Member for St Thomas, I lay the Reply to Question No. 96.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has brought us to the end of business for today and I move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 7th February, 1989 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the Sitting accordingly. 8.57 p.m.

CONTENTS

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3092

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday,
17th January, 1989..... 3090

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the
months of September and November 1988 as
prepared by the Accountant General..... 3090

PAPERS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 3090

The Annual Report of the Caribbean
, Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1987.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3090

Resolution to grant the sum of \$344,940 from
the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the
disposal of the Government to supplement the
Estimates 1988 - 89 Part I, Current as shown in
the Supplementary Estimates 1988 - 89 No. 14.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 3091

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3091

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE - RE

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN..3091

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3091

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF
COMMITTEE 3091

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3091; Hon. B. M. Taitt,
3091.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988 - 89
CURRENT No. 13 - \$9,170,235 3091

HEAD 10 GOVERNOR-GENERAL 3091

Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3091

HEAD 13 PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE 3092

HEAD 14 MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL
TRANSPORT, TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AND IMMIGRATION 3092

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3101; Hon. P. M. Greaves,
3092 ^094, 3103, 3106; Hon. H. deB. Forde,
3098, 3106; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3093, 3094,
3096; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 3095, 3098.

HEAD 39 MINISTRY OF EMPLOYMENT,.
LABOUR RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT 3106

Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3107, 3115; Hon. L. E.
Sandiford, 3109; Dr. E. A. Simmons, 3114;
Hon. N. K. Simmons, 3106, 3117; Mr. D. J. H.
Thompson, 3111.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1988 - 89 -
CAPITAL NO. 12 - \$5,654,322 3118

HEAD 84 MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND
WORKS 3118

Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3123, 3138; Dr. Hon. D. G.
Blackman, 3118, 3127, 3137, 3138; Mrs.
Barker-Welch, 3130; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 3134;
Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3136; Mr. D. A. C.
Simmons, 3121, 3127, 3128; Hon. N. K.
Simmons, 3131; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3125; Mr. D.
J.H.Thompson, 3132.

PARISH BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1989..... 3139

Hon. H. deB. Forde, 3143, 3145; Hon. P. M.
Greaves, 3139, 3147; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons,
3141; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3142, 3145.

FISCAL INCENTIVES (VALIDATION OF
BENEFITS) ACT, 1989 3148

Hon. E.E. Greaves, 3148.

QUESTION TIME 3149

QUESTION NO. 90

Hon. C.V.Walker, 3149.

QUESTION NO. 96

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 3149.

SUSPENSIONS 3106, 3127

ADJOURNMENT..... 3149

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BARKER-
WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph) BLACKMAN,
Dr. Hon. D. G. (St. Michael East) FORDE, Hon.
H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon.
E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St.
Michael North) PAYNE, His Hon. J. J. (St.
James North) SANDIFORD, Hon. L. E. (St.
Michael South) SIMMONS; Mr. D. A. C. (St.
Thomas) SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael
South East) SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James
South) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St Michael West)
THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John)
WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North)