

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 28, 1989

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, November 28, 1989.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P. (Speaker)
Rt. 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.
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, Minister of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration and Leader of the House)
Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P.(Edin.), (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, B.A., M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Legal Affairs and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.L.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)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc.(Econ.) ^Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)
Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.

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

Mr. R. P. BYER, LL.B.

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

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session. The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, November 21, 1989.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the Meeting held on Tuesday November 21, 1989 be taken as read and confirmed, Sir.

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

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$229 080 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1989-90 Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1989-90, No. 6.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$145 825 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1989-90 Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1989-90, No. 7.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$711 293 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1989-90, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1989-90, No. 8.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$2 700 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1989-90, Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1989-90, No. 9.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 18, Audit, Subhead 1, General Administration, Object No. 11.

A Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Head 73, Ministry of Finance, Subhead 4; and

A Bill to provide for the implementation by Barbados of the Agreement for the establishment of a regime for CARICOM Enterprises and for related matters.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, a Bill to provide for the implementation by Barbados of the Agreement for the establishment of a regime for CARICOM Enterprises and for related matters was read a first time.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, at the last Meeting of the House, it was agreed that a matter would be undertaken at this moment.

First let me apologize for not passing on the information to the Prime Minister. In fact, I only mentioned it to him as he took his seat here. It slipped me, as a matter of fact.

However, Sir, two or three weeks ago, Sir, the mother of the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs. Muriel Haynes, as is said, was called to the Great Beyond. The matter of death is always regrettable and especially of one who is associated with someone that we all know and have known for quite some time.

Mrs. Muriel Haynes was not very well known to me. I believe I met her probably on about two occasions. Therefore, Sir, I can only judge from the offspring that she has produced what indeed would be the character of the lady. Although not all offsprings are the same. But by and large, I would have to say, Sir, from all accounts it is clear that Mrs. Muriel Haynes was a God fearing woman, a devout Christian and clearly a good and caring mother. She was a Goring which is a well-known name I believe in St.

George, as I understand it and a family that has made a contribution not only to St. George but also to Barbados in a number of ways.

It would not have been easy, I have no doubt for Mrs. Haynes to have brought up her children in those days. I do not now recall how many children there were but there were at least 4 or 5 or maybe even more, Sir, and certainly that could not have been easy in those days. Fortunately for the most part, she had the support of her husband and when he passed away a couple of years ago, Sir, the children at that time were already well grown and adults.

It is my view that not enough recognition is given to family life in Barbados. I believe that any union that can last for about 50 years, as in fact I believe that the union between Mrs. Muriel Haynes and her husband did last should be a cause for some kind of recognition.

We all know that today marriages do not last very long. I believe that the union of Mrs. Muriel Haynes and her husband should be held up as an example for the rest of the community so that they can see what is possible. It should be a good example for others to follow⁷.

Mrs. Muriel Haynes' children have made some mark in this community. We have here with us the Leader of the Opposition, former Minister of Finance, an outstanding Physician in this country without doubt, Sir. There are other children of Mrs. Muriel Haynes who have done well and made a mark and are making a contribution to this country. In that respect, Sir, one can say that Mrs. Muriel Haynes has made a tremendous contribution to Barbados.

It is true that she lived to a ripe old age. She died I understand in the seventies and perhaps at that time she would already have made her full contribution. But it was a worthwhile contribution just the same.

We regret her passing and we would like to pass on to her son-owing relatives our condolences. May she rest in peace. 12.30p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did not know the late Mrs. Muriel Haynes, but I certainly knew two of her children, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition since our school days in the middle 50's when he was then known as "Pliny", the great Latin writer. He made the family proud by the winning of the Barbados Scholarship around 1956, 1957, and we were close friends when I was a student in London and he was a student in Edinburgh.

From all accounts, talking to persons at the funeral and during the period of mourning before the funeral, Mrs. Haynes seemed to have been a person who had made a tremendous contribution to the social life of St. George. I

am told that she was a very devout Christian and a lady of tremendous charm and wit.

The Leader of the Barbados Labour Party is out of the island today. He asked specially that his name be associated with the remarks. He tells me that he knew Mrs. Haynes and he regrets very much her passing.

We have no doubt, Sir, having regard to the offspring produced of that union which lasted, according to the Deputy Prime Minister, for almost 50 years or 50 years, that she did her life's work in a most satisfactory manner and in her I am sure that her God is well pleased.

On behalf of the Barbados Labour Party, we wish to tender our sincere condolences to the Haynes family and to say that we all deeply regret the passing of Mrs. Haynes.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, permit me to lend my opinion to these proceedings. I was born in St. George. I have spent all my life there except for the period of study overseas, and my district, Greens, where I was born and where I now still live is separated from the districts of Newbury and Workmans where the prominent St. George names of Haynes and Goring have their roots. There are just a couple of districts in between and the crossing is not that great, just a matter of two miles at the most. From the time I was a youngster the names of Haynes and Goring were always prominent in St. George.

As a youngster I myself knew of, although I was not particularly well acquainted with, Muriel Ilene Haynes, but for the time that I have known her and I have heard about her I have formed my own impressions. Of course, I will also have had a vicarious experience of that lady.

As we all know, she passed away in the early hours of Tuesday, October 31 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. At the time of her death she was 79 years old, just a matter of two months, I am told, short of her 80th birthday. Although she herself never sought nor welcomed public acclamation for anything she did, it is right and proper that as the representative of the constituency of St. George South, which as you all know is just an artificial division of the parish of St. George, I should say a few words on this occasion.

She was bom into a family, the Gorings, which has been in St. George for over 200 years and which has served that parish and the wider community in several fields of human endeavour, whether it be in the politics of local government, as Vestrymen, Churchwardens, Law Officers, Nurses, agriculture, construction, quarrying, teaching, business and certainly the list can go on. She herself in the late 20's and 30's ran from her parents' home a school training many young women in St. George in various types of handicraft and later, from my research I am told, she opened a fabric store through which she helped hundreds in

the parish. I believe that my mother and my aunt, who is a seamstress, would have benefited from this.

Though her family were the beneficiaries of the limited franchise at the time, she was one of those who participated in parish life and she was in the forefront demanding the vote for all adults and considering her closeness to politics, her son being Leader of the Opposition, I am certain that she maintained her interest in politics to the very end.

But these were not her essential interests. She presided over and ensured the continuity of the bonds that linked that large family, and each and every one depended on her for counsel and advice.

In the wider St. George community hundreds have benefited from her numerous acts of charity over half a century. Everyone felt comfortable with her and she always had the time to enquire into, and follow the progress of, the numerous families that she embraced, of course spanning over several generations.

Above all, Sir, she was a devout Christian, a pillar of the Christian Mission Church in St. George, and she addressed the needs of many. Certainly I know for a fact that her family, being a family of masons, for example, would have contributed towards the building of the Christian Mission Churches in St. George, certainly the one that serves the St. George Parish Church.

I believe, Sir, that her loss is a great loss for the parish of St. George. She placed her stamp on the several areas of development in that parish and she will be missed, not only by her immediate family and also the extended family, but by the entire St. George community. I know I saw several families from St. George represented at that funeral and that was a significant testimony to the fact that she was well loved and well respected by the wider St. George community, and even further. 12.40 p.m.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add a few words on behalf of Mrs. Muriel Haynes, better known to us as Maggie. I have known her all my life. Indeed she and her family were personal friends of my mother who was from the same district and my mother attended the same school, at some point they were in the same classes. They continued to maintain that relationship over all the years.

As I said she was a personal friend of mine. Unfortunately I was out of the country at the time and my mother made it a point to call me to notify me of her passing. I recall when the Leader of the Opposition was some eight years old she was very concerned about his trying to drive a truck, because one Mervin Clarke was

presumptuous enough to take care of her oldest son, as she used to say, at that time.

The last time I had the occasion to visit her, I had indeed promised her that I would have seen her within the last few months, and certainly I recall being on a plane with the Leader of the Opposition and he himself pointed out to me that she has asked for me and wanted to know when I was actually coming to see her again. I had promised him that I would have seen her after I returned from the recent business trip that I was on. Unfortunately that was not to be.

Both the family here in Barbados and the extended family which also lives together in the United States were always together. They shared the same home for a number of years. She was around longer than "Clipper" her husband, and indeed it was the name of Maggie Haynes that was always mentioned - Maggie Goring Haynes. It is true that in the family of the Gorings from which she came there was one uncle who was a vestryman living in St. Jude's and a businessman in St. Jude's, there was another uncle who was from, Airy Hill who also maintained a business on the site next to what used to be the old St. George Girls School. He was very well known for his famous voice in St. George's Parish Church, and there are several jokes to be heard in St. George North about Goring the vestryman and the singer and the pew, and I will not at this stage go into those jokes.

The rest of the family surrounding Maggie were the policeman and the mason. All of the Gorings were well known - Reggie and Clarence and all the others who had risen to heights within the Barbados Police Force, Sempra and all of them.

She was a devout Christian, always attended the Christian Mission Church about fifty yards away from the Workmans School. She lived in St. George from Workmans to Newbury, two locations in Newbury and at Hillbury, and at all times she was the lady that we knew from childhood, I would say, to be a very quiet, apparently unassuming lady, but one with a depth of personality, humility and concern for others.

I on behalf of the constituents of St. George North, - she was a constituent of mine - on behalf of all of my family would like to offer my condolences to the Haynes and Goring families. Thank you.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of this Honourable House of Assembly in paying tribute to the life, the work and the commitment of Mrs. Muriel Haynes, who has passed to the Great Beyond. No one can really know the intense pain and grief that the passing of the sojourners on this earth may have on those who remain. For me the life and the times and the passing of Mrs. Haynes is one of deep personal regret and sorrow.

Apart from the Leader of the Opposition and, perhaps, the Honourable Member for St. George North who has just spoken, I do not think there is anyone else in this Honourable Chamber who knew Mrs. Haynes as well or as intimately as I did.

Her son, the Leader of the Opposition, and I were very good friends. I would wish to speak in the present tense also and would believe that on a personal level a friendly relationship may still exist. Certainly I have no personal cause, except for the general, no personal cause to spurn him. At a personal level I have no animosity towards him, and it is because in our youth as adolescents we shared many a moment of enjoyment, many a moment of intellectual jousting, many a moment of exploring the various crannies and avenues that life holds out for those at that stage of life. We had a very close personal relationship and at the end of it all, day or night, morning or afternoon, ^ whenever I visited the family home at Newbury in St. George, there was always a welcoming carpet for me and a warmth as to a son returning home. 12.50p.m.

I cannot say that on all occasions the greeting on the return of the natural son was as warm as I received because on many occasions he would have been returning home long after he was supposed to be at home but always mother was there with warmth, with love and with ** affection.

We have sat at the table for a drink or to share a meal or just to have a conversation about life and about the changing scenes of life and always there was a serenity, a contentment, and a faith that pervaded the life of the good and dear lady.

I think that it is of that kind of stuff that the backbone of Barbados is made.

I believe that there are those mothers who have made something out of very little in terms of material resources who have been able in good Bajan language to cut and contrive and to raise a sizeable family with dignity and in respect and to pass on those kinds of precepts which have enabled each one of them to launch out on their own separate careers and themselves to make a contribution both to community life as well as to national life and, indeed, to life in other countries as far away as Africa.

I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my deep sorrow at the passing of a lady who did not seek the limelight but who sought in her own quiet way to do what she perceived was right, who sought at all times to be a peace-maker and who, in spite of whatever political difficulties developed between myself and the Leader of the Opposition at all times stretched out a welcoming hand, a yearning heart and a healing touch to me and to the _m relationship which I have had with that family.

I believe that she has ascended to the heights of Heaven because the elements were so combined in her as to make her of that ethereal stuff and I believe that her legacy to her community and to this country is the legacy of commitment to the fashioning and moulding of the lives and character not only of her children but of all of those who came into contact with her. I have benefitted tremendously from that.

I have learnt many a religious precept from her - some of these bypassed my friend - and I believe, nevertheless, that the essence of her philosophy of life, love, sharing and caring, are precepts which this country can do with a greater measure.

I join with my friend and colleague and with the surviving members of the family, a family that has known sorrow and has known tragedy, with all of them in this moment of their sorrow. But, at the same time, in good Christian spirit. I know that there is always hope for those who have faith in their maker.

Mr. SPEAKER: On my own behalf, I would like to associate myself with the comments and remarks made on the late Muriel Haynes. I like many of you have not had the privilege as the Honourable Prime Minister to be associated with her in the way in which he has benefitted so that we could be the beneficiaries of the kind of life she lived.

My association or closest association with that family was very short. In my very early life the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself entered Combermere School in the same form and we continued thereafter for a few years.

I had no doubt that he was from a family that would encourage one to develop not only in the educational sense but, I believe, in the overall development of a person who could in future life make a worthwhile contribution to this country. We all would have hoped that the late Mrs. Haynes would have achieved her birthday which was about two months to come. Nonetheless, that has not, in any way, taken away from her the contribution she has made and one noted on the evening of her interment the number of people who were able to say "Well done thou good and faithful servant." 1.00p.m.

I shall, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition responds, ask that we observe one minute of silence in the passing of this Motion of Condolence to the family and on my own behalf I want to express my sincere condolences to the family.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this Chamber for some 11½ years and it is perhaps the first occasion that I have found myself in a little genuine difficulty to find words.

From time to time one elects to remain silent or to speak in garbled terms but on this occasion I must say that I do have a genuine difficulty. That difficulty arises, Sir, from the almost extraordinary difficulty that one has in coping with the death of one's mother. I guess this is an experience that most of us have to face or have faced. But I can assure you that it is the kind of body blow that leaves its bruises for a long time.

However, Sir, I think that one is indeed heartened by many of the kind words that one would have heard today. The Honourable Member for St. George North has been a close friend of the family, certainly for my entire life, and I would imagine for his entire life, and would be fully aware of all of the parameters of what was said. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas on behalf of himself, his party and the Leader of the Opposition has been very kind indeed and the Honourable Member for St. George South has also been very helpful in his comments in dealing with this matter.

But however, Sir, I must reserve pride of place for the Honourable Member for St. Michael North, the Leader of the House who took this opportunity to introduce this matter before the House. I am very grateful to him for his kind remarks and his support during the immediate period of bereavement.

Of ever greater pride of place, I think I must give precedence to the remarks by my lifetime friend and colleague the Honourable Member for St. Michael South. Our friendship shall endure. It shall not suffer because of the requirements of public office. We both have our public duties to perform in the light of what we perceive to be in the best interest of the country and I think we are old enough to understand that.

But there are those many moments, stretching from St. George through various avenues of Bridgetown on to the St. James coast, at various times within 24 hours, sitting, standing, leaping, lying from time to time that one will always remember. It is also a matter of interest that my mother always regarded him as a son. And indeed referred to him in such terms, I think up to the day before she died.

It is important, Sir, that we recognize the role that such persons have played in generating all sorts of positive influences in the community and I am sure that the influences of our combined families will ensure that those things which in the long run might well be more important than temporary differences that they shall endure.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank you for your very • md remarks and I wish to thank everybody, and at this point I take my seat. As I said in the beginning I was at a loss for words and I still remain at such a loss.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please stand.

The House stood in silence for one minute.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 106 is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the Order of the Day

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving now the suspension of the following Standing Orders: Standing Orders Nos. 6,16,18,20,42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the days sitting was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY THE CROWN OF PARCELS OF LAND TO FACILITATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL URBAN LOW INCOME HOUSING PROJECT

Order No. 3 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Thomas Gap, President Kennedy Drive, St. Michael for the purpose of the implementation of the National Urban Low Income Housing Project.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Housing, I beg to move the passing of this Resolution.

As one would see, there are 8 Schedules indicating that there are 8 parcels of land which are intended to be acquired from sundry owners for the purpose of advancing the work of the National Housing Corporation. Specifically on this occasion, Sir, it is a project which is called the National Urban Low Income Housing Project. 1.10p.m.

Let me say at the outset that this area of land I understand comprises some 6725.7 square metres and already there is a number of houses on that land in varying degrees of habitable use. Some I understand are substantial, are solid, and a considerable number are not. I understand that there are already about 50 houses on that particular

land and this land will form the first phase of this particular project.

The intention is, if the negotiations already commenced with the Anglican Church are successfully concluded, to acquire lands that comprise the St. Leonard's Church area. If those negotiations are carried to a successful conclusion, then that additional area of land not forming part of this Resolution will be used for the construction of some houses. In this case, Sir, the area of land now to be acquired is not for the construction of houses but is for certain services to be put in and to uplift and improve the standard of housing in that particular area.

This is only the beginning of the drive to improve housing in the urban areas. There are other areas that have also been identified, not necessarily urban, but it depends on what one understands by the word "urban". However, I understand that places like Rices in St. Philip - I do not know whether that is urban or not, Sir, it depends on your interpretation - Valery is another such place. As a matter of fact, work has commenced in both Rices and Valery and I understand that that work will be completed by the middle of next month. I see the Leader of the Opposition taking notes. I hope he does not take the credit as he is taking the notes. This is the work of the Housing Corporation and the Minister of Housing will take the credit, they having identified the area and commenced the work.

There are other areas that have also been earmarked for work of this kind. The areas, as I understand it, include Well Gap in Cave Hill, which will be a joint project with the Ministry of Transport and Works. I understand that the work in Thomas Gap will commence probably and very likely in the month of January. Let me repeat, Sir, that the area we are being asked to acquire will provide for 50 houses as well as 10 house spots for relocation of houses from within the project area, because the establishment of roadways, drains and footpaths might bring about some kind of dislocation and it is intended that the houses so affected will be relocated within the same area.

I believe, Sir, that this is one of the many worthwhile projects of the Government and I commend it to this Honourable House and move the passing of this Resolution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in rising to second this Resolution I do so with a great deal of happiness and pride that the Resolution has reached the House and that we are this farther along in bringing this particular project to that area of the constituency which I have had the honour to represent for the last few number of years.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is, relatively speaking, Sir. I am being told "a long time", but relatively speaking, and for a

man of my tender age the number of years I have served is still relatively few.

The area is that area on President Kennedy Drive as one heads from Bridgetown towards Eagle Hall, immediately after the St. Leonard's Church and where the late Joe Brome has his dwelling place. There is a small area of land that formerly used to be part of Thomas Gap before the President Kennedy Road was constructed. Thomas Gap, you will remember, was one of the landmarks of the Westbury Road area, and many are the important Barbadians who came from the Thomas Gap area.

It is the first time for a very long time that anything has been done in the constituency after the Democratic Labour Party became elected to the Government. After we were re-elected in 1986 the Government, recognising that this constituency and some of the other surrounding constituencies, like St. Michael North West, Mr. Speaker, one with which you are very familiar, Sir, and St. Michael Central, which although being within a radius of two miles from the centre of Bridgetown had the level of poverty, and therefore the quality of life, for a large number of people which was, and in some cases continues to be, so low as to degrade the normal standard associated with this country of ours called Barbados. These are the people who have made significant contributions to the upliftment of Bridgetown and its environs.

These areas include the places where the people who worked in the Port and who worked in the stores in Bridgetown, and who originally worked in the plantations surrounding the Bridgetown area. All of these areas used to be plantations. The people therefore lived on tenancies of plantations which subsequently were divided into little plots. Anyone who is familiar with Passage Gardens, Bank Hall, Fields Land, Richmond Gap and Thomas Gap and those areas will know that although we are within a stone's throw of Bridgetown, the conditions which exist in tenancies still exist in many of these areas, and so the decision to bring a quality of life through the facilities that are provided to these areas is something for which credit can be taken but which, as I have said from the floor of this House on many occasions, is long overdue. 1.20p.m.

I recall going with my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Michael East when he was a Minister in the other administration throughout this constituency and looking at the roads, and I had occasion to praise him and will do it again, Sir, when I indicate that in the context of uplifting that whole area stretching from Black Rock all the way across to Harmony Hall and beyond - where all of the roads have now finally been put beyond the issue of a political football - the roads are now brought to a level and quality that is in keeping with the standard of life that these people have a right to expect.

A little pocket in my constituency and another little area across from it in what is called Fields Land and First Avenue Richmond Gap and Second Avenue Richmond Gap are pockets which have not been able to benefit from the policy for road building and road repairs which has permeated the city and the surrounding constituencies including my own. The people who live in these area are grateful for the attitude which the Government has displayed and which suggests that all the roads in all of Barbados should be upgraded as quickly as possible. This area because of its configuration was not susceptible to that kind of approach, and so it falls now within the low cost urban development scheme. This first part of the programme will upgrade vehicular access and the improvement of footpath access with the associated drainage, water supply and electricity improvements. Fifty lots will be defined to accommodate the dwelling units with ten lots being used for housing relocation, because anyone who knows these areas knows that the houses are cheek by jowl, and it would be necessary to realign and rearrange them. It is proposed to build four core units and to make home improvement financing available.

All of the home owners in the area have had discussions over the last few months with officials from the Ministry of Housing, the National Housing Corporation, the representative and other necessary people with a view to ensuring that they will have the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, some of them had started wondering and had voiced their views that the matter would not be dealt with expeditiously. I have been at some pains - I have had to write my colleague, the Minister of Housing, two or three letters reminding him that these constituents were waiting, but it was the process which the governmental system requires that these things must go through before we get to the stage that we have reached today.

The total cost of this project, the site, is approximately \$670 000. Approximately \$200 000 represent infrastructural development cost, and \$10 000 will represent relocation costs. The estimate land acquisition cost is relatively small, and it is shared by four or five land owners. The Government expects to recover some \$453 000 from the beneficiaries through direct cash payments, and that figure of course will not include the relocation cost and the cost any utilities for which householders had already paid. We will have for the first time roads in the Thomas Gap area roads that vehicles can go into. We will have the spider legs, as we call them, consolidated into a single four or six inch water pipe - in that particular project they may use a four inch, but it does not matter - and they will now have the kind of water installation and the kind of electricity installation and the alignment of the housing area so that those people who now own their plots, (they will be allowed to own their plots) can get on with the business of home improvement.

There are at least three generations of families in that small area. It is a compact area. It is one where the overriding relationship is one of love, and it is an area which, because of its fierce attachment one family to the other, got the nickname of Viet Nam. The huts and the houses in that area were put together in many ways like some of the huts one saw on the television in Viet Nam and I believe that is why the people themselves - it is not a pejorative term - designated the area Viet Nam.

To say that I am pleased that we have reached this stage is, to put it mildly, an understatement. We hope that it will not be long before conclusions are reached between the St. Leonards Church - and here I declare an interest, Sir, because I serve in that government as well - and the Government, and I find myself sometimes having to weigh the relative merits of the Government's position on the secular side and the Government's position on the spiritual side. Mr. friend, the Minister of Education who finds himself in a similar position *vis-a-vis* his church, is smiling because we have difficulties. If you sit on the parochial council or in the synod and you are called upon to make decisions concerning Government's acquisition and there is a feeling that the Government might be a little heavy handed in its approach, you find yourself having to take one position or the other; but I believe that negotiations are proceeding so that there will be an additional acre of land to allow for some additional house spots, and to provide a much needed relief for some of the people who live in that constituency.

We have no open land whatsoever in St. Michael West except for Passage Gardens which at one point, as I had heard from my friend from St. Peter, they were thinking of removing from us. My friend from St. Peter had informed me, properly so, that along with some damage which they had planned to do to him they would have moved Passage Gardens, but we have been able to retain that open area in Passage Gardens. The pavilion is being built. We have been able to retain that open area in the constituency, and the pavilion will soon be completed, I am told. The Minister responsible for Sports has informed me that it will not be long before we are able to occupy the pavilion, and this is the last Independence that we will, not have our own pavilion and sports complex that we, too, like all the other constituencies will be able to have national sports away from the school.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would this be all part of this development?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir. It is right behind it, Sir. In fact, these persons from this area will find their recreation immediately across the street in that compound. That is the only reason I mention it, Sir, as I think of their psychological development and I think of the need for their physical growth and I realise that they will be able to use the recreational area. But the point I am making is that one

of the densest populated areas in Barbados can be found along that strip that runs in a line from Carrington Village right across to Deacons Roads. You can find, if you take all of those neighbourhoods as you head north and go through Bridge Gap and move towards Deacons Road and towards the round-about, you have among the densest populated areas of Barbados, and it is very necessary therefore that any Government should pay special attention to the physical arrangements in these areas. 1.30p.m.

I recall, Sir, when the then Town Planner had to go with me into Westbury Road to see exactly what the difficulty was because somebody had sat down and worked out the size of a plot and decided that that was going to be the size of a plot and if your size was too small then you had to move and when I drew to his attention that using those kinds of criteria everybody would have to move because when earlier arrangements had been made, as has been the case in places like Alkins, the size of the lot used to be 800 sq. ft. to 1 000 sq. ft.

The concept of 2 500 sq. ft was not a concept that was familiar to the old Vestry system and one of the reasons why Local Government proved inefficient in the administration of the Greater Bridgetown area was precisely the lack of across the board planning which would have allowed for some uniformity in the development of the area.

Commonsense has prevailed and we have been able to straighten up and tidy up some of the areas. This, in a sense, is a continuation of that attitude where we are, using commonsense, using modern techniques, modern approaches but allowing the plots to conform to the tradition which has been established by these neighbourhoods.

One of the major differences and I think it is a fundamental requirement for Barbados, between these neighbourhoods which we are seeking to preserve and the new neighbourhoods that have come with the modern housing is that they are, in fact, neighbourhoods.

People who live in the various neighbourhoods whether it is Carrington Village, whether it is Fairfield, Black Rock, or Thomas Gap or one of these areas, the people who live in these areas are, to pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker, neighbours. These are people who know one another, who feel for one another, who understand one another's problems and who, therefore, form what we call a community and who are the backbone of the community that makes Barbados so special and so different from almost anywhere else in the world and it is incumbent upon us as decision makers to preserve that Barbadianness while giving those people the opportunity, whether it is in the New Orleans, or Lightfoot Lane, or Thomas Gap, or Richmond Gap, giving those Barbadians the opportunity to

taste of a higher quality of life without having to remove themselves from their ancestral and traditional homes and homesteads.

I believe that these kinds of projects are as crucial to the development of Barbados as the massive projects which we from time to time come to this House and agree to and so, Sir, it is a distinct pleasure for me to be party to this and I am grateful to the Minister of Housing and to the Government generally for their attitude in these matters. I wish to give the assurance from the floor of this House to the constituents who live in that area and whom I do not now seek to canvas, Sir, but whom I talk of as my friends, and the people whom I have known all my life and who I expect to know for most of the rest of my life, I speak and say to them that good things are on their way and I say also for them to the Government, "Thank you for remembering this constituency." The combination of the new roads and the new alignment and the recreation area will constitute more work having been done in that and surrounding areas in the short period of three years than had been done in the previous 40 years.

In the previous 40 years I encompass all the Governments that have gone before. I am not being partisan. I am saying that for 40 years the people in these constituencies had extreme difficulty, in New Orleans and the whole of - Sorry, I will not list the names, Sir. I will stay with Thomas Gap but all of the areas like Thomas Gap had tremendous difficulty.

You know what it is for a woman to be going to church at All Souls' Church and having to step out on a Sunday morning into a pool of water in the 1980's and she lives in Thomas Gap?

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes. The people from Thomas Gap go to All Souls'. Some go to St. Leonard's but they go to All Souls'. They go to St. Stephen's. Some go to the Cathedral or they used to go to the Cathedral and they choose the church. They go to St. Mary's. It is a free church. They have churches in all directions; but the point is that when they step out on a Sunday morning no matter where they live, if the rain fell, they used to step in water - two miles from Bridgetown.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for the City is a man who understands. The Honourable member understands these things and what he is suggesting to me *sotto voce* is the kind of thing I would have suggested to him if I were over there. I have no quarrel with that but leave it to Jesus, Sir. One day we are going to be able to convert him again. We are going to be able to bring him into the arms of the

Sir, I am very grateful to the Government for what it is doing and I am very happy to second this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, that is the longest bit of seconding of a Resolution that I have heard for a long time and I trust the Honourable Member would appreciate that he has already spoken now in the process of seconding.

Sir, I want to raise a few issues relating to acquisitions of this nature. I am a little concerned, Sir, that these piecemeal acquisitions - and I think in this instance it is just over an acre and a half of land - that come before the House from time to time, are without any clear vision, certainly of parliamentarians, as to the overall plan of Government in respect of the housing of this nation within a given framework.

From time to time in the past there was some kind of a convention that when acquisitions of this kind come before Parliament that one would be given some idea of the cost of these acquisitions.

We heard today of the amount of money that Government hopes to recover but we have not been told what would be the cost of the acquisition and from time to time the courtesy of a map is made available.

In fact, I distinctly recall the Honourable Member for St. Michael North when he was in the opposition almost always when he spoke on these matters insisted on having a plot made available to him.

Sir, we on this side, and I notice recently that there has been some clarification of our status in the political spectrum of Barbados when the Honourable Member for St. Michael East openly declared that we are not a damned party.

We are not condemned to damnation, that we are a party on the move. We are an upward party and I thank him very much for making that contribution in the upliftment in the fortunes of the party. I believe, Sir, that there was some misunderstanding of the Press and "damn" was reported and not "damned." 1.40p.m.

So I take this opportunity, Sir, to point out...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I heard damned. That is what I heard. Sir, we seriously believe that housing is critical to the development of this country. We believe it is important from the point of view of the development of the family, the development of our communities, from the point of view of health development, educational development, employment generation, generating a wide range of investment security opportunities for the people of Barbados and opportunity

for savings. It certainly represents a fundamental prop for democracy in Barbados and for the participation of the people of Barbados in some form of savings and investment for the enhancement of themselves and their families and their communities. And therefore we regard housing as being one of the number one economic and social priorities for the development of this country.

We would like to see a comprehensive plan to provide house spots which are so much in demand throughout this country for those in need of those house spots. And we would also like to see a comprehensive plan for the various forms of housing in Barbados. Otherwise if we continue with this kind of piecemeal approach, nobody in the long run knows what is happening.

I want, Sir, to focus specifically on the point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West where he spent a long time during his speech pointing out that these various areas in St. Michael represent culturally knitted communities and that any kind of development within these communities should take into consideration that factor. As an example, Sir, Valerie in St. Michael South Central was owned by one of the traditional families in Barbados for many years. Around that family, a lot of cricketing skills were developed under the tutelage of one of the outstanding cricketers in Barbados who owned Valerie. He who himself made the lands available, as tenantry lands, to a large number of people living in Brittons Hill who had given a commitment to the people of Brittons Hill that that area would be for them and for their future development. A major church in Barbados sought to acquire that property and also gave a commitment on my intervention, to preserve the playing field and preserve the land, the land that they did not need, for the people of Brittons Hill. After that the land was acquired by the Government of Barbados and in the Manifesto of the present Government, various commitments were made in relation to Valerie.

The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Sports, the Honourable Minister of Housing and I, when I was Minister of Finance, visited that area and the promises in respect of the playing field were honoured - those, Sir, in respect of the development of the Valerie area. I should like an assurance that a matter which is now worrying the people of Britton's Hill, and I am not only talking of those from St. Michael South Central, those from St. Michael South as well be addressed: That those house spots and that development would conform with the principles outlined by the Honourable Minister of Health in his contribution, that is, maintaining the integrity of the community, Sir, as part of a justification for this kind of expenditure.

I do not see this expenditure purely in terms of land and rocks and mortar. I see this kind of expenditure in terms of community building and I hope that no kind of influences would be brought on the allocation of those houses and house spots in that area which might disrupt the

overall objective of healthy family and community development.

I think that the money is worthwhile once it goes towards healthy family and community development, the kind of expenditure. The kind of thing which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West very ably talked about when he spoke in respect of his constituency. But I am quite sure he might be in a position because he may know that the beneficiaries of that development would be those who live there and those whose community development would be fostered.

I know the tremendous concern in the Britton's Hill area and I think that it would be wrong to allow extraneous considerations to disrupt what could be a potentially great project for the people of Brittons Hill who have suffered so much in the past by losing open lands and so on to various forms of development.

Sir, when I speak of the need for a comprehensive programme for housing development in Barbados, I believe that if there is any legacy that legislators of this period can leave to the future of Barbados, it is one of transforming the housing of this country.

I am concerned and I must be concerned that projects of this nature will be frustrated by the present interest rates regime in this country. It must be. The banks have no money to lend. The mortgage rate is so structured at the moment that the banks cannot lend, even if they had money to lend. One month deposits are today attracting interest rates at the level of about 8%, 9%; larger deposits 10%. It means, Sir, that a bank cannot borrow short and lend long. Borrow at an interest rate that is approximately the same as the mortgage rate or higher than the mortgage rate and all that is going to happen is that mortgage money will not be available. Many of the housing projects, including this one will be seriously compromised unless there is some adjustment, some "look and see" as to what is happening in relation to mortgage financing in Barbados.

If you ask the banks to borrow short at 8%, 9%, 10% and lend at the prevailing rates, you are really asking for bankruptcy in the banks. That is what has happened, Sir, to the Savings and Loans Society in the United States, where for a long period, because of the interest rates regime they had to borrow money short at high interest rates and lend out at lower rates than they can command from mortgages.

I am not advocating any increase in mortgage rates. What I am advocating is a reduction in interest rates.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I would prefer the Honourable Member to do, even though he ventures into those areas is not to have an extended debate. I would prefer you to stick closer to the Resolution in relation to the matters you are raising.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Absolutely, Sir. This capital investment, for a sum I do not know but it is Bridgetown property which I suspect will be fairly substantial in terms of outlay can only be justified if at the other end there are houses which the people of Barbados can afford. I think that we all understand this - and which the Government itself can afford, Sir. Because do not forget the cost of this project would be substantially compounded by the fact that the Government itself has to pay more for money. The Treasury Bill rate will rise. Government's investment, Sir, would be compromised to the extent of the cost of money to those projects which put money in the Consolidated Fund. 1.50p.m.

The Government will have to look for another ten to \$15 million in one year to accommodate the 31% cost of debt imposed on the people of Barbados by my good friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, in the last two years. A 31% increase in the cost of the money you have borrowed, that is what a 3% increase in interest means.

Now, Sir, to get back to the other point I am trying to make. There will be no new mortgages, no money, and I do not know how this project is going to come to fruition unless we have this kind of thing available to us. Mercifully, Sir, I do not know whether or not the source of funding might be the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company, because that may be the only one that would be able to attract deposits, probably from the NIS, at a rate that would permit it to continue on-lending. But on the other hand, Sir, the NIS money has all been spent by the Government, so I do not know if the Government intended to get financing from this through the only source that I see on a financially viable basis would be able to deal with mortgages at the previous rate of disbursement. That institution would be the only institution that will be able to get the NIS funds; but alas, Sir, the money is not going to be there, because the Honourable Minister of Finance has found it necessary to utilise National Insurance funds at a rate unprecedented to finance other forms of expenditure.

I think that this is the kind of project where the savings of the people of Barbados collectively, the savings of the people in that area who are working, should be « channelled into this kind of long term development in order that this particular Resolution before us for the acquisition of this land and the building of homes for the purpose expressed might be fully....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution specifically states what it is dealing with.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you are bearing that in mind.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But, Mr. Speaker, I could not support the acquisition of land just for the sake of acquisition of land. It has to be for a purpose, and the purpose has been clearly expressed in the presentation of the Honourable Leader of the House. Whereas he has been rather lax, in my view, in not telling us the cost of the land, or providing us with a map, he has not been negligent in saying what the purpose of acquiring the land was, and I must say that.

So, Sir, I believe there will be a lot more that I will have to say in due course on this question of housing, particularly low income housing, but I think that we need seriously to take an overall view of public sector policy to housing, the overall environment in which housing development can take place, bearing in mind the overriding and overall consideration is that there is absolutely nothing that you can do for the Barbados of today and the Barbados that we anticipate would exist between now and the turn of the century, other than to make sure that we have a renewal of the housing stock of that section of the housing stock that needs renewal.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Resolution before the House calls on the House to approve lands to facilitate the implementation of the National Urban Low Income Project. Indeed, Sir, I am very glad that this Resolution has come before the House and that the question of the National Urban Low Income Housing Project is again a matter of national concern.

This matter was introduced today by the Leader of the House, who himself was a former Minister of Housing, but who spoke as if he was only a former Minister of Housing and knew nothing whatsoever about this project. The Member for St. Michael West spoke in strong support of the project because it is a project that is benefiting his constituency. I am very sad that the substantive Minister of Housing is not here, because this project raises a large number of considerations, some of which seem to entirely escape the knowledge of the Members of the Government side, particularly the Leader of Government Business and a former Minister of Housing.

When last this matter came to the House, Sir, it was the World Bank Urban Low Income Housing Project. It came to the House in 1982 as a companion piece, if I must tell the House, of the Housing Credit Fund which was established in the early 1980's by the Barbados Labour Party to provide a source of financing for the development of the housing stock on the part of low income persons in this country and to also provide a source of financing for those persons whose incomes allowed them to be classed as low income persons to get funds for home improvements.

This project, Sir, was a companion piece - and I say this for the benefit of the Leader of the House and the Member for St. Michael West - of the Housing Credit Fund and it formed an integral part.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member will give way on a point of elucidation, the only reason one did not refer to that matter is that one was following the rules of the House that you cannot refer to a debate that has already taken place in the same Session. That is all one was doing, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not referring to the debate. A lot has been said about this project and one would get the mistaken impression that this is a Democratic Labour Party project. We are hearing that this is the first phase of a project, but there is a lot more to this project than has been spoken of by the Government side.

This project was a companion piece of the Housing Credit Fund. It formed part and parcel of a comprehensive approach by the Barbados Labour Party not only to finance housing construction and home improvements for the benefit of low income persons but, as this project was conceived, to provide a financial mechanism by which serviced lots could have been created in various urban centres in Barbados so that the urban part of Barbados could be transformed in much the same way as we wanted to transform the plantation tenancies of this country.

It has been frustrated by the Democratic Labour Party. Indeed, Sir, this is a project for which World Bank financing was previously secured, but World Bank financing has been lost for this project precisely because the Minister of Housing and Lands and the Cabinet of this country have so completely changed the character of this project that the World Bank withdrew financing from this particular enterprise.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That is a fact. Check the Accountant General's Report. World Bank financing was withdrawn from the project. One may reasonably wonder how it could be that Rices, St. Philip could form part.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member is giving the impression that the World Bank withdrew financing and I am stating that that is not so. The Honourable Member has to give the House information to demonstrate such if he is going to say the World Bank has withdrawn financing from this project. That is not so. This project is being financed under the World Bank. 2.00 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health does not know what he is talking about. When this project came to the House previously, the Minister of Housing then told us that the World Bank had withdrawn financing from this project.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, but he told you that he told him that they had withdrawn it and he told him why.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two Honourable Members on their feet. Order please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member just said that....

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

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: A point of order on a point of order. What is the House coming to, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will make the ruling myself.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am saying that the World Bank did not withdraw anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two Honourable Members on their feet.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has spoken. I cannot speak with two Honourable Members on their feet, so both will sit. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West made a speech and he is entitled to make as many points of order as he wants to make. If he had not spoken, then most likely that may have been relevant, but he has made his speech and he wants to rise on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, out of an abundance of clarification - I said the Honourable Member was misleading the House because he said that the World Bank withdrew. There is a difference between the World Bank withdrawing and the Government deciding that it did not wish to have something financed by the World Bank. That is exactly what happened. He is saying the World Bank withdrew, and you know the context in which you say that the World Bank withdrew, it means that the World Bank got angry and withdrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the important point is that this was a project which was conceived of as part and parcel of a comprehensive approach by the Barbados Labour Party to addressing the housing needs of low

income people in this country. The Democratic Labour Party came into office and they completely revamped and destroyed the whole meaning of this project to the stage where we now find Rices, St. Philip, forming part of an urban low income project. It is no wonder that no international institution would put funds in support of this particular type of initiative. There are other means by which districts such as Rices could receive support, but by what criteria do you get Rices in St Philip.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, the information which is being given to the House will mislead the House. The World Bank required and wanted us under what he is saying to raise the rents to an unconscionable level. The Honourable Member was Minister of Finance at the time, and we refused to cause this social upheaval by raising rents.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, the Honourable Member is saying I was Minister of Finance at the time of something. I was not Minister of Finance.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this project has been completely reconstructed by the Democratic Labour Party along lines that could not satisfy an international lending institution that it was a project worthy of their support. The Government, Sir, in 1989 should be ashamed to come to this House and speak in terms of their now starting the first phase of this project. This project has a long history. In 1987-88 a sum of \$2.5 million was voted by this House to support this project. Nothing happened, but they would pride themselves on platforms and wherever else about how much they love poor black people, but this House in 1987-88 voted \$2.5 million to support this project and nothing happened. Last year, Mr. Speaker, this House voted \$1.9 million to support the national urban low income housing project, but this party that loves poor black people, and there are only poor black people living in urban tenancies, how much did they spend of the money that they ask a responsible Parliament to vote? Of the \$1.9 million that was voted last year ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask Honourable Members to desist from interrupting the Honourable Member.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Of the \$1.9 million that was voted last year, the Democratic Labour Party spent less than half. They spent according to the Accountant General's report only \$719 000; and what is significant, Mr. Speaker, is that even though the Government has not yet started to do any serious work on this particular project, the amount that this Government is asking us to commit by way of resources to low income housing in the urban areas has dropped each year. In 1987 it was \$2.5 million, last year it was \$1.9 million and this year all they have asked for is \$850 000. Can we regard this as a Government that is

serious about improving the lot of the poor black people in the urban areas in Barbados, Mr. Speaker? Can we regard them as being serious when they would go and include in the project to help the people in the urban areas of Barbados a district in St. Philip which can only be described as urban by the use of the widest stretch of the imagination? But this is how the Democratic Labour Party operates. There were different programmes under the Ministry of Housing and Lands by which rural tenancies could be dealt with, but this is symptomatic of the kind of pork barrel approach that has become so much a hallmark of the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party, that the Minister of Housing and Lands himself frustrated this project by insisting that unless a part of his constituency was included the project could not spin, and the reason why this project has gone nowhere....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Honourable Member has just made a statement of which he has no knowledge. In fact what he has said is not true. It is false. He said that the Minister of Housing and Lands frustrated the project because part of his constituency was not in the project. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. That is entirely false. He said we are including a part of it in the project; he never said that the project would not go ahead unless part of his constituency was not part of it. It is not true.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I started up by saying that this project started as a Barbados Labour Party project, a companion piece to the housing credit fund. I was very familiar, Sir, with the planning of this project. When this project was conceived, Rices, St. Philip was not a part of the project. But the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker, went out of his way to make sure that a rural community which he represents forms part of a project that was intended to benefit the urban parts of Barbados, and it only could have been included in that particular project on the basis of the pursuit of the kind of pork barrel approach to politics that has become the hallmark of that particular party.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, by the decline in its commitment through the budget to this project is showing itself once again to be a party very long on its rhetoric where the poor black people of this country are concerned, but very short on performance. It is a disgrace, Sir, that this project of which the Honourable Member for St. Michael has spoken so very strongly in terms of its intrinsic value, should have stayed at this stage for four years, even though funds have been secured and put down. 2.10p.m.

Detailed planning work had been done from as early as 1983/84. Most of the planning problems surrounding this project had been put out of the way and it is a disgrace that four years has elapsed now before this project can be brought to the first phase of its implementation. It is a sad thing and one wants, Mr. Speaker, to ask again, in what

precise ways is this project of today different from the project which was conceived? One only hears contingently that certain districts now have been included. We hear now about Rices being included.

We want to know, Sir, what is the status of the urban low-income projects that existed? In what precise ways is the project of today different from the project as conceived?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that the Government no longer has access to World Bank financing for the project, Sir, and that this project now has to come entirely out of Government's resources, I would also want to enquire if by reason of the loss of funding the project has in anyway to be reduced in scale and what would be the implications of the project being reduced?

It is important that the Government recognize that its own commitment to this project has been shrinking over the course of the last three years. It must say to the Members on the other side that in so far as Government now does not have a large pool of funds to spend through the World Bank facility and it has to rely only on its own cash flow, that this type of project which has so much tremendous intrinsic worth in improving the lot of poor people in this country could be made a victim of Government's own cash flow problems.

It starts and it stops depending on whether Government has the cash flow resources to commit to it and it has gone nowhere precisely because of that particular stance and I am asking, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to say whether the loss of World Bank financing for this project has, in any way, led to any changes in the scale of the project as conceived because the project now has to be carried entirely from Government's own resources.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You spoke in here today, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South said...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed Members to speak and it is for myself to determine whether that speech is made within the confines of the rules. If you are referring to the Honourable Member's speech I would prefer you to say the Honourable Member rather than "he".

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West spoke today about this project and he drew reference to its worth. We on this side are anxious to support the project, not so much because we conceived it but because we also recognize its worth.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of elucidation since the Honourable Member is referring to me.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am not giving way on a point of elucidation.

We recognize its worth, Sir.

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

The Honourable Member is misleading-the House. He understands my reference to this project in terms of a World Bank loan. I was dealing with the intrinsic value of the work that is going to be done. I was not suffering from projectivitis which means that once it is identified as a project by the World Bank that it cannot be changed in World Bank terms. There is nothing immutable about something that is conceived by five men from Washington. I was dealing with Thomas Gap, not Washington,

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point I am trying to make is that the Barbados Labour Party conceived of this project, despite what you would hear from the political hermaphrodites in the Democratic Labour Party who are here today and there tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your language is creating a difficulty for me because if you are saying that they are here and we are in the Chamber..

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I say here today and gone tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only deal with the Chamber. I can only deal with the language in reference to the Chamber so I would think the Honourable Member should be very clear in how he is making that reference and I am tempted to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, we in the Barbados Labour Party have a lot of feelings and we hear a lot in this country about how we do not like black people and it is a disgrace.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Not me. I speak on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party so when you are going to curse the Barbados Labour Party you are cursing all of us.

You do not mean me? Do not make an exception of me.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member for St. Michael East has a lot of mouth now that Tom Adams is dead and he will curse him but I hope that one of these days he will not confuse the Honourable Member for St. John with Tom Adams and run him out of the House.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The point I am making, Sir, is that we are anxious on this side to support this project but we do not understand the Government's approach towards it. We do not understand how a project that could have been cast in terms of \$2.5 million in 1987/88 can be cast now in terms of a \$800 000 project. We want to know what is the future of this project.

I also want to enquire what has happened to the relationship between the Housing Credit Fund and this project as well because these two things were supposed to go hand in hand and that one project was intended to provide the service lots whereas the other project was intended to provide the financing by which people could do their home improvements as well as do the home construction.

They were part of a team and, therefore, the Government has not spoken, in my view, in a forthcoming way of this very critical project and I, therefore, again must repeat that this is another very clear example of the type of approach by the Democratic Labour Party to the dealing with the problems of low-income people in this country, an approach characterized by a lot of rhetoric, a lot of emptiness but when we come to measure the commitment of resources and the follow-through what one sees very clearly, Mr. Speaker, is that the Democratic Labour Party's follow-through and its delivery where projects of this character are concerned bears a very striking difference from the rhetoric of which they are so fond.

I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, we have all been made hungry by what we have just heard and I think it is time we should have a break. I am moving that the sitting be now suspended until 3:15 p.m. today, Sir.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3:15 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Air. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 2.20p.m.

ON RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that there are no other persons willing to make a contribution on this particular matter. Therefore it leaves to me now to wind up in this particular debate.

Now, in the first place, Sir, I can see that this project as is now being implemented has wounded some person or persons in this Chamber. For that, Sir, I on behalf of the Government am making no apologies because we are convinced that the way in which we are now implementing this particular project is in the best interest of the persons for whom we are developing this particular project.

I want to make it clear, Sir, that because a project is conceived, it does not necessarily mean that the project will be implemented in the terms in which it was conceived. I think the people on the other side know that better than most people, particularly on that side of the other side. We conceived and had plans for Heywoods for the people of Barbados. Heywoods was conceived as cluster block hotels for the people of Barbados. Heywoods as implemented is completely different from the Heywoods that was conceived. And Heywoods was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party and implemented by somebody else. So it became something else. But it will not benefit the people of Barbados in the same way as the project that we ourselves had conceived. The same is true for other projects.

So one cannot bellyache now because we have not done it your way or feel that in fact that something is wrong with the project, or that we are scaling down the project. In fact we are scaling up the project, not scaling down the project. We are including places like Rices in St. Philip in the project which were not considered as part of the project in the earlier times.

It is clear to me, Sir, that some particular Member, the Member for St. Peter might not like the idea of Rices being in the project. Rices is part of Barbados, Sir. The people of Rices are as much entitled to have the same standard of housing as the people in Thomas Gap or any other part of Barbados. Of course we included Rices in the project.

Valerie is in the project, Thomas Gap is in the project, Well Gap is in the project. It was not in with them. But Valerie was brought into the project. Well Gap will also be brought into the project, Sir.

Why have we not implemented the project in the way in which it was earlier conceived? It was earlier conceived as a project to be financed partly by funds from the World Bank. But it was conceived by them. They, the Barbados Labour Party conceived a project which along with the

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, we were clearly *ad idem* on those matters at that time, and I do not know what will be his position now. We have looked at this matter, Sir, and we believe that this whole question of the qualifying age for the receipt of parliamentary pensions needs to be looked at again.

We feel very strongly about that, and we believe that consistent with what obtains generally in this population, consistent with the wishes of the people, consistent with the people of whom we are one and whom we represent in the broad community, our feeling is that the pensionable age should be raised, not reduced, to 65 years. That is our position. That is the position of the National Democratic Party. I think it is wrong. I have spoken on this on numerous occasions in this Parliament. I have never been happy with the principle of linking parliamentary salaries to the salaries of public servants because I was always very much aware of the generous pension provisions. The law makes provision for exceptions in cases of disability and in any event if it did not make such provisions where someone becomes disabled and is unable to work, that can also be enshrined in the law, but I am not happy about it. We in the NDP are not happy about it, we sat down and looked at all the parameters relating both to salaries and to pensions, we are concerned about the double standards which we apply to ourselves where we say that our salaries must be linked and relate to that of public servants, must increase every time public servants get an increase, and then we have completely separate pension provisions which are totally unrelated. That is the issue because it is the issue which is rooted in morality and integrity on these matters.

I go further, Sir, and say this: I want to make a firm promise to the people of this country and I am mandated to do so by the Councils of the National Democratic Party that should we in accordance with their votes and wishes form the Government of this country, that we will put that legislation in place whereby these pensions will be paid at age 65 years. All I am telling you is that everybody has their different views. I fully and totally recognise that there are strong differences of opinion on these matters. I do not challenge and in point of fact I would say that I have participated in debates of this kind probably on about half a dozen occasions or more. I accept that people can have different views on these matters and that their perspectives on these matters might be completely different. I have heard all kinds of arguments put forward, but I am quite sure that on this one that we are morally right in the position that we are taking. And make no mistake about it, it is a tremendous drain on the Treasury as it stands now. I know what is involved. I know the sums of money involved, and if you just sit down and think about it, let us assume that there was a change of Government at the next elections; look and see the number of people who would now be qualifying again. Let us assume there is another change in 1996, then you begin to see what is happening in terms of the number of people receiving these retiring benefits. I am saying that the

experience of the past 21 years has shown on a reasonable projection that we are going to find ourselves in a very embarrassing position. I am told that the maximum is 216 in 40 years. By quick calculation I don't think that is correct, but anyhow, what I am saying is that if you think through these things carefully, you begin to see that there is a serious problem.

I don't want to get into any further details in this matter. All I will say is that I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that you are dealing with a situation here that constitutes a major drain on the Treasury. 3.50p.m.

I have no doubt whatsoever that those persons who framed and designed these provisions acted in good faith. What I am saying now just as we benefit from 21 years experience and come in here to make amendments because of that 21 years experience and because of that we have made a series of amendments, all I am inviting this Honourable House to do is to look carefully and see what the implications are down the road for the cost of running Parliament when you reach a situation when there are several times more people receiving retiring benefits than those actually in the service of Parliament and I can assure you that it is going to be very substantial.

It has been- difficult, Sir, to get the exact numbers, obviously, because you have to factor in a whole lot of things. If you assume a given lifespan of 75 years or so average, if you do that kind of thing, you will see that down the road there are a lot of people and the figure of 216...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is not that simple. If the figure is 216, that is still a lot of people compared with those in service and it is not going to get any cheaper. It is going to become more expensive and I believe one big advantage of a new political party is that it has the opportunity to look at these things afresh, to bring a new dimension of thinking on it. It is not locked into any past, on these matters and, therefore, I think that we have a clear and unmistakable duty to look at these matters and see what the implications are down the road because I am sure that the framers of the legislation did not anticipate this outcome.

Now, for example, when that legislation was originally framed, many will recall that there was absolutely no principle of linking parliamentary salaries to the Public Service to regular increases in that area, none. Therefore...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no. This is a fact and, therefore, it was seen in a sense as some kind of compensation for the lag that parliamentarians and

Ministers would have had in relation to public servants since parliamentary salaries were only periodically fixed and on no set basis in that period. But now you have a different set of circumstances operating and my view is that you cannot have both. The overall climate has changed. The overall situation has changed from the time when that legislation was originally put in place.

Now, I am on record as taking the view...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But this is the kind of argument that you always oppose.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the reason for basing your argument on linkage is to establish the two positions and also to try to establish that when the legislation in relation to pensions was introduced, there was no such concept. In fact, the idea of linkage was never even canvassed at that point in time and so we have this tremendous disparity between the principles on which salaries are based and then a completely different set of principles on which pensions are based.

I do not understand it and when we considered it we could only go on what generally obtains in the community because I am one of these people who believe that my pension awaits me in Heaven.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My pension awaits me in Heaven as an award for my good works and my faith down here; so we cannot, Sir, allow ourselves to be obsessed by ideas of pension and I give my record.

When I was called to political service at the national level in this country I just resigned like that. All I had to do was to be in office for another few months and I would have qualified for a pension.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about when I was a public servant. I had not completed my ten years to qualify then. As a matter of fact, it was the Honourable Deputy Leader of the House who spoke to me on the question of responding to the call for public service at the national level and I could not refuse because I was the person who invited him to join that party over there years ago.

The point I am saying is that I have never been obsessed with the idea of a pension. In fact, I have no pension. I can speak on this because in our party I would be

the only one who would have qualified for some kind of a pension and will have to wait until 65 for it at this point in time.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Why could I afford to? I have no money. I cannot borrow any money. I went to the Bank to borrow \$2 000 the other day and they told me I have to deposit \$2 000 to borrow \$2 000. They told me they did not have any money.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Precisely. So I asked them if I have to deposit \$2 000 to borrow \$2 000 that does not make any sense to me. Two thousand dollars, Sir, a big bank in Barbados!

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, Sir, is not in any way connected with any elements of what can be construed as not being true.

So our position is clear. We are opposed in principle to this and it is a principled position that we are taking on the matter. Because we recognize that either something is going to have to be done about it now or in the future. Something is going to have to be done about it, on pure mathematical and actuarial assessment. It is going to have to be done. 4.00 p.m.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: An adjustment in the age. It is going to have to be done. If you check it, it is going to have to be done.

The point is this that sooner or later, the position that I have enunciated today will have to be taken in this House of Assembly in the public interest. And there is no point getting up and accusing me of trying to run down the value of Parliamentarians and that kind of thing.

What I have asked this House to do is to address the situation where, because of the average length that people live in this country, and there is no evidence that politicians die any younger.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But there are a lot that went to eighty something too.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must not trivialize these things. Our position is clear. It is certainly not politicking. It is one that is there to protect the public interest and the public purse. We recognize when the legislation was originally framed, a different set of circumstances obtained from what obtains today. We are able to look back and see what has been the experience over the past 21 years. We can make reasonable projections into the future and we feel that we are on solid ground, as a political party, and certainly our positions would be supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of Barbados.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think Honourable Members would expect me to say that I am, on this occasion, in disagreement with what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said.

I have made my position in here clear on several occasions about parliamentarians, their salaries, their retirement benefits. Although I must confess I did not know too much about the retirement benefits until this Bill came up and I started to go through it within last week. But I am not going to rehash anything that I have said before, Sir. The National Democratic Party says that it is taking a position on principle. I wish also to start on the basis of principle and at the same incorporate some practicalities in what I have to say.

The provision for retiring allowances first became known under the Democratic Labour Party in 1969. We have had this provision for 20 years. No one has sought, to the best of my knowledge, to deny that Parliamentarians are entitled to retirement benefits. I do not remember in the early seventies after I came back hearing anyone in criticism of this legislation. The criticism tended to centre around salary increases and the methodology for arriving at those increases.

There was a time in 1979 when certain members of the Democratic Labour Party, then ex-ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries and certainly one backbencher, at the time were very concerned about the level or quantum of pension which they were receiving. Representations were made to the then Prime Minister Adams to try and do something by way of amendment of the legislation to provide a better pension for them. And I think it was only fair, Sir.

You know, where I think we get detached somewhat from reality, Sir, is when we fail to consider that public officers have virtually guaranteed employment. It is very difficult to fire them. They do not come up every 5 years for the people to kick them about and kick them out. You become a public officer and unless you do some heavy

stealing, you have your tenure guaranteed. You do not have the kinds of problems to cope with day and night and the early morning too that Parliamentarians have to deal with. You saw what is going on in St. Thomas the last weekend, all this confusion. I am not commenting on it because it is now the subject of a court case.

For the last 4 or 5 weeks I have been meeting quietly, to the knowledge of the police at the Headquarters Division, in Holetown, in little districts with the groups trying to find out what are their problems, trying to talk to them, forming them into useful organizations. We have a few clubs formed. Some nights I get home having worked a whole day in my Chambers, I get home for the first time to eat at midnight. You tell me that to go through that for 15 years and like the Honourable Member for St. John who would like to be in here for another 30, wait until you get to 65?

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Public servants can retire at 50! And get what? Can they not get retirement benefits? We who make the laws, make the rules, create the atmosphere for people to move up, do well and achieve are now being told that we must be so altruistic and foolish as to say that high principle tells us that we must deny ourselves.

It was recognized 20 years ago before any of us was in here that the complexity of contemporary politics in Barbados, Errol Barrow who brought this Bill recognized it, that the complexity of contemporary representation in Barbados had changed.

We have responsibilities - I have been through that already - the types of responsibilities that we have, we have no Local Government, you are responsible for, from a dead dog to a house fire. If somebody gets there before you, it is a big thing. You have to hustle and get there. Do not care how you do it. If somebody's house burns down, you bolt your food and try and get there before the other fellow from the other side gets there. We have to put up with all of that and do. But these are the realities.

I stand first of all full square with the principle that established the entitlement of parliamentarians to retiring benefits. 4.10p.m.

Secondly, I am also on the side of linking parliamentarians' salaries and benefits in a similar way, relatively speaking, to what happens in the Public Service until all the politicians can agree that we have to sit down and work out a method that would be acceptable to everybody. In the absence of that tripartite, as we now have it, consensus, let the status quo remain and if the Public Officers get their emoluments changed every two years, the parliamentarians should have theirs changed every two years.

That is not to say that there will not be occasions when perhaps as a matter of....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: More than symbolism, as a matter of practicality. Sometimes we might have to set an example when things are very bad. You might have to forego taking an increase or defer it, and we will have to set those kinds of examples as we have done in the past. But as I say, Sir, in the absence of any tripartite consensus, then let it operate as it has been for the last few years.

The more that we try to take positions which are now verging on the esoteric - because I am hearing about all kinds of actuarial studies looking into 42 years hence and so on - but do not let us get into that right now, Sir.

I would like to say that I think we are all conscious of the fact that our output in political activity is such that it takes some years off you, Sir. Do you know when you have the problems? We had two Prime Ministers die in office and we are not learning some lessons about the stresses and strains that are associated with these jobs. Let me say it now, Sir, because you know I speak straight and truthful, I do not hold back anything.

Do not mind that the Attorney General gave vent to some foolishness the other night, Sir, about verbal diarrhoea. I will withdraw the word, Sir, not foolishness. I will deal with him in due course, Sir, leave him to me. You know I can handle myself.

I would like to know how the Prime Minister feels every day when he takes up the newspaper and sees somebody pounding him all the time. I do not care if your back is as broad as a Transport Board bus, and if water will run off it, you cannot go through that day in day out and not have it affect you. That is the responsibility of a Prime Minister. He is in the office and he accepts that he will take some pounding, but it is the reality of it that I am talking about. You get it.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the Reporters will have difficulty if Asides continue to be made.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Ministers get it, Sir. It is not easy to open a newspaper as a Minister and see somebody saying something very scathing about you and get on like nothing happened. Who are you? The Minister of Health is making comments about telling lies, Sir. That is one thing I would like to see, that every time a politician tells a lie on a platform you should take off \$500 off his salary. Do you know, Sir, that by that measure the Attorney General would be carrying home a blank cheque this month, after Sunday night? Do you know he told people Sunday night this legislation we are dealing with - I have to protect him, I am

looking after his retiring benefits - do you know he told people on Sunday night that I said to build more gaols? I heard him, I was out there, Sir. I would have to dock his pay for that, Sir.

Hon. M. A. KING: I have to rise on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I did not say that the Honourable Member suggested that. Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is that the Labour Party's philosophy as has been articulated several times is that they were to pass legislation several years ago that every house in Barbados should be converted into a gaol, that provision should be made for it to be possible to declare every house a gaol. I went on to make the point that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is probably more concerned about building gaols for the public than for providing housing and all the mass of things which are needed in the country.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is the watered down , version, Sir, but I was present and heard.

I really think that this constant quarrelling among us as parliamentarians over salaries and benefits, as I said already and am convinced, is doing us great damage out in the public domain. It is creating further cynicism. Everybody else can agree about their salaries and so on and every time ours come up there is some quarrelling or arguing. I thought after 20 years we would have settled the parameters. We have had this tiling for 20 years. What are we talking about? When you get an increase sometimes you do not even reach \$60.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: A technical adjustment, as the Minister of Health said once, I think that there are persons who have served in the Other Place not for one term but for more than one term, and I think they deserve some recognition. There are persons who have a contribution to make to Barbados, but who may not be temperamentally or otherwise suited to go in the hustings and put themselves up for election, but if you nominate them and give them the opportunity they can give this country as good service as some of us who have been elected.

I believe that the parties would want sometimes to have a continuity of service. You have a man who has done well in the Senate, or a woman for that matter, and you win again, so you want to carry them along at least to help in the organisation of your team for the Senate and so on. I see nothing wrong with that, and I see nothing wrong with some provision being made to preserve and ensure the benefits of that person when they have come to depart from public life.

We know the stories, Sir, we know the examples of politicians, some who have gone and some who are still

around - as the Honourable Member for St. Peter is saying to me, Sir, I cannot put it any better - who are getting real lashes, who have suffered, and I think that we have a responsibility not to forget them. We do not forget the poor pensioners out there that we represent, the ordinary pensioners, but should we forget the parliamentary pensioner? I cannot do it. I have to think of Reynold Weekes, Russell Lowe, Eyre Hoppin and blind M. E. Cox that we have to go and help hold. 4.20 p.m.

They put in the work that laid the foundation for all of us in here today without the kind of salary or benefits which we are getting, but we are only getting these salaries and benefits because society has moved on. When my father was working as a teacher for \$5 a month, that was those days. What are the teachers working for now? All that we have had is a progression through the march of time and an acknowledgement that an egalitarian society should provide for you not only when you are physically able to work, but also when your time for retiring from active service comes. I do not think I need say any more. I am supporting this.

Hon. C V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. In supporting this Resolution, I just want to make reference to a couple of points made by the Leader of the Opposition. In his projection of 40 years down the road whereby we would have more members in parliamentary pension than you would have in the Government service, I think a few factors and the reality of the world would have to be taken into consideration. Forty years at a five year term give you eight and if you take eight times the 27 the maximum that would give you is 216. If you were to use a factor of 10 per cent of people dying and you take 10 per cent of 216 which is 21 and give the benefit of the doubt in terms of the odds, you are talking of 200 people, provided they were entitled to the pension at the end of one year, but the law now states three terms. So you have to further divide the number by three. Even if you do not divide it by three and there are some two and a half or four year terms, the maximum you can get would not be 216 over the period.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, I wonder if the Honourable Member has given any thought to the very large number of people already receiving retiring benefits as of today....

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not finished my elucidating point... which already exceeds those of us here already.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, if you want to elucidate along that line, then I can bring other factors, but I will not go into details and consume the time of the House. The statement was made that if you project over the next 40

or 42 years, and that is what I responded to. It is specific, detailed and correct. It is simple. You had some of the basics too. Maybe you did not extrapolate on yours, you went another way. However, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise that.

The other area has to do with the question of not agreeing with the philosophy of the National Democratic Party. He tends to misunderstand the question of timing which is to change, as is suggested, downwards to 50. . That is timing. Age in itself has nothing to do with the amount, because the amount you will receive if it is at 55, you will receive it at 55. If you are to receive an amount at 50, it will be at 50. As I pointed out you cannot then multiply any number of people over the forty years divided by the maximum of eight. Mr. Speaker, you will find that your figures can in no way approach 200 over 40 years. To me, Sir, I submit the most we could be looking at that time would be about 95.1 thank you, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very short intervention in this matter in respect of the position taken by the National Democratic Party in relation to this whole amendment here today. Later I will seek some clarification on the legislation from the Attorney General. There are one or two things I am not very clear on.

Now, Sir, I have no problem with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas or anybody else in here as to the demands of parliamentary life and representation, but the idea of pensions is one that concerns me for the reasons advanced by the Leader of the Opposition, and even after hearing the Honourable Member for St. George North, I am not too convinced that eventually this country will fall under the weight of pensions as presently administered.

Now for one thing, Sir, when you are looking and dealing with large corporations, large corporations entrust funds deducted from their employees to investment houses to be invested. Now we know that Barbados does not allow for the investment of "pensions". I know that the contributions are too small, but one thing I would like to see and I think that the time is fast approaching when we should sit down as legislators and try, is that we work out some new approaches to the whole idea of pensions.

Now *sotto voce* the Leader of the Opposition said that the contributions that we make are too small to be invested. That might be so, but the point I am making is that some provision ought to be made in the legislation for the investment of funds somewhere that would eventually go towards the payment of pensions down the road. To constantly deduct and take money from the Consolidated Fund for the payment of pensions will eventually cause this country to fall under the weight and the demands that pensions funds are having on the Treasury. From time to time, and from the time that I have been following political developments in this country, I have noticed piecemeal

amendments to allow persons to qualify for pensions and so on. Now we have to decide whether or not this is a desirable trend, or whether we have to, as I was saying earlier, sit down and try and work out some new principles governing the award of pensions.

Now I know as a fact that some ministerial appointments are made to help people to qualify for larger pensions. I think that that is not too desirable an approach to this whole thing. At the same time we, as the Honourable Member for St. Thomas said, have many Russell Lowes and Eyre Hoppins and Reynold Weekeses out there who are drawing pittances, having served in this House for fifteen and twenty years and having given meritorious service and they are not now being awarded a pension that could afford them a decent and proper living.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas made a point just now when he said that that side of the Opposition would support this amending legislation, and one of the points he made that caught my attention is that the civil servants had guaranteed employment.

But the point I am making, Sir, is whether this is the proper way to restore that imbalance, the imbalance as between our terms and conditions of service as Parliamentarians, if we have terms and conditions, as
 • against the terms and conditions of service of civil servants. The Prime Minister was saying that they are fire proof, and that at some time, for example, when elections are called, some of us might lose our seats, and we have to wait to see if we can qualify for this pension. What I am saying, Sir, is that I do not think that the award of pensions in this way is a correct way to restore whatever perceived imbalance one might anticipate or one might seek. I think that rather than sit around and hem and haw about this whole thing that Parliamentarians should decide first to begin with, and this „ in my view is tangential to what I am talking about. 4.30 p.m.

The salary that we are getting as parliamentarians, I will say it, Sir, is not a decent one for the very reason that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas was saying. One has many difficulties.

Nobody rang a bell and called me, Sir. I opted to get involved in politics but the point I am making is that for the problems that we have that we ought to get proper remuneration.

I am saying, Sir, that we should be remunerated now and not by a pension coming as early as it does. For example, Sir, if I may go a little further, the areas of benefits and allowances must be examined. Diplomats and persons working for regional and international organizations obtain duty-free allowances. That is the point I am making. We are not considered for this kind of thing.

I do not see why we have to make this a party political thing, this whole thing of terms and conditions of service for parliamentarians. I have no qualms of conscience about that at all.

We earn a mere pittance for the kinds of service that we render. No where, I believe, Sir, in the Commonwealth are parliamentarians called upon to perform the kind of service that we perform.

I remember one time the Honourable Member for St. Thomas said that at the end of the day he gets \$200 in his pocket and then in the political columns Douglas Leopold Phillips took him to task for that. It might be playing politics but it is the very thing that he is talking about that we get in this Chamber and we criticize each other for saying that we should be getting more money. I believe that we should be getting more money, Sir. It is next kin to nothing.

I do not think that whatever imbalances exist as between the civil servants and Members of Parliament ought to be corrected or repaired by a larger or a more substantial pension or a pension coming at an early age.

I have no difficulty with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas when he speaks about the difficulties that parliamentarians experience. My difficulty with him and the difficulty with this legislation has to do with the age of qualification for a pension. I believe that there ought to be parity in this regard as between civil servants and members of Parliament when it comes to the age of qualification.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am talking about years of qualification.

I accept that contemporary representation today is a very complex matter but I do not believe that we ought to use the mechanism of pensions to compensate ourselves down the line for any imbalances that exist at this stage.

Now, Sir, before I close, this is directed to the Attorney General. Section 2 of the amending Bill - this is a strange thing - 2(a) (IB)(a) - I think that is the correct citation if I may read it, Sir, and I crave your indulgence:

"Section 4 of the Retiring Allowances (Legislative Service) Act, in this Act referred to as the principal Act, is amended by

(a) deleting subsection (IB), and substituting the following:

(IB) Where a person who has served as a member of the Senate other than in a

know other things as well, Sir. We must leave things intact that those who come to look upon us and can say: these men who were entrusted with the reins of government carried on that government in a manner that is acceptable to us and therefore rather than damn them or defile them, we will praise them. We do not seek to be praised. But we have a right to leave behind us footprints that people can put their feet in comfortably.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter on which we are to have a divide. This is a matter of principle. You are saying to me that when Errol Barrow, the late Right Honourable gentleman for St. John sat down with his band of intellectuals 20 years ago and worked out that the age of 50 was a reasonable age for a person exposed to the hustings of politics to be considered for pension.....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: At that time one of the young men of his Cabinet resigned arguing that the age of 50 was too late. The then Joy Edwards argued that it was too late because he was young. But those men using the brains available to them at that time came to that conclusion.

We have had a peaceful change of Government which has been revered by everybody who knows it* and we have examined these matters. We have never had a divide on whether people should be pensioned. And we have hardly had any voice

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir, The issue is not whether people should be pensioned. It is the age at which they should receive their pension which is age 65.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The only person who has ever said age 65 is the Honourable Member today. The Honourable Member when he was on this side with me, when we used to lock arms in battle against the Barbados Labour Party never said 65. But I charge that it is convenient for him....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member is correct. I did not say 65 then because I did not want to repeat what he said. He said 65.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is using integrity as one of his watch words, and I will just remind him that he is so doing, without going any further, Sir.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that when he and I locked arms and fought the Barbados Labour Party tooth and nail, the question of age 65 was never an issue. But the NDP has a right, if it examines the issue, to come to that conclusion. But when it comes to that conclusion, it must not condemn the rest of us to suggest to us that it is somehow immoral to

have a position other than 65. The choice of age sixty-five is the result of a mature of thought. 4.50 p.m.

No one who examines this issue in its entirety could come to that conclusion, because even in the context of the Public Officer the question of 65 is one which is not even settled.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. At the time when the legislation was introduced you drew pension as an ordinary person at 68. We reduced it to 65 and at that time the original framers of this Act thought that 55 or whatever it was was the age.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to the Honourable Member. I go further. You will recall - and the Honourable Member assisted us in that - that one of the major battles we had when the late Right Honourable Member for St. * John was in receipt of two pensions because of the legislation the argument that we put up, and the Honourable Member assisted in putting that argument up, was that the one relating to old age and the one relating to time served in one post ^aght not to be linked to the other one.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, the Barbados Labour Party * took away one of the pensions from Errol Barrov. The Honourable Member helped us discuss that on the floor of the House.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The record will show that we discussed it. There are a lot of things that, we are going to have to discuss. I know you doubt it, but if you want you can check it. I am telling you that my mind is not clouded ^ by any of the difficulties which surround some of the problems in this country today. My mind is crystal clear about a number of things we have done together, so I wish you to become crystal clear about them too if you are going to deal with integrity and me. The Honourable Member introduced the question of my integrity in relation to this. We always discussed the salaries and the linkage, we did not discuss the pension, because we always knew that the pension would be at age 50. What we are saying now is that those who served in the Senate, which applies to Bree St. ^ John, to Senator Louis Tull, to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, to all Honourable Members who served in the Senate, we have agreed over time that we are going to discuss this to allow those members who served in the Senate to participate in a pension scheme. That is all we are doing, Sir. We are not giving them anything.

We agreed, because there was a time when I served in the Senate, from the same day as Louis Tull. I served as a Minister and he served as an ordinary Senator and the ••

rationale was clear because by virtue of my holding office as a Minister I would have been in a more favourable pensionable position than he. That could not be acceptable and fair, and so that was changed on the floor of this House. The Barbados Labour Party changed it and we accepted it. What we are doing now is giving Senators who do not become Ministers an opportunity to make a contribution. We are not giving them anything, we are saying that they can make a contribution to the pension scheme so that they will be beneficiaries of the same pension scheme. This is what we do to ordinary people working at banks, working anywhere. How can we as a people keep taking advantage of ourselves in the name of politics?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that in his heart the Leader of the Opposition means everything he says about this. He cannot mean it with other Honourable Members and all the young people he is trying to induce into the NDP and telling those young people, some of them who are virtual mercenaries, that he wants them to come into politics and get their pension at 65? Are you telling me? I know some of them well, so the people you are trying to lure into the NDP are virtual mercenaries. A dollar bill and them are twins and you cannot tell the one from the other. I know some of them well, I can tell you about them, and will, so don't you come to talk about this little innocuous Bill that has nothing to it. Let us divide on it, you divide on it, but while you are dividing on it do not bring me into it.

The Democratic Labour Party's position on this was settled 20 years ago. It is not a position we are taking today. The Democratic Labour Party is not embarrassed about emoluments for parliamentarians. I have suffered under the Democratic Labour Party where we went for an entire period when the then Prime Minister stood up on the floor of the House, without any consultation with the rest of his Ministers, and said there shall be no increase, and that was the end of that. I have come back into a Democratic Labour Party administration where the party as a whole and the Cabinet decided that as a measure of principle it would reduce Ministers' salaries by 5% in 1986, and we did. Again the principle was that it was not fair to ordinary back benchers and to those who had a vested interest, and therefore we never interfered with the salaries of those persons who had gone before. So that the pensions of Bree St. John, *et cetera*, are on a higher basis than the pension of any Honourable Member on this Front Bench.

The Honourable Member knows that he participated in that discussion to reduce salaries by 5%. We then went into what I call a technical adjustment and I took my political lashes for the 2% increase which we got, but as a good politician, a man of principle and a Christian I take my blows when I get them. I dish them out beautifully, too, when necessary and ride with the punches.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the Democratic Labour Party's position has been crystal clear and it is not

fair for the Leader of the Opposition, who is a crypto member of the Democratic Labour Party. He is a Democratic Labour Party member through and through. You heard the two of them today, Sir. He could call himself NDP till he turns blue, inside him he is a DLP, always will be and whenever he is ready we will take the whole motley crew of you, bring you back, examine you, wash you and take you back if you want us to. That is what you are. You are a born again Christian but you are using the same hymn book. You do not fool me, I know where you stand. You disagree with some principles and some policies of the Prime Minister. That is fair enough. You should be behind here giving him some trouble, telling him what you want him to do, like how we used to steer you.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, he did not tell you to leave, you had "leave" made up ever since, but I am not discussing whether you left or not - I am not meaning you, because you have not left - what I am talking about is because you have left you have to go constantly looking for these make work situations. You always have to find some point of principle to depart from the Democratic Labour Party, and it is difficult, Mr. Speaker, because the Democratic Labour Party is rooted in principle. You cannot change principle. I can understand them, Sir. I can fight them like the beast at Ephesus every day, because they have a principle that they believe in. The Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party, that is the divide, Sir, and we will meet outside, talk sometimes friendly like, sometimes like warriors, but we have a divide, but I do not know what to make of you. 5.00 p.m.

I am not being phoney, I am very serious. All of you have friends over here and your problem is that you are like lawyers doing what they call distinguishing a case. You have no case at all, but you have to go in court and say something, so you start examining the issue to see what you can find that is different; so you examine the issue, and you find a little half a point, and because the system is such the Judge will let you speak for a long time and you go and spend an hour and a half on that half a point, and the Judge in keeping with the methodology will say when he is giving the judgment "I have nothing but admiration for the efforts of counsel who has failed in his bid, but must rot be negated in his attempt." That is the position with the NDP. We do not hate the NDP yet, because the NDP is a party that understands and should feel, and note I say, should feel the pathos and the ethos of the poor people of this country. So your attempting to find issue for great division should go beyond this kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, my contention is that this is not a point of departure. Sixty-five? No one to come in here would ever qualify, and I think, Sir, that the point made by my friend from St. George South who has a different point,

who says that we should be paid more money now, is a point of principle. I have no quarrel with that, but we cannot be paid more money for two basic reasons. The country cannot afford it, and the population will not allow it. The Government that decides to pay politicians what they are worth will be a Government no more. That is a fact of political life. Every time the Government has to come down to Parliament about politicians' salaries, they have to spin cuffs, turn around twice and wonder if the people are going to cut off their heads, because that is the framework that has been laid by the first Ministers in this country. That framework was laid long before us, so if you have to resort to some of the activity that the Barbados Labour Party under Tom Adams resorted to, when Tom Adams grossed up ... We attacked that, because we recognised it for what it was. He grossed up and then added on. I am not going to go into details because it is not necessary to bury Tom Adams twice. But the fact is that that is the framework in which politicians are paid. Do you mean to tell me that I am not worth anymore than Chitrani or Chatrani or one of the people in Swan Street? Do you mean to tell me that the Attorney General could not...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If anybody is getting \$189 000, that would have to be looked into. That is no problem. The Minister is here and he will look into that. That is not a matter that we will take lightly. But do you mean to tell me that the Attorney General with all of his seniority at the Bar could not earn more than whatever it is he is earning? But that is not the point; the Attorney General by virtue of his office or the Minister of whatever by virtue of his office is also in terms of image and prestige getting a lot more than money can buy. There are a lot of people who earn a half a million dollars a year who would do anything for the Prime Minister to name them a Minister for two days. So I am not going to take this business of being a Minister only in terms of how much money I get. Being a Minister is an important factor in the life of a country, and we must not pretend that it is not so. All of us are proud when the time comes, ask the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, for you to serve at this level, we are all proud. If the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central disagrees and leaves or as the Prime Minister said the other night "up foot and run", that is a matter which can be taken in its perspective, but he cannot deny that he was proud to be a Minister. We all are proud to be Ministers and that is why we put up with taking low salaries. But we don't have to put up with being buried and put away and condemned and spat upon and walked upon; it is not necessary, but if it is done by the people, that is part of the crucifixion scene. If it is done by each other, that is a different story because we should know better. It is not the same debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Wind up.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It becomes the same debate when any Honourable Member tries to turn it on the same path. I thought that with the coming of the NDP, according to the Dean, a new day had dawned. I thought that we would not have to have this debate. Well the Dean said so and he is Dean. So I thought, Sir, that it was a new day dawning, and I did not expect this from the NDP. Note the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party are agreed on this; so how come this is a new breed of brain that has < * emerged in the NDP. Do you know however you bow your head up and down the others don't say anything. It is because they know that there is no way you can get a new brand of brain; it is the same brain thinking different thoughts, and the Leader of the Opposition has been thinking different thoughts for the last few months and that is what we need to draw to his attention, that at the end of the day there is a larder full of thoughts that you have to draw from. There is hardly anything new that the NDP and , * in particular the Leader of the Opposition can pull out of the larder; different but not new; so Mr. Speaker, he must not come to us and try to give the impression on an issue like that

Asiaes.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: There are a lot of people who would say thank God for the NDP. Anyhow, Sir, the time will come when we will discuss the NDP in those terms. * What I am saying is that the Honourable Leader-of the Opposition must choose other issues; he must not choose this issue of pensions. There is no issue whether Parliamentarians should get pensions. The question of whether they should get pensions at 50 or 65 is not an issue. If he believes it is an issue, he is wasting time. It cannot be an issue. There are civil servants who retire at age fifty. I know some of them who are at home who retired at age 50; It has always been an option until recently when the law was changed, so don't start with the 65; you can retire at 50, * you can retire at 55. Anytime after 50 you can retire with the permission of the Governor General, and there are doctors who help people to retire before fifty, doctors who practise while they are still Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very obliged to you for giving me a few moments beyond my time, but the Honourable Member is provoking me to deal with him in a particular way, and I am not going to be provoked, Sir, I am very grateful to you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear the former speaker in full flow, but I though I would want to make some points although he said what he had to say very well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition might have been speaking in a moment of less than clear-headedness when he brought up the issue of Parliamentarians having to wait until 65 in order to benefit ^ from a pension. Sir, I speak as a trade unionist and it is

always a matter of difficulty for me when workers, which is what Parliamentarians are basically, enjoy a particular condition of employment and then somebody seeks to make it worse than it is, unless there are extremely good reasons for that.

Sir, we as Parliamentarians stand in a fairly anomalous position. As a trade unionist I see Parliamentarians as nothing more than white collar workers basically. You look in here and whom do you see? You see highly qualified Barbadians, very well trained. White collar is a terminology that relates not to basically your attitudes in what you are doing. 5.10 p.m

But it relates to the job functions you perform and one of the international organizations to which the Barbados .. Workers' Union, for instance, is affiliated, the FIET, the Federation of Clerical and Managerial Workers define whom these white collar workers are. They are people involved in planning, directing, controlling, researching, making decisions and so on for enterprises and, therefore, we find ourselves with people who are professionals, people who are in the private sector and so on.

But while these people do this kind of function for an enterprise, we do it for a nation and many people here can leave and set up consultancies, or whatever and be subject to far better conditions than they can ever hope to enjoy while they are Members of Parliament and the difference between these other persons is that they are either in contract of employment, or a contract for employment that there are very strict rules for breaking.

In our situation the only contract we have is every five years we go and face the electorate and there are no rules in that. That contract could be broken one way or another for a
^ multiplicity of reasons and I, therefore, do not believe that parliamentarians are any worse off than other persons.

There is a certain amount of self-contempt I think that parliamentarians have for themselves. For political reasons we berate each other and I am totally against that and will always be against it because I believe that most of us who come in here come in on a sense of service. I believe so fundamentally about everybody on both sides of the floor and that, I think, is clear in the lives of everybody here represented.

We do not need to go into instances where people conic here are worst off than if they had remained where they were before. That happens but we do not need to go into those specifics.

What I am saying is that where parliamentarians have a particular condition, that is, that they will be eligible for
^ pension at 50. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says it must now go to 65, making these conditions worst

off for this category of workers on behalf of the masses. He would have to give crystal clear reasons because this is an anti-trade union position.

Why would you want to make the conditions of service for this group of workers worst off than it is now? There really can be no good reason. I have heard no good reason adumbrated on this floor by a process of deduction. I have reached the conclusion that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to do is to give the impression that he is not self-serving, but all of the rest of us are and that by wanting to enjoy a pension at 50 that in some way we are immoral or something like that and he involves his colleagues, honest men, quite frankly, straightforward men but who might not want to differ with him for public reasons.

He involves all of them in that foolishness that they must agree with him because when he speaks he is NDP and he involves all of them. It is not true. I do not believe 'that they agree with you in a position that 65 is the year of benefit. That is something you got up and spoke about whimsically.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: And I mean it. You do not have a resolution from your party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have already indicated when I spoke to this Honourable House that I have been mandated by the councils of this party to put this position. Now, the Honourable Member is actually implying that I was not telling the truth.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not implying that he is not telling the truth. I am saying, Sir, that when he stood up and spoke about extending the age to 65 it was a whimsical position, it was a position of a point of departure to discuss, really. I do not believe that he is very serious on this. I do not hear any analysis the Leader of the Opposition could bring forward to really justify the 65 position. Why? Why do parliamentarians have to wait until 65 to enjoy a pension when everybody else out there can enjoy it before that.

In the private sector, most pension schemes are vested pension schemes that after 10 years you benefit. You do not have to wait until you retire and that sort of thing. After 10 years you have a vested right in that pension and if you come out you get it and even those who do not have a vested pension scheme after 10 years you can come out, you can take what you put in, all the interest accumulated and so on but you can come out with something substantial. But why parliamentarians? Why this group of persons be

put in a worse category? Their level of sacrifice is already high.

I want to take objection too with my friend, the Honourable Member from St. George South because the question of paying better salaries now that is another issue that can be discussed. But that must not be taken as against the age of 50 or 65. Because you give a person a better salary now you would come and say that therefore they should not get the pension at an earlier stage. The two things are not necessarily in conflict.

You can give people a better salary now and a pension at 50. There is no difficulty with that. There is nobody in here who wants to walk with public funds or some kind of largesse but the point must be made that no parliamentarian should leave these Chambers and then be in a penurious position out there in his old age.

We can see the present. It is very difficult sometimes to see the future. I do not mean in terms of voting and so. I am not talking in terms of that at all. I am saying that if you were living in 1930 or 1940 you could not perceive what the cost of a house would be now, the cost of living in terms of buying food for yourself and so on. You do not know what future economic history is going to be but one thing you know is that it will become progressively more difficult to maintain a certain standard of living and what you do not want is for your parliamentarians to be penurious because it belittles not only the parliamentarians, it belittles the system.

The last thing you would want in the world is that your legislators and the people who set the standards for the country are people who are looked down on by the masses, the populace, you might call them. It is a very serious matter. I am afraid that we do not take our status for granted.

Now, all of these people who are talking nowadays about the less Government the better and the less state, I say this to them. One of the first institutions was the institution of the state. Politicians were here first, long before so-called private people and the others came about.

If you take the Bible, if you take history, whatever you take you had to have people to regulate society and even in the Eastern countries when there is change from so-called closed societies and open societies, it is still the parliamentarians who have to take division and the lashes to do the changing so you can berate parliamentarians how you like. The fact is that there are a courageous group of people who will do what a lot of other people would not want to do.

They are bold people. They come out there and take some challenges, some lashes and so on and a lot of people would like the benefits but they would not like to expose

themselves to what parliamentarians have to do. Most of us if, we remained in the public sector where we were, would have been senior people. We would have gone up the ranks somewhere and if we were in the private sector we would have gone somewhere too.

If we chose in our various lives and to come into Parliament, it is not easy to go out there. One of the hardest things in the world is to go and convince 8 000 or 9 000 persons that you can carry the mantle for them. 5.20p.m.

Do not let anybody fool you that that is an easy job, Mr. Speaker. That is a tough job. And then to manage that constituency is not an easy job. It is no less onerous than anybody running a staff of 120 people because with contracts of employment that you can terminate, you can do what you want with them because the law gives you a certain authority and power over those people that you control.

But in Parliament, when you are a Member of Parliament and a Representative for a constituency, you do not make the rules. The people you represent can make the rules and they will tell you, if you do not do so and so for me, I am not voting for you next time. And you are going to hear that 8 000 times from 8 000 people. If you do not get a house for me, if you do not get a job and so on. Then we make our job look as though it is something that we do not deserve or that it is not onerous. That is not true.

And I therefore feel that we are getting into cosmetic discussions when we are talking about something like this. We have not moved the age, it is 50. That is what it has always been. And somebody raises a false argument whether it should move it from there now to 65. Trying to prove what? That he is holier than thou? But that is a rich man speaking from a selfish point of view. It is nothing to do with any party position. No NDP council gave him any mandate. That is the Leader of the Opposition standing up in his seat. My friends in the NDP have a bit more sense than that than to give him that mandate. I would bet that one. The ones that I know. That is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition standing up there. It sounds like an Honourable Leader of the Opposition position to me. I would otherwise have to reach the conclusion that he is so overwillingly strong in the NDP that the others have no real say. And I would hate to believe that.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Because I know you fellows. I know the Honourable Member for the City and I would be surprised if you really stood and allowed any kind of council... You must have been overweighted by people like Russell and those guys then. They must have voted against you. Because I could not believe that the 3 of you would support that foolish position. So the others in the council

must have overweighted you. That is my position. I believe so strongly.

Because I cannot believe that you would want to go out and tell the public of Barbados that Parliamentarians when they get a pension at 50 that that is too early. Against the wisdom of the Houses that have debated this already is an agreed position. All of a sudden they are unwise. What has changed the position that it should now be 65? Why 65? All I want is a rationale, a sensible rationale coming from the Leader of the Opposition on this one. But I know him and I know the Leader of the Opposition goes for the press to carry a position. He goes for this feeling that if you say it and it sounds popular. Look, cheap things can become very popular. We have a responsibility to lead and not to follow. When you get elected here you have a responsibility to lead people; not to follow. And you cannot by indicating that conditions that people presently enjoy should then be worsened just through whim and fancy.

And I take strong objection to the position that was put up by the Leader of the Opposition. It has no value in it moral or otherwise. And as far as the economics of it is concerned, as the Honourable Member for St. George North adverted, the statistics are wrong. The economics are wrong too. We do not want to go into those details because basically that is no argument. It is no argument that you have to pay a few dollars to past Parliamentarians. That is deferred earnings to a certain extent. That is how we treat pensions in case you did not understand. And nobody can talk about the value of a Parliamentarian, the real value of their contribution and put a salary to it. Out of the question.

And therefore I believe, Sir, that we can all support this Bill that has been brought before the House. I have no difficulty at all in supporting the Amendment because to me it is a cosmetic change basically in terms of the age and in terms of giving the Senators the right to qualify for a better pension.

I would not be like the Leader of the Opposition telling the Honourable Member for St. George South that Louis Tull would benefit from this and therefore feel that that is a red flag in front the Honourable Member for St. George South. The Honourable Member for St. George South is a man of principle. He is not going to look at those kinds of personal things. Just because Mr. Tull can get a little benefit that is something that will make the Honourable Member say something is wrong with it. That is how people bring personal things into issues of principle. We do not get caught up in those things. I saw your face when he told you so. You want to know what he is talking about at all. He wants to break your stride. But you are talking about principle. But some people are motivated by personal animus in these matters. The sooner we are able to move out of that personal animus and deal with the issues as they confront us, or our philosophies, which might be different, it would be better for us, as Parliamentarians. The

better example we would set out there in the country: Let us divide on issues and not on little personal, petty matters and hold out on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you, Sir.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I can probably begin this debate by using the same language that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central used when this matter was introduced in the House of Assembly in a debate which is recorded in Hansard for the 27th November, 1979. That was the occasion when the Retiring Allowances Legislative Service (Amendment) Act which is the groundwork for the one which we are discussing today was passed. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central then began by saying:

"Mr. Speaker, I had absolutely no intention whatsoever of speaking on this particular matter before the House."

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: That is why I say I could begin like the Honourable Member. But then I would do just like the Honourable Member, say I had no intention to speak but then go on to make a speech. And the Honourable Member on that occasion expressed quite clearly and perhaps in better language, if I may say so, if the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will pardon me, in better language than he did today, the basic philosophy behind this whole matter of pensions. This is what the Honourable Member had to say at page 3016:

"I want to say that I am committed to the principle that persons who hold public office in this country, whatever formula is derived, that during their period of holding office they should earn an income which reflects the general levels of income to the community. But that, and this is most important, when they leave public office they should not be paupers 10 die in almshouses and to be laughed at in the community. Therefore I will support any pension measures that would make sure that people who hold office would be able to live a reasonable life afterwards."

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: When they leave office. Do you not understand the use of language?

"It is vitally important, I want to say this and this is most important that when they leave office"

We are not talking about age. He said "when they leave office", whenever that is:

"when they leave office, they should not be paupers"

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Just a minute. The point I am making then is if you are saying it was such a big issue then, in this Debate when the substantive bit of legislation was being dealt with no position was articulated that the age should be 65. The legislation which was then before the House related to an age of 50.

All I am saying is this that if it were so fundamental a principle to use then, why was not the age of 50 challenged at that time. So one goes along with the basic assumption that that is what was put forward, that is what has been agreed. And you were a Member of the opposition Democratic Labour Party at that time. But now you are a member of the NDP so clearly a different position has now got to be taken.

Now the point about this present Amendment before the House, Mr. Speaker, is that basically, it does not introduce anything which is in substance new. Honourable Members before have made the point that the reference to the age 55 is the result of a law revision error, where as I understand it, the legislation as it was passed had the age of 50 as the relevant age. But when the law revision exercise was being done, the number 55 years got into the records. But the substantive Bill was in fact passed in relation to the age 50.

So that the opportunity has been taken in Clause 3 of this Bill to correct what has in essence been a law revision error in getting the laws together. 5.30 p.m.

When you look at the other sections of the Bill, and this is why I say that nothing new is being done, all that is new in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides a formula for determining how the contributions are to be made by persons who were once Senators and who subsequently became members of the House of Assembly.

Prior to this legislation which is now before the House the position was that persons who were members of the Senate and subsequently became members of the House of Assembly had the right to opt to have their Senate years taken into account, but the one lacuna in the law was that nowhere did the law indicate the level at which contributions should be paid. You knew that you could opt, you knew that you could have your years in the Senate taken into account and added to your years in the House of Assembly, but the one thing which the law did not say was on what basis should your contributions, in respect of your Senate years, be done. All this legislation is doing today, Mr. Speaker, is to clarify that point and to state the basis on which the contributions had been made.

There have been members of this Honourable House who lost seats in the last election, who sought to take their Senate years into account with their House of Assembly years but ran into the problem of at what level should the contribution be paid, because the law did not say, so what this legislation is doing today is making it clear the basis on which the contribution is to be paid. There is nothing new in principle then in relation to the fundamental-aspect of the legislation.

The other thing it does, and this is all that 2(a)(1B) does, because if you look at the original legislation you see that the only change in the new legislation is that when it talks about "where a person subsequently becomes a legislator he may, whilst he remains a legislator. . ." the only words added are "or within such further period as the Minister of Finance approves in writing become a contributor." That deals with a situation where obviously a person has ceased to be a legislator but before that, perhaps, may not have exercised his option, but the law does provide that he may exercise his option whilst he was a legislator, so what it does in essence is to say to parliamentarians "look, what sense does it make requiring you to opt whilst you are still in Parliament? What is the difference between doing that, forcing you to opt whilst you are still a legislator and giving you the opportunity, so to speak, to make that option after you have been rejected and now you are out?" All that does is to give the Minister of Finance a discretion to provide an opportunity for any member in such a position to opt to have the years taken into account.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this amendment is introducing nothing which is substantially new, or which is fundamentally new, all it does is to clarify some difficulties and to provide a remedy for some difficulties which existed in the previous legislation. So that all the sound and fury, I am saying, about when parliamentarians should be entitled to pensions and all that, that issue had been settled long ago, an issue which has been settled without any protest, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: In 1979 you were in the House. Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with 1979. The original Bill came into effect in 1968 but these substantial amendments which are the issues which arise today in relation to the years at which parliamentarians should be entitled to pensions, those issues were introduced for the first time in 1979 and not before.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Unless the laws again are constituted wrong, the clause which deals with that is indicated as 1979-42, and I have taken the trouble to get the

debates of Hansard and it is the Hansard debate where this issue....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, all I am trying to do is go by the records of this House, unless the records are so wrong then. The 27th of November, 1979 is when this debate took place on a Bill to amend the Retiring Allowances (Legislative Service) Act.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: At 50? The point I am making is this then.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: But you were here in 1979. I agree with you entirely that you were not in here in 1968, nor was I, but you were here in 1979. I was not here in 1979 and I am saying that the issues which the Honourable Member is raising now as issues in 1979 were available for him to raise in 1979, but then it was not an issue with him.

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and the only purpose of my intervention was to indicate that there was nothing fundamentally new about this and that all that was being done was that an attempt was being made to clarify the level at which contributions should be made in respect of persons who were in the Senate and later opted to become members of the House of Assembly, and also to give the Minister of Finance a discretion to allow parliamentarians to opt to receive their pension after they have been thrown out of Parliament. What is wrong with that? It seems to me that there is absolutely nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill and to declare an interest straight off. You may recall that from 1971 to 1976 I was a Governor-General's Senator in the Upper House and then from 1981 to 1986 as one of the two Opposition Senators in the Upper House, and since 1986 I was elected into this August Chamber, so you may well say it is about 13 and a half years in the House of Assembly and the Senate.

I just wish to say, Sir, that I am making it abundantly clear to the Members on this side of the House and the Members over there that I am not in favour of waiting until I reach the age of 65 to get pension in here or anywhere. I think it is dishonest - can I say that, Sir? - or selfish to tell any Honourable Member of this Chamber that you have to wait until you are 65, or put in 33 and a third years before you get a pension.

Sir, I left school at 18, like most Barbadian boys, except the few privileged ones in here who have been Barbados Scholars and went on. After one year serving apprenticeship as a telegraphist like the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, not a motor cycle rider, and then five years as a good telegraphist I went on to England to play professional cricket. After 15 years of either playing or managing the West Indies team, another 10 years as the Personnel and Public Relations Manager at Banks Breweries, and then another six years in a managerial position at Cable and Wireless, which is now BET, I can think that I would have had the equivalent of 34 years' service in various places. It is not my fault that people have asked me to work in senior positions in different companies, and I may add, Sir, companies that are among the best in Barbados. 5.40 p.m.

They cannot tell me that Banks (Barbados) Breweries and BET are poor companies or inefficiently run companies, and therefore I can only say that having done that service and coming into the House of Assembly, I cannot see why I would have to wait until I am 65 to draw a pension. I do not think that is right, but I just wanted to make my position very clear on that. You see, Sir, the very first hour that I can recall as a Minister, it was decided that Minister would have a five percent decrease in salary and you would have no car. I had hardly worked in the last 20 years for anybody without a fully serviced car and a house. Those were the sort of jobs I held, despite the fact that the Barbados Labour Party walked about in 1981 and said that a cricketer is now coming to the House of Assembly. It was never thought that cricketer could sit in this august Chamber, but now they are sitting in higher places.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, I am not aware of the Barbados Labour Party spreading that kind of propaganda.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, that is not the issue. Everybody in Barbados knows it is true. Now the Barbados Labour Party are having cricketers in their ranks, but that is what they said on the political platforms. As a matter of fact, Sir, when I was made a Minister of Tourism, I recall very well, and I might bring it in here and make it a document of the House, that Joan Benjamin said imagine giving a million dollar Ministry to a cricketer.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I don't even know whom the Honourable Member is speaking of.

Hon. W. W. HALL: What I am saying, Sir, is that when the Members of the Barbados Labour Party said so, it caught on to their friends. Sir, I need not be contentious this evening. I really do not wish to be contentious, I just wish to say that from my own perception, I have noticed that

many old and great politicians served in this Chamber for many years and when they retired they did so with a pittance. That has also been the case in commerce. But life is a dramaturgy, Sir. We have people playing back stage roles and we have people playing front stage roles. In other words, some politicians are full of charisma; some, Sir, are not that much charismatic, and therefore we must look at the contribution politicians have made in the service of this country.

I have often wondered, Sir, what could propel a man like a doctor or a lawyer to become a Minister and work some months for \$3 000. I wonder what else but service to the people. I can only say that. It is all right for those Honourable gentlemen who obviously may not think it is necessary to have a pension, but I feel, Sir, that when a doctor who can command good fees and a lawyer who could make that \$3 000 or \$4 000, a person like the ex-Attorney General, my lawyer, judging from the fees he charges me.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, I have always heard that the clients that you work for free are the ones who always give you the lashes. He knows I would not charge him. The insurance company paid me; I did not charge him. He offered me a little berry out of the substantial damages. I was glad to accept.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I was only making the point that such illustrious lawyers make more money bowing to the judges than the \$3 000 they would get as a Minister, and therefore I think it is a sacrifice they are making, and we cannot then assume that after ten or fifteen years in here they must then wait until 65 to get a pension. I think that is wrong. I do not wish to get on like that. As the Manager of the West Indies team, I used to command a fee of US\$5 000 per speech, and they paid it willingly and it went into the kitty, not to me, as you would know. I admit there are not many around who can get \$2 000, so I feel it is wrong to come and tell me that after you have worked so hard and contributed so much, you should wait until 65 to get a pension.

Mr. Speaker, this political life is very hard. First of all you get paid, in my view, for the work done, paltry salaries. I say so without any fear of contradiction, and until today it seems the arrangement for pension has been inadequate, and no wonder the people believe if you are working for poor salaries and even with poor pensions and you have money, something is wrong in the state of Denmark. You cannot say that about me, Sir, because nothing in my hands I brought in and nothing in my hands I carry. It is simple. Those who have ears to hear, let them hear.

I am saying, Sir, that we must look at this problem very seriously. Thirty-four years ago I entered Cable and Wireless with the Honourable Member for St. Michael

West. I was junior to him. It only meant that he caught the eye of the assistant manager before me. It had nothing to do with brilliance at that stage. I am saying that 34 years later when you look around and see the amount of talent that has passed through there, anyone could wonder what could have happened. People who were juniors are now divisional managers. The gentleman who was number five in my department in 1954 in the personnel management department is divisional manager now, working for three times my salary. I don't begrudge him that. I go to the office sometimes and the resident manager of Hey woods, a hotel owned by the Government - I do not hold it against him - calls me "Sir", but check his salary compared to any Minister, compared to the Prime Minister. And then the Barbados Labour Party is saying that we are making sport at tourism when you put a cricketer as a Minister. That job entails over \$90 000 a year with a car and a house.

Sir, one shudders to think what people like the manager of Sandy Lane and these prestigious hotels would get, making the Prime Minister's salary look like chicken feed. I am saying that, Sir, not to make an impression, but to give you the stark realities of the scene. We want people to know exactly what is happening. I am not therefore going to agree that we must sit in here day after day. We go to so many funerals, Sir, that some of us may well believe we are morticians. Every week as you know you have to go to funerals; you have to be subjected to all sorts of things, and that is the life of a politician. We are not complaining, we are not saying that people are too hard on us; we knew when we took up the job that as representatives of the people we would have to do that. Indeed we went and begged them for the votes in order to do just that, so we must not cry now. But, Sir, pay us adequately and commensurate with what we do as a job every day. 5.50p.m.

I think that is very important and I believe that as long as that is done, Sir, I would have no quarrel.

I have spent a lot of years negotiating with the Barbados Workers' Union, from the top to the bottom, all of them, the mighty and the great. Sometimes after being locked in battle for the entire day, you would get the impression, well you are DLP and they are DLP so, therefore, you all are copycat.

They could not understand that we as black people have become so sophisticated in terms of having to agree to disagree at times that we could lock horns for six hours, like lawyers do, and come out and have a drink. They feel that the battle must wage inside the negotiating room and outside. But, Sir, we have passed that stage. I had to tell them that.

Sir, I was there for 10 years, never had a strike because the idea was your job is only well done in Personnel Management when you avoid them. You do not

need a strike. You must let the working conditions be so good that people would never really strike. You will find that they would have such a loyalty to the group but some people do not know anything about loyalty. I could tell you that.

I, Sir, have only risen to explain my position. When you recognize that, perhaps, you could look at a Ministry like the Ministry of Agriculture. There must be five or six technocrats in there getting more money than the Minister. It is true, Sir, and when you consider that senior Permanent Secretaries will get more money - it is true that a few allowances might make your take-home pay a little higher but the proof of the pudding is in the eating and what happens is that when you retire the difference is between the pension you get and the pension the other officer gets.

I am saying that Ministers of Government, Prime Ministers - could you imagine anyone living in some country and working for the salary of the Prime Minister of Barbados? The same trials, and tribulations that you talked about? It happens to every Prime Minister. Some bear up well or appear to bear up well and suddenly die, as you said, because of the pressures and things like that.

Others are constantly maligned and they bear up better than you think they are bearing up. I am saying that, Sir, and, therefore, I am saying that we need to look at this Bill very favourably and I am not talking because I am involved in it because that will always be my position.

I do not believe that some of the politicians who have served so well in the past, some of them not glamorous, as I said, but made a fantastic contribution. We have seen both political parties and, indeed, if the day ever comes that the official Opposition ever gets the reins of Government, they would probably do the same. They would have more scope to do it.

We have seen Governments being forced of necessity, of course, to sort of make things right for an unfortunate parliamentarian. We have seen it. Do not let anybody get up in here and say it is not true. It is true. Therefore, we have to make sure that when parliamentarians work for the benefit of the people and the time comes for their retirement benefits, I think they should get it.

I am not speaking at all, Sir, because it seems to me and I know that people will say that I am one that will benefit. I got \$500 a month in the Senate. I had a job so I felt the contribution that I made in the first place to the people of Barbados since I felt that as an Independent Senator it had to be to the people of Barbados and, secondly, as a member of the Democratic Labour Party in the Senate, one of two Senators, the contribution you make to your party and, indeed, subsequently to the people of Barbados, I thought it was worthwhile, even though you had a job outside of politics.

I believe, Sir, that the time must come when we must look beyond party affiliation in these issues and stop allowing ourselves to be in a position where the people outside the walls of Parliament laugh at us.

The Berlin Wall is now down and yet the walls of Jericho that surround most of the politicians that I know are still standing. I think they should come crumbling down and all the resentment and the hatred should go and we would then see that hatred is only a wasted emotion.

I hear so many things that do not make sense to me coming from the mouths of people who are so erudite in other matters and who are, obviously, very bright people and yet when it comes to a simple matter, it seems to me as if something clouds up their minds. Their vision has gone.

I, Sir, with those few words would like to support the Bill and to say that I believe that the Government has put right something that was wrong for some time and it means that politicians who have served from the Barbados Labour Party, and politicians who have served from the National Democratic Party will benefit if they qualify.

I feel that the Government should be complimented and I will never believe that anyone of the Honourable gentlemen serving in this august Chamber must ever wait until they are 65 or 33 1/3 years to get a pension.

Only last week a man resigned from the Tourist Board and he resigned on the dot, on the same day that he joined the Board 10 years ago. What does that mean? It means simply this that he will get a pension later down the road when he qualifies and I do not deny him that. He has put his 10 years and the Government of the day says he can get his pension when he reaches that age.

Why is it then, Sir, that we as Honourable Members of this House must operate on a basis where, and we make the rules, Sir - that is what they say - we amend them and we must operate on a basis where you have to be in here until you are 65 or, to my mind, serve for 33 1/3 years.

The Judges do not do it. The Governor-Generals do not do it and they retire, I think. The Civil Service do not do it and I am lost for words to determine why is it that the politicians in this august Chamber must be subjected to that sort of thing?

We are wrong to ourselves. We are bad to ourselves if we do that and as a result of that, I will never ever - it does not matter what happens after now. I will not change my mind on this.

I will always believe that once you have served the required amount of time in the House of Assembly or in the Senate - some of the most beautiful speeches in the

assemblies in Barbados are made out there in the Senate. I am telling you. There are many Honourable members who have done their apprenticeship in that Honorable Chamber and, therefore, do not let us then feel that it is something degrading to go out there.

Indeed, Sir, I think that it is an assembly that adds stature and character to the politician and moulds him in such way that when he comes here he is ready for the real McCoy, the real thing, Sir.

Having said that, just let me congratulate the Government for bringing this Bill and lest it be said that I am involved in it. Yes, I am involved in it and whether I am involved in it or not, indeed, Sir, you do not even know how long you are going to live so you do not know whether you are going to get any pension or not.

I think it is the principle more than anything else and the pressures of political life, they are such that none of us can stand up and say that we are going to be 70 or 80 and in office. Any one who has any ambitions to be in political office at the age of 70 or 80 in Barbados well, I think, they need their heads examining.

When we look around this Chamber we do not see anybody in here 23 or 24. The Honourable Member for St. John is the youngest member. He came in just a few years ago. Your time will come when you may be in here another three or four years. 6.00 p.m.

Perhaps in another 8 years you will see younger people coming in here and making a contribution. Instead of writing in the papers and getting on the radio and talking nonsense, Sir, they will come in and see exactly what the life of a politician is, the real thing, actually getting up in here and making speeches, getting up in here, Sir, and getting out in the highways and the hedges and serving the people of your constituency. If they know what that is about, they would hardly have the time for all this rhetoric;

Therefore I have great pleasure in supporting the Government in this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my contribution on this Bill which I shall not support. I have listened attentively to the various speakers. But I realize that the only person they think worthy of their hire in this country is a politician and that grieves me.

I want to ask the question, what makes a politician better than a labourer? What makes him much better than a carpenter? What makes him much better than a mason? These people, Mr. Speaker, Sir, draw a pension at age 65.

The Honourable Minister of Labour, shortly after he became Minister of Labour told his workers, the labourers that when the sun is too hot they should take a break. Those same workers who toil with blood, sweat and tears in the hot sun in the broiling hot sun must wait until 65 to draw a pension. Are they any different from a politician? Are they the inferior of this society?

Mr. Speaker, I lived in Canada for 17 years. I contributed to a pension scheme for 12 years and I can clearly remember when the Honourable Minister of Health called me one afternoon and asked me if it were convenient for me to come home now that the Labour Party might call an election and he wanted me home in a hurry. I said, well I would be having a lot of bread to take home believing that I would leave with all these contributions. Mine is still in Canada. Every year they send me a letter telling me at age 65, yours will be such and such and such. It is all right with me. At age 65 I do not see anything wrong with it.

And most of them are talking about work, the stress and strain of a politician's life. I do agree. There are some politicians who go through a lot of stress and strain. I will not deny that. But there are many politicians who do not. There are many politicians when you call them they are either in the shower, they are busy, they are not at home and most of the constituents cannot find them to get things done. I do not want to call a few of them.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: No. I would not bother to call some names because I would begin with you. You would not work for me. I do not want to call some names because....

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: He is working for my constituents though. I would not deal with that. I would not go into that. I do not want to waste much time this evening because I am tired of listening to the rhetoric.

All I want to say is when you qualify for your pension, you should wait until you are 65 to draw it. I qualified for mine and I have to wait until 65 and it has done me no harm.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: But I get the feeling and the people out there on the street get the feeling that the only thing we politicians want is to come out on the back of a lorry, talk some foolishness, bamboozle some people, go in Parliament, look for big salaries and at the age of 50 or after you spend 2 terms, you draw a fat pension. We are giving the people out there the impression that we are not workers, we are sluggard, all we are looking at is money. That is the impression we are giving the people outside.

And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that I will not support this Bill, under no kind of consideration. Age 65 you can qualify at your 10 years or 8 years or 5 years or whatever years it is. But when you reach age 65 you draw your pension like the mason, the carpenter, the labourer and all those kinds of people.

With those words, Sir, I thank you.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill and basically to say the reasons why I wish to support this Bill.

Some time earlier, Sir, I spoke on a matter relating to tributes to a former Member of this House. I was very hurt by the fact of circumstances surrounding that Member and many other former Members of Parliament who had virtually been forgotten, not only by his colleagues, not only by the Parliamentarians of the day but virtually by the people whom he had served.

We speak very loudly of attracting persons who have a contribution to make in this country and expect those persons to come forward to make those contributions and at the same time fail to recognize that there is some necessary contribution that we must make to them, as a country, if we expect them to give of their best to our society.

One of the things I would hate to be seen as is a political hypocrite. Perhaps the sentiments raised so far by those opposing this Bill is a kind of eye opener to what I am beginning to feel out there in the society and especially in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. The question that is constantly raised is, who is able financially to become a candidate or to be a representative? And this is fuelled by a lot of reckless spending in the areas just leading up to what you would expect people to see you as, as a potential candidate or representative of Parliament.

And so, I should like to think, Sir, that when we rise in this Chamber to make comments the messages that we send to the people must not necessarily be messages that they will state about us that we are saying things that they like to hear but we must be sending them the kind of message that they can think down the road that they can be confident that that is the type of programme we intend to carry out.

Whatever I say, Sir, in my capacity as a Parliamentarian, I intend to live by. I believe that when people opt to make a contribution to the life of this community that they must do so recognizing that whatever details in the effort that they make is part and parcel of what they have agreed to. 6.10p.m.

The history of Parliament in Barbados tends to suggest that in the very early years those persons who became legislators were persons who would be considered well-to-

do and they had their own reasons for becoming legislators. In order to break the camel's back, or the load on the camel's back, we had to look for men of the calibre mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, persons like Sir Mencea Cox, D. D. Garner, Sir Ronald Mapp to help in the struggle to emancipate the poor masses of this country. We all knew then that when they were called and when they answered the call that their means of support were trivial to those whom they were coming up against, and it has to be said that the payment of legislators did not start with the Democratic Labour Party administration, but we understood that if these persons were expected to make a valuable contribution they must have something with which they could sustain the rigours of life.

We came to the point of ministerial status, Sir, and Ministers were paid very trivial salaries. It seems to me that as we continue to serve in a political sense in this country there is need for considering improvements by way of the allowances and the salaries that are required to meet the cost of living. In fact, none of us goes into a job without recognising that we have some measure of stability or something to look forward to down the road that we can consider security.

Those of us who are Members of Parliament are painfully aware of the large number of persons who want to get into the Government Service because they believe that in getting into the Government Service they have a measure of security on which they can depend down the road. All I am saying is, Sir, that whatever sphere of activity in which we are engaged in the development of this country is worthy of whatever form of remuneration that is legal and lawful.

I wish to say, Sir, that as far as I am aware, none of the Honourable Members of this House is or was unaware when they went to the hustings for the first time that there were salaries and retiring allowances apportioned to the service of the people in the political sense, and to wait until this time, 1989, to speak in terms of the retiring age and then speaking of one's disgust about people expecting pensions, when this same Democratic Labour Party under its former Minister of Finance looked at the concept of making pensions non-taxable, and indeed made pensions non-taxable for all the people.

I believe, Sir, that we must keep a relatively straight course in our public life, because we fail the people of our country when they are doubtful as to the particular stand we take or the line that we take. We cannot today say one thing because we believe it is pleasing for the ears of some people, or because it gives us a different slant on things, and then tomorrow we change it only because we feel that the tune out there is heard a little differently. I believe we have to be honest to ourselves, I believe we have to be honest to people who put us in the position to represent them.

The point has been made by all those Members supporting this Bill that it is an arduous task to be a Member of Parliament and a true representative of the people of this country. I get calls, Mr. Speaker, at half past five in the morning. I do not allow that to stop me from answering the telephone or from having a telephone that is listed so that the people can find me, because I have accepted the responsibility to be available to the people of my constituency. I feel that if I have accepted that responsibility I should not masquerade, I should not give people a feeling that I do not deserve what when I came to this Parliament was a matter of reality, what was the figure and what was the condition that gradually things would be improved. I want people to understand that if they have elected me as their representative, whatever falls due to parliamentarians in a general sense is what they know they were electing me to receive.

I want to say further, Sir, that there is also a feeling, and I got wind of it as I heard the Leader of the Opposition speaking, that pensions are given. I have to make it clear lest anybody hearing that contribution believes that in my own case that a pension, if I become eligible, will be given to me, because I am making a contribution to that pension, and I would like to think that all members of Parliament are making contributions to the pensions they hope to receive.

It is all part and parcel of the development of our country that we can take time out to give of whatever little we have, and if we are doing that, then there is nothing sinful, there is nothing disgraceful in expecting the kind of remuneration that can come our way as that will come our way.

With those few remarks, Sir, I would like to add my support to the passage of this Bill and to compliment the Government for seeing this in this light.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I sat here this afternoon and did a little introspection and analysis, and quite frankly I think by and large Barbados is a fairly backward place. I do not see how in this year of Our Lord 1989 we could come now with the kind of debate that we had in this House of Assembly today. We are not as forward thinking and as advanced as we think we are. We are indeed backward. In 1989 we are still discussing our eligibility for pensions or no pensions? In 1989? I am amazed. It really saddens me, the fact that we can be conducting these debates in our House of Assembly - I do not want to say wasting people's time, because we do not waste people's time in here, it is said. .20 p.m.

I began and made the presentation of the second reading of this Bill by saying that when I became a Minister Ministers were not pensionable, Parliamentarians were not

pensionable, and we all thought we were making an advance in the 1960s when the House of Assembly, not by the Government on its own, not just for the Opposition agreeing with the Government, but from the establishment of a Joint Committee of the House of the Government and Opposition, agreed to the recommendations that made it possible for Parliamentarians to receive retiring benefits as indeed it should be and as is done in all civilised societies, and we are still debating at this time the question of pensions. Do you mean we have nothing more to do that this simple two section Bill can cause the kind of debate that we have in here today? No wonder the people out there are very cynical. How are we advancing the people's causes when we can spend so much time on so little. We think we are doing the people's work. Perhaps we think we are on to a good thing. I have been in here long; I have been a Parliamentarian for a long time, and I know in fact when we are on to a good thing and when we are not on to a good thing. This will not get us anywhere, either one additional vote or not one vote taken away. I want to make this quite clear. From my own experience I know this will not make us win the Government, it will not make us lose the Government. We are not doing anything anti-people. Agreeing to this is not doing anything anti-people. In fact I thought this was the most simple Bill that we have had come in here to discuss.

First of all let me say this, Sir. This benefits nobody as far as I am aware in this Chamber as it is now constituted. This benefits nobody not even the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central who is now the Minister for Tourism, because as the law now stands without this amendment he is still entitled to his pension. This benefits nobody in here, and the impression that will be given by the newspapers tomorrow is that we are doing something for ourselves, when in fact we are doing nothing for ourselves in here.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Which newspapers? The one that you contribute to every other day.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The one I have shares in, yes. I have shares in the Advocate, I have shares in the Nation, and every day I allow you to put a release and a this and a that in it. So tomorrow the newspapers will say that the Members of the House of Assembly are voting themselves this and that when in fact this Bill benefits me nothing at all. It does not increase my pension, it does not increase my eligibility for a pension, it does not increase my qualification for a pension, it does nothing for me, it does nothing for us in here. All it does it make it simpler for a person who has qualified already under the existing laws to understand that if in fact there are certain things they had probably omitted to be done during the time they were Parliamentarians, and I am using Parliamentarians now to include Senators, it gives them the opportunity within a longer period of time to opt to do it. I will put it more simply now. Those persons who would have qualified for a

pension but had failed during the time that they were sitting Members to elect whether they were going to receive a gratuity and reduced pension are given an opportunity over that extended period to make that election. You have a time to elect, and this is all this is doing, giving you a period to elect, and we come in here and will debate this as though we are doing something in here for ourselves.

The next point is the minimum age at which one can receive a pension. Parliament voted fifty years as the minimum period for receiving a pension; Parliament has never yet voted 55 years for it. I was a Parliamentarian at the time, Mr. Speaker, I was in the Senate at the time, and the Parliament voted 50 years, not 55. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder if in fact we have to do this in this way or if we could not just have had it changed without coming back to Parliament, because we never voted for 55 years, we voted for 50. We never voted an amendment to it from 50 to 55; so therefore I am beginning to wonder why are we back here with this Bill when in fact Parliament voted 50 years and never voted otherwise, and yet we are hearing something about 65 years. How many persons remain in Parliament until they are 65 years, Mr. Speaker, so what are they going to do in between the period that they leave Parliament and 65 years. Let us think of persons like D. D. Garner, Mr. Speaker, who made a great contribution to Barbados. I have chosen a bad example because I really do not want to go into that one, germane but bad. I really do not want to go into that. Not everybody is a doctor.

Mr. Speaker, we are demeaning ourselves in this society by the kind of debates that we are conducting in here about our own selves. What do you expect the people out there to be saying about us on Gutterperk, on Tell It Like It Is, on Basics, on the street corners, in the rum shops or wherever they may be. Today is a sad day in Barbados, whatever you may say, that we can have this type of debate in here that we have had today. I have nothing further to say on this, Mr. Speaker.

The question that this Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. B. M. TAITT; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN; Hon. N. K. SIMMONS; Hon. W. W. HALL; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. C. V. WALKER; Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE; Dr. E. A. SIMMONS; Mr. C. A. NEBLETT; Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH; Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 16

NOES: Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. R. P. BYER; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER and Mr. E. BOURNE - 4.

On motion of lion. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House

went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair. 6.30 p.m.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to move, Sir, that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it has just occurred to me that if any attempt were made to change the 55 that exists in section 5 of the present Act, if we attempted to change that to 65, would not we all be entitled to law suits on the basis of legitimate expectations and on the basis of a statute...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, No. I am serious. I am not saying that legitimate expectations - I am using legitimate expectations in a very general sense, not in the Administrative Law sense of a legitimate expectation in here. I am not using it in that sense.

I am using it in this sense that it is arguable that under the existing law when you took up this you saw under Clause 5 that you would be entitled to your pension rights at age 55 and surely there is a presumption of statutory interpretation against new legislation divesting you of accrued rights and if only on that technical legal ground I am more convinced now than ever before of the correctness of my position and that of the other members on that side that we could not have legislated to increase it beyond but we have to legislate to bring it down, if any.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and the point we were making over here....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the point had been made earlier in the debate by Honourable Members on this side that this legislation was not designed to benefit any of the existing members of Parliament and the simple reason for that was that the existing members of Parliament, certainly those in respect of whom rights are vested, cannot be affected because any person who had a vested right by virtue of the existing legislation, if legislation is subsequently changed adversely to affect their position, they would have clearly a lawsuit in respect of that matter.

Now, that does not mean that legislation cannot be passed now which would affect those who are not presently beneficiaries so that this legislation would be in

perspective. If you change this to 65 that would apply to people who come subsequently into Parliament.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and supported by the Attorney General is a valid point in terms of legitimate expectations and it was something that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and myself adverted to across the divide.

Certainly, we on this side of the Opposition never thought for one moment that any legislation that we pass to this effect would affect already approved rights. That was never the intention because it is an established principle of law, so, even if we were minded to do that, certainly, it would be something that I would have adverted to or the advisers within the Attorney General's Chambers. It would be something that would have been brought to light.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to the point here, something which is not generally known, certainly it does not seem to be known in Barbados and has not been canvassed in the Caribbean but in the United Kingdom and in Canada, this is the expectations point, that a Member of Parliament who loses his seat gets severance payment.

It is not known in Barbados. It is not known in the Caribbean but when a man loses his seat he gets severance payment.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not going to lose my seat in a hurry so the question is not whether I get severance payment. I am just making the point to put it in the record for information in the future.

It is very important that we understand that these are matters which have been settled in other civilized countries. These are not matters which are discussed in partisan or hot terms.

There is one member of Parliament who every year discusses whether the Queen and the Royal household should be paid. That is his whole reason for being in the House. He gets re-elected every year and that is his business. Everybody knows that he is going to speak so other than that there is no discussion. I really think that the time has come now where we have reached a certain maturity. After 350 years of Parliament the time has come for us to establish our pay at the political level. No Commission of Enquiry.

I remember one time they tried Neville Nicholls who said we would have to come and press a button to clock in and if you were out of the country you would not get paid

for those days and stuff like that which we laughed at because it did not make sense. It does not make sense now.

You cannot knock us off like hoe handles and even the people who worked in the field in agriculture were given a five day guarantee of work by the Democratic Labour Party many years ago so that did not wash.

When I was much much younger, the then parties of the day, and they were not deemed to be as sophisticated as these parties now although when we read their debates I have a certain question about that because those debates are worth examination by almost anybody. I am speaking of the days of Allder, Cox, Tudor and those people who used to have some towering debates in this House but when you read those debates, those were the days when those people used to get together at the back of Speaker's Chair and discuss the emoluments for parliamentarians and it seemed that there was less acrimony in those days.

The problem came when the Labour Party of the day was in Opposition and the late Speaker of the House and the then Elliott Mottley came to a conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that their Leader of the Opposition, the then Tom Adams, had bowled them one that the umpire did not see in the jerk of the hand and that started a whole new ball game on the discussion of salaries when, perhaps, the most acrimonious debate ever to take place on one side, one * amongst the other when the then Burton Hinds indicated that Tom Adams could not lead him which may have led to his becoming one of the Speakers of this House over time.

I will not spend anymore time on that in committee but that is when the whole business of the politics of parliamentary salaries started emerging again.

I feel that we should get as much information as possible about how this business is being handled by other - parliaments elsewhere and we would be surprised if all of the heat has been taken out of this issue. 6.40 p.m.

In the United States they have hit on a formula which I once recommended in debate. It is a very simple formula. The House of the day legislates for the next House. In other words, the House of Representatives cannot and does not legislate its own salary. It legislates for the next House when it comes in. And perhaps, that is what we should do. Perhaps what we should do is lay down principles that would apply not to this particular or the particular session but we lay down principles for the next session. So that those who are elected, whomever they may be will come into the session where they find the wicket already rolled. That would perhaps reduce the heat. But I just thought I would put that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make another point. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East said that we should compare ourselves with carpenters, labourers and masons. They have to wait until 65 and on that basis, we should wait until 65.

Attractive though that is surely I think one has to look at it realistically. There is a greater mobility among artisans in Barbados, their ability to move from job to job, than there is for Parliamentarians. I know some, one of whom certainly has not worked since the last election and is in a very terrible financial state. I know another who had great difficulty in finding a job....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, Parliamentarians. I am going to say it, Sir. I will put it in the Record of the House. The Honourable Member for St. Peter for all this time has not been able to find a full-time job in his chosen field. Great pressure has been placed on prospective employers not to give him a full-time job. These are the harsh realities of political life. We know, Sir, that because of stances you take even as professional people, you are ostracized. Do you think any of those firms down town would give me a retainer for what I have said and stood for all my life? I do not have one from them, Sir. So I mean, different strokes for different folks.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That is a matter for him and them. He may be luckier than I am. I am telling you about me. I do not have any difficulty.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am like L. E. R. Dear. I work for the poor people all the years and that is no problem with me. But I am only highlighting the difficulties that will attend Parliamentarians who lose their jobs. Those who have professions upon which to fall back will survive. Those who do not have independent professions can be placed at great difficulty and disadvantage. It is not as easy to compare us with the carpenter or the mason, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, when this Bill was in the Second Reading stage, I raised some matters pertaining to the terms and conditions of this uncertain occupation. I say uncertain because one never knows when one will suffer a loss at the polls. But the Member for St. Michael West has succinctly stated the point that the time has come, just as I did in Second Reading that the time has come when we will have to take the heat out of this whole thing. We have got to sit down as Parliamentarians and work out the whole range...

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: - Do you not think so? - of this thing. I do not know. It has got to happen. If our future as Parliamentarians must be secured and bettered then these issues have got to be discussed and we have got to put behind us, we have got to forget what the political or the newspaper columnists will say. Some of them will have a lot to say. There is one of them who is in the habit of saying that he does not understand why a Parliamentarian should fix his own salary.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I do not know. You know the other one.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Right.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Yes. He says that from time to time. I think that these are things that we will have to put behind us and we have got to sit down and work it out. It has got to happen, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I was just reflecting that precisely the same verbiage, the same tone I heard coming from the Government side when I used to sit on the Opposition on matters relating to pensions and salaries, we have heard a rehash of the same thing now. I am hearing exactly the same things. I can even identify the speakers on the other side at the time whose views were just spouted out here today. It is very interesting. And perhaps the one person who might have been relatively constant in his views did not participate in the debate at all. The one person.

But it is interesting that you are articulating the same views that were articulated on this side by the Barbados Labour Party Administration for 10 years with repetition one after the other. And even the final speaker, I could remember, Sir, Mr. Lionel Craig winding up the debate as Leader of the House saying that it was a dark day in the history of Barbados that we should come in here to discuss these matters to waste people's time. Even the winding up was very much the same. Anyhow, it is fascinating experiencing them.

The point I am trying to make, Sir, the issue which we addressed in the Second Reading was not whether pensions should be paid or not. That was not the issue. The issue was when should pensions be paid and in our judgement it is age 65.1 sat down here and listened to all the distortions in the debate and I waited until this time to speak.

The issue was not whether pensions should be paid or not. The issue is the age at which the pensions should be

paid. The reason for this, Sir, is a clear perception on our part that if the law remains as it stands then, as time passes, you are going to have several times more people receiving parliamentary pensions than those in service now. And I rather suspect, Sir, that that situation obtains already. I suspect. I have not done a check but my initial questions I made during this debate suggest that already there may be more people receiving pensions than people actually in Parliament at the moment. The point I am making is that if you are paying pensions for an additional 15 years the multiple effect goes up.

When I brought this Resolution, Sir, I was painfully aware of the tremendous cost to the Treasury of Barbados on the change of a Government. And you are not talking of half a million dollars. You are not talking of \$1 million. You are talking of a lot of money involved in the payment of gratuities and thereafter pensions with the change of a Government. 6.50p.m.

As time goes on it is going to amount to considerably more money, and the question is that sooner or later the issue is going to be whether the country can afford to pay those levels of pensions and pay the salaries at the kind of level which many people in the debate have suggested should be paid.

Of course there was no question of retroactivity ever suggested in anything we have said, because such a course has always been repugnant to accepted principles of law in Barbados and I do not think that I have come across many pieces of legislation which had any retroactive application to the disadvantage of anyone who would have benefited from the legislation before. I think there was only one case or something like that that came to this Honourable House since I was in here, and that was corrected. I do not remember exactly what the case is, but I think I can remember a debate relating to the retroactive application of a piece of legislation which affected one individual or a group of individuals, and that was subsequently amended, so the question does not arise. They are all red herrings.

The whole point is as simple as this. This clause sets out the various amendments and so on in relation to the conditionalities for qualification, 50 years rather than 55, which I understand is a technical amendment, and I am very glad that the Attorney General did learn a bit of law today, not the principles of law but a fact of law, that the 50 years in fact applied from 1968 and not from 1979.

It is important to remember when you are attacking the Leader of the Opposition that he has legal friends on the other side who would seek to correct him.

Aside

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am corrected, Sir. That is a matter of record, not a matter of law. Thank you very much.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Leader of the Opposition correctly, he is saying that if you were to pay pensions to parliamentarians at age 50 the chances are that you pay much more money because more people become 50 or leave before 50. If you carry that to its logical conclusion, is he also saying that because people are living longer you should increase the old age pensions from 65? That seems to be the type of argument he is making and it does not make sense at all. If more people are living longer as parliamentarians and you raise the age, is he saying that because more people are living longer you should increase the old age pensioners now from 65 to 73? We must understand what we say in this House.

Hon. M. A. KING: One brief comment, Mr. Chairman. One would tend to get the impression from the tenor of debate of the majority Opposition that all parliamentarians begin to draw pensions when they reach 50. The fact of life is that a lot of parliamentarians remain in Parliament long past 50 years. Politicians do not just leave at 50 for the sake of age. When politics get into the blood of politicians, all of them sometimes say they are going to leave at this age and that age, but invariably they tend to stay on until the people tell them it is time to go.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Retiring Allowances (Legislative Service) (Amendment) Act, 1989.

QUESTION TIME

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, Question No. 106.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Question No. 106 reads as follows:

To ask the Minister of Tourism and Sports:

1. Will the Minister please state whether he will permit the electrification of the hard courts at Holy Innocents, St. Thomas by reusing some of the lights that formerly were in use at the

National Stadium prior to the change of the lighting system thereat but which are presently in the custody of the National Sports Council?

2. If the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, will the Minister state a date for commencement of the installation?

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows:

Consideration was given to the electrification of hard courts, including those at Holy Innocents, using the lights which were formerly used at the National Stadium prior to the change of the lighting system there. However, many problems such as short life and high price of the tube, low output of the light and high consumption of electricity were associated with these lights necessitating their replacement. In the

circumstances, reuse of these lights to electrify hard courts, including those at Holy Innocents, is now not being pursued. Alternative lighting systems are being considered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any supplementaries? None. That is the end of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further that I intend to bring before this House in terms of Government Business. I therefore move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 5th December, 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. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of

Tuesday, November, 21, 1989 4400

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4400

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 4400

1. Notice of resolution for \$229,080 - 1989-90 Supplementary Estimate No. 6.
2. Notice of resolution for \$145,825 - 1989-90, Supplementary Estimate No. 7.
3. Notice of resolution for \$711,293 - 1989-90, Supplementary Estimate No. 8.
4. Notice of resolution for \$2,700,000 - 1989-90, Supplementary Estimate No. 9.
5. Notice of resolution to amend Explanatory Note to Head 18, Audit, Sub-head 1, General Administration, Object No. 11.
6. Notice of resolution to amend Explanatory Note to Head 73, Ministry of Finance, Sub-head 4.
7. Notice of Bill to provide for implementation of Agreement to establish a regime for CARICOM Enterprises.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 4401

A Bill to provide for implementation of Agreement to establish a regime for CARICOM Enterprises.

OBITUARY SPEECHES 4401

Re: Death of Mrs. Muriel Haynes

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4401; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4401; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4402; Hon. C. V. Walker, 4402; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4403; Mr. Speaker, 4404; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4404.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. W. W. HALL 4405

Re: Question No. 106

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 4405

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4405

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THOMAS GAP, ST. MICHAEL TO FACILITATE NATIONAL URBAN LOW INCOME HOUSING PROJECT 4405

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4405, 4414; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4405; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4408; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4410.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES (LEGISLATIVE SERVICES) (AMENDMENT) BILL 4415

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4415, 4437; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 4416, 4440; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4419, 4438, 4440; Hon. C. V. Walker, 4421; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4421, 4439, 4440; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4423, 4439; Mr. R. L. Morris, 4428; Hon. M. A. King, 4430, 4438, 4441; Hon. W. W. Hall, 4432; Mr. E. Bourne, 4435; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 4436; Hon. N. K. Simmons, 4441.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS 4441

Question No. 106.

Hon. W. W. Hall, 4442

SUSPENSION 4414

ADJOURNMENT 4442

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4442.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O.S. (St. Peter) BOURNE, E. (Christ Church East) BRATHWAITE, L. L. (St. Michael North East) BYER, R. P. (St. George South) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) MORRIS, R. L. (Christ Church East Central) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas) SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James South) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North) WEEKES, His Honour L. A. (St. Michael North West)