

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 7, 1989.

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.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. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)
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.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P.,
(Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development)
Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.)
Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Mr. E. BOURNE
Dr. E. A. SIMMONS, M.D.
Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M. (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, B.A., (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of the Civil Service)

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

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER

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

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

Prayers were led by Fr. Ivan Harewood. Mr.

SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the 31st October, 1989.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minutes of Tuesday, 31st October, 1989 have been circulated and I have no indication that there are any difficulties with them, so I beg to move that the Minutes be taken as read and be confirmed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following Standing Orders be suspended: Standing Orders 6,16, 18, 20,42(5), 43 and 44.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: And that is for the remainder of the day's sitting. I take it is for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, for the remainder of the day.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant order of the day. Order No. 3.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90, NO. 2 A

Resolution for the sum of \$5,016,740 was called.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move the passing of this Resolution for the sum of \$5,016,740. The purpose of this Resolution is to supplement a number of Items which have proved to be insufficient for public expenditure purposes, and we are required from time to time, as necessity requires, to come to this Honourable Chamber if such a situation occurs. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of subhead 6 of Head 15, Cabinet Office, I wish to state that there are three object numbers here to be supplemented. Object No. 6 relates to travel, and the original provision was \$14 668. That has proved insufficient and a supplement of \$7 000 is required to the end of the financial year.

The reason why this supplement is required, Sir, is because the rates of travelling allowance payable to public officers, have been increased retroactively from July 1988 and a heavier demand has therefore been made on the existing vote than was budgeted for. Of the sum of \$14 668 provided, \$11 469.90 has been spent and that has left a balance of \$3 198.10, and it is estimated that approximately \$9 850 will be spent under this item during the remainder of the financial year, and this is broken down in terms of \$8 850 on fixed travelling and \$1 000 on travel per mile as is paid to the officers as far as the staff of the Cabinet Office is concerned. Supplementary provision of \$7 000 is therefore required for this particular Object No. 6 under the item "Travel".

Under Object No. 12 the sum of \$505 360 was provided and as the Addendum states, \$480 000 out of this was earmarked to meet the expenses in relation to the 350th Anniversary of Parliament celebrations. To date some \$300 000 has been spent and there are commitments together with further anticipated expenditure amounting to \$251 874, and a supplement of \$90 000 is therefore required for this particular item.

As far as Object 30 is concerned, Sir, the sum of \$100 000 has been approved in the Estimates, and it is very difficult to estimate how much money will be spent under this particular item; it is for compensation for personal injury and damage to property, and there are funds provided to meet those particular contingencies, but as I have indicated, it is very difficult to anticipate the amount exactly and sometimes even in close proximity. That vote of \$100 000 has been completely used up and we are seeking therefore a supplement of \$140 000 to meet the * claims which may arise during the period ending March 31, 1990. Under subhead 2, Sir, Government hospitality, the amount of \$144 375 was voted and \$144 140 has been spent or committed, so we are very near to the limits of this particular vote, and we are requesting supplementary of \$100 000 to meet anticipated Government hospitality during the remainder of the current year.

Under subhead 3, Conferences and Delegations, the sum of \$1 251 250 has been provided to meet the cost of delegations participating in conferences, and there is a balance of \$26 249 on the books. We are estimating that a further sum of \$800 000 is required to meet anticipated requirements to the end of the financial year. I would like to state that on this particular item our expenditures in previous financial years were as follows: 1985 to 1986 the amount voted including supplementaries was just over \$2 million, \$2 092 799 and \$2.064 million was actually spent. For 1986/1987 there was a sum of \$2.5 million actually voted and \$2.1 million spent approximately. In 1987 the amount voted including supplementaries was \$1.9 million and \$1.8 million was spent, and in 1988/89 \$1.7 million was voted and \$1.6 million was spent. So with the original amount provided and this supplementary, we are getting back to the amount spent, let us say, during the period 1985 to 1986. We have had many debates over the years on this question of conferences and delegations, but when we actually look at the figures, it can be seen that there is a very decided effort to seek to keep these expenditures within historical limits.

I beg to move that Head 15 - Cabinet Office - stand part.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by characterising the various supplementary Resolutions before us today of which this forms a part as obviously ar*

example of runaway expenditure. If I look at the specific Head being asked for ...

Hon. B. M. TAUT: On a point of order, I don't like interrupting the Honourable Member, but the Honourable Member started off the very first sentence in a manner which is contrary to the rules. He cannot debate the entire gamut of supplementaries. He said he sees this and the supplementaries that we have today. Head 15 is what he has to confine himself to.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Head 15 shows that the Prime Minister is asking under a part of his portfolio for increases ranging from 50 per cent at the low to as high as 140 per cent on items of expenditure. 12.35p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am characterising this as one of the series of what is, obviously, an example of runaway expenditure and squandermania.

I say so because if one looks at the overall expenditure of the Government in the period 1985 to 1986, the Government's overall expenditure was \$663 million. By 1989/1990 it is \$985 million and this supplementary, together with the others, will bring the expenditure to over one billion dollars so what we will find, Sir, is that in a period of three years we have increased expenditure by over \$300 million, or approximately \$300 million.

Now, Sir, the Government must exercise discipline in the manner in which it is expending money in this country, particularly having regard to the effect which expenditure of this nature can have on the foreign reserves and the pressure on our foreign reserves.

I am surprised that in making his presentation the Minister does not tell us what areas he is proposing to exercise some sort of discipline in the various departments of Government because this is, obviously, the first of which will be several supplementaries coming before this committee between now and the end of February.

Now, Sir, I am going to take the alternative. If it is not fiscal indiscipline, if it is not a position of runaway expenditure, it must be bad budgeting, one of the others because it is really surprising that one is going to get such substantial increases occurring in such a short time in matters that we debated in this House as recently as March.

I do not know whether when the Prime Minister had his original request the considerations which now apply were taken into account. The Government ought to have foreseen that we were going to be having a 350th Anniversary of Parliament. Surely it would have been possible for the Government to estimate with more

accuracy than has been estimated in this case the kind of expenditure that the Government would have incurred during the period of time.

Now, whilst I can see that in relation to claims having regard to the system that has been operated in the past, there is really no accurate forecast of the claims coming before the Government but, certainly, in the other areas of expenditure that we are dealing with here, Sir, \$100 000 and \$144 000.

Eight hundred thousand dollars on \$1.2 million and \$7 000 on \$14 000, obviously is either very bad estimating on the part of the Minister's advisors and the Minister or else it is Government trying to come before this committee in the month of March and pretending that Government is containing expenditure and towards the end of the year finding itself inevitably facing the position that it must come before this committee with supplementaries. It could be only one of three, Sir.

I do not believe that some of this expenditure, with the exception of the item relating to claims, could not have been foreseen and it is because of that that I said it is an example of either very bad budgeting or, alternatively, it must be an example of failure of the Government to control expenditure.

Now, I want to deal with each subhead and ask a few questions. The 350th Anniversary Celebrations do, somehow, give us the impression that there is no sustained momentum going on at all. There are certain events that have been run successfully, like the courtyard concerts, but there are others in which one seems to get the clear impression that there has been long enough planning that has gone into the events.

I know there has been some regret on the part of past parliamentarians that they have not been involved enough in some of the various activities that have been planned and that, therefore, one would want to know how involved they have been and what are the other items being planned by the Government for the balance of these celebrations for which we have committed ourselves to the funds that are now going to be voted by this committee.

Sir, I am also asking the Minister to tell us something about the plans for the pageant. As I understand it, the Government has had to go to the private sector cap in hand asking for provision of funds in order to stage a pageant and I would wish to know what is the amount that has been collected from the private sector and that we get some undertaking that the various requests which have been made to the Government be particularized and we see some details of what had been collected overall.

I have one particular concern as well about the staging of the Youth Parliament.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order, if the Honourable Member would give way.

There is an aspect to this debate that would be unfortunate unless it is clarified.

The Honourable Member is discussing and castigating the Government on the one hand but the matters relating to the 350th Anniversary of Parliament are matters which have been the result of an all Parliament Committee. The decisions that have been made have been brought back to this House and, therefore, to criticize the Government per se will be unfortunate, if not unfair.

It is an all Parliament Committee made up of all parties so the 350th Anniversary Committee must take the responsibility and includes a representative of the Honourable Member's party, and a representative of the official Opposition. I do not think it is fair for you to be castigating the Minister who moved the head under the 350th. Let us deal with the 350th separately.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the point I am making is that I participated along with the Honourable Member for St. John, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister in the unavoidable absence of the Prime Minister, in an event dealing with young people and talking to them about Parliament and what it means. That was a good example of one of the events that I think has been successful, not because I participated but because I saw in it great possibility for young people to know something about how this Parliament functions.

I understand that it is proposed to have a Youth Parliament and that an approach has been made to the House, through the Presiding Officer, for this Parliament to be used. I understand, and I hope my information is correct, that that approach has been refused.

I wish to say, Sir, that when similar events have taken place in the Commonwealth Caribbean and elsewhere, the youth have been allowed, without any desecration of the sanctity of Parliament, to have participated and to use those facilities and I would wish to know what is the reason why... 12.45 p.m.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not understand what kind of example the Honourable Member is setting. His representative sat on the Committee that agreed that that should not be done and now he comes in here to criticise it. What kind of double standards are those? Your

representative sat on that Committee and agreed and you come in here now to criticise it.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Did she vote against it? Did she come and put in a minority report? You have to be honest about these matters. Do not come in here grandstanding and now trying to give the people the impression that the Government is making a mess of something when your representative sat on the Committee.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member knows, if he is referring to Miss Miller, that she never agreed to that and that she was in favour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stood at this point of the sitting.

Certain remarks made by the Hon. Member of St. Michael West and Hon. Member for Christ Church West were ordered to be expunged from the record.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to inform all Honourable Members that that type of behaviour will not be condoned. It does not befit the dignity of this Honourable Chamber for Members to behave in that fashion and I shall not be condoning that any longer in this session.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I wish to apologize, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would only not conform with the Rules when other Members persist in breaching the Rules and I have to reply, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow any Member not to conform with the Rules while I am sitting in this Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You will have complete compliance from me, Sir, once that is followed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude his speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Now Sir, I want to move on to the question of the settlement of claims. I believe, Sir, that last week the Honourable Member for St. Thomas drew to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, the Honourable Attorney General's attention various outstanding claims and obviously this vote will go somewhere towards answering those problems. But it seems to me, Sir, and I know that I certainly have seen this being urged, that the Government will find itself increasingly being faced with more and more claims particularly since the enactment of the Administrative Justice Act and particularly as people are becoming more cognizant of their

rights both in relation to acts of omission and acts of commission on the part of the Government. It would make more sense in my submission for the Ministry of the Attorney General - I know that it has been traditional to place this vote under Cabinet Office and I have heard it explained by past Cabinet Secretary the reason why it has been placed there - having regard for the increases which are occurring to have its own vote since it is principally responsible for litigation and maybe the estimate of what is likely to happen would be much more accurate. Certainly at anytime the Ministry of the Attorney General would have within its confines the relevant information relating to both its threatened litigation and litigation which is pending and should be able to provide much more accurate details as to the likelihood of Government having to make compensation under the various heads that we have before us today, Sir.

One of the benefits accruing from a better estimation under this Head would be to save Government itself a substantial amount of legal cost when the Government is forced to litigate and do this or is slow in settling. As the Honourable Member would know, not only is there a question of cost but there is likewise the question of interest particularly on damages. The court has recently been following within the last couple of years the principle that invariably, particularly in personal accident cases, interests are awarded both in relation to special damages and also interest is awarded on damages from the time when the accident occurred. I will strongly suggest - Sir, I am just going to finish the sentence as you are indicating that my 15 minutes have run out. I will strongly suggest that in those circumstances that one should provide a separate vote within the substantive Ministry with responsibility for claim I will have to revert on others.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this Resolution, I must say that there is just one aspect of it that I am not particularly happy about when we look at the entire Resolution within the context of the stated objectives by the Prime Minister when he delivered his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals over the last few years. I believe that on each occasion what came through was that Government would seek to control spending as the object of economic policy.

Now I am particularly concerned with the fact that this Committee now has to consider a further sum of \$800,000 to be used to supplement Subhead 3. This is the one aspect of the vote of this Resolution that I am not happy about, the one that we are looking at now, Sir. Now at the end of this financial year it would mean about \$2 million would have been spent on this Subhead. If we are going to affect or if the Prime Minister is going to affect the objective of controlling spending, it would seem to me that all aspects of

current expenditure should be examined with a view to achieving this desired objective. The Prime Minister when he made his presentation said that he is trying to keep this Head of the vote within historical limits and over the last years the vote on this Head has continued to go up and up. Of course, we will have to allow for the fact that an element of this increase could be considered an increase in the area of increased cost in travel and that kind of thing, air travel, and so on. But it would have been a good thing if we are to debate the vote with any certainty if some idea was given as to the use to which this \$800,000 would be put in terms of allocation. It comes under the Head of "Conferences and Delegations". I still would like to get some idea from the Prime Minister how it is anticipated that the money would be spent and, if that is not possible, how the initial vote of \$1.2 million was spent thus far. As I said, speaking about keeping things within historical limits, I do not think it is a very strong argument. If we take the Prime Minister's argument to its logical conclusion, then I could say that all aspects of spending should be kept within historical limits. 'What is historical? That is the point one should seek to ascertain. Over what period are we looking at to ascertain whether something is being kept within historical limits? 12.55 p.m.

If I may say so, Sir, at the end of the year our expenditure would be in the region of over a billion dollars, and for an economy that is undergoing the strain that we are undergoing at the moment, this is not a desirable thing. I believe that efforts ought to be made, because these may very well just be the beginning of a series of supplementaries that will be brought coming on to the end of the financial year to supplement Government's spending, and expenditure might conceivably rise significantly higher than was projected.

This, Sir, to me is but an example of the squandermania ineptitude and bad financial management with which we are faced at this moment today. I am not at all happy with the approach taken by the Prime Minister. I have said so on more than one occasion and no amount of back slapping on his part, no amount of self congratulation will change that fact. To say that you are the most courageous person who has ever tackled the economic problems that this country has been faced with, to my mind - if it is in fact true, I do not know if it is true, I have not had cause to examine it - but it is in a way blowing one's trumpet or conch shell, and even though I know one member of Parliament has said before that the only person who can blow your trumpet for you is yourself, nobody else is going to blow it, I still do not agree that that ought to be the approach. Self congratulation certainly is not the approach that one ought to take in these matters. No one probably has congratulated the Prime Minister on whatever initiatives he has taken to remedy the ills with which we are faced in the economy, probably because nobody is

convinced that the measures being taken will remedy the ills with which we are faced.

I am not happy, Sir, with this aspect of Subhead 3, the large vote. It is over \$800,000 that we are being asked now to supplement and in his reply if the Prime Minister could give me some idea of how it is projected that this money could be spent, I would be very happy. Alternatively, if he cannot give that information, certainly how the \$1.25 million was spent previously.

.In relation to Subhead 1, Object 30, that aspect of the Resolution that is dealing with a vote to meet claims against Government for compensation for personal injury and damage to property, this is a very important aspect of the Resolution which I think deserves some time for discussion.

Over the years people who have sought compensation from Government for one reason or other have had to wait an inordinately long time to receive that compensation. This is not a criticism of Government, maybe it is an observation of the kind of mechanism that one is faced with when one seeks to make a claim against Government for damage to property and personal injury. For example, if one's car is damaged on the highway because one of the wheels fell into a hole and one suffered injury, one has got to start off by having someone from the Ministry of Transport and Works go to the spot and investigate that accident or investigate the occurrence, then a report is sent through the Ministry to the Ministry of the Attorney General for a legal opinion. Then, a legal opinion having been given, the opinion is transmitted back to the Ministry of Transport and Works, and sometimes depending on the size or importance of the claim, the claim is either dealt with slowly or it is dealt with fast.

I know this for a fact, because when I worked as Deputy Crown Solicitor in the Ministry of the Attorney General I advised people who made claims against Government to go ahead and repair the vehicle, because sometimes a \$300 claim took as long as three years to be sorted out. I do not know if that is still the case, but I know some claims I have had to deal with since then involving Government have taken an inordinately long time to be dealt with. I believe that some effort should be made to look at the mechanism with a view to amending, adapting that mechanism to suit a speedier conclusion of claims that are brought against Government, because as the member for Christ Church West said, because of the introduction of the Administrative Justice Act, and because people are becoming more and more aware of their rights under the Constitution, I foresee that over the years there will be an increase in the amount of claims made against Government for damage to property and personal injury.

The claims will become more and more complex and the claims for compensation will increase, so we are asking two things here:

- (1) that there be an adaptation of the mechanism with a view to allowing for a speedier conclusion of these matters once they are brought to the attention of Government, if we could circumvent the present mechanism in some way, and
- (2) that there be an increase in the vote from the very beginning. In other words, when Government is sitting down looking at its expenditure, that provision be made very early over and above ... the vote last time was \$100,000 and that is a bit small. I believe that we should be making efforts to allow for a larger vote in that area.

One way one might look at circumventing the mechanism probably is by assigning attorneys-at-law to various Government Ministries where you would have direct contact with someone who can give you an almost on the spot opinion as to whether a particular claim ought to be met or not. That is one way we could deal with it.

I think there might be some argument for the decentralisation of the Attorney General's Chambers. You must have a central place where you have the Attorney General's Chambers, but certainly I think the time has come now where Government has seriously got to consider providing attorneys-at-law for the various Government Departments and Statutory Boards that it has to administer. At the National Housing Corporation you have lawyers on the spot, I think at the Industrial Development Corporation, at the Caribbean Development Bank there is in-house legal counsel, at the Income Tax Department at one time I think there was in-house legal counsel as well, and I think that this trend ought to be continued with a view to expanding the areas and sort of diffusing or decentralising the Attorney General's Chambers. That is one way we could tackle that problem. 1.05p.m.

I do not have anything to say about the 350th Anniversary of Parliament. It is a combined effort, if we may look at it on a party basis, that the entire Parliament is making. I am a little disappointed that there appears to be stops and starts, but at the same time we have never had to organise a 350th Anniversary of Parliament before, and I do not think we will have the opportunity again, but certainly the experience that we are gaining at the moment from this will serve us in good stead when we are faced with organising plans for the 375th anniversary or the 400th anniversary or whatever else we plan to do, but I will not criticise the efforts that are being made at the moment. Whenever we have had an occasion, it has been one where

participation has been broad-based and certainly one which I believe the people of Barbados fully supported.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I will confine this intervention primarily to the 350th Anniversary Celebrations, and I am grateful to the Honourable Member who has just sat down for his approach to the matter, and I think one can understand the view that the events seem to be stop and start, and it is precisely in the interest of controlling the expenditure that the Committee at its outset determined that it would have in essence peaks and valleys.

Now from the very beginning, and the reports have been made to Parliament, there was an all party Committee, and even after Miss Billie Miller ceased to be a Member of the Upper House, the Committee determined that because she had formed, representing that party, a part of the overall Committee, we would continue to allow her not only to be a Member, but to chair the sub-Committee which was responsible for certain events.

The organisation of the 350th Anniversary was done by way of a series of sub-Committees each of which had responsibility for a particular event. Consultation was made across the country in all sectors, and given the limits we had set ourselves in expenditure, bearing in mind the total cost, we arranged these events to come at certain points along the way in the whole year, because we were celebrating for a whole year.

The first part of the celebrations was a visit to Barbados by Her Majesty. As it will be recalled, she came with Prince Philip, delivered the Throne Speech where she touched on the political connections between Britain and Barbados and that was the beginning of the 350th Anniversary Celebrations. The next high point was the joint Session of both Houses of Parliament which was centred around June 26, the actual day of the 350th Anniversary, and you will recall the very impressive ceremony which was held in this Chamber and which has been recognised by all and sundry as having been representative of the dignity which we have achieved over the years, and which was manifested in that particular movement of 26th June. So well received was that particular activity that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation was asked by many citizens through the 350th Anniversary to repeat the television broadcast of that event.

We then moved after that during the month of June to a number of exhibitions to mark the 350th Anniversary. The Barbados Museum and Historical Society set up a display entitled "The Growth of a Nation" which included pictures and documents depicting the history of Parliament in Barbados. The British Government gave to Barbados an exhibition which is going to be a permanent exhibition that will be available here in these precincts over time. The National Art Foundation had an exhibition which like that of the Museum was held in the Parliament Buildings. This

one was entitled "Art in Bloom" and combined exhibits from the National Art collection with artistic floral arrangements. Again this has been hailed by all as a successful activity.

We had an opportunity to observe an exhibition of heraldic banners which have been a gift from the Mobil Oil (Barbados) Limited, and I want to say, because one columnist has made it almost a penchant over the last few months to discuss this question of getting money from the private sector, and the Honourable Member referred to it, that at the outset the Committee agreed that to the extent it was possible, we would seek to include the widest possible community in the celebrations, and again bearing in mind that the total cost of the celebrations would run to a fairly tidy sum, recognising that it was desirable, it was agreed at the outset by the entire Committee unanimously that we would approach the private sector and ask them to make a contribution.

The contribution has come in many ways. Some companies have made contributions to Parliament itself by way of kind. There is one company that has made an antique dining table of mahogany available; that will be displayed in due course. That contribution was made even before the 350th Anniversary began; it was made when the Honourable Members on the other side formed the Government.

You will recall seeing the Senator who represents the National Democratic Party on the Committee sitting in a Chair on the front page of one of the newspapers when one of the business houses in Bridgetown had made a contribution of chairs to the Senate. Throughout this building you will find a number of things that have been contributed by the private sector. Mobil (Barbados) Limited made the presentation of the heraldic banners which I believe cost some \$30 000, or is it 30 000 pounds, which were done by a Barbadian, Miss Ann Rudder who has this special capacity and ability. These can be found and they are in fact going to be on permanent display in the west wing of this complex when it is completed.

The heraldic banners were so well received that recently Sir Shridath Ramphal was going to be inducted as the new Chancellor of the University and the University asked whether they could borrow the heraldic banners, and they were in fact sent to Trinidad on loan with Miss Rudder and they were on display as part of the celebration of his induction into the office of Chancellor.

The courtyard concerts were designed to represent the people's part of the celebrations, and the court yard concerts have been held every two weeks. They have been enormously successful and they are scheduled to be completed with, if you will pardon, the concelebration of a pageant. The pageant was conceived again at the very beginning and was designed to represent the contribution of

the youth. I believe that the contributions from the private sector total in excess of \$100 000. The Chairman of the sub-Committee reported this to the press, it was published in the Advocate and the Nation newspapers. I expect that more will be collected because a budget for the pageant was done, and the private sector who had been consulted indicated that this is the area in which they want to make the contribution.

It has been portrayed that some politician has been going around to the private sector extracting from them money for the pageant for the benefit of the party. This party does not - unlike the last party when it was in Government when they had a hit man who used to pick up the telephone and call people and name the number and tell them how much they had to contribute or else they would not get contracts - operate like that.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is not untrue. You know it is not untrue. You know you had a hit man who used to call up people and make demands of how much money they wanted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member come back to the Head we are discussing? Order. 1.15p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The fact is that the impression being given because we allowed the private sector to make contributions of \$5 000 each or thereabout to the pageant - the pageant, Mr. Chairman, is a project which is being directed as an historic pageant which is a dramatisation written by Dr. Elizabeth Clarke and it will involve about 2 000 young people. It will trace the history of Parliament from the days of slavery through Independence to the present and the venue is the National Stadium and the date is November 24 this year.

This is one of two big projects planned for November, the other one being the Youth Parliament, and the historic pageant.

On the question of the Youth Parliament, when the matter was being discussed the committee agreed that the actual House of Parliament would not be used for the Youth Parliament. A representation was made by the Chairman of that committee that it ought to be held in Parliament and after mature discussion, including the two Presiding Officers of Parliament, one of whom has been given the responsibility to retain all that constitutes Parliament as custodian, they determined that in their mature judgement it was undesirable and the committee made the decision.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my swift reaction to the Honourable Member which occasioned a little heat was

based on my very firm and strong belief and commitment to the concept of collective responsibility.

It is my judgement that if we form part of a committee, that if I form part of the Cabinet of Barbados, or I form part of an all party conference of this Parliament, and if I disagree strongly with a view, or my views disagree strongly with the majority view, it is my view, that I should make vigorous representation during the deliberations.

But it is also my committed clear, clear understanding that when the decisions have been taken I cannot be heard to be going outside criticizing the decisions of the committee unless I was prepared at that time to put in a minority report or to resign from the committee.

It is a principle which ought not to be violated by persons who claim to subscribe to the rule of law because the rule of law embraces that particular principle and it is a principle which we have accepted, that is, the collective responsibility of which everybody talks about.

It is clear that in any Cabinet at any time you cannot have all the members agreeing 100% on every issue but what you have as a fundamental, if not the fundamental aspect of this system of Government, is that when once they have agreed, when once a decision has been made and you have not resigned, you form part and parcel of that decision. So it is with the system we set up for the 350th Anniversary Committee that whatever decisions are made they are binding on all of us unless we state at that time that they are not binding. Hence, Sir, my reaction when the Honourable Member sought, and I know that he knows better - at least, I thought so up until that point - to suggest that his representative disagreed with not making the Parliament available.

If Mr. Speaker says it cannot be used, that is the end of that and it was not even Mr. Speaker. It was a committee on which both Mr. Speaker and Mr. President from the Other Place sat.

I say no more on that except to say this. The 350th Anniversary Celebration was conceived as a year long celebration. It was anticipated that there would be gaps between the highlights. Those gaps were to be filled, and I believe have been filled to a large extent by the concept, the essence of Parliament being interspersed in utterings, in debate, in writings, in all of the things that are done during this year. That is why the emblem which was arrived at after a competition in which the whole community could participate, now forms part of the paraphernalia of Parliament and can be found and seen from time to time in various places all throughout the English speaking world where one goes.

Recently I went to Trinidad and Tobago to speak to the Friends of Barbados in Trinidad and Tobago, an

organization that was chaired by a relative of the Honourable Member for the City. We went to speak to them and they had the emblem of the 350th Anniversary of Parliament and they were celebrating.

In London they have had celebrations. In Ottawa, in Toronto, all over the world they have had celebrations of the 350th Anniversary of Parliament and this is what we set out to do. We did not set out to have a bacchanal all year round. We set out to sow the spirit of the 350th Anniversary and to demonstrate thereby what we had achieved.

I know that all Honourable Members agree and I think that honest and sincere criticism of our total effort is possible, is probable and is desirable. We will not have another 350th Anniversary but, maybe, the people who celebrate the 400th Anniversary will be able to look back at what we did and determine whether we did the correct thing but I would like to think that in the words of a youngster who spoke to me a couple days ago about the 350th when it was suggested that we might have cancelled the courtyard concert, who said to me, "Skipper, we might not get everything right, but this year we have had a good year about Parliament. Do not stop it."

I would like to think that that is the feeling that we have been able to generate and, therefore, I hope that the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party contingent of the Opposition who is a constitutionalist, will desist from any further temptation to use the 350th Anniversary as grist for his political mill.

I know, Sir, as I wind up, that he is in a new situation feeling for the first time that he has become the sole and only Leader of the Barbados Labour Party. I understand, therefore, that he might have a feeling that he has to say something but I hope that...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The member must conclude now.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He is the sole and only. Billy is no longer interfering with him, from what I understand. He has been selected from the floor for the first time and, therefore, I can understand how he would want to behave, Sir. I will speak to the other matters in due course, Sir.

Thank you.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I want to continue in the same vein in which my friend from St. Michael West left off and then possibly go on to the question of Conferences and Delegations.

First of all I want to compliment the Committee for the 350th Anniversary for the fine work which they have done. Wherever I have been attending any of the

celebrations all persons present were in high praise for the standard of planning and implementation and, indeed, the committee has done Barbados proud.

My understanding of the composition of the committee was that the representatives would have reported to their respective parties, at least that was our understanding in this party, and that we would have fed back to our representatives certain ideas which we had.

For example, I know for the youth when it was fed back to us in my Ministry we asked and I asked that a member from the Community Development Division be on the committee to help plan it and the Youth Officer.

If the representative for the Barbados Labour Party did not report to her party, then that is their business but I think it is rather unfortunate that the leader of that party would have come in here today and try to castigate the Government on any matter dealing with the 350th Anniversary.

I would like to say that as far as the stops and starts are concerned, that that is inevitable. 1.25p.m.

For one, we have had to use the Civil Servants and again I would like to compliment the Civil Servants for the wonderful job they have done. We must understand that the Civil Servants have got their normal work to do and then go beyond the call of duty to assist us in the planning of the events. For example, when the CPA Conference was held here, Civil Servants worked around the clock. Some slept four hours a night in the whole week - four hours per night for the week. How can you expect them then to go from that event straight away into another event? It is absolutely impossible. Then we have to consider the venues. Barbados is a very small place and there are things going on in Barbados daily and weekly over and above the celebrations of the 350th Anniversary. The conference centre - Dover - we have not got the sole choice on Dover. We have not got the sole choice of the policemen who work. So therefore one would expect that; plus the fact that we have other festivals going on. Would you expect the 350th Anniversary Festival to clash with Crop-Over Festival which really starts in May and goes through to August? So it is unreasonable for anybody to come in here and talk about stops and starts in the one vein and then talk about expenditure.

Now if you are saying that the amount of money being spent on the 350th Anniversary is excessive - as a matter of fact, if my recollection serves me correctly, the Barbados Labour Party complained about the money spent for the CPA Conference as far as the whole conference. The CPA Conference was \$1.5 million, as I understand it. But now they are saying to us that you are having stops and starts but you should control expenditure. You cannot have both.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not aware that the Barbados Labour Party objected to any money spent on the CPA Conference, or ever voted against it or even criticised it. I would be grateful if the Minister would indicate who said it, where they said it, and what was said. We have never been against CPA or any money voted for CPA. We quarrelled about the buses. You will hear about them later.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member for St. James South continue?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Thank you very much. Even the buses - had not for the buses, and you can ask anyone who worked at the Conference, it would have been impossible to move the people, totally impossible. Let me say this as well. We go on conference overseas and we get first-class treatment, but we expect people to come here and get less than first-class. Ask anybody who has worked at the conference and they will tell you that had not been for the buses we could have not got the people there on time. This is one of the first conferences of the CPA.....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I have some order please?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: and delegates were at every function. As a matter of fact, some delegates got there even fifteen or twenty minutes before the time and that was the success of the conference. You see some people expect in the West Indies when you come to a conference that you must come fifteen or twenty minutes late to show how important you are.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for the City.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Leave the Member for the City. He does not talk very much anyhow. Give him a chance to talk now. As I was saying.....

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: The level of behaviour - you expect that from him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member take his seat just one minute. Just take your seat for one minute.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Sorry, sorry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I again wish on the first hand to appeal to Members to understand that the Chair is to be respected and I am not going to tolerate that kind of attitude. Please desist from that kind of behaviour. The Honourable Member may continue.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, do not expect that the 350th Anniversary would want to clash with other festivals in the country. So therefore again we had to have a stop for the Crop-Over Festival.

The question of planning for one event to the next is also important, because once you have successfully carried out a programme then you have to make sure that all ends are tied up for the next. The problem is that some people have never had the opportunity to plan anything and, therefore, when they see it come off successfully they believe that it is so easy to be done. That is why all they do is to complain. But I would suggest that sometime some of them get involved in the planning of events and then they will see how difficult it is. Invariably in Barbados anyhow you see the same faces having to plan everything and that is one of our problems because we are small.

As far as the cross-section of people is concerned, I have tried to attend most of the functions and I can say that all sections of the community were considered. If you were to go to the concerts in the Courtyard, you will see every person from the toddlers to grannies and every form of music even "dub" you can get there. So that the Committee has catered for all persons in the festival and nobody has been left out.

Now the Opposition Parties always talk about expenditure. I have not heard them suggest for one moment yet how we can cut this expenditure, bearing in mind that 70% to 75% of the current expenditure is spent on wages and salaries. If they intend as in 1984, I believe it was, as the Barbados Labour Party intended to lay off people at the Transport Board, then tell the people that. But they cannot cut expenditure and I will challenge anyone of them to tell me how they would cut expenditure without laying off people, because they attempted to do it already when my friend here from St. Michael East was Minister of Transport. He will tell you the details about that. I do not have to go into that. But they have not yet told this country how they intend to cut expenditure and I am suggesting to the people....

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: I know nobody is going to cut the NCC workers for sure. I know who would like to. I know who complained when the NCC Board did not take him on. So tell the people of this country how you intend to cut expenditure. Do not always get up and say "run away expenditure" or "squandermania". Tell them how you are going to cut it and let us know.

I would like to, as I said earlier, look at this question of "Conferences and Delegations". Now there is a misconception in this country which probably has been spearheaded by politicians ourselves. The Member for

St. Thomas is always saying that we sell ourselves cheaply and that is true. We criticise ourselves all the time about conferences. The major point I want to make is this. The majority of money spent on conferences is not spent by politicians. That is point No. 1. Secondly, you have got to measure the benefits which are derived from the conferences. For example, the Ministry for which I have responsibility is the Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Development, responsibility for women, youth, environment, coastal conservation, and beautification of the Island. So that when we are planning to go overseas we take the opportunity - I forgot Child Care Board and National Assistance Board - to visit agencies with which we deal and to see how they do work. It is not just a question that when we are going away on a Farm Labour Programme in Canada that you are going to see where workers are or how the farmers are treating workers. But it is a chance to get an opportunity to go and see how other agencies operate and, indeed, to see if we can get sometimes attachments for some of our workers and if we can get experts or consultants to come in and help us in certain areas. Therefore, it is very important and more specifically I can tell you one of the benefits we derive from the Farm Labour Programme in our going.

When we came into office, there were 430 people in the Farm Labour Programme. Today, there are 1200. We had 4 women when we came in and there are 94 now.

Asides.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: We are dealing with "Conferences and Delegations", so I am under that Head. I am saying that you have to look at the benefits that can be derived. I am saying that unless you go and talk to people and you see people you cannot expect to get anything. Let me say this as well. If people think that going overseas is just a fun trip, you work harder overseas than you work when you are here especially in big countries. 1.35p.m.

You are either in a car sleeping or you are at a conference. Sometimes you do not even know which hotel you were at last night, because very often it is two days at a hotel, travel for 200 miles, another two days at another hotel, travel for another 200 miles, a further two days at a hotel, so you are never at any one hotel for more than two nights, and it is very taxing and tiring. Therefore people must understand this and I hope that we ourselves will not constantly get up in this forum and try to indicate that when Ministers go overseas that we go on some trip having fun and are fancy free.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to draw the attention of the House to those few points and I support the Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I will not be dealing with the conferences and delegations just yet, I want to deal with some matters of principle first.

The Honourable Leader of the Labour Party and the member for St. George South have identified the level to which Government is now seeking to increase its expenditure under various Objects and Subheads of Head 15. The burden of the argument, as I understand it, is that in March when we debated the Estimates of Expenditure Government ought to have been in a position reasonably to anticipate the kind and the quantity of expenditure that would have been required for the fiscal year ending March 31 next year.

Take Object No. 12. We voted \$1.2 million in March and Government is now seeking to supplement that by another \$800,000 in November, by 67%. I am not going to deal with the others yet, because we are not on to them yet, but that is indicative of careless, shoddy, unintelligent planning on the part of the Government.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not want any headlines. It is difficult to believe, since the Prime Minister himself speaks of himself in terms of a household operator, he manages things like a housewife, he said it in one of the budget speeches, he applies the principles of household management to the economy of Barbados, it is really inconceivable that in his own private affairs he would have planned his own household budget as this has now come to us at the national level.

In 1988, the very first budget speech, page 11, the Prime Minister said: "I have already given the message to my Ministers that Supplementaries will not easily be approved; any such requests will be most meticulously examined for their justification."

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am nothing to do with CARIFESTA, I am dealing with the Government now. I will deal with you shortly.

On page 3 he said: "Fiscal prudence, which had been the hallmark of government's financial management during the previous ten years, restrained us from undertaking programmes of excessive spending which contributed to the severe economic problems that some of our better endowed neighbours experienced." I concluded and distilled from this that in his financial management the Prime Minister had foremost in his mind an objective of careful, controlled spending; that he was prepared, given the historical experience of the previous ten years, to line up himself with the previous Ministers of Finance and exercise fiscal prudence, as he puts it. But in three years, Sir,

Government's expenditure has risen from \$663 million to \$985 million, and later on today it will rise even more.

Fiscal prudence. Compare the five year period 1981 to 1986. In five years Government's expenditure rose by \$190 million, from \$473 million to \$663 million. It is all here in the ten year review. In three years they have increased expenditure by \$300 million against a principle of controlling expenditure and exercising fiscal prudence.

The Honourable Minister of Labour, Community Development and Unemployment....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there any such title?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there any such title in the Ministry?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Minister of Labour, Community Services and Unemployment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Oh, is that so?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What is wrong with it? Show me the thing here. It is in the Estimates, Sir. What is it called? Minister of Labour ... oh, Employment.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: It means that he cannot read.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Pardon me, Sir, that was a slip of the tongue. I am so accustomed to his citing the unemployment rate at 33¹/₃% that I was carried away to the extent of accusing him of having a title which is not final but which exists in reality.

The Honourable Minister just said that he would like to hear from this side how you can reduce expenditure. That is why I asked 34 questions last week of them, because they do not even remember what is written in their own Manifesto. Look at page 6 of their Manifesto. There is a Subhead EXPENDITURE in bold blue type. I will read it.

"The Democratic Labour Party proposes to match the net loss to the revenue arising from the tax proposals by a corresponding reduction in Expenditure, in relation to the approved Estimates of Expenditure. We have estimated this amount to be \$53 million. However, estimates of the gross tax loss made by officers of the Ministry of Finance indicate that the net tax loss could be in the vicinity of \$60 million." 1.45p.m.

Nevertheless a DLP Government will immediately set about achieving \$53 million in savings on the already approved items of expenditure for 1986-87. Our strategy, not tactics, will be as follows: (1) the capital programme for

1986-87 will be re-scheduled to extend over 16 months instead of 12. Rescheduling will be designed to reduce planned capital expenditure from \$188.5 million to \$149 million. (2) All Ministries will be asked to identify expenditure cuts equivalent to 2 per cent of the approved current Estimates of Expenditure. The expenditure cuts made under (2) will be reversed on a priority basis when savings on various approved items of -expenditure materialise in the normal course of events. Under no circumstances will there be a reduction in the services or jobs provided by Government.

Then they go on to the Transport Board.

A DLP Government will introduce continuous review procedures to identify and to eliminate areas of inefficiency in the public service.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Don't argue with Rambo. Keep quiet there a minute.

Mr. OIAIRMAN: I am not arguing with anybody.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not you, Sir. You are most proper. You would not argue; you have to rule and we obey. It has escaped the comprehension of the Minister of Housing that the philosophy of the party and the strategy were that there would be tax cuts and cuts in expenditure, and all that we are saying on this side and that must be crystal clear is that they implemented tax cuts and now we find that far from controlling expenditure, expenditure has escalated. More than that, Sir, you will remember that in 1987 I asked a long detailed and involved question of the then Minister of Finance to identify the areas where Government had instituted cuts consistent with the policy set out in the manifesto, and he gave me the answers; almost like a book. It must have been ten or twelve pages of answers showing each Department or Statutory Board or whatever agency of Government had been reduced. I accepted that. An effort was being made then to control expenditure. I cannot say that for the last two years Government has in fact been keeping expenditure under control even by 2 per cent reduction as they promised to do, and if they have been, it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister to tell this House.

You know, a lot of questions are asked in here of the Prime Minister every week, and the Prime Minister will never respond to the questions asked. He always tries to rise above them and fly around. I think that the House deserves better. Last week a number of specific questions were asked for which the Honourable Member sought responses and got none. I don't think that is good enough. Nothing has changed with this manifesto according to what we heard last year during the budget time, and on the 17th May, 1987, the Honourable Member for St. John wrote in the

press, Government's manifesto is still intact, that is, to determine whether expediency or intimidation has slowed the objective of change. That is when he said that the three Members of the Barbados Labour Party were intimidating the twenty-four on the other side. I don't know whom we were. Were we some kind of McGuffey? But he said that Government's manifesto was still intact; the one that was thrust on them at the last minute, or rushed on them that nobody had any time to read, was still intact. Now if it was still intact, then I want to hear from the Prime Minister in his reply how he has been able to keep consistency with page 6 of the manifesto, first column. Now, let me repeat, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has just two minutes to conclude.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In 1987 I think we voted for supplementaries and were then criticised the following year, - castigated they are telling me - chastised when we complained about expenditure. We were trying to cooperate. Government departments needed money and we voted to assist in the good government of the country. The Prime Minister took it upon himself the following year to say you can't complain about expenditure, because when I came with the supplementaries you all voted for them. Well I have news for him today, five minutes to 2 o'clock; we are not voting for these today or in the future. You will be hoisted on your own petard. When you try to offer suggestions to this Government, they don't listen. When you try to cooperate with them, they use it against you.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is misleading the Committee. This Honourable Member you will remember, Sir, spoke very slowly, categorically and carefully when he said that he was not cooperating with the Government; now he is here talking about when you offer, to cooperate.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is saying that to be picked up by a yard fowl, not of my party, who formed his own party and is walking about town in a suit with a brief case. I will not even favour him with a...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Wait, wait. Dr. Haynes is walking about in a suit with a suitcase?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Opposition cooperates with Government from time to time. There is nothing wrong with that. There are times when there will be diversity of opinion.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Leader of the Opposition is the only person who formed a political party recently and he does not walk about town with any brief case.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The Honourable Member who, just sat down could not be referring to the Leader of the Opposition, neither could the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, I believe, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I would not speak in terms of any Honourable Member of this House; I am talking about a stranger.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: One who would like to get in here. But, Sir, just let me make it clear, this Government knows as well as any that we have cooperated with it. On the drug issue alone I made it clear, and I don't want to repeat it every Tuesday I come in here, that we are not sitting down to fashion any joint policy with this Government on drugs, not on that item. If his head is so hard....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would you conclude your speech?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was saying, Sir, that if the head of a Sunday columnist is so hard and impervious to commonsense as not to understand how Government and Opposition work, then I am not going to give him any lesson by replying to him in the press. He is a nuisance and I treat him as such.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will not be long, but I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas although he read what the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party said, still was trying to confuse Members in this Honourable Chamber. 1.55p.m.

He quoted the Manifesto to suit himself and what the Manifesto said he also tried to use that to suit himself.

The Manifesto sets out here, Mr. Chairman, and it said that we have estimated the amount which is the reduction in revenue to about \$53 million but that certain people say that it could be in the vicinity of \$60 million. I am just paraphrasing.

The Manifesto went on to say this, and we are speaking about the year 1986/87: "Nonetheless a DLP Government will immediately set about achieving \$53 million in savings on the already approved items of expenditure for 1986-1987." That is what the Manifesto said and it went on "Our strategy will be as follows for 1986-87. The capital programme for 1986/87 will be rescheduled to extend over that." He said that.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An Honourable Member is on a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. He was interrupting me when I was on my feet by not sitting. I am now on my feet. Is the Honourable Member saying that the Manifesto, therefore, was a one year document and not a five year document?

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party said that for 1986/87 as part of the strategy for that year all Ministries will be asked to identify expenditure cuts equivalent to 2% of the approved current Estimates of Expenditure for 1986/87. Only some person who is crazy could believe that in 1989 that you could ask any Ministry to cut its expenditure to 2% of what it was in 1985 or 1986. Only somebody who is mental so it is obvious that was for 1986/87 and it says so here.

It says there are three things that we would have done. There are three things that the Democratic Labour Party promised to do on this page to recoup the \$53 million. One was the rescheduling of the capital programme, (2) was to ask all Ministries to identify expenditure cuts and (3)....

Mr. R. P. B YER: On a point of order, Sir.

We always like to get things straight in here. Did I just hear the Honourable Member for St. Philip South refer to the Honourable Member for St. Thomas as a madman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No. You would have heard something different from me. I would never have allowed that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is being faithful, Sir, so I am not taking him seriously.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am trying to make the point that we said that we would try to recover the \$53 million that we had lost by our proposals in that year. There were three things we said we would have done to recover the money (1) the capital programme for 1986/87 would be rescheduled to extend over 16 months, (2) all Ministries would be asked to identify expenditure cuts equivalent to 2% of the approved current Estimates and (3) the expenditure cuts made under (2) would be reversed on a priority basis when savings on various approved items of expenditure materialized, etc. so there were three things we said we would have done in 1986. That is crystal clear.

How could any person believe that a Government could commit itself to reduce its expenditure in 1989 to 2% of what it was in 1985 when there are so many schools in Barbados that this administration has to be repairing? There are so many police stations that this administration has to be repairing.

Do you know that most of the land acquired by the Barbados Labour Party, by two members in particular,

especially one who was representing St. Michael West Central, this administration is still paying those people? They never were paid. Only yesterday a letter came to us from a gentleman whose land the Barbados Labour Party acquired in 1976 and he is going to sue the Government for \$474 000 if he is not paid for his land so I want to know how we are going to control the expenditure when we have to do all of those things you all left here.

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

I was hoping that that debate would come later on when we deal with another Resolution. I will have to tell him about how this Government has gone into Baxters in Miss Brathwaite's land and taken up 13 acres of the woman's land, bulldoze it, change the watercourse, and would not even reply to my letter.

I am coming back after lunch for that. Government will be put in court. I assure you of that - Baxter's near the Thompson Bridge. Ask the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, change the water, bulldoze the woman's land and put down tanks on top of it and I wrote them and they have not even . eplied, six months have gone.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Philip, please continue.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are not aware of it? I wrote your Permanent Secretary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have to cool him down. I do not know if I have to get medication.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member cannot even hear me. I was asking the Honourable Member if we would need to get any medication for anybody.

Aside.

On motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT seconded by Hon. M. A. KING, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour the SPEAKER and asked for leave to sit again.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is now after 2:00 p.m. and I am about to ask Your Honour to accept a motion for suspension for an hour or so.

Before I do so, I would like to draw to the attention of Honourable Members that today, for the first time, we are going to be doing a shake down cruise, as it were, on the dining room so lunch is going to be served in the dining room downstairs for the first time. Although the facilities are not totally and completely ready, it is necessary for us to give it a proper run through so that Members can indicate, and I would like to indicate to all Honourable Members that the dining room is available and the Ministry of Transport and Works which has been responsible for the magnificent work that has been done would wish the comments of all Honourable Members so that we may make any necessary adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m. today.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3.15 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 2.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Committee of Supply is resumed. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a short intervention on this particular matter and it really has to do with the kind of statements which were made in here and which generally speaking are being bandied around about this administration.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition in speaking on this Resolution before lunch referred to....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He was not present.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sorry, I get so confused at times as to which is Opposition and which is not the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West referred to the Supplementary Resolutions which are before the House as evidence of lack of control on the part of this administration, liking it to squandermania, and from this side we understand very clearly the implications which the Honourable Member was trying to get across to the public certainly in this debate.

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas in his intervention quoted figures to indicate that between 1981 and 1986 the expenditure for the then administration rose from something like \$473 million to \$663 million, a mere \$100 million in that five year period. In comparison, he indicated that between 1986 and 1989 expenditure rose from between \$600 something million dollars to over \$900 million dollars or will move up to about \$1 billion this year and that in 3 years time we moved expenditure by over \$300 million, whereas in the 5 year period the Barbados Labour Party administration only moved expenditure by \$190 million.

Now Sir, I think that this has to be looked at in a number of ways, but more specifically I would like to state that I do not really think that it is any credit to the Barbados Labour Party to say at this stage in the 5 year period that they were only able to move expenditure by \$190 million but at the same time left all the police stations in Barbados in a bad state of disrepair, at the same time left community centres in a bad state of disrepair....

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Give me a chance. I have not finished yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member is really misleading the House.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Misleading the House?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir. Hon. E. E.

GREAVES: Tell me how.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: During the tenure of the Barbados Labour Party a new police station was built at Oistins. It was the only new police station built since 1955. In addition, at District "A" Police Station the expansion took place and in addition, Sir, the facts will show that this Government has spent no more money on the maintenance of the police stations than we spent in our time.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the Barbados Labour Party left all of the police stations in Barbados in a state of disrepair and we are now faced with a situation where we have to repair all of the police stations. The very Police Association would want the Democratic Labour Party to repair all of the police stations in one year and the Barbados Labour Party and the Opposition, generally speaking, are calling on the Government to repair all of the police stations at one and the same time. Not only that, they are asking that all of the community centres in Barbados to be repaired one and the same time, all the day care centres to be repaired one and

the same time, all of the schools to be repaired at the same time, and all of the roads to be repaired at the same time. Yet we are to control expenditure. We are being accused of spending \$300 million in 3 years. The \$300 million has not gone into the Prime Minister's pocket. It has not gone into the Minister of Health's pocket. It has not gone into my pocket or no Member of the Government's pocket. It has been spent in this country.

The point I am making is that the money has been spent and one can see where the money has been spent in doing a number of things in upgrading a whole set of things which were not done by the Barbados Labour Party. That is why they were not able to spend more than \$190 million in that 5 year period because they did nothing during that 5 year period. One can understand their position.

So what we are saying very clearly, Sir, is that we have now in this period to do a whole set of things which were not done during that particular period. But that is not all. There are other issues and other factors which have to be taken into consideration such as the demands which are made on the Government and certainly improvements which the Government has made to the life and general wellbeing of this country. We have a very serious debt service commitment to meet which you know we are now in a situation where we have to meet that up front. We have to meet wages and salaries. These are tilings which have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is the debt service in this thing that we are dealing with today, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: No, it is not and neither is housing, roads, neither additional provision for pensions, increases in travelling....

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: No, take it c*sv. I ar:i coming around to that. I will show him how fooh>t* Le is. Give me a chance and I will show the Honourable Member how foolish he is. So that having made that point, Sir, let me say that all of these are expenditures which the Government has to meet. So that if one is going to try to impress upon the public, then all we are doing is just sending it up with run away expenditure and squandermania.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Like if we built a Central Bank!

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sir, the important thing in all this is that the money which has been spent has been spent not only in creating proper economic and social environment in this country, but at the same time we have

to meet commitments which were already there and we also had to do things which were not done by the former administration about which they are boasting. You are boasting about not having done a whole set of things and leaving all of these things to us. Do you know, Sir, what I believe? The Opposition, both the Barbados Labour Party and the National Democratic Party - is that what you call it? - are going throughout the length and breadth of this country and they are saying that we should control expenditure. You know I do not think that anybody in this administration is so irresponsible as to just spend money at a flash. It is very difficult to pry money out of the Prime Minister's hand. It is very, very difficult. Do you think, Sir, that it is sweet? These are Resolutions that one had to argue over and over. It is very difficult. But the point is that there comes a time when one recognizes that certain things have to be done and this is what we are doing. Every supplementary expenditure has to be justified. There are Ministers here who would like to get a lot more done. ^m
3.25 p.m.

We recognise that in the present circumstances we have to be careful, and this is what is being done, but because of the problems which were left and certainly which we have to undertake in order to make sure that this country remains on a stable course we have to do it. These parties and other spokesmen for these parties who go up and down the length and breadth of this country, calling on * Guttaperk, Getting Down to Basics and Tell It Like It Is and writing in the newspapers trying to give one the impression the Government has to do this, the Government has to control expenditure, but every day you hear them calling, they want the Government to do this, they want the Government to spend money on this, everything the Government must spend money on, but at the same time we have to control expenditure.

Sir, all I am saying is that this administration - I am [^] telling you from the bottom of my heart, and really it is as honest a statement as anybody could expect - we endeavour and we try very hard to control expenditure, and we do succeed in controlling expenditure.

I do not think that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas in his more sober moments would equate controlling expenditure.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I ^{*} have not even had a drink for the day.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: In his more sober moments I do not think he would equate controlling or even containing expenditure with it remaining at a point where it was in 1986.1 do not think anybody in his right sense could expect that. Even if you had to take into consideration that you had to meet increases in wages and salaries, that in itself will cause an increase in expenditure. One has to be practical about that. The Opposition knows it. The Labour Party *

knows it. The NDP knows it. I find it very difficult to understand the position which they are taking. They want us to control expenditure and when we try to control it we are criticised for not doing enough for the policemen. They are encouraging the policemen to reject the regrading proposals. Do you think the regrading proposals will cost two cents?

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Both the Labour Party and the National Democratic Party. I say that without any fear of contradiction.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: If you are not encouraging it, get up and deny it. I defy the Leader of the Opposition to get up and deny that he is not encouraging the policemen in this country to call....

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am sorry. The Member for Christ Church West and leader of the Labour Party. I want him to get up and deny that the Labour Party is encouraging the policemen in this country to reject the regrading exercise and to call for whatever increases they want. Let him deny that

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Member for St. Lucy was going on very well until he started to make wild and groundless allegations about members from the National Democratic Party interfering with the process "of negotiations going along between the police and Government, that we are encouraging the police to reject the proposals. Let me categorically state now that nobody in this party is trying at any level at all to engage in any such act, and this side of the Opposition dissociates itself from any such attempt by anyone.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member wanted me to make a statement and I will make the statement for him now. I have represented the Police Association for many years against the wicked Democratic Labour Party Government between 1961 and afterwards and fought for them to get various rights. I have not seen the regrading proposals, so the Honourable Member is absolutely mistaken, but if those regrading proposals will take away or not give to the police what they are rightfully entitled to, then I will be in the forefront of those agitating for the change. I have not seen them, though, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member has not said anything, but we understand. That is typical of the Honourable Member. He really has not said anything.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The point I am making, Sir, is that this Government is faced with a number of choices. There are lots of demands which are made oh the administration from the point of view of personnel, from the point of view of services which we are committed to ensuring that we do not reduce and that we try to create the kind of atmosphere both within the Public Service, those persons who have to deliver the service and also the service which is delivered. There is a cost to the administration of that service and there is also a cost attendant on the particular service.

The point I am making is that on the one hand we are being asked to even build, improve and increase on the service which already exists. This is going to cost money. The Opposition is calling for an increase in these services and at the same time they are calling for an increase in the services they are trying to lambaste the Government for trying to provide money for these.

I do not want to comment on matters which are on the Agenda, but I am sure that if you look on the Order Paper you will see Resolutions here which, if accepted, have been put in both by the Barbados Labour Party and by the National Democratic Party which will call for additional expenditure. It is so inconsistent that I find it very difficult....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. There is one Resolution standing in my name and it has nothing to do with increased expenditure. It calls upon Government to take measures to reduce the burden of the high cost of - it should be musical equipment and sports goods, but they have it printed as medical equipment. That is an error.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: So you would like to reduce the revenue coming in to the Government and at the same time....

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: We will discuss the Resolution when we come to that. There is an inconsistency in the position which is taken by both Opposition parties and I think it ought to be brought to the fore. Somebody has to say it because they are misleading the people of this country and making them believe that this is a tree that grows and all the leaves which come out on this great tree is money. The money has to come from somewhere, and if we

try to raise taxes to deliver the services which they are asking for, the Government is being chastised and castigated for that. If we try to spend money to deliver the services, we are being accused of spending too much money. It is a very difficult situation and their position is very inconsistent, but we are not going to be deterred by their position, we have a programme to carry through and we are going to carry through this programme.

We believe that we are serving the interest of this country, we know that we are serving the interests of the people of this country and we will pursue this particular programme. I just thought I would make that particular intervention because I think it is unfair to this administration and somebody has to say it. I have no compunction about saying it. 3.35p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy spoke with his characteristic wildness which might help us to more easily explain why Barbados' trade position is not improving under him, and is never ever going to improve as long as that Honourable Member is the Minister of Trade and Industry. He showed, Sir, his characteristic lack of incisive examination of things, and a lack of courage to face the fact that a courageous Government must take hard and serious decisions.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the course of this debate dealing with items of expenditure which allow Government the only discretion that it has, the only discretion at its disposal in keeping Government expenditure under control. The Government, Mr. Chairman, as you know cannot affect or touch expenditures which are called statutory expenditures, and if indeed a Government of Barbados is serious about in fact keeping expenditure under control, the only possible way by which it can do it is by controlling its capital expenditure or controlling those things in the current Estimates which show up as "Other Expenditures", and the issue that we in the Opposition are putting is a simple issue, that the Government which by its very statement in both manifesto and budget have pledged itself to control expenditure is bringing to this House requests for supplementary fundings which are out of character with the kinds of requests that we have known in the past and which are completely out of character, Sir, with what is happening in the rest of the economy.

The point that has to be made and made very strongly, Sir from this Parliament is that the rate of growth of Government expenditure is way out of line with anything that is happening in the rest of the economy. It is way out of line, Mr. Chairman, with the rate of growth of the economy of which the Minister of Finance wishes first to speak, and the Government must ask itself what is really happening in an economy when Government expenditure is growing that much faster than the economy as a whole. Clearly it must occur to Government if they are doing an incisive

examination of things that resources are being transferred in a wholesale way from the private sector to Government in contravention of the very pledges that the Democratic Labour Party gave to the people in 1986.

I am glad, Sir, that this debate has taken place for the reason that it was always my understanding that the Democratic Labour Party made a pledge to the people of Barbados that there would be embarked on a strategy to be consistently pursued whereby they would be cutting taxes, and in order to support those cuts in taxes they would year by year and not just in one year make sure that expenditures are kept under control and cut if necessary. What we are hearing today, Mr. Chairman, is a complete rejection of that particular philosophy which a lot of people in this country, the broad mass of people in this country, was led to believe was the fundamental position of the Democratic Labour Party, and there is no wonder therefore, Sir, that the country is in the kind of turmoil and confusion that it now finds itself in; that it was led to believe one thing and now Members on the other side are asking us to accept something else.

The Members of the Democratic Labour Party should be ashamed when they come to this House and try to justify why it is that Government should be allowed to spend and spend and spend, because the 1986 election was precisely about that particular issue. The Democratic Labour Party said then that they had some magical solution by which a government could compress itself in support of the expansion of the private sector. You said that in 1986 and you should be ashamed now to come to the House and put this silly argument that there should be some open tap by which a government should be allowed to spend and spend and spend. The point about this debate, Sir, and the point that has been stressed before is that we are concerned about the rate of increase in Government expenditures; we are concerned about a Government that would vote to one Head for example \$100 000 in March and by September has to come back and ask for an additional \$80 000, because the relationship between the initial vote and the supplementary is such that either Government is not controlling expenditures, or it is not involved in proper budgeting, and if there is any capacity for incisive examination of things within the Government, this will become apparent. Nobody in this House on the Barbados Labour Party side has ever condemned the notion of an activist Government. Indeed I must remind the Members of the Democratic Labour Party that their whole attack against us in 1986 was that we were an activist Government, that we believed in the expansion of the State at the distress of the private. We went through an election having to carry that attack against us and it is therefore a distress to us to hear Members of the other side now have to come to put a case that they have now realised that the Government must have a social responsibility. The arguments being advanced on the other side are feeble.

Mr. Chairman, it does not require any incisive examination to know that money spent on police stations and community centres as they would have us believe can justify or explain the \$309 million in Government expenditure per year that has taken place between 1986 and now, but we keep hearing that this expenditure can be justified by reference to the fact that the Government has had to repair police centres, police stations and community centres. What else has the Government done? Indeed, Sir, the very things that they are citing as accomplishments on the part of the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, still await to be attended to. The police stations in Barbados still need to be repaired, despite the fact that Government expenditures have increased by this massive rate. So the argument that the Government is putting is an argument without any foundation. Indeed the case we are putting is that the other expenditures as distinct from the statutory expenditures are precisely the areas of discretion in which Government can act if it is serious about keeping expenditure under control, because you cannot do anything to stop your statutory expenditure. If the civil servants who are established have to be paid, they have to be paid and we do not have to come back to the House to ask for funds for that purpose. If the debt has to be paid, that is a statutory expenditure and you don't have to come back to the House for that purpose. There is no discretion in the matter, but there is a discretion as regards how much funds you are voting for travel, how much funds you are voting for things like plant, furniture, equipment and so on, and we are asking Government, Mr. Chairman, to exercise discretion in these matters. We find it truly uncomfortable on this side to continue to support expenditures of this order of magnitude where the supplementary being sought is as much as the original vote. What form of budgeting is that, Mr. Chairman, that a Government in the process comes to the House in March and says support us, for example, in relation to Head 15, that during the course of the year we intend to spend \$144 000 on Government hospitality. This matter has been looked at by Ministries, have gone to the Budget Committee under the Ministry of Finance and Planning and they said all we need to do this year to support Government hospitality is to spend a sum of \$144 000. You do that in March and by November you have come back to us and told us that \$144 000 agreed on six short months ago is not enough, you need another \$100 000 more.

Sir, it is the accumulation of these things that is putting this country in a position where Government expenditure has got completely out of hand, and we will not be supporting it because at the end of the day we do not feel that the Government is exercising sufficient discretion in areas where discretion can be exercised, and we feel, Mr. Chairman, that more effort can be made to make sure that the rate of growth of Government expenditure does not run ahead to the extent to which it has been running ahead over the course of the last two years. The truth about the matter, Sir, is that the massive increase in Government expenditure has occurred not between 1986 and 1989, but between 1987

and 1989, because if you were to look at the facts, Mr. Chairman, between 1985 and 1986-87 Government expenditure increased only modestly; it increased from \$663 million when last we were in office to \$685 million in the first year of the Democratic Labour Party administration, but since 1987, Mr. Chairman, Government expenditures have increased from \$685 million to \$989 million voted, plus what will come now by way of additional supplementaries. 3.45 p.m.

It says something about a new attitude in the Ministry of Finance, as far as I am concerned, which does not believe that economies must be brought to bear in relation to the management of Government finances and should there be any doubt, Mr. Chairman, Sir, because the question was asked in here rhetorically today, if you were to take the Estimates and look at the 10 year summary you will find that in 1983/84 because the circumstances so warranted it, the Barbados Labour Party spent less on current account than it spent in 1982/83.

We could not in the context of tough economic circumstances spend our way out of it and, indeed, the Government....

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, we could not in the context of tough economic circumstances commit Government to a strategy where we could spend our way out of it because we understood clearly that when times are tough....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member must conclude now.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am asking, therefore, why can it not be that the same example that was set then cannot be set now because the question was asked earlier by what way, by what means does Government cut its expenditures? It requires courage and I stop at that point, Sir, for the time being.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, Sir the whole can of worms in relation to Government's expenditure and the way the debate has gone I believe emanating from something the Minister of Employment said when he mentioned that Opposition members have not indicated to Government how they ought to control expenditure.

Now, the member seems to be saying that the fact that Opposition members have not indicated to Government how they must do this that that gives Government some licence to go ahead and spend widely and he said that 70% to 75% of Government's expenditure is for personal emoluments which, as you know, Sir, is statutory expenditure and Government does not come back for

increases or ask Parliament to vote supplemental in relation to statutory expenditure. Now, the argument raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas today about the Manifesto approach of the Democratic Labour Party in relation to controlling expenditure was an argument I had raised in here some time ago and the Honourable Member for St. John at the time had accused me of elevating that statement about how the Government would control expenditure to a general principle. I remember he said that at the time and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas raised it again today.

But, Sir, my argument is not a question of elevating that to a general principle and I am not even saying that I was misled into believing that that is the way Government wanted to approach its control of expenditure.

The point I am making, Sir, is that even though one may not want to raise it to a general principle, it, certainly, provides the basis for some approach for the Government in its efforts to control expenditure because the control of expenditure is a plank of the Government's efforts to manage the economy and that has been said on more than one occasion, the beginning of 1988 by the Honourable Prime Minister.

If I may quote, Sir, at page 11 of his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposal of that year which was given on April 28, a Thursday, he said:

"During the year, the staff of the Budget and Management Services Section of the Ministry of Finance will be visiting Ministries, Departments, and those Statutory Corporations which are financed entirely out of the Consolidated Fund, to keep check of their expenditure, to assist them in setting up proper systems of accounting where necessary and to bring to my attention at an early date, any trends in expenditure which are going in the wrong direction."

Then he went on to speak in terms of creating two posts of Finance Officer and Chief Accountant in the Ministry of Finance with the Parliamentary Secretary being the one responsible for controlling expenditure in that Ministry so that from the time the Prime Minister took over the management of the financial affairs of this country he has made efforts constantly in terms of controlling expenditure and so on.

It does not make sense to me to come in here today and say that you cannot expect us to build police stations as the Honourable Member for St. Lucy was saying, repair schools and so on but then expect us, in turn, to control expenditure. Why then would you want expenditure control to be an arm of your policy? It does not make sense to me.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Well, the Attorney General is talking about unnecessary expenditure. I am not saying that police stations are not...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order.

What I want to find out, is the Honourable Member saying that this Government is not controlling expenditure? That is what I want to find out.

Mr. R. P. BYER: What I am saying is that you are not controlling expenditure because of the magnitude that it has grown over the last years. That is the point I am making. It has grown from over \$600 000 to \$1 billion.

What I am saying is that the approach in the Manifesto provided the basis for the development of a theory, the development of some approach to the control of expenditure. I am not saying that you can control expenditure by 2% or 3% every year on the 1985 figure but, certainly, some effort should be made to do that.

I do not accept the point because it is an arm of Government's approach. Even when the Prime Minister in the same document I quoted earlier on, when he dealt with the fiscal deficit at Page 12 of this document when he introduced us to what I called "Copperfieldian Economics", he spoke again in terms of controlled expenditure that one must balance current expenditures with current revenues so you can have a Government policy and I believe that efforts should be made to do something about the burgeoning in expenditure that we are faced with today.

The Prime Minister would accept that it is causing these problems today if we do not control expenditure and that he is going to have more problems down the line so I cannot buy the argument, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Resolution and I should like to begin by saying that every time there are supplementaries of this sort at this time of the year the arguments that are advanced on behalf of the Opposition regarding runaway expenditure and that kind of thing are expected.

I do not think that they are anything new. They are not anything, certainly, that we would not anticipate.

As I have said before, if the Honourable Member for St. Peter did not have the opportunity to debate supplementaries, we would not hear the speech that he delivers every occasion and, therefore, he would have nothing else to say in the House.

The point is that you can answer those speeches before he starts. 3.55p.m.

What I have always felt is that it does not make sense having a concept in Government of controlling expenditure after the fact - in other words, budgeting for certain kinds of expenditure and then talking about cutting it back by a certain percentage. I do not think that makes sense. If that is the procedure that the Public Service operates or the procedure that is common to Government, well then for the time being we have to live with it. But I think that there must be some more orderly and progressive way of budgeting within the public sector that can be utilized by us. I do not think that it makes sense to have a Budget or to have certain levels of expenditure and then say that there must be a general cut-back of 15% or 2%. I do not think that it really honestly makes sense. It does not make sense for us to debate it each time what level cut-back there should be and that kind of thing. That is the view that I express and it is the view that I still honestly hold.

The point is that this Resolution relates to expenditure of money on a number of things including the 350th Anniversary of Parliament. Very often I am one, as many other Members of Parliament are, to criticize the private sector as it is called in its broadest sense. But I think on this occasion from the information we have received from the Acting Leader of the House the private sector should be commended on whatever contribution it has made to the physical structure that we are now enjoying particularly in the 350th Anniversary of Parliament. What concerns me more than anything else, Sir, were the remarks of the Leader of the Minority Opposition, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West. Now Sir, he will have a vested interest in criticizing the person who represented the Labour Party on the Committee who planned the celebrations. I believe that one can carry the level of ungratefulness and ungraciousness to an extreme. The point is that, as the Honourable Leader of the House said, she was no longer a Member of the House of Assembly but she contributed wisely. She did not take the often foolish position of Members of the Barbados Labour Party that they are going to stay away from events because they were once

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that. I honestly cannot accept that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Excuse me, Sir. I was listening to the...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member take his seat? Thank you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member, Sir, has accused me of having a vested interest in criticising the former Honourable Member for the City. The Honourable Member knows that that is absolutely untrue. He knows that is untrue, Sir. He has what

is called a wicked tongue, Sir, that does not always see where facts and fiction lie, Sir. So the Honourable Member is absolutely untrue and I do not want it put in the debate without getting immediately a denial from myself, Sir.

Sir, in racing parlance, I believe it is, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas will let me know the expression "the one to beat" is the one that would be best used to describe the Honourable Member for the City. She is the one to beat. Therefore, I know the Honourable Member for Christ Church West....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. You can also say "in with a chance".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not heard a point of order.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, as I understand it now, all of you are in with a chance. Everybody is in with a chance now. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West is a seat warmer when it comes to leadership of the Labour Party. The point is that therefore he would have a vested interest in being critical. It is ungrateful as far as I am concerned and it is strange enough that the Honourable Members for St. George South and myself along with the Honourable Member for Christ Church West attended a seminar that was held in Queens Park with all of the six formers. Well, not all of the six formers were there but representatives of all of the sixth forms. We faced some very hard questions. Persons like myself had to defend the role of the back-bencher which was not easy. The Honourable Member for St. George South had to defend his defection which was equally as hard if not harder. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West had to defend probably his existence in Parliament. I was there when he was being questioned. As he knows, the seminar was an outstanding seminar in which these six formers came and openly asked all of us questions about Parliament and our function. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West then retired to lunch with me and you know that we talked together about how successful the planning for the 350th Anniversary of Parliament was. We talked about the anniversary of Parliament. So I was flabbergasted when today I heard the criticism.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Do not mine the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point is that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West and all of us enjoyed the seminar as Members of Parliament and I thought it was an outstanding feature of the celebrations no matter who organized it. I know the Ministry of Youth

Affairs had a tremendous input in it, Ralph Walker, and the former Member for the City, Miss Miller.

So that as I said it was a shock for me to hear the criticism that he levelled at the nature of the parliamentary celebrations that were held this year. He himself said that the Courtyard Concerts were well attended and very popular. The Honourable Member for St. James South, as Minister of Youth Affairs, convened a youth rally in Independence Square which also was very well attended and popular. The young people were involved and we spoke about the 350th Anniversary of Parliament/We had the CPA Conference.

The whole point about it is that the celebration of 350 years of Parliament is not only our celebration. We have to motivate other groups in the community and the media. They should be talking about their role in Parliament and how they perceive their functions in Parliament. They have to convene their own sessions to discuss that and if not we would have spent even more money. So the staccato nature of the celebration which was a criticism coming from the Acting Opposition Leader, the stop and start nature of it....

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I should not say stop and start. What were the exact words? Ebb and flow.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Sir. No, it was not a criticism. What I am saying, and I think it was explained by the Member for St. Michael West, that the only regrettable thing about it was that we were stopping and starting all the time.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, I am sorry. If the Honourable Member did not mean it as a criticism, I understand it. I mean it as a criticism in the sense that if the stop and start nature of the celebration is expected. Whcpi Government organises these activities, there are only so many things that Government itself can -vrganise in a celebration of this nature over a period of a year. For that matter, spending \$20 million in two weeks in tins country in 1981 on CARIFESTA is not something to be lightly dismissed or laughed at and that is the legacy of the Labour Party. We have spread these activities over an entire year. We have involved as many people as possible in the activities over the year and the Committee obviously cannot plan all of their activities to run one after the other. That is why I am saying the political parties, media, non-governmental organisations, women organisations, and all of those other interest groups should themselves have got together and in this year's celebration told us how they perceived Parliament as relating to their development. Therefore, the activities would have been a lot more meaningful if other people were involved.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is making...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what point have you risen, Sir?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what point have you risen?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He has given way, Sir. In Committee, Sir, he has given way and as you know we can speak at anytime.

Asides,

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, I am not elucidating. He has given way and I am speaking. But Henry, you know that is so. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I am just assisting the point this way. It would be unfortunate if because the myriad activities by a number of the organisations which the Honourable Member is listing have not found their way in the popular Press the impression was put abroad that they did not in fact do the things which the Honourable Member is listing. There are a number of organisations, some of them not national in character, which have been carrying on activities for the 350th Anniversary, but because they do not have the paraphernalia, or they do not have what might be called a Prime Minister of Press Releases, they do not make the Press. I can recall that the St. Leonard's Old Scholars had a magnificent discussion about the 350th Anniversary in which a radical teacher from The Lodge School discussed with a great degree of negativity whether we should be celebrating.

I am just drawing it to his attention to assist.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that I will give way again to anybody under whatever rule.

The point the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is making is the important point, that every primary school I have been in in Barbados I have seen something of Parliament depicted on the wall. Only today a school from St. Philip called me and asked me if they could borrow a wig, because they are having a ceremony and they want to borrow a wig for the Speaker. The Sixth Form of my old school and other schools have invited parliamentarians to come and speak to them.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Combermere School. The Old Scholars of various institutions have asked people to come and speak to them, so once the concept of the

celebration of Parliament has got into the popular consciousness, I believe that we are paying a very small price for it in money terms.

Now we heard the criticism in 1987 about the expenditure of money on the 21st Anniversary of Independence. The same Labour Party, then the Official Opposition, Sir, criticised caustically this Government. They were more concerned that they were left out of certain functions and were not invited - and it is recorded in the Estimates Debate where the Honourable Member for Christ Church West indicated that certain people were not invited to speak on Craftsmen of our Fate.....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. John is now being very economical with the truth. Our criticism of the 21st Anniversary

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: How do you mean I was not in here? I made the point that you did not invite Sleepy Smith. That is the point, Sir. We made the observation that leading members of the Democratic Labour Party, past members of both parties at the time had been ignored and had been left out, had not been invited to some of the official functions. The Government at the time accepted that that was so but said that they had no control over the issue of invitations because it was done through.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is made.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has accused me of being economical with the truth and has then provided all the evidence of the assertion I was just making.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You are telling me that I am not speaking the truth....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The impression I formed, regardless of what you say, was that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition then complained that he was not being involved in events. That is the impression we formed over here. Suffice it to say we have now come to the 350th Anniversary of Parliament and once again the expenditure of money on this historical event in our country is being denounced by the Opposition.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Members for the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to conclude.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you. As I said, Sir, the issue of celebrating Parliament is the issue of democracy, of helping people to understand the development of Barbados and I believe that all of the institutions have been involved at some point. We are going to be having a Youth Parliament shortly and there will be other events to culminate the celebration, and I believe that this money which is being spent is worthwhile, regardless of the remonstrations of the Opposition.

In that regard, Sir, I should like to support this Resolution.

Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a short intervention. I recognise that time is limited, but I first of all want to support the Resolution and there are a couple points I want to make.

When we start talking about restricting expenditure, et cetera, there are certain aspects we have to look at, and I want to look mainly at some of the conferences that have been held in Barbados and look at it with respect to restricting expenditure.

It has been my fortune to have represented this country for the past two years at the ACP/EEC conferences when they are being held, and earlier this year Barbados hosted the ACP/EEC conference where the Government of Barbados was able to point out to the European countries the importance of rum on the international market. I think that is a very, very important aspect, but what is even more important is that Barbados was able to attract some 66 countries to this island, having television exposure to almost all of those countries. If we had to pay to advertise Barbados in the European countries, et cetera, we could not get the mileage for money that we got when we held the conference here.

What is even more important, I have had the fortune of speaking to a lot of the parliamentary representatives, people who can make an impact on what can happen to Barbados in the future, especially with respect to tourism, and there can be no doubt that Barbados has made an impact on those people at that level. It redounds to Barbados in the future that the exposure which we have had in hosting these conferences will be to the advantage to Barbados.

But there is another important aspect. We have to understand that we live in a world that is getting smaller and smaller every day because of television, et cetera, and when we talk about 350 years of a parliamentary

democracy, we interact in a world, especially the Third World, where most countries are fashioned by a military dictatorship, especially in Africa. I have been heartened by talking to the African delegation when they can come to another black country and recognise that the history of black people in the present day world is one that we can be proud of, because the Barbadian Parliament is a longer living Parliament than 90% of the European Parliaments, and this is something that Barbadians must hold their heads proud about. They should not hide it under a bushel, they should hold it high because it is important to recognise that all Third World countries are not ruled by dictators, as is the impression that is given.

I know that we are restricted for time and I wanted to put in that aspect. I will come back later to make some other contributions, but I know we are restricted for time in this particular aspect and I want to lend my support to this particular Resolution.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, like the Member who just sat, I recognise the constraints we have with time, and the Honourable Prime Minister did indicate that we were running late on time, which is unfortunate with this one. 4.15p.m.

Sir, arising soon after that court jester like performance of my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. John, we may want to get back to a little more seriousness as far as this is concerned. Just to touch the issue briefly since we are short on time, there seems to be some confusion in the minds of some on the whole question of the 350th Anniversary of Parliament. This side of the opposition did not have any quarrel with it, and we certainly did not criticise it. I think what we were trying to make clear and what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West agreed with, was that it was a joint effort, in terms of the Committee. What I did have difficulty with, and what he did say at the time, and I do not believe he meant it to come out that way, because being a person who is involved in business he would know he would have said it wrong, was that the stop and start nature of it was to handle the cost of running it, to be able to control the expenditure. I don't think he meant it that way because that would not control the expenditure; the expenditure would be controlled by proper planning of the Committee up front and designing the whole programme over the period of time, whether it be a year, a month or whatever.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, I think the Honourable Member is right if I had in fact meant it that way; but the point I was making is that we had decided on high points and that we would make the major expenditure

on those high points and in between we would allow the non-governmental agencies to continue, so you are perfectly right.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I am glad the Honourable Member has cleared that up because the next thing that happened was that the Honourable Member for St. James South got up and said that in fact it was not done for that reason, it was done to give way to other festivals, the Hometown Festival and Crop-over and so on; so one did get confused as to whether all Honourable Members on that side understood what was really going on *vis-as-vis* the whole celebration.

The whole question of the source of funding and things of that nature and the fact that the private sector was called on and did rise to the occasion to assist, I found very interesting. The Honourable Minister of Health applauded the involvement of the private sector and he was joined by no less a person than the Honourable Member for St. John who normally flogs the private sector. I certainly commend those companies who are involved for getting involved, because we hear so often other colleagues from that side castigate the private sector, and I have often said that it is not a good thing to do even in the sense that they do not separate the private sector and determine what area of the private sector they are really aiming their barbs at; so it was heartening to hear, and I would agree and would like to join in expressing my satisfaction with the private sector for their involvement, whatever it was, in the whole exercise.

Let me turn, Sir, quickly to another point. The Honourable Member for St. James South made a comment which he continues to make for about the last three years. I have been hearing him make a similar comment if not the same comment over and over for the last three years and this has to do with the fact that he believes, and I think now that he really believes it, that for you to control expenditure you must retrench people, because every time one talks about controlling expenditure, he repeats the same thing: "are you saying that we should send home people; why don't you go out there and tell people that we sent them home?" As far as he is concerned you can send home whom you like, but nobody is going home from the NCC. I don't know if he is the Minister of Finance now. That is a matter for them, but he did say that, and it is interesting that his knowledge or his familiarity with expenditure and the control of expenditure stops at the fact that you should only control expenditure by retrenching people. It is interesting because that Honourable Member is the Minister of Labour and, as was corrected today, Employment and not unemployment, and therefore it is a very puerile thing to say.

Clearly when the Democratic Labour Party spoke in their Manifesto of 1986 about reducing expenditure, I really do not believe, and if my memory serves me well I happened to be there at the time with the Democratic

Labour Party, that they intended to reduce the expenditure at that time by sending people home. I don't believe you, Sir, who were a part of that team believed that they intended to send people home to reduce expenditure. There were other Members on that side who were very quick to point out that in fact the DLP cut expenditure and increased employment. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South and the Honourable Member for St. James South were very quick to say that employment went up. I am not denying that. I agree that expenditure was cut and employment went up, so the point is that if it happened then, why can't it happen now? Why is the Honourable Member saying now that for you to cut expenditure, you have to go and look to retrench people. What we are talking about here are economies. We are not talking here about how many things you buy, but what you pay for them. You don't just reduce expenditure by cutting out the number of things you do; it is by getting them at the right price. And this is exactly what we would like you to start practising over there. That is all we are saying. Nobody is going to disagree with you if you say that and you practise it. What we disagree with is saying it and not practising it. That is where we get into that problem.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: That is one of the reasons why I am here.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is saying that I am using the Minister as a bad example.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, I am indicating to the Honourable Member that to use his being over there to support the point he is making is a very bad example.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if we could get Hansard whenever it is printed, we would see that a lot of the things that we say, if we could reflect on them, we would know whether it is a bad example, but you should be able to find my last Budget speech for that party on that side. But Mr. Chairman, just let me wrap up.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there is a rule in here about Honourable Members reading speeches. I would like to suggest that the Honourable Member has been in here long enough that he should be able to speak without reading his speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please press on with your contribution.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I must tell you this, Sir. The Honourable Member who has just took his seat has been in this House and the Other Place for a long time and I have observed his style, and I noticed that he was very good at sticking close to his notes, so I do the same thing.

The question at this juncture which has to be addressed is whether or not expenditure rose after 1987, and we have to wonder if there is not some coincidence that the Minister of Finance changed at that juncture.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to be long on this particular matter, but I would wish to clear the air in respect of certain issues that have been raised. Let me make it clear to those Honourable Members who are not seised of procedures in this Honourable Chamber that if they wish me to give an answer to a question that has been raised, there is a specific procedure open to Honourable Members for dealing with that. They give notice of a question and I will answer those questions. It is pointless to get up and raise a question most of which tends to be tendentious anyhow and expect necessarily that there will be an answer. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Honourable Member is misleading the House. It is not true that he answers questions when questions are put to him by way of members submitting their questions.

I once asked the Minister a question concerning the removal of persons from a grade and the response I got was, the Member must go and read it for himself in some official publication.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: But that is within the rules of the House. That is exactly what I am saying. If the Member does not understand procedures in the House you cannot ask a question about a matter which has been publicized in an official document. That is one of the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can I have some order, please. The Prime Minister may proceed.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is right, Sir. He got up and asked a question about a point of order and it was not any point of order. That was disorder.

Secondly, I am a politician but I am most amazed sometimes at how brazen politicians can be. How can people get up, or how can that Honourable Member for St. Peter get up and talk about squandermania when he was a beneficiary of, perhaps, the only example of squandermania that we have seen in this country in a by-election in St. Peter and they are talking about squandermania.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Now, I will not have that entered into the record, Sir. No public funds were spent on me in a by-election in St. Peter, Sir. Monies were well spent to relieve those persons in St. Peter who were affected by a flood in 1984 and I want the records of this House to reflect that fact, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Am I to understand the Honourable Member to say that the money was well spent in relieving those people who were affected by the flood in St. Peter? I want to know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister may proceed.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think the Honourable Member understands the point that I am making and I would not really pursue that anymore. He understands that particular point.

Thirdly, Sir, the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:...asked, if I can recall the question that he posed. In what areas would fiscal discipline be applied as far as the public finances of the country were concerned?

Let me put it this way, Sir. The answer to him is, fiscal discipline and fiscal prudence will be applied in all areas and they are being applied in all areas of public finances, not in some, in all, because I am not admitting, and we are not admitting as a Government, to any indiscipline in any of the areas.

Let me point out what I am talking about, Sir. Subject to any refinement of the figures, the information I have at my disposal is that in the year 1985/86, the total expenditure of Government, that includes current and capital, was some \$819.8 million. The GDP at factor cost was some \$2 180.7 million and the ratio of expenditure to GDP was some 37.6%.

In 1989/90 on the basis of the Estimates, or rather, let me deal with the figures for 1988-89. We have total expenditure of \$1 080.4 million with GDP factor cost at \$2 665.4 million and with a ratio of 40.5% so we have a ratio in 1985/86 of 37.6% and for 1985/86 and 1988/89 that is 40.5%. I suppose on the basis of this year the figures are not complete but I expect it must be between 42% and 42.5% or thereabouts.

Now, who in his wildest dream on the basis of an increase from 37.6% to 40.5% or 42% if you wish to go on the incomplete figures, would claim that there is runaway expenditure or would claim in very lurid terms that there is squandermama. The only time that I have heard that word used in Caribbean politics is in relation to some illegal activities which were carried on in another Caribbean country.

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

I will get the Debates of this House. When the Honourable Prime Minister was a member of the Opposition in 1985 and in 1986 during the Budget presentations he sat and lent support to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who used that word in relation to the Barbados Labour Party. I will get the Debate and read it a little later on.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: If you bring it and we have used the word I will join him in the criticisms that I am making now. I am not afraid to do that and you show me the kind of support that I gave for that. Anyhow, I am not really dealing with that.

I am saying that in the present context it is a most inappropriate term. It is a most offensive term and it does not relate to anything that is going on in this country.

Now, we have that kind of increase and I am not afraid to say it either. Over 50% of the funds that we expend go on salaries and wages that is the Government's expense, over 50% that was said by the Minister of Employment.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying over 50%. That is what I am saying. It goes on salaries and wages and let us not forget when we are talking about increases in expenditure, we have to include in that increase the wages and salaries that are paid out and we have had to contend with two salary increases, not one, but two, over the period that we are talking about. 4.35 p.m.

Next year we have another salary increases or rather negotiations. It is pointless getting up to mislead the public when you know better that there is some runaway growth in expenditure when, in fact, the growth in expenditure relates to specific situations. A major part of it is increases in salaries and wages for the public servants of this country. It is a disservice to public political discussion in this country also to talk about expenditure increase without relating it to growth in the gross domestic product. It is a high measure of madness to talk without any reference to the very high expenditures that had to be provided in the years let us say 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990 and will feed into 1991 as well as far as amortization is concerned. That is part of the expenditures as well. You cannot ignore them. The money that has been borrowed and the money that has to be repaid has to form part of the expenditures and we cannot walk away from it.

I have not promised and I am not promising anybody that there will not be an increase in expenditures. You do

not believe in growth. You said that last week. You do not believe in growth.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can now begin to understand why the economy is so high.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the Honourable Member risen?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Member is misleading the House. Last week I did not say that I do not believe in growth and the Minister of Finance knows that is not true and he is deliberately misleading the House. I said, Sir, that nobody in Barbados knows what the growth rate is and the records of the House will show that I did not say so. I ask that those remarks be withdrawn.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if he did not say so, everybody in the House believed that he did not believe in growth and he was happy to be part

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was about to say to you that I believe in growth.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, Sir. I believe that you believe in growth. Sir, you have grown a lot during the years so I know you believe in growth. I know that, Sir. I cannot say that about the Member for St. Peter.

Asides.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, no, you have grown mentally. Anyhow Sir, I withdraw the remarks. I am making the point, Sir, that there has been growth in expenditure just as there has been growth in revenues and there has been growth in GDP. There has been growth in the amount of money we have had to spend on amortization. There has been a major growth in other areas of expenditure including expenditure on wages and salaries. But we will continue to keep discipline on expenditures consonant - yes, we will do it courageously - with the growth and development of this country.

Time is very limited and I do not wish to hear that there is any question that has been asked that has not been answered, but we are operating against constraints of time. I understand the Acting Leader of the Opposition in the way that he has put his points here today. Of course, we do not agree with what he has said but at least he has tried to be objective. No, there is no objectivity about that. He has tried to be reasonable in his particular position.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not talking about you all man. I am talking about out here, not you all.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: He is talking about the real, real Opposition man.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to state that I believe that during the 1980*s Barbados had among the highest rates of expenditures to GDP in the whole of Latin America - in 1984 or 1985 I believe in Latin America - according to some published documents. You can check on that. Check on it.

I wish, Sir, to conclude by saying that we will continue on our path of spending money in order to create the best possible conditions for the people of this country even with the posturings of the Opposition, because they are taking up positions which when they had responsibility for this Government they never succeeded on behalf of the people of this country, and now all of a sudden they have all of the information, all of the knowledge, and all of the advice for all of the people of this country - those people who failed when they had responsibility for the reins of Government of this country.

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is just to inform Honourable Members that the time allotted for this debate has now run out

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

*Subhead 16 - Adult Education Programme -
\$100,000*

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to move that Head 34 stand part, Sir.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 34 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Subhead 1 - General Administration -\$52200

Subhead 2 - Electrical Engineering Dept. -\$120,000

Subhead 5 - Public Building Maintenance - \$55,740

*Subhead 6 - Maintenance of Roads, Car Parks,
and Bus Stands*

Subhead 9 - Vehicle Inspection and Licensing - 42,000

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Sir, I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that, Sir.
4.45 p.m.

ITEM (b) - SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90, NO. 3

HEAD 70 - MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT - CAPITAL - \$9 650 000

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there should be hardly, any debate on this matter. This is to do with the acquisition of a microwave communications link for our air traffic control system at the airport.

For some considerable time we have had the links above the ground and we have had some under the ground. Anyone who is familiar with the methodology that is used for linkages at short distances will know that the technology has advanced to the point where microwave linkages are the order of the day. As a matter of fact, we have been extremely fortunate that over time we have been able, without accident, to be able to have communication between, for example, the tower at our airport and the other communication linkages. Video, voice and telemetry information is presently transmitted between the radar station and the ATC terminal building through special cables on telegraph poles.

Sir, only a few people who are seized of the knowledge of what is involved here will recognise how very fortunate we have been over the years, and this is nobody's fault, it is simply that over time we have had that system. It is the kind of system that could be interrupted quite inadvertently by a cow moving in the wrong direction, or somebody going home late at night who may run off the road and strike a pole could disrupt our telecommunications at the airport for some considerable time. One needs not go too far to identify what havoc that would wreak on our economy.

The Technical Director and the Chief Engineer responsible for electronic sections, having expressed concern about the possible disruption of this vital communication link and the consequential halt to air traffic operations if the cables were brought down as a result of, say, a motor vehicle accident, have asked that we move to the more modern technique of a microwave system.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in the event we had such an accident the special cables which are used now could not be repaired and would have to be replaced, and the cost would be astronomical.

Perhaps I might give the House some more information and say that the vehicular traffic, I think it is

obvious to everyone, between the airport and Bridgetown, for example, has increased sevenfold if not more, and so the system that has served us well over the years has outlived its usefulness. Even though as I speak it is working, I think we will have to agree with the technical people that a new system is necessary, and so this supplementary comes to supplement the vote to allow for the new system to be purchased and installed.

I might say, in answer to the question as to whether this was not known at the time of budgeting, the answer is it would not have been known because the system was being evaluated by the technical people and it is only at this point that we have an indication of the amount. In the absence of the Minister I will seek to answer any questions which Honourable Members might ask about the system, but as I said at the beginning, the supplementary provision of \$1.5 million for such a vital link in our communications system ought not to occasion any acrimonious debate, and so, Sir, with those few words I beg to move that Head 70 stand part.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would have expected that the Acting Leader of the House - I am not sure he is acting on behalf of the Minister of International Transport, I am not sure which Minister is acting - would have taken the opportunity to inform the Committee of what are the current plans, if any, which the Government has for the expansion of the facilities available at Grantley Adams International Airport.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member says *sotto voce* more money. Let me put very clearly the Labour Party's position. If the Government is going to expend money that is going to add to the productive base of Barbados and at the same time control needless expenditure, it would have the support of the Barbados Labour Party. They want to know what is our view on this and therefore you will see that when we go into projects such as the Grantley Adams International Airport, we go into them because they add to the productive base of Barbados in many ways.

My information is that the airport itself, although it is not on a separate Statutory Corporation or Statutory Body, despite the recent study done by BIMAP, is not only meeting its current expenses but it is at the same time giving a good rate of return. There is some argument within the Government itself as to whether or not the airport is earning its keep. It is my understanding that it is doing so despite the recent BIMAP analysis. The Attorney General might have had access to the BIMAP Report, but these

studies are done as a matter of course and if you go near to BIMAP you will find out what is being done.

I want to go on, Sir, because I also recognise that development has been taking place or being planned to the east south east of the Grantley Adams International Airport, and part of that development would involve the use of lands at Spencers.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am talking because it is under this one, Sir, it is under the airport. That is what we are using it for. If those lands are used for the purpose of another entity, then we might find that when expansion has necessarily to take place to the east of the Grantley Adams International Airport the land is not available, so I want to know from the Ministry whether the plans to expand the Spencers area for the use of the cotton industry will in any way affect future development at Grantley Adams Airport.

Likewise, it seems to me that the Government should by now have had some proposals in relation to the use of the former terminal which is to the west of the airport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to the Honourable Member that we are dealing with the matter of equipment?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: We are also dealing, Sir, with Capital under Grantley Adams Airport. There is only one place you can use this for, Sir, I am talking about the airport's needs. It is not only its needs for video, voice and telemetry information to be properly transmitted, but if in future they do not envisage expansion in any way at Grantley Adams Airport, then obviously I cannot make the point here, Sir. 4.55 p.m.

I would wish to know, Sir, what plans they may have for the use of the former building to the west of the existing main terminal, what is the planning in that respect the Government would have on the drawing board or within what used to be called the Planning and Priorities Committee, which is now the Central Planning Committee. I am not sure of the exact designation. I wish to know what is being planned in relation to this part of the development in Barbados.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member has raised questions which could, if one attempted to explain, take this debate far beyond what Your Honour would allow since it says here only plant, equipment and furniture. K /wever I will answer the specific questions which he asked. The plans for the cotton project to the east south east of the airport will not in any way affect any expansion for the Grantley Adams Airport. The policy concerning expansion of the Grantley Adams airport as outlined in the Development Plan for Barbados has not in any way been

interfered with to the extent that any building will be established in that corner of the expanse of land going east from the airport, that building would conform to the specifications of the Town and Country Planning Department.

With regard to the building to the west, the Ministry of International Transport is actively examining the best use to be made of the existing building and any other ancillary services which might be applied in keeping with the progressive development of the airport instituted and initiated by the Democratic Labour Party some very long time ago. I was a little surprised that the Honourable Member would choose to discuss the airport in terms of their project when replying to some *sotto voce* comment he said that when they, meaning the Barbados Labour Party, go into projects like the Grantley Adams airport that they go into them as developmental projects. Now, Sir, a long time ago when I was President of the Democratic Labour Party, at an annual conference I made the point that if you could have something called intellectual passing off that the then Prime Minister Tom Adams would have to appear in the Supreme Courts of Intellectual Justice and would be found guilty and probably sentenced to intellectual hanging, because he had gone into England and had suggested to a Barbadian audience that they were responsible for the Grantley Adams airport, and I think that the history has to be recorded, and re-recorded otherwise the Ronnie Hughes of this world will have to write and clarify what is perceived by the Beckles' of this world.

The airport as presently constituted is a result of a telephone conversation between the late Rt. Honourable Member for St. John Errol Barrow and Pierre Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada where a \$25 million loan without more in keeping with the reputation which Democratic Labour Party governments have had when in the Ministry of Finance, that \$25 million loan was given to Barbados without more as a soft loan bilaterally without any further discussion, and that is the result, the Grantley Adams airport.

When the Barbados Labour Party came to office, the only thing that remained to be completed at the airport were the facade where we had insisted that we use the clay from St. Andrew in the facade, and the runway needed to be extended. That is all. So don't talk about development projects. The Democratic Labour Party is the party of development in this country. We took Barbados from a village to a town, and we have carried it beyond. We entrusted you, the Barbados Labour Party with the Government between 1976 and 1986, you left us in massive debt; you left the people.....

The Honourable Member laughs, so I will have to spell it out. From \$258 million in total debt, the Barbados Labour Party took us to a figure in excess of \$1 billion. The Barbados Labour Party is the last political party in the

Caribbean that can discuss debt in any serious way. Sometimes it is offensive to the intellect to hear Members of the Barbados Labour Party and in particular the present Leader of that Party discussing debt in the way he attempts to do it and tries to give the impression that the Barbados Labour Party is some Daniel come to judgment. The fact is that if we were going to discuss methodology of Government, one would have to see the Barbados Labour Party as the party that brought massive projects, projects that cost a lot of money; and I am not now going to use this debate to discuss what we have said before, that there is a theory of big projects outlined by some people in Trinidad and Tobago when they were discussing the likes of those who had to fly to Brazil, and they said that they had massive projects because the pickings from small projects were too small.

I have no difficulty dealing with the politics of this country when you all want to discuss the economy. I understand that the present Leader of the Opposition would have to make some noises and can discuss containment. The time to discuss containment with him will come when he is present when we can discuss how we managed to keep the faith on the 2 per cent and where it led us. We can discuss that, but the Barbados Labour Party is not to be heard in this debate. The Barbados Labour Party, not the three of you all. The three Honourable Members have to carry the flag and they have to go on and make the odd noise here and there. To give you an example of how they do it, last week the Honourable Member for St. Peter

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You want to know where the money is going, so it is not irrelevant. This is \$1.5 million; this is not \$200 000. This is \$1.5 million to provide proper communication, microwave in keeping with the international civil aviation organisation's request and requirement that we go into microwave. This is \$1.5 million, so you have to tell the population where the money is going. This plant and equipment here is where the money is going. But last week, Sir, the spokesman for finance for the whole Opposition last week - I got up and asked so and he said so; I specifically asked the question and he made the point for the whole Opposition. Hear him last week "did not". Sir, he does not jump very high for obvious reasons, but he jumped to his full height. "Did not the Central Bank send out a whole panoply of measures? I am saying you should implement those measures." So hear him now this week, one of the panoply of measures that he called for its implementation is implemented, and the newspapers quote him as saying a recession is imminent as a result.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St Michael West is absolutely misleading the House, Sir. Last week I asked the Government a specific question, if the Central Bank has complied - and Mr. Chairman, I spoke very carefully on the matter - as required

by law with section 26 subsection 3 of the Central Bank Act.

5.05 p.m.

I did not make any statement in relation to their sending out any measures. That has come from some other quarters. I have asked if it complied with Section 26, Subsection 3 and, in any case, Sir, I am speaking in relation to the legal requirements that the Central Bank must observe.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Is he denying that he told the Honourable Member for St. John and myself that he agrees with the measures the Prime Minister is taking but that he should have brought them as one entire package? Are you denying that? Are you denying that you told him and me that?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the records of this House...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the Honourable Member risen?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR; Mr. Chairman, Sir, apparently there is some rule..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the Honourable Member risen?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, on a point of order, on a point of order. The Honourable Member rose on a point of order, on a point of order, Sir. There is no provision for that in this Honourable House so I have risen on a point of order, on a point of order, on a point order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you state your point?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The records will show, Sir, that I have never at any stage or ever agreed with any particular policy of the Democratic Labour Party, can never.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The records of this House will show that when you were speaking for the entire opposition you asked the question rhetorically, did not the Central Bank send down a whole package and included it in that package and now this week when the interest rates were up he allowed himself to be foxed by the Press...

I know you are going to get up on a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is straying away from the subject. He must be relevant. He is irrelevant toward the irrelevant. There is no point trying to fight last week's debate today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: This week's debate. It is this week when he is saying that recession is imminent, when they had the two economists, they had the economist from the NDP, the guru and the independent...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could we have some order, please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It upsets me that the Honourable Member was mentioned in the same breath as the guru. I know that the Honourable Minister only might have responded a knee jerk reaction to a question asked.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am going to say, Sir...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could we have some order, please.

Hon. B. M. TAITT:...that I was disappointed in the press report and I believe that the Press report may have misquoted him. Let me say it that way but I know that everybody does not remember what they say every time each time. This is the \$1.5 million, Sir.

The answers I believe I have given to the former Leader of the Opposition.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: There is no minority in here. The speaker ruled on that. If he wants to move from that position he has to get Bourne to move across.

The question of the leadership over there is not open to discussion because Lickmout Lou who is now the scribe of record for the NDP...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order.

The Honourable Member is irrelevant. I just want to know how much he could take in here so I could in turn, Sir, so I am moving again and drawing it to Your Honour's attention that the Honourable Member is irrelevant and is in breach of the Standing Orders, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Members must know that Lickmout Lou writes every week to her family in England. She has travelled because she said in a column recently that she had got on an aeroplane and gone all the way to Canada. We are discussing the airport where Lickmout Lou went through. I do not understand how I could be irrelevant. You are saying that only you can travel?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us press on with the -debate under Plant, Equipment and Furniture.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

The question that Head 70 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 84 - MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will start from Subhead 5 first, with your permission.

This is a request to supplement the funds in the Ministry of Transport and Works under Head 84, Subheads 5,10,15,16 and 17 for the following amounts.

In the case of Subhead 5, that is an area of activity which entails the renovation of Government buildings. The two amounts requested and listed under Object Nos. 2 and 23 respectively, for \$150 000 and \$1 million represent a continuation of work commenced during the year.

The projects involved are the West Wing of Parliament, the renovation work done to the Immigration Department, the installation of new windows in the Treasury Building, the complete rewiring of Government Headquarters and extension to the Ministry of Transport and Works.

That there is an ongoing problem of renovating Government Buildings which is largely the responsibility of the Ministry of Transport and Works, is nothing new and, therefore, I do not think any amplification on the request is needed at this point.

The second request is with respect to Subhead 10, titled Construction of Other Road Projects, Object No. 23, Structures, and the request is for \$750 000. This sum of money is sought for the paving of residential developments.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, private developers throughout Barbados build houses as well as the road infrastructure adjacent to those houses and after a period of 12 months, these roads are handed over to the Ministry of Transport and Works. Sometimes the official notification to the Ministry is not made until years after. By that time the surfaces have virtually disappeared. 5.15p.m.

Having regard to the condition of roads in such developments, the Ministry of Transport and Works has a separate programme for surfacing roads in such areas.

The third requests under this Head is in respect of Subhead 15 - Highway Rehabilitation, Object No. 23 - Structures. The sum requested is \$2 million. This section deals with banks with roads that are rehabilitated under an agreement with the World Bank entered into in 1984. The term for its account indicates that the roads reconstructed under this item are roads that are done by the Ministry of Transport and Works and are now subject to the Rules of International Competitive Bidding. Under these international agreements, a portion of the work is set aside for execution by the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Under Subhead 15 currently the projects undertaken by the Ministry of Transport and Works are Salters, Turnpike, Walkers, St. George Church, Lower Estate, Parish Land, and Belle.

Under Subhead 16 - Highway Rehabilitation, I see International Competitive Bidding. This is a sum of money requested to go towards the expenditure of Highway 2A which is the sole road under rehabilitative construction which was done under the Rules of International Competitive Bidding. The next amount involves Subhead 17, Object No. 7'- Utilities, \$750,000 and Object 23 - Structures, \$2 million. It involves road widening and junction improvement and other highway safety measures. It often entails the removal of telephone poles, the laying of new mains and so forth and the sum of \$750,000 is needed for the payment to these utility companies.

The roads currently involved in this programme are Bank Hall Crossroad, Ho wells Crossroad, Highway 1-Johnson Road-Fitts Village, Highway 1 Brighton, Highway 4B Windsor Brighton, the road adjacent to NUPW which has just been completed, footpath along Lascelles Road in the Pine, footpath along West Terrace and Haynesville, access road to Six Roads.

Some of these projects have historically been funded by the Transport Levy Fund and this supplementary represents a part of the restoration of some of those funds. But over and above that, Mr. Chairman, anybody who is familiar with the conventional engineering practices in Barbados would recognize that it is very difficult to anticipate the cost of any given road where excavation work is required. I have had occasion to allude to these particular problems and I want to state that my view is that conventional engineering practices which are followed in Barbados and which engineers use to excavate until they reach a rock surface before they lay a road are in my view obsolete practices and lead to unnecessary expenses. There are societies where people build roads on swamps and other less solid surfaces. But in the present situation where the layer of rock in Barbados is uneven, wherever excavation has to be done within the context of present engineering practices, it is virtually impossible to anticipate the cost of a road. Over and above this within the Ministry of Transport and Works, expenditures in large measure are determined

by acts of God, circumstances beyond the control of anyone within the Ministry of Transport and Works. When precipitation of an unusual nature occurs and bridges are knocked out, expenditure is incurred which is not foreseen and every year such supplementaries as come from this Ministry to this Honourable House, Mr. Chairman, include requests as a result of damage done to bridges and other road surfaces by flooding. No man not even a Solomon could predict with any certainty the sums of money that the Ministry of Transport will be requesting as a result of these unforeseen contingencies.

With that, Sir, I invite the Honourable House to approve this Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I just want to ask the Minister about a couple of local constituency things. I understand the strategy was to do St. Michael and then Christ Church and you would reach us in St. Thomas in due course, Sir, and perhaps the north generally. That is a matter of Government's priority. That is a matter of policy and Cabinet is well able legally and otherwise to determine that policy, although I think it bears unnecessary hardship on the residents in the rural areas, Sir. 5.25 p.m.

It is true that the Ministry is helping with the construction of a road at Bennetts Tenantry, but St. Thomas being an agricultural parish in which there have been

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to follow the Honourable Member very clearly. Am I correct in understanding the Honourable Member to say that the Government's policy is to do roads in St. Michael and Christ Church to the exclusion of the rural areas?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not to the exclusion, but as I understood, as my friend said, the definition of priorities, it was they would do the roads in St. Michael first, then go to Christ Church and in terms of where the concentration of work would be, I was very careful to point out that notwithstanding that general policy and my understanding of it that work has been done.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The use of the word "do" is an equivocation. To do a road may mean patching it, it may mean barber greening it, it may mean reconstructing a road. Barbadians have a way of using the word "do" to mean any of these things.

In the case of the programme which I believe the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is alluding to, it involves a new approach to maintenance. I do not want to make a speech, Sir, but all I want to state is that it is a maintenance programme that is done in a systematic way.

We felt that there would be greater public satisfaction if we abandoned the practice of doing roads in a fragmentary manner. You start in a community where the majority of people are, the most densely populated communities, and move out into the rural areas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, speaking as I do, as a Bajan, I accept the Honourable Minister's redefinition that the word "do" is full of equivocation. I was drawing the inference, since it was equivocal and not unequivocal, that satisfied my purposes and my understanding of the matter. I will be more careful in future and say that in so far as the maintenance programme that was designed by the Ministry went, that was my understanding and the Minister has corroborated that. Start in the areas of heaviest human concentration and radiate out, move out to the other areas.

I was also saying that I did not expect that the programme was one where the Ministry's concentration on the heaviest areas was to the exclusion of the rural parishes, because I am conceding that I have got some help in terms of the provision of a new road at Bennetts Tenantry, but there are still other areas in St. Thomas which are left undone and which are crying out for Government expenditure. There is one in particular, the road at Lion Castle.....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Expenditure well within the competence of this Government. I know where he is coming from. The road at Lion Castle has been measured and remeasured at least three times by MTW between 1984 and present day. As I understood it, it was hoped to have reconstructed that road last year and nothing has happened, but it is in a particularly bad, bad state.

Lest I be misunderstood, I will also draw to the Minister's attention that Highland Road, which is next door to Lion Castle, also requires some work, not to the same extent as Lion Castle, but as tenancies go, these were former plantation tenantry roads and there are quite heavy concentrations of people living both in Lion Castle and Highland and I am pleading for some help to be given as a matter of urgency to Lion Castle in particular, Sir. Although I find that the residents of Lion Castle are competing with the residents of Vacluse Tenantry, which is also known as Forty Acre, for perhaps having the worst roads in Barbados. The road at Neils Plantation has undergone reconstruction and repair. That was formerly one of the worst, a lot has been done. We got some help, Sir, and I have already thanked the Minister for his generosity in regard to the residents at Neils.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will come to Bloomsbury and Whitehall and all of them in good time, but I must address Forty Acre first. I have said in this House that Forty Acre perhaps is one of the areas in St. Thomas, and indeed in Barbados, which offers Government a lot of scope for development as a housing settlement. There are few houses in there, I do not think we are beating 20 yet, there is a lot of land and it has an excellent view, but beyond that Forty Acre is bereft of a proper water system, proper lighting_____

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, but it is foolishness to tell me that somebody was there representing it for ten years. Boxill before him represented it for ten years. Barrow had been in St. John for about 50 and St. John is still without a lot of these basic things. I am not accusing or blaming anybody, I am concerned with my present position. I am representing the constituency now and I want to draw these things to the Ministry's attention.

Sir, on 9th May, 1988, over a year and a half ago, I wrote the Ministry to draw to their attention that the road is essentially a long, rough mud track, but I asked for some levelling of the road and at least a rolling with marl fill, and if they could afford it, some binding agent. 5.35 p.m.

I also pointed out, Sir, that it remains one of the very few districts in Barbados without running water. There is running water at Glendale Children's Home beside the road and people have to go to Glendale sometimes to get water. I asked for a pipe to be put in and I pointed out that there is not even a public telephone booth in the area, though there is some electricity, and I asked for a public telephone booth at least to enable the residents of Forty Acre in the case of emergency to be able to communicate. Nothing has been done, Sir, and these people have been long-suffering, and all we are asking for is some help. If the Government cannot afford a barbergreen road in this financial year or early next year, we want the road properly cut, levelled and some marl put down. This is part of Vacluse estate.

Similarly, Sir, over the weekend I stopped by the depot in Bagatelle and had a look, and I noticed some more equipment in the yard at Bagatelle than hitherto. I had previously asked a question in here, it may still be on the Order Paper for all I remember, about the lack of equipment at Bagatelle. It was affecting road repairs in St. Thomas in a negative way, and the lack of that equipment as I said had a bad effect in respect of certain of the roads, particularly White Hall tenantry road and roads just off Shop Hill which are in need of maintenance, but now I see the equipment at Bagatelle, I trust that in the next few weeks the Ministry will apply itself with diligence to righting some of the wrongs that exist in White Hall tenantry in particular and the Shop Hill area.

I am not going to dwell on Bloomsbury, Sir. The road there had collapsed going on for three years now and nothing has been done. People are being re-routed. Tourists particularly who are trying to get to the Flower Forest and to the East Coast have to go around through some cane fields, and when the rain falls they are only on a marl road, so it is very mucky, it tends to slip and of course it dirties your vehicle. Since I have a question on the Order Paper I am not going to go into it any more, because Government will obviously have to respond and tell us what are their plans for rehabilitation of that road, but I would ask that perhaps Government in the meantime deploy some of its work force to clean around the area. It is now thoroughly overgrown with bush at Bloomsbury where the road has broken away, and it is very unsightly and of course it will be a haven for rats and vermin.

One final matter, Sir, and it is in respect of utilities generally. I wish to mention briefly that there is something that bothers me about Windsor Arms which is now rented by Government and part of the Ministry of Legal Affairs is installed there. There is a problem with the payment of the electricity bill. There is one meter and in the Windsor Arms Government occupies space, Universal Gym occupies space, a Restaurant occupies space, a photographer's studio occupies space, and all of these people use electricity, some more than the Ministry of Legal Affairs and what has happened is that there has been no proper system for the payment of electricity bills, so these other tenants will pay a part of it and leave the balance for Government; Government becomes the milch cow. I am not blaming the Government in any way; these things can happen, but now that I have drawn it to Government's attention, I hope that Government will use its offices to ensure that these various tenants of the building have their own separate meter so that everybody can know what is his particular liability to the Electricity Company.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the matter of support for this Resolution by me is not in doubt, but I want, Sir, to spend a couple of moments expressing my concern which I share with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, although the particular facts are not the same about the tenantry roads in Barbados. Now, Sir, it is this Government that has taken it on as its responsibility to develop a modern up-to-date tenantry road programme which will service all of the tenancies in this country over a certain period with roads, new roads, provision of water mains and street lights.

Now, Sir, this is a very important aspect of development of the rural sector, and particularly in a constituency like mine. We have had a lot of discussion in here about agriculture on many occasions, but we cannot hope to keep people living in the rural sector if the conditions under which they live remain the same way as they were three centuries ago, and it really pains me considerably to think that three centuries after the

settlement of people on plantation tenancies, the plantations never provided any roads; the people paid rent, they paid taxes, they upgraded their surroundings and today in 1989 we are found in a situation where those same people by virtue of the taxes they pay have to end up contributing to a massive capital works programme known as the tenantry road programme. It says something about the kind of development that we practise in this country. .

Now in my constituency alone there are probably nearly 100 tenantry roads that need repairing. I can think of big tenancies like Venture which is really in St. Joseph, Sunbury tenantry which is in St. Philip and a part in St. John, Colleton, Society and Clifton Hall. All of these are massive tenancies that if you drove into them you would not believe that where people are passing could even be conceived of as being a road. I believe, Sir, that the faster that we get this programme into place, the better for the people living in those areas, and it is a question of the solidarity of the Democratic Labour Party with people living in the rural sector that this programme has been placed in such high priority on the programme of the Democratic Labour Party.

The point is that all of the talk we have heard about the Manifesto, the tenantry road programme as a programme was not in our Manifesto, but if it is implemented it will be one of the most path breaking, social service programmes that this country has witnessed. Now, Sir, I do not want to be contentious about the questions of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, but I want to make it clear that I do not conceive of that Act as being revolutionary in any way. All it did was give the people who already were living on the tenancies and could not be put off the right to purchase them, and it was the responsibility of the Government bringing that legislation before this Chamber to also make arrangements for the provision of tenantry roads, street lights and water.

Now the Honourable Member for Christ Church West is doing a bit of quarrelling, but the record will show that the Barbados Labour Party if they built 40 roads between 1980 when the legislation was passed and 1986, they built a lot. I cannot think of one single tenantry road in the constituency of St. John that was built by the Barbados Labour Party since the passing of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, so that all the talk about revolutionary piece of legislation, all it did

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the Honourable Member has been complaining that there has been no tenancies roads in the parish of St. John. With that I agree wholeheartedly, but would the Honourable Member inform the Committee that the parish was represented by the Rt. Honourable Errol Barrow for 27 years, seventeen of which he spent as Prime Minister or Premier and had done nothing for the people of St. John. He should not be heard

to open his mouth in this House at all. What is he complaining to the Committee for?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the very point I was making has been missed by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party. 5.45 p.m.

The Act was passed in 1980 and he was in the Opposition. You mean he must just take up tractors and barbergreen and go on people's private land and build roads? That is foolishness and is the height of ignorance for anybody and you live in St. John...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member knows that the Government between 1961 and 1976, 15 years, had the power to use the Land Acquisition Act if it was necessary to do it. His predecessor has represented St. John. St. John for 27 years has been under the Democratic Labour Party. He should not complain.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: All I am saying is a simple point. If he does not understand the concept of development, that is his business. Passing legislation is not revolutionary. Any person can bring any piece of legislation in here and pass it and then if nobody acts on it or improves the conditions of the people of this country, no development has taken place. You just do not put legislation on the Statute Book and walk around beating your chest and talking about the Labour Party has done this, that and the other and in the end of the day the persons whom it affects most cannot see any physical or spiritual improvement to their lives.

I am talking about post 1980 and I am saying that if the Labour Party passed the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act in here, they should have brought, at the same time, a programme to put in place tenancy roads, street lights and watermains for the constituents of St. John and elsewhere.

He knows that since the Democratic Labour Party has been in office we have built a brand new road at Pool in St. John. He knows that we have built a new road at Welch in St. John when the surface had completely deteriorated. He knows it has been done in Glenburnie. He knows it has been done in Sherbourne, No. 1.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He does not know. Since 1986 all of those were done. He lives in Society Tenancy and the road to his house is better than in the tenancy itself, he does not have anything to complain about. All you can do is walk around and, probably, collect a few limes from people living in St. John on a Sunday morning. That is the only time you see the conditions of the roads so do not come in here and challenge me on my representation of the people of St. John.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I would like to confirm that the only time the people of St. John see the Honourable Member is when he passes through once or twice and hides his face. I would like to confirm that for the committee.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: And you live in Christ Church West. They see you every day and you are still in here at the same time. That kind of foolishness we have passed that. That is the kind of excuse you would hear from a moron on the street who does not understand how politicians function and the contribution that we make to this country by contributing and meeting people, not necessarily on the street, but in our branch offices and by calling on the telephone, and by coming in here, and by discussing policy, and by going to our party headquarters, but you are joining with the rebel rousers to talk foolishness to make people think that we are not representing people in this country. That is the attitude. You pass through a constituency and wave at people and that is the only time they see you. That is the kind of thing that you have to be 'up against from a man who has been in Parliament for so long who lives in my constituency and cannot take constructive criticism. That is the kind of problem.

He passed the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act as the Attorney General but all the Labour Party can say is that they passed the Act. They cannot point to any of the tenancies that they have put in the facilities that are necessary for a modern, rural sector and this is an important point. It is not to be pooh-poohed and joked about.

I am saying to you that in the constituency of St. John people have lived in tenancies for under four centuries and they are living in the same conditions that their foreparents and their ancestors were living in and that something has to be wrong and that our concept of development in the rural sector has to be revised and we have to have a central approach to the development of the rural sector.

This Tenancy Road Programme is going to bring untold relief to thousands of people living in the rural sector in this country, and it is not in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party but, as far as I am concerned, it outweighed nearly every single of the other pledges that we have made to the people of this country both in the cost of it and the social impact and that cannot be denied by anybody in the House of Assembly here today.

Sir, I have to be concerned that there is a comprehensive scheme for the provision of these tenancy roads and all I want this evening from the Minister is for him to indicate the progress of the programme because I know that the Government is still fully committed to the development of the programme and committed to redressing this imbalance in the development of the rural sector and redressing that historical imbalance that meant that people laboured and toiled on plantations and at the end of the day had to walk through mud tracks to get home.

Now, Sir, I have also been asked to raise with the Minister a few concerns relating to a constituency known as St. Michael North East, particularly, the condition of the Canewood Road which is regarded by the Democratic Labour Party as a priority because the surface is bad and the road is very narrow, particularly, in view of the fact that this road is heavily used by cane trucks and carts which convey canes to Portvale Factory and the lack of foot paths has posed a problem and a danger to the pedestrians.

The same is true regarding the surface and drainage at Skeete's Road in Hothersal Turning which the Labour Party neglected for the 10 years in which they were responsible for the Government of this country.

In addition to that, Sir, there are the tenantry roads in that area, four avenues off Long Gap adjoining Piedmont Park, Canewood Hill, Richard's Land, Bush Hall, Holder's Land, Coleman Road, Jackson and the Adventist Gap. Those are the main areas that I have been asked to raise with you.

But, Sir, I want to make the position of the Democratic Labour Party on this Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act clear. I hope that 20 years from now when I sit in this House of Assembly I do not hear people coming saying that the Labour Party passed any legislation and put in any amenities.

The only thing the Labour Party will ever be able to say about the Tenancies Act is that it allowed people to buy land they were already living on for 300 years at a reduced price but they did absolutely nothing else and that the right to buy the land in no way enhanced their status because the majority of them are not going to build and remain on that land unless the infrastructure is put in place.

There are a lot of young people who live in tenancies today who are not going to take up their hard earned money to build a wall house and then have to run 60 lengths of pipe from their house to the main road to meet j Wdiepruiir; and those are some of the conditions that ,tre prevalent in the rural areas in Barbados.

I can think of areas like Kendall where people run 45 lengths of pipe to meet a watermain. I can think of College Savannah where people run 60 lengths of pipe to meet a watermain but I can also think of Society where this Government put in the watermain and I can think of Guinea where this Government put in the watermain in St. John and I can think of this Government that recently put up street lights throughout the whole length of Society Hill to benefit the Honourable Member of Christ Church West and my other constituents who live in that area.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. rt. THOMPSON: Street lights were put in. If you have not passed down the bottom of the hill for a long time to wave at anybody I have and I know...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: This morning when I was walking at 5:00 a.m. I believe the Honourable Member was asleep, Sir, because we really do not see him those hours in our constituency.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West is my constituent and as much as he competes for the affection of the people of St. John at a personal level, I have no problem with that. The people of St. John are warm in their hearts and he knows exactly how they operate but when he ever challenges me on politics and on the nature of development in the rural sector and in St. John, he is going to be faced with a full response on every occasion.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am waiting for a plan? You want to talk about a plan? You objected and got up in this Chamber and attacked the Honourable Minister of Agriculture regarding a proposal for a subdivision of certain agricultural lands in St. John, Clifton Hall Plantation, Hothersal and Wakefield.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will not give him anymore ideas. On a point of order, Sir.

I pointed out to the Honourable Member, ask him, Sir, an area that he can get for proper development outside of the water zone area in St. John. Ask him. I have pointed it out to him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes to wind up. 5.55 p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Minister and I located a site in St. John for housing and we are about to acquire the land now. But we also had located sites for other kinds of development and in a surreptitious manner the Opposition came in here and accused the Honourable Minister of Agriculture of being in cahoots with people for cutting up agricultural land. As a result, the Town Planner-well, I am not saying as a result of that - but the result of the whole thing is that the Town Planning Department did not grant approval.

We need at least 2 acres of parking at St. John Church. Hundreds if not thousands of tourists visit St. John Church and we have nowhere for people to park. People of St. John could be there operating a little stall with icecream and handicrafts, hot dogs, and patties, and all of these things. But everytime there is any attempt made to cut up agricultural land and to improve the conditions of people in

the rural sector you hear that we are going back to 1975 when Barrow cut up all the land in Barbados. So at no point can the rural sector of this country lift its head out of the under-development that is prevalent. Every occasion we try to take steps whether through the private sector or through Government agencies the Opposition launches into a massive attack on the Government for cutting up agricultural land and for using it for purposes other than agriculture. This is a grave and serious problem and the questions of under-development in those rural constituencies are very serious questions that need very serious attention and just passing legislation in here does not matter. We have to go a step further and get the policies and programmes in place and commit the resources to carrying out these development programmes in the rural sector in Barbados.

Thank you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George South.

Mr. R. P. BYER: A lot of the remarks made by the former speaker I would like to associate myself with

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: the previous speaker and also the Member for St. Thomas, especially the Member for St. John, in so far as the Tenantry Road Programme is concerned. Now Sir, I was born in a rural district and I have spent all of my life apart from periods of study abroad in the very district in which I was born. My relatives were born and lived in one of the largest plantation tenancies in Barbados which is Drax Hall. So that any efforts made and any programmes implemented by the Minister responsible for Transport and "Works towards alleviating conditions in rural constituencies I would like to associate myself with those programmes.

Now Sir, I am one who likes to give praise where it ought to be given and I am particularly impressed with the approach that the Ministry of Transport and Works is taking in so far as the programme for road rehabilitation and road renewal is concerned and also road repair because the people in St. George have been the beneficiaries of the efforts of the Minister. The previous representative for the parish never really did anything in terms of appreciating the efforts of.....

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The previous representative, Louis Tull, of the constituency never did anything in terms of making representations for road repair and road renewal in St. George. He does not have any record in that area, Sir, none whatsoever.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: So it is important that I would like to place on record the efforts that are being made to remedy the situation in terms of roads and whatever services that are important to the people of St. George. The last thing that previous representative for St. George South did was to go into Drax Hall Tenantry and say that when he came there the people in Drax Hall were still catching tadpoles when the pipe was open. That is what he said at a public meeting in St. George. It was reported in the *Advocate* too and it just showed the contempt that he had for the people of St. George. Of course, it was not true. Of course, that was not so.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The whole Labour Party never really did anything in terms of not even representing the people's interest in St. George, in St. George South to be particular, and the former Minister Louis Tull was a complete failure in that regard. You cannot point to one thing up there that - he really made an effort to get done when he was the Minister. So that I applaud the efforts of the Minister of Transport and Works in this regard.

Now the Member for St. John spoke about one aspect of tenantry development, that is the roads. The other aspect of tenantry development I would like not to speak about but just mention, Sir, because it properly fall under this Head, but it has to do with the passing of titles to those people who occupy house spots in those areas. I know that we had debated the amendment to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act in this House, but I do not think that it was debated in the Upper Chamber. So it still has to be passed up there before anything can be done in relation to that. But I would be very interested to see that titles are passed.

I know there is one particular area, Sir, if I may just divert a bit ...

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Oh, I am sorry, Sir. I was told that it was passed but not proclaimed as yet, Sir. Now the Lower Estate Tenantry is causing some problems. I do not know if it is because of the peculiar nature of the Lower Estate itself and the problems that that estate is undergoing at the moment. But the Lower Estate Tenantry which is to the west of Charles Rowe Bridge is causing some problems. That is in St. George North. But the whole of St. George is really my stomping ground and I would like to speak about St. George. Specifically Sir, in relation to St. George South, I have previously made representations on behalf of the Drax Hall Tenantry. Drax Hall Tenantry has many different locations. You have Drax Hall Tenantry itself, Drax Hall Hope, and then there is an area going into Harmony Cottage. It is a very large tenantry stretching over many acres and the road conditions especially in this area are deplorable.

I know that the Minister has a plan of action but there still in a sense of anxiety when one speaks on these matters that one would like to see the work done. For many years, as the Member for St. John said, people have been living on these plantation tenancies without their problems being addressed, paid rents, and so on. It is always with a sense of urgency and anxiety that one would like to see these things attended to. One can also speak in terms of Todds. On an occasion when I was still a Member of the Democratic Labour Party, the Minister asked me to take him over to Jordan, Jericho, South District, Dash Valley, and Bye Mill. These are all areas that he was told before and I know that he is aware of the difficulties and the problems with the roads in these villages in St. George South. There are also some aspects of Bye Mill and Woodland, Brighton, Windsor, and Buttals that need to be addressed.

I would like to get some word from the Minister not necessarily in relation to St. George South but what progress is being made on the Tenantry Road Programme in terms of not only implementing the programme but the actual funding of it and so on - that is if the information is available - and what is the present status of that programme.

Now outside of the Tenantry Road Programme, there are other areas of my constituency, St. George South, that need development and so on. There is one area in Ellerton, St. George which is being attended to but the work is going at a very, very slow pace. I had asked a question in this House about that way back in 1986 and the actual work started in 1988 and going at a very slow pace. 6.05 p.m.

One road has been repaired and they have started work on another one, but I am told that the money for the repair of the road is coming from the maintenance vote and not from any other vote.

The roads at 1st and 2nd Avenue, Greens, are being done, also the road stretching through from Highway 4B right up to Brighton Plantation. It stretches from the junction of Haggatt Hall and Salters right past Bulkeley to the Old Works Hill and then up the turnpike. A lot of work was done to improve the general area of Brighton Plantation. That was an area where there was more or less a blind corner and it was improved and looks very, very attractive.

Sir, if I may say so, I am very pleased with the standard and quality of work being done recently by the employees at the Ministry of Transport and Works. If you look at these Parliament buildings, especially the accommodations on the bottom floor of this wing where the parliamentarians will meet to have lunch and over on the other side, I think the work has been of an excellent quality. Certainly this has spilled over into the manner in which the workmen are going about their work in building the roads,

rebuilding the roads, expanding the roads, whatever. I am very pleased with the quality of work that is being done by the workmen.

The only thing I might want to say is that roads take a little long to be built by the Ministry of Transport and Works because, I believe, Sir, there is a lack of equipment, like for example curb building equipment, but as you bring in that kind of equipment then you have to look for other areas to put people to work. It is a question of balancing on the one hand efficiency against displacement of workers. This is the whole thing. It is a delicate balance that has to be approached very delicately and in a manner that would be pleasing to everyone. That is but one aspect of the work and it is not even a criticism, Sir, it is just an observation that the work could be done at a quicker pace but for the lack of equipment.

I have noticed recently that some street lights are now dotting some of the areas that previously had no street lights. For example, there is Mount Heights, some areas of Dash Valley, some areas of Bye Mill as well, so all in all I have no quarrel. For a long time we have not really had much to cheer about in St. George, so there is now something to cheer about.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I can say that I would like the Minister to convey to his employees my profound pleasure with the quality and standard of work they are doing. I can see a new sense of purpose and a new pride in the way they are approaching their tasks.

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: Mr. Chairman, in support of this Resolution by the Ministry of Transport and Works, I would like to echo the sentiments expressed by my colleague from another rural constituency, that of St. John, because we in the rural constituencies have special problems and I must say it is a tribute to the foresight of the Ministry of Transport and Works that they have understood and appreciated the problems in the rural areas. It is all very well and good to make highways, but the majority of people in the rural areas have to use those tenancies to get out to go to church, to go to work, wherever they want to go, and I personally am very happy that there is a tenantry road programme. I am assured that by next year most of those tenantry roads will be done.

The Ministry of Transport and Works has been most democratic in the way they have gone about some of the improvements in my constituency. For instance, the Horse Hill area is going to be done, in that the hill is going to be regraded and in some cases some people may lose a little bit of land or the road may go around someone's house. Only two weeks ago - mind you, there were no television cameras to put this on the television - but the Ministry of Transport called a meeting of the residents of the area. I cannot remember ever having been in such a gathering where the people of the area were able to question in order

to find out what is going to be happening in their own area. I call this democracy in action, where the people who are concerned are asked and have participated in the decision making.

Also, just a few weeks ago some of those very tenantry roads of which we were speaking were visited by the Technical Officers so that they could see first hand what is to be done with these roads. It is all well and good to sit in an office and plan for roads, but you really have to go into these tenantry roads to see the state of them in order to understand and appreciate how the people of those areas feel. It is not for me to apportion blame to anybody, but I would like to say that this is the very first time that tenantry roads in St. Joseph are going to be done.

I have walked the length and breadth of that place. In fact, some of my colleagues wonder how I did it, because the state of those tenantry roads, many of them not very long but very crucial, was very poor. Added to that, we have a situation in St. Joseph and also in St. Andrew which is peculiar to us. We have the Scotland District and in repairing roads and doing things in the Scotland District it takes a great deal of engineering skill and it takes a great deal of money to get this done. However, the Ministry of Transport and Works has targeted areas in both of these constituencies that have this peculiar problem in order to relieve the problems given to those people in the area.

I would like to say also that the Ministry of Transport is to be congratulated, because there are at least four special parts of St. Joseph I can name where the people could not even get out. I can tell you stories where the ambulance did not want to come in the road because every second foot was a pothole, so that the people in those areas are extremely appreciative, because it is one thing to be there during the sunshine when there is no rain, but when people had to get out to go to a doctor in the rainy weather, that was a terrible thing. 6.15 p.m.

So I am sure that they are awaiting with bated breath fulfillment by the Ministry of Transport which I have no doubt will be carried out. I have already seen the plans, I have alerted my people about it and I am sure that within a year or two the tenantries which are the bulk of roads in our parish will be done. I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution for a supplementary. Thank you.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I rise just to respond to one brief point which the Honourable Member for St. George South raised. He enquired of the Minister of Transport and Works what was the state of the agreement in relation to the funding of the tenantry road programme. I am perhaps in a better position to answer that than the Minister of Transport and Works. He himself did enquire from me recently what was the position with the agreement because it was with the office of the Attorney General. The

Solicitor General's Department which is the department which usually deals with those agreements I have been in contact with. The officer who was apparently dealing with the agreement is on holiday until 2nd December and it did appear as if other officers in the department were not over anxious to deal with it in the absence of the person who was substantively dealing with it, but I did have a word with the acting Solicitor General on the matter over the past few days and impressed upon him the urgency of getting the agreement done, and he has assured me that he will take every step possible to ensure that the agreement is dealt with as soon as possible.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I have waited very patiently to respond to some of the incorrect statements made in this debate by the Honourable Member for St. John. I had hoped that since his getting into this House he would have begun to learn, but it seems as though he has a hard head, Sir, because it is going to take some time to drum into his head basic facts. He also unfortunately does not do his research, and very often he makes statements here that cannot be justified factually, and whatever goodwill he might have come in to the House with, I think he is fast dissipating, unfortunately for him, and I believe that dissipation is now spreading to his own constituency of St. John, and as I said, Sir, he has recently been on record as saying that the St. John plan has been rejected, the plan that we the residents of St. John heard so much about.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, the Honourable Member is not now in his place and I can say of my own knowledge that he pointed out to me that publication in a newspaper was absolutely inaccurate, that he never said any such thing anywhere any time to anybody.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is suffering from great inaccuracies. I am glad to hear that there is still a St. John plan. I am looking forward to its publication and I hope that time will not expire for the Government by 1991 without the plan being revealed to those of us who would like the opportunity to implement it after the next election at least as a tribute to the Rt. Honourable Errol Barrow's 27 years of having remained as a representative of St. John with such acclaim from the people of St. John without once having fixed a tenantry road in the parish of St. John until the last minute when he fixed Pool Tenantry. Really when I hear the Honourable Member complain, the Honourable Member should really not complain about anything that he says has happened to people in the tenantry roads in St. John because of the last 28 years of Parliament the Democratic Labour Party has been in government for over eighteen and a quarter of those years or beyond, and during that period of time the parish of St. John was represented by the person who was Minister of Finance, who was the Prime Minister of this country, to whom all roads led, and there should have been no road

leading to him that was not properly fixed in his own constituency.

I salute him for being able to get away, none of us in public life has been able to get away, with the way in which he has got away in the parish of St. John with consistently being returned with such big votes having done nothing. It is nothing that I have not said to the Rt. Honourable Member when he was alive, and the debate will reflect that I always commented on this fact, and it is part of the hypocrisy of the Democratic Labour Party that they would then seek to take that blame and that shame and pass it on to the Barbados Labour Party. If any Member of my party had remained in Parliament for so long and had done so little for the people of their constituency, I would have been ashamed of him.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, we don't want to play *quid pro quo* with that Honourable Member. Nobody is going to mention Sir Grantley Adams in the same context. There is no shame or blame for the representation which Errol Barrow gave to St. John and the Democratic Labour Party. We are not shifting any blame. The Honourable Member, the representative for St. John, spoke on merit in relation to what he perceived, and he castigated the Barbados Labour Party correctly. The representative of St. John for those 28 years was busy representing the entire country and was selfless enough to allow the representative for Christ Church West to get things in his constituency at the expense of St. John to the extent that he did not so represent and is now not here in the flesh to defend himself. The Honourable Member is not behaving in the proper character.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member will make use of your very generous indulgence to try to defend where there is no defence whatsoever, and I forgive him because today he has a general brief, and that means he can range wide and far without making too much sense. At the end of the day it is really only another symptom of the person he has come to misrepresent, a lot of talk, no action and no substance. I am really not concerned about....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Either he is lying now or he has lied before. He is constantly discussing the amount of substance which this Honourable Member has. How can he now to make a point get up and talk about the lack of substance. The record is replete with references to the substance of this Honourable Member by that Honourable Member.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is guilty of a malapropism; he has really been confusing sustenance with substance.

I am now really going to put the tenantry road business in its true perspective. Honourable Members in this House forget that tenantry roads were the responsibility

of the Vestries for a very long time. After the Vestry system moved, and this is a fact, tenantry roads moved to the Local Government, the Central and Northern District and the City Council, and one of the reasons why there has been a delay in Central Government action, and I am giving them part of their defence too, has been the fact that the whole road system previously to the change of 1969 was really decentralised in the hands of various Vestries, and you got different reactions at different times. In fact in some of the rural areas you would still find, Mr. Chairman, that the surface of the white road which was put in by these Vestries still remain, and if one is going to look back at what has happened with the tenantry roads, one cannot speak sensibly about these matters without looking at this particular fact. Having said so, it is not correct, as the Honourable Member for St. John has said, that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing about tenantry roads in its second term in office, because I am advised, and I have not got the list here, that some 54 tenantry roads were fixed during the time and the votes of the House would reflect it. Honourable Members continue to say that nothing was done, whereas we have to admit that there is a lot still to be done by way of counter-balancing the development in the rural areas as against the development in the urban areas, and development at the pace that we would wish to see has continued faster afield in the urban areas than it has in the rustic or rural areas.

Now, Sir, it does not mean that everything has been put right in the urban areas or suburban areas within the city of Bridgetown, within my own constituency, within Christ Church West Central there are still several tenantry roads in need of being done, and one of the reasons why we pushed the Freehold Tenancies Purchase Act and the adjoining Act to deal with this problem is that you first had to get in there, give people the right to purchase, make the development orders called for under the conjoint Act which we did, and then start the programme of improving the basic utilities for the people. 6.25 p.m.

The Honourable Minister of Housing would know that he has made, as we had made, several Orders now under the Freehold Purchase Act and that the programme for dealing with these tenancies is being developed in conjunction with his Ministry.

If you look through the Official Gazette you will find a whole list of Orders but I do not expect all to be fixed overnight. It would be unreasonable to believe in the time frame that they all can be done within that time frame.

I know for a fact that before the change of Government, we had UNDP assistance and experts within the Ministry of Housing, who were themselves developing the programmes for some areas. In my own area, the Gospel Hall, Dayrells Road is one area. They are really disgraceful, if I want to use a pejorative term as other members are

using. The condition of the area between Brewster's Road and Amity Lodge, that has been declared as one of the areas and there are several ones and I do not think there will be any Honourable Member in this House who would not speak feelingly of the need to provide provisions and supplies in order to deal with the longterm problem but if Honourable Members persist in carrying this debate on the basis, if they wish, simply to cast aspersions on the Barbados Labour Party, they will find a very ready response because really they know that those are not the facts as they are speaking to.

In fact, the Minister was very careful in introducing his Resolution, for instance, under Subhead 15, to say that the projects at Sailers and Turnpike, Lower Estate, Parish Land, St. George Church, came under a World Bank Programme an agreement of 1984. Now, who was the Government in 1984 but ourselves?

The Minister did not get up and present his case in that way and that is why it is easier to deal with this Minister in making a response than in dealing with some of the other Ministers because they become combative from word one and they wish us to give them every quarter but they are not prepared to give us any quarter at all and when we object we are unpatriotic or we are going outside leading people to pull down the country.

That is the sort of defence now that we get everywhere. When we object, and I have sat in this House very frequently and heard the historic role which the Labour Party has played and the caring role being misrepresented by the very side but if we try to object and reply we are always wrong, Sir, and, therefore, I say it is easier to deal with this Minister because he did not put his case on other than that basis.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not begging. The Honourable Minister and I have had some of the biggest clashes in this House. He knows that. I can respect when he puts his point of view but I differ and when I differ I will say I have differed.

The paving of sidewalks. The Honourable Members would recall, just before the last election the big fuss made by the former Right Honourable Member for St. John again about cutting down mahogany trees all along the Collymore Rock area and all along Hastings, for widening the sidewalks. This is a continuation of the programme if the Honourable Members are being fair and, probably, an intensification of the programme but it is a continuation of a programme that was foreseen.

I am concerned about the statement of the Minister about the \$750 000 which he has asked for under Subhead 10, not because I am going to contend that it should not be

granted, but the reasons which he has explained to the committee, none of us can be happy with.

He has explained that the Government has to go in in residential developments because of disintegration taking place very soon after developers have had and made money out of developing an area, put the profits in their pockets, have done the roads recklessly as possible, and within a year or less than a year they are washed away.

Now, I have a classic example in my own constituency in Dayrells Court, right off Dayrells Road and Rockley, a nice development, but the tremendous problems that have occurred because of very bad drainage and very bad planning and when I complained between Town Planning and another department, nobody seemed to know whose responsibility it is if, in fact, the law has a provision to discipline these people.

I believe that we must develop within the Ministry, whichever Ministry, appropriate legislation, as happened in some of the other Caribbean countries, where the day that a development is finished it is handed over to the Government, but the developer remains liable for a period of time to put right what goes wrong for a reasonable time where normal wear and tear of use would have occurred.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute.

Hen, H. deB. FORDE: It would save the Treasury these enormous sums and I am not blaming any Government Department for this. I think it is about time that we advance on that, Sir.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member spoke about road widening. I am pleased to see the road widening that has been taking place in areas like Howells Cross Road which needed it for a long time, Bank Hall Cross Road, Brighton's and so on,

I am a little bothered at what happened at Howells Cross Road for this reason, Sir. When the Ministry of Transport was continuing its work, for some reason either the utility company, whether it was Light and Power, Telephone or what's not, left poles there for several months which not only delayed the work but has made it necessary for the Ministry now to go over to have to do two things. That, Sir, is bad.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order.

I assume that what the Honourable Member means by going over the road is putting another layer of barbergreen. That was in the plan. It was recognized at some point in time that the utility companies would be dilatory in being able to catch up with the Ministry. In the meanwhile vehicles would have to use the road and, therefore, they put

a thin layer of asphalt on to facilitate the flow of traffic but they are not going over the work. It was deliberately done that way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I accept the Minister's explanation but the point I am trying to make is this that the utility people must really jump into line and be in proper planning because they are delaying movement.

I can say the Sailers Road has gone very quickly and very well and I would wish to say that I do not agree with my friend, the Honourable Member for St. George South, when he said that there was no problem in relation to sidewalks because the slipper drains - because I saw the Ministry of Transport themselves doing the slipper drains and doing them very fast and very effectively.

The problem that we had on Sailers Road is even when the Ministry stipulated that motor vehicular traffic should not use the road, there were people who were defying their signs, I have seen it myself, Sir, and driving right through.

Now, I do not believe in this indiscipline. They should have complied because I found it was not only dangerous, but it really delayed the speed at which that road was being completed but I watched very carefully the work carried out there.

It was of the highest standard and I believe that it could have been completed a little bit sooner. I believe the time was for September. It could have been completed within the time period if the road had been closed off and if people when the parts of the road were closed off had complied with the reasonable requirement of the workmen on that road.

My time has expired.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, of course, I know that the Honourable Attorney General would know that my intervention in this is going to be very short because he likes to claim that I have had everything done in the City. I think it is about time anyhow. The people have waited a long time in the City, throughout two administrations to get anything done so it is about time.

I really got up, Sir, to make a short intervention. The Honourable Member for St. John is one of those people who I reluctantly will agree with this time because we do not normally see eye to eye in politics, but he did make a very valuable contribution, along with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, regarding the whole matter of what the social impact would be *vis-a-vis* the rebuilding of the tenantry roads because, as the Member who just took his seat tried to explain, there were some sort of roads before. Some people tended to call them barberwhite because they were marl roads, really, but in terms of giving

people proper roads, I believe, that they would be some great social impact particularly for people in the rural area.

I am not pretending to be a person out of the rural areas, though I live there now, but I know that this sort of thing happening to a people does have great impact at that level. 6.35 p.m.

I think one thing we tend to do is to take things for granted. I do not think often we understand the hardship that some people go through. We as leaders are the people that they depend on to ensure that they get better conditions to live in. As was said and rightfully so, those people who have made their contributions long ago and continue to make them still cannot get the basic comforts like running water, except maybe when it floods, and a good roadway to travel on.

This is not, Sir, to be taken as criticism. It is to be taken more as support for the type of programme that we have now. I think that matters like this go beyond the bounds of any partisan position. It does not matter which party happens to be in when this programme is being carried out. It does not matter whether this is an extension of a programme that another party started. The point is that the people are entitled to it. That is the point. Are they entitled to it? The answer is "yes" and any responsible Government, keeping the expenditure well within bound though, of course - I do not mean that we run wild with the money - will provide these services.

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: That is alright. But Sir, as was alluded to by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, there are one or two areas in the City which are still in a bad state of disrepair. It is not a matter of trying to get a little patch here and there. We are talking about a situation at Dunlow Lane, for instance. I believe the Honourable Minister is quite aware of the danger and condition of the road at Dunlow Lane. At Dunlow Lane, for instance, there is a wall right there around Dr. Scott's property which is a whole rotten wall and I feel that it is going to fall one day and I want him to look at it. That area needs to be widened. What has happened recently which I thought was a very good move on the part of the Ministry was that they made that side of Dunlow Lane a one way street, because there is a business place up there which has very large trucks which are called traders that haul containers and so. You can imagine trying to come down Dunlow Lane if one of those trucks decided to come up. So you have a situation where the truck completely blocks the road and they turned that into a one way street.

It was assured by a Senior Technical Officer at MTW that something is going to be done about Dunlow Lane in terms of some road rehabilitation. I would hope that the

only delay is being caused by the fact that the wall should be moved and the road should be widened.

There is another problem which could be seen as a niggling problem, but it becomes a very serious problem when one looks at the level of lawlessness that seems to be perverting the society, and that is one of street lighting. I know that, as I heard other Honourable Members who spoke before about rural areas, street lighting was probably something that they needed because of the fact that they needed it to illuminate the dark areas in their place for people to see just to get along. In the City, and St. Michael in general, street lighting becomes a security matter. We have several areas in the City which I can think of like San Domingo Alley and Dukes Alley at the corner of Clarkes Alley where people are afraid to pass there at night - people who live in the area, because they are afraid that someone will grab them. We had a similar problem where it has actually happened on several occasions by the St. Mary's Church wall, where the Government - the previous administration - when they were planning to widen the road in that area had removed the street light that was there. We are not even talking about putting in a new light. We are talking about replacing it. You removed the street light and it was never replaced and the wall was never moved. St. Mary's Church has gone now to the expense of putting up their own street light there because people were coming from Bible Classes and were being grabbed right there at the corner of Lakes Folly.

Sir, I just thought that I would like to commend the Ministry on what I think was an excellent job done in the City. We had a few technical hitches. As the Honourable Member for St. George South explained and I have seen for myself, you are working with some very limited equipment. I know that in New Orleans, for instance, there are one or two areas where because of the nature of the area I believe there are some low areas where catchments form and when rain falls you get small lakes which disappear over a day or two. There were some technical issues and there still are some technical problems which have been assured by the Ministry are being addressed.

So that I rise to commend the Ministry for the excellent job they have done throughout the City. There are many other roads in the City that have been very well paved which is true and the sidewalks in Baxter's Road have been done. I was promised in this Honourable House when I was on that side that the sidewalks would be done and, although I am on this side, the sidewalks have been done in Baxter's Road. I think everybody is pleased for that. It has corrected if nothing else the danger and eye sore. We agree that this has been done because of me and the Minister who keeps his word. The people have got the roads. But beyond that, I believe the Honourable Minister of Tourism will agree with me that he saw Baxter's Road as being a tourist area too. I do not think there is anything more colourful and more Barbadian than seeing those women with a coal pot going at

night frying fish in Baxter's Road. There is nothing more Barbadian than that. I have travelled to several countries as I am sure most Honourable Members have and I do not think that I can think of anywhere else I have seen that kind of activity at that level. So that when we debate these sorts of things we have to recognize that there are things as in this particular area of roads, lights, and electricity of social development that crosses party lines. It has nothing to do with which party is in. It is something that has to be done if we really say as Members in here that we are interested in the welfare of the small man.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I shall be extremely brief and I must confess, Sir, that the speech by the Honourable Member for the City has tempered me considerably. Here it is we today were in a situation where - the Government was being taken to task by the Opposition for the run-away expenditure and not controlling expenditure, and all sorts of accusations were being levelled at the Government. Although the Government has been commended for the road programme which it is implementing, one still finds that accommodation is coming not in a forthright manner, but in a kind of round-about and grudging manner. I would like up front to offer my sincere congratulations even though I am part of the Government to the Minister of Transport and Works for conceiving of this programme and implementing it in a most effective manner. Although the programme has begun in St. Michael and is moving out into the rural areas, there are rural constituencies which are already benefiting from this programme. I can certainly say in the constituency of St. Lucy that we have benefitted and continue to benefit and, when the road programme gets into full swing, I have every reason to believe that we will certainly get our share of what is being done.

I think it is very important and it is necessary that the Opposition cannot be that charitable to say good things about this particular programme for us not to hide our lamp under a bushel but to hold it out and be very proud of it. Sir, we have the situation where they on the one hand will accuse us of squandermania and on the other hand where we require money to do this kind of programme each one will tell the Minister which road, street light, gap, and alley they want to be done which is going to cost money. All of this will cost money.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the Oppositions blow hot and cold - on the one hand they got hot before lunch and this afternoon is when the votes matter now.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am sorry that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and Minister of Trade is so forgetful of his speeches when he was in the Senate, Sir. The speech

I made today was, Sir, a replica in better language and more tasteful than the speech which the Honourable Member made in the Senate sometime ago, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, all of the speeches I made in the Senate were very tasteful. 6.45 p.m.

All I am saying, Sir, the point is that obviously the Government will have a limitation on the amount of money which it can spend in anything, and what the Minister has been attempting to do is to create a balance. There is no member of Parliament, whether he is sitting on the Democratic Labour Party side, on the NDP side or on the Barbados Labour Party side, who could honestly say that he has not got a piece of the action. In every constituency something has been done. That is a fact, and I would like to commend the Minister for this. It shows the openness with which we in the Democratic Labour Party treat the country, that everybody ought to be able to share in some of the bounties.

I would want to end by congratulating the Minister and I would hope that he would continue with the programme, and particularly when the tenantry road programme gets going maybe he could switch and come from St. Lucy and move on.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has a very convenient memory. It is not true, of course, that a tenantry road programme is to be started in St. Lucy by the present Minister of Transport and Works. In truth and in fact, Sir, in the period between 1983 and 1986 at least four major tenantry road developments took place in that constituency. Therefore, Sir, if the present Minister

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I can call Mount Gay and Trents, and I think Benthams and Checker Hall. Four tenantry roads were done in St. Lucy. If the present Minister continues to attend to the needs of the tenants in St. Lucy, then I think that long-suffering constituency will be well served.

My intervention in this debate is to raise two specific questions. Earlier in the year much was made of the fact that the Government was proposing to secure a very large loan to deal with the matter of tenantry road development in a total package. Mr. Chairman, this is a development that one would welcome, and I say that very deliberately. I look forward to the day when we reach the level of political development in Barbados where members of Parliament do not have to be judged as they are judged now by the question as to whether you have given a road or a street

light. I say that in this context, Sir, since I do not want to be misrepresented. I believe that it is within the capacity of the country to put behind us once and for all the remaining pockets of poverty in Barbados, and if it requires that the Government will have to enter into a loan arrangement to deal with this matter, then it would certainly secure my support and the support of the Barbados Labour Party. It would be money well secured and I think money very well spent.

I cannot stress the point too strongly, Mr. Chairman, because the development of the Barbados rural society is a matter that has to be addressed in a very holistic way, not only in terms of its impact on the social welfare of the rural society, but because the rural society as well holds forth the potential of contributing substantially to the economic development of this country, once we can develop the communities as places which can retain their talents and once we can develop the communities as places that can attract investment, particularly of a kind that is in conformity with a particular scale.

There is no question in my mind that we would never get the best out of our rural society in all its various facets unless a very considerable investment is made to give to those communities the types of facilities that they deserve and that they require.

It was in that context, Sir, the context of a situation where the Government had announced plans to secure a very large loan to deal with all the tenantry roads of Barbados, that on May 3 the Minister and I went on a tour of the roads in St. Peter so that he could see first hand those roads in St. Peter which I would have wished him specifically to be mindful of in the definition of his particular holistic programme as he would have wished to call it.

My specific question, therefore, is what is the status of that particular proposed initiative? Has Government advanced to any appreciable extent towards securing that large loan for the purposes of dealing in a very comprehensive way with the problems that really confront the rural society? If the Minister could shed some specific light on where that matter now stands, Sir, I would be very grateful. I also wish to raise the question of the Highway 2A road, since it is a road that runs through a part of my constituency. I think the House would benefit from an update as to the progress that is being made in relation to work on that road. Last year the work on the road was slowed down because of the need to make extraordinary arrangements to accommodate vehicles during the crop and one gets the impression that if the work is not behind schedule it certainly is going at a relatively slow pace and therefore in that context, and to the extent that we are being asked to vote a supplementary provision to meet additional expenses on the road, I am asking the Minister to give us an update on that matter.

I am grateful to the Minister for having shown interest in the people of St. Peter by undertaking to go first hand to see the tenantry roads in St. Peter that need repair. Members on the other side will say that one cautions Government about spending but yet wants funds spent on one's constituency.

I will caution Government again about the type of spending that is set out in some of the supplementaries. It is one thing to spend on the bureaucracy and a lot of these supplementaries that are being discussed today entail spending on the bureaucracy. If you will examine them, Mr. Chairman, you will see that the money will be spent on a lot of furniture, travel and so on for the Public Servants. If you were to go down the supplementaries you will discern that there is a lot of spending on the bureaucracy. Yes, there must be spending in the country, but we have in the process of economising to select our priorities, and the public of Barbados is going to be satisfied with public spending if they themselves can feel, in terms of their own standard of living, the beneficial effects of Government's spending. I do not see the contradiction of which the Honourable Member for St. Lucy speaks. One can question aspects of Government's spending by referring to the manner in which Government is isolating its priorities, and I reserve the right and the discretion to question increased spending where that spending in my view is going into the bureaucracy in preference to going out into the communities where its benefits would be to the greater advantage of the people in general. 6.55 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy would want to tell the Opposition how to go about proceeding in the debate. There are some aspects of Government expenditure which cannot be justified; there are others which can be, and because one takes a position in relation to some lines of expenditure does not mean that all aspects of Government expenditure stand to be condemned. That is the fallacy and the loose thinking of the Minister of Trade and Industry which I must insist stands in the way of the Minister doing a substantial job in helping to develop Barbados' exports. He has no sense of priorities, he has no sense of programmes and he has no sense of strategy.

It is against that background, Sir, that I want to say that the work that has been done generally since 1981 to bring material advance to the people in the rural society is work that stands to be commended, and if the funds that the House is now being called upon to approve are funds that will accelerate that worthwhile effort that was started since 1981, it will certainly solicit and receive my wholehearted support. I am obliged to you.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Before the Minister replies, Sir, I don't like to deal with misinformation and therefore I have to ask the Minister for some information on Highway 2A. I understand, and I wonder whether the Minister will

help me on this, that there is some change being made to the alignment at Lancaster and that instead of the original alignment, it is possible there may have been a change. There was supposed to be a round-about, I am not sure, so I am asking for information. I have not got the facts. Also it is likely that about two miles, part of the highway will not now be in this part of the project. I wonder if the Minister could let me know that. Would the highway come right back to Warrens or is it now being altered in some way, and has there been any alteration particularly at the Lancaster side of the highway?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, first the tenantry road programme. The tenantry road programme is designed to construct 300 new roads in tenancies designated as plantation tenancies under the Freehold Tenantry Purchase Act. The construction will be done in three phases, and it is envisaged that each phase would last for a minimum of eighteen months. The first phase is only weeks away from commencement, and 88 roads have been identified for construction. Barbados has been divided into five zones for the purpose of construction, and it is hoped that when the programme commences that there will be work in every part of every zone taking place simultaneously the first day that the national programme starts.

Zone 1 includes St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. James, 15 roads are to be constructed in that area. I don't have details about the roads with me. The Ministry is still in the process of consulting representatives in those areas about the priority of roads to be built.

Zone 2 will be, my notes here say St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. John, but it is St. Joseph and St. John. St. Andrew is not in the tenantry road programme - there is a special Scotland District programme for St. Andrew - fifteen roads between St. Joseph and St. John. Zone 3, St. George and St. Thomas, fifteen roads; zone 4 Christ Church and St. Philip, 21 roads, zone 5, St. Michael, 22 roads. Engineering consultants have been appointed for each zone already and the design work is well advanced. The Venezuelan Government agencies have agreed to finance a substantial portion of the first phase which will cost \$24 million, and the Venezuelan agencies FIV and Finexo will be contributing approximately \$16 million Bds. of the \$24 million.

The San Jose accord which is the oil fund promises to bring in another US\$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, the construction agreement which will be signed by the Ministry of Transport and Works and a Venezuelan firm designated to be the main contractor, ABA Inversiones, is with the Attorney General as the Honourable Minister has indicated, and it is given the highest priority, and it is hoped that its signature will be days away.

There are seven local construction firms that have been recommended by the Ministry to do the actual work ranging from the largest firms to the smallest firms; so all of the road construction firms in Barbados with capability will be pressed into service when the programme starts. The programme is tripartite in scope in that not only does it involve civil works, but also the laying of pipe for the installation of water where running water is not now available as well as the extension of electrification, and it is hoped that this infrastructural work will transform the rural areas of Barbados.

In so far as Highway 2A is concerned, when work commenced on that road it was well behind schedule for the first few months. Recently the Chief Technical Director has reported that Rayside Asphalt Company has accelerated its work considerably to a point where it is necessary to have a supplementary request. 7.05 p.m.

The amount allocated in the Estimates was based upon computations done in the Ministry which took into consideration the slow pace at which work was being conducted at that time. Therefore, considerably more work was done or has been done at this time than was anticipated a year ago and that is why it is necessary to pay additional costs. This is not extra money. This is due entirely to the fact that the quantum of work is greater than what was estimated by the engineers on the last occasion. There also were extensive changes in the design of the road.

I was informed that if the original design had been followed, that the road would have ended up somewhere in Arthur Seat rather than at Warrens so the design had to be changed.

Also, the amount of excavation which was anticipated was far more than what the contractor had to do. In some areas I am told they had to go down to a depth of about 12 feet or so.

I was informed by the technical personnel within the Ministry that as a result of the increased excavation, they were recommending that the road be stopped 800 yards or be made 800 yards shorter than initially planned. I have overruled that.

But such delays as are currently encountered have to do not with the design of the road or the contractor, but the tardiness on the part of the Government in removing some 17 houses that need to be relocated for the work to proceed at a much quicker pace than is the case. Altogether the Ministry is very satisfied with the work that is being done by the contractor and the speed at which it is done.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there are any other questions which were raised.

I now beg to move that Head 84 stand part of the Resolution.

The question that Head 84 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A division has been called for.

The question that Head 84 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. B. M. TAITT; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN; Hon. W. W. HALL; Dr. E. A. SIMMONS; Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. R. P. BYER; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 14.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Head is passed with no dissenting voice.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES -1989-90

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS \$1237285

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this supplementary under Head 37, it has a number of subheads..

One would realise immediately that a lot of the funds required are required because of increased travel occasioned by revision of salaries earlier this year. Under Subhead 1 the increase there is mainly travel. Some of it is for office equipment because of the increase of staff in the Property Management Section where there are now about three or four Terrier Officers trying to get the Land Information and Property Information System into place. 7.15p.m.

Under Subhead 2 - This is funds for the National Housing Corporation and the bulk of those funds are needed because of increase in personal emoluments and their outstanding contributions for this year and a little from last year. So that Subhead 2 grants to public institutions, as I said, an increase in personal emoluments and outstanding pension contributions.

Subhead 7 - Town and Country Planning Department - again that is because of increased travel rates occasioned by the increase of the revision of salaries. Equipment - this is where the Town and Country Planning Department had to replace a copying machine and that forms part of the request as well.

The Land Registry comes under Subhead 8. This is a comparatively new department and had to be staffed recently by an increase I think of about 8 or 10 persons. The

main part of the supplementary for that section is required to meet the salaries for those additional temporary staff assigned to that Ministry. Part of the funds, \$11,000 of the funds, is required for the revised travel rates and the commuted travel allowances and the Land Registry at the moment rents copying machines and computer equipment from I think Barbados Business Machines. So \$36,000 are required to meet the cost of rental of that equipment. The other \$10,000 are needed to purchase binders and documents and other things as set out in the Addendum to this Resolution.

The rest of the funds for the Land Registry is needed for additional equipment and furniture for the additional staff and also for maintenance and the service contracts on the new equipment and new office at the Garrison Block C.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers all of the Subheads under Head 37 and, with those remarks, I beg that Head 37 stand part.

Hon. M. A. KING: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty with Subhead 2, if the Minister probably in his reply explain. We voted \$3.2 million this year under this Head. I do not understand how we now need another \$1 million to cover part of the shortfall. The Addendum says part of the shortfall. Can we expect then that later on in the financial year we will have to vote another \$1 million or whatever to cover all of the shortfall? I would like some explanations as to the \$1 million to cover part of the shortfall, because I am not aware at the moment how many persons are employed by the National Housing Corporation. I certainly am under the impression that National Housing is no longer operating a direct labour programme where they actually build houses for rent and houses for sale as used to be done in the past. I will leave the Minister to explain that for the benefit of the House.

Secondly, Sir, I promised the House earlier today that I would have adverted to the question of some Ministry... I am not sure which.... trespassing on lands of persons in St. Andrew. On April 12, 1989 I wrote the Attorney General and copied the letter to the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Transport and Works in connection with the invasion of property owned by a person who is now residing in St. Thomas but formerly resided in St. Andrew and who owns some....

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. I think what the Honourable Member is speaking about is concerning a request made for drainage somewhere in that area and apparently in doing the drainage this lady's land was encroached on. But it has nothing at all to do with the Ministry of Housing. I think that was done by the ADC or Soil Conservation. It has

nothing to do with the Ministry of Housing. I just thought that I would make that point.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am grateful to the Minister for explaining that it was nothing to do with Housing. But I must raise it as a matter of public importance where 12 acres of land owned by a family in St. Andrew at Baxters and other lands owned by another family had been, as I said, invaded by some Department of Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is it National Housing?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, there are houses on the land, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that this is a Resolution dealing with the Ministry of Housing and Lands which falls under....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You are saying that the Minister has said that it is not his Ministry who had the responsibility. Alright, Sir.

Sir, just for the sake of completeness, I crave your indulgence to give the answer to my letter, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me see where you are going.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: So that answer would also exempt the Ministry of Housing to the extent that it was a letter issued from the Solicitor General's Department to say that my letter of April 12th addressed to the Attorney General had been received and the matter was being investigated and they would communicate with me as soon as possible. I have not received anything else, Sir. Six months have gone and no Department of Government has responded to my original letter of April 12th. I do not think that is good enough, Sir. I understand the Minister of Housing position that it is nothing to do with his Ministry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Therefore, we cannot discuss it any further.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Therefore, I will leave that, Sir, and on another occasion, if I do not get a response within the next week, I will raise it again and at the same time I will have to issue a writ.

In respect of this particular Resolution, we do not have any argument with Government's desire to improve the facilities for the various Departments for which increased furniture, improved furniture, and additional furniture is being sought. 7.25 p.m.

I would say that the Land Registry is obviously being upgraded and modernised, and the Property Management Unit, but as we are doing that I crave your indulgence also to make a plea on behalf of the Reporters of Parliament. Here it is that we are giving desks and chairs to the Property Management Unit under Subhead 1, a copying machine under Object 25 to the Town and Country Planning Department and so on.

It has been drawn to my attention recently, Sir, that one of the problems in getting out the debates of Parliament is lack of equipment. I believe we have three word processors and five Reporters, Typists, whatever we call them, and it is impossible for them adequately to perform the service which we expect, and I take the opportunity to make a call for the Prime Minister to address this matter and if possible to have at least another two word processors provided for the Reporters of Parliament. It may assist.

It is not under this Head, but I am arguing by analogy, as it were, Sir, since we are providing desks and copying machines and so on.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not even saying that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you said what you wanted to say.

Mr. D.A.C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. You are with me. I know as my constituency neighbour you will look after me, Sir, as I will look after you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I look after all Honourable Members.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Perhaps the Minister could tell us how many titles have now been registered with the Land Registry. If he does not have the information, I will understand, but in respect of this particular Resolution this part of the Opposition will support it. I want to make it clear that the strictures that we levelled against a Resolution earlier today did not necessarily apply to this Resolution or any other Resolution, except when we specifically say that we are going to vote against it.

I am much obliged, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I have no difficulty supporting this, neither does the National Democratic Party have any difficulty supporting this Resolution, but I would want at the very outset to issue a plea to the Minister. The Land Registry has now begun to function, I would say, properly. Many of the teething problems have been sorted out and I would want that as important a Government Department as

this be given a permanent home very early and be properly staffed and be staffed by people who are properly trained.

I am very interested in affairs that have to do with registration, whether it be registration of births, deaths, marriages, whatever, because I believe that the registration of a country's records embodies a lot of its history. I would not want the day to come when we are faced with the problem that Dominica faced many years ago when the whole of their Registration Department was burnt to the ground. They now have the difficult task of restructuring and setting back up a new Registration Department.

It is important that the Land Registry be housed in a permanent home at the very outset of its operations. So far it has moved from Marine House, it is now at a block in the Garrison just adjacent to the Town and Country Planning Department. It is important that it has a proper vault for storing records, a vault that is fireproof in every respect and can withstand the hottest of flames. This is very, very important and I would support any expenditure to make sure that the Land Registry is properly housed, properly staffed and staffed by people who are properly trained.

That is all I would want to contribute to the debate on this aspect of the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just a few brief points, Sir, on this Resolution that is before us. I merely wish to underline that I had indicated that over 50% of the expenditure of the Government goes for wages and salaries and related expenses. This particular Resolution is a very good example of that.

We see this Resolution relates to travel and supplementary provision is being sought in order to increase travel allowances. Plant, Equipment and Furniture, funds are being sought in order to provide furniture to accommodate additional staff, so it is either directly on wages and salaries or on matters related to the staff and the payment of those wages and salaries in order to enable the staff to perform as efficiently as they may.

I wish also to underline another point, Sir, or to make another comment, and that is if the problem relating to the quick production of the debates of Parliament relates to the provision of a couple of word processors or similar kinds of equipment, I will have no hesitation in ensuring that the appropriate Resolution comes to Parliament, if necessary, as soon as possible in order for the funds to be provided, that is if funds are not already available under an existing Head. I will have no hesitation at all in coming to that and I hope I will get the full support of all sides of the House.

It just shows the necessity to be very circumspect in the kinds of comments we make about expenditure, and to take intransigent positions that we are not supporting this particular Resolution or any supplementary Resolution, that

position is not really a sensible political position to take either for the Government or for the Opposition. I think in this particular regard the opposition leadership as currently constituted at this sitting of the House has been much more sensible than the positions taken by the minority Opposition. 7.35 p.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, I think that the Prime Minister has missed the point that was coming from here earlier today to which he is alluding by inference, and it is that where this part of the Opposition sees expenditure of a nature that ought to have been foreseen at the time of budgeting and that is apparently excessive, this Opposition is not going to support the Government. Where expenditure on the other hand is necessary, and there is a crying need, we are going to cooperate fully as in the case of the word processors.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have no quarrel now with that formulation. He has now seen the good sense of what the Government was trying to say and what the Official Opposition has been saying. We accept that back track on the part of the opposition.

Just finally, Sir, because I don't wish anything on the record to remain in which I am consciously aware that there may have been an inaccuracy, I believe I did say some time today that Barbados had one of the highest ratio of expenditure in relation to GDP for the year 1984-85. That was not the point I really wished to make at that particular point. The point I really wished to make was that Barbados was among four or five countries which consistently had a ratio of five per cent or more of expenditure to GDP, and that this was their particular problem as far as the Latin American countries were concerned, not that it was the highest, because that is really not so. I thought I would correct that. You see, this is the whole point about how debates should be conducted in a reasonable way and through the light of reason. I am never afraid if there is some inaccuracy to correct it if it is drawn to my attention, and I really wish to make that correction.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Just in that same vein, Sir, earlier when I was discussing the pageant, I said it was going to be the 24th; in fact it is on the 17th of November and not the 24th. I just want to get the records straight that the pageant is going to be the 17th November and not the 24th as I said.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, throughout the years as the Honourable Member for St. Thomas would know since he was Chairman of that Corporation at some time, the National Housing Corporation, that is, because he was CBC as well, the National Housing Corporation through its commercial vote usually comes in and does certain things with its commercial vote, such as paying pensions and things like that with the full realisation that it will be reimbursed at a later day, that it is just a matter of

cash flow. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas has asked about the part of subhead 2 which says "to cover part of short fall". I think how that came about was that the National Housing Corporation had requested \$1.4 million as supplementary and we decided in the Ministry with the agreement of the Ministry of Finance that it was only necessary to have \$1 million, and that is why you see that this is to cover part of the short fall. I don't think that this means we are going to come back at the end of the year for additional money. The commercial vote will take care of that.

The increase in the personal emoluments that will be needed, the \$493 465, you can see off the hand is almost half of the \$1 million, so I don't think that you need to worry about covering part of the short fall because the way how the National Housing Corporation functions, I believe that we would be able to take care of that.

With respect to the Land Registry, the question of safety of records was raised by the Honourable Member for St. George South. I should like to say that the Land Registry is now in what we consider a permanent home in Block C, the Garrison, it is a very sturdy building, and the vault is one of the most up-to-date vaults built down under and it is very secure I think you should go and see it - and even the filing cabinets are fairly modern, and I think that all your concerns have been addressed already. There are a few teething problems with regards to the plan which you have to stick at the back of each conveyance. At the moment the computer is not putting out that plan properly, so that is the one problem at the moment. The conveyances are available, but the map or the plan that you put at the back of it are not available at the moment. We have been in contact with the CIDA people and they are looking into the matter, because we are using the computer at the Lands and Surveys section to do that plan. They are looking into the matter and it should be straightened out fairly shortly.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg that this Head 37 - Ministry of Housing and Lands - stand part.

The question that Head 37 - Ministry of Housing and Lands stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90 - NO. 5-\$359 715

PART II - CAPITAL - HEAD 79 - MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Part II - Capital - Head 79 - Ministry of Housing and Lands - was called.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 79 - Ministry of Housing and Lands stand part.

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

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise a matter which perhaps as between the Minister of Housing and myself I hope will not be acrimonious, but may be. There is a matter outstanding from 1986 involving the grant by the National Housing Corporation to two individuals of a lease for specific purposes in the Grazettes area, and as I said last week, I think that Government and its agencies have a responsibility to act with due probity in these matters. I am not going to go into the matter in any detail, we want to wind up, but I have to say irrespective of what anybody's belief may be as to how the lease came to be granted, the legal fact is that a lease was signed, not by the Ministry of Housing but by the National Housing Corporation to two persons enabling them to go on lands for a substantial period of time for the specific purpose of running a mini-mart. 7.45 p.m.

After the change of Government in 1986, without any proper notice as was called for under the agreement, the National Housing Corporation told the tenants to cease operation on the property. It did not involve the Ministry of Housing and Lands at all.

If the lease should have been granted with the approval of the Ministry and it was not, that did not concern the Ministry. It is a matter between two signatories to a lease, the lessor, the National Housing Corporation and the lessee, two Barbadians. We have been trying to get the matter settled for a long time and we have only made a little progress towards settlement.

I am asking the Minister in his capacity where he has final responsibility for all matters engaging the attention of the National Housing Corporation, not to direct the National Housing Corporation because that may well be interference, but to tell the National Housing Corporation to go ahead and settle the matter with the lawyers representing - and I am involved, Sir, I have an interest and let me declare it. I am working for the two tenants, but I think it is scandalous how the National Housing Corporation is behaving.

Their lawyers and us came to an agreement as to what should be the settlement for breach of the lease. Having come to that agreement some time in July this year, they are now resiling from that agreement and denying that they should be paying certain items that were claimed.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We have a difficulty. My friend is saying sue but it is a Statutory Corporation which has a limitation period of a year. Now, I know that in England Lord Denny some years ago said that he would override and did, in fact, override the limitation period in

respect of a Government agency because he said a Government agency should behave in a particular way.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, he went through with it.

I really do not think, Sir, the matter should go to Court. I just feel that the National Housing Corporation is being unreasonable in this regard. I understand the position that there is a new Board which has to have some continuity but all I am asking of the Minister and I have spoken to him Sir. I must say that I have spoken to his Permanent Secretary and they both gave me a very patient and understanding hearing and I am imploring the Minister not to get involved by way of a directive but tell the corporation it does not concern the Ministry. It does not. It is about a lease. It does not concern the Ministry. Let them go and get themselves out of the foolishness that they did.

I have known this to happen several times in the past. A corporation is involved and the lawyers settle the matter as corporation lawyers with lawyers from the private Bar. We have it every day.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right. The Insurance Corporation of Barbados for which the Prime Minister is responsible and we settle with them daily. There is no problem. I must repeat that I am not saying that there is any ministerial interference in this case but I get the impression that there is fear within the National Housing Corporation that they cannot settle freely with the lawyers on the other side.

That is all I want to say, Sir.

The question that Head 79 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe this brings us to the end of the work in the Committee of Supply, Sir. I think we should report progress, Sir, given the time.

I would like to acknowledge that we went beyond the normal time in Committee so that the Reporters would appreciate that we knew that while dinner is served, we thought we would complete before coming back in.

On motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT seconded by Hon. M. A. KING. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I beg to move that these Resolutions be now read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that these Resolutions be now read a first time. Honourable Members in favour please say Aye, those against please say No...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should make it quite clear that in voting on this Resolution that we still maintain our objection to the first Resolution for the purpose stated, Sir.

On separate motion of Hon. B. M. TAITT seconded by Hon. M. A. KING the Resolutions were read a second time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these Resolutions be agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that these Resolutions be now agreed to. Honourable Members in favour please say Aye...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on this part of the Opposition I just want it clearly recorded that in respect of the first of the four Resolutions the three members of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition wish to dissent from the first Resolution and just have it recorded.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am saying it. Do not tell me it cannot be. I am saying that we would wish our opposition and dissent to the first Resolution to be noted in the records of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That decision was taken in Committee.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was not in the House at the time. I am informed that my two colleagues voted "No" but did not divide.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, that makes a lot of difference now. If there was no division...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what new procedure is being sneaked into this Chamber. This would be innovative, to say the least. It would be seminal to allow for some commentary to be made, not even an explanation of vote. 7.55 p.m.

I do not think we can find this procedure which they were urging upon Your Honour. Either they ask to divide the House and vote or they hush their mouths while you put the question. But they cannot be saying we wish to make it

clear on something that has already been passed or agreed to.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is being agreed to now. You either agree or disagree. If when the question is put that this Resolution be now agreed to you have a position, you say "no" and then you ask to divide, and you get the division at that point if you want. But you cannot make a commentary. The commentary should be struck from the record, Sir!

Mr. SPEAKER: The point I am making is that if that decision was taken in the Committee, that is for the Committee and if no division was taken then that was also for the Committee. But by consent, it was agreed that all 4 Resolutions be passed and agreed to. Now they have been passed at the second reading.

That is the point.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the 4 Resolutions are being taken and this Opposition is reserving its position as to one Resolution, in my submission the records of this House must clearly show that that is so. We have spoken into the records and the records are there. We are just clarifying that our position is in relation to the Resolution. It does not make any difference to its passing, but in relation to the first of those four Resolutions, our position still remains that we are not consenting to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only rule that the position at the moment is that you either agree now to the 4 Resolutions and accept the division or decision taken in Committee as your dissent on the particular Resolution. But certainly we have passed them and we are now agreeing to them.

The question that this Resolution be now agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, that brings us to the end of Government Business for today, Sir. Before I move the Adjournment, I just want to draw to the attention of Honourable Members Section 8 of Rule 41 - Voting.

41(1) says: "Save as otherwise provided by any law or by these Standing orders, all questions shall be decided by a majority of votes. Whenever on a division the votes are equal, the Speaker, or in Committee of the whole House, the Chairman shall have a casting vote."

41 (2) At the conclusion of a debate upon any question the Speaker or Chairman shall put that question for the decision of the House. A question is fully put when the

Speaker or Chairman has collected the voices of the "Ayes" and of the "Noes". No further debate may thereafter take place upon that question."

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well, any statement is a debate. You cannot have a statement, Sir. The last one is:

"41(8) - If a Member states that he voted in error or that his vote has been counted wrongly, he may claim to have his vote altered, provided that such request is made as soon as the Speaker or Chairman has announced the numbers, and before the Speaker or Chairman has declared the result of the division." Has the Honourable Member said that they voted in error?

Mr. SPEAKER: But I do not think that I will entertain any further discussion on it because I have already made a ruling on the matter.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Very well, Sir.

Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 21, 1989 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 8.00p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of

31st October, 1989..... 4331

Hon. B.M. Taitt, 4331.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS..... 4331

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90

NO. 2 - CURRENT - \$5,016,740..... 4332

HEAD 15 CABINET OFFICE - \$1 237 000

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4332, 4355; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4332; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4337; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4335, 4349; Hon. N. K. Simmons, 4339; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4341; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 4343; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4345; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4348; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 4350; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 4354.

HEAD 34 MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

AND CULTURE - \$100,000 4357

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4357.

HEAD 42 MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

AND WORKS 4357

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 4358.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90

NO. 3 - CAPITAL - \$9,650,000 4358

HEAD 70 MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL

TRANSPORT - \$1,500,000

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4358, 4359; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4358.

HEAD 84 MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND
WORKS 4361

Hon. Dr. D. G. Blackman, 4361, 4375; Mr. D.

A. C. Simmons, 4362; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4373; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 4364; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4367; Mrs. M. Barker-Welch, 4368; Hon. M. A. King, 4369; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4369, 4375; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 4372; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4374.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90 - NO. 4

- CURRENT - \$1 237 285..... 4376

HEAD 37 MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 4376, 4379; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4377; Mr. R. P. Byer, 4378; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 4378; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4379.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1989-90 - NO. 5

CAPITAL - \$359 715..... 4379

HEAD 79 MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 4379; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 4380, 4381; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4380; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 4381; Mr. Speaker, 4381.

SUSPENSION..... 4344

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4344.

ADJOURNMENT 4381

Hon. B.M.Taitt, 4381.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)

BARKER-WELCH, Mrs. M. (St. Joseph)

BLACKMAN, Hon. Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)

BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)

BYER, R. P. (St. George South)]

FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)

GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)

KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)

MILLER, P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown)

SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)

SIMMONS, D. A. C. (St. Thomas)

SIMMONS, Dr. E. A. (St. Michael East)

SIMMONS, Hon. N. K. (St. James South)

TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)

THOMPSON, D. J. H. (St. John)

WEEKES, His Hon. L. A. (St. Michael North West)