

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 18, 1990.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met on December 18, 1990 at 12.15 p.m.

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

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.), (Leader of the Opposition)

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

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

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.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)

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

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. E. BOURNE

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

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

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.

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 Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, November 11, 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes for the meeting of this Honourable Chamber held on November 11, 1990 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Bill to make provision for the prevention of praedial larceny.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. M. A. KING: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the Praedial Larceny Prevention Bill be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Sexual Offences Bill, 1990 be read a first time, Sir.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Domestic Violence (Protection Orders) Bill, 1990 be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Mr. Speaker, that a Bill to amend the Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property Office Act be read a first time, Sir.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Boyce Pension Bill be read a first time, Sir.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Financial Administration and Audit (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1990 be read a first time, Sir.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Telecommunications Bill be read a first time.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the order of the day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving the suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting, Sir. Let me state here, Sir, that I have already informed the Leader of the Opposition of our intention, time permitting, to commence the Motion that has been set down in his name, Sir, and later on this week we will continue it. But at any event we will meet this week again. I feel certain about that, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I second the suspension of the Standing Orders.

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

BOYCE PENSION BILL

Order No. 9 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled Boyce Pension Bill.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is not the usual kind of Bill or legislation that is normally brought before this House. The purpose of this Bill, Sir, is to enable a former servant of this country who has served this country in a number of capacities to be able, Sir, to get the benefits which we in our own wisdom on this side, Sir, believe that he is entitled to.

I am referring, Sir, to Mr. Chezley Rosevyn Boyce. Mr. Boyce was a former Clerk of this House before he was dismissed on a Resolution. Now Mr. Boyce has served this country in a number of capacities - first as a teacher where he served for about 16 or so years. He also served, Sir, as a magistrate for three years before he was then transferred to the post of Clerk of Parliament where he served for seven years. 12.30 p.m.

The accumulative service would normally have entitled Mr. Boyce to a pension, because section 5(a)(i) of the Public Employees Pensions Regulations, 1961 provides that an employee who left the Public Service before age 55, whether or not he has completed ten years pensionable service, would have his service treated as continuous if he is re-employed in such service for a period of five continuous years. In fact, Mr. Boyce had served for more than ten years as a teacher in the first place, and then when

he was re-employed, he was re-employed then for another ten years, first as a magistrate, before being transferred as the Clerk of this Chamber.

Mr. Boyce was, I understand, dismissed either very shortly before or very shortly after his 50th birthday, but the fact is that he lost his eligibility for pension because of the fact of his dismissal, and I want to say here now in my opinion, in very questionable circumstances. It is these circumstances that motivated us to bring before this Chamber this Bill to correct, in our opinion, a wrong that had been earlier committed.

Mr. Boyce is now 63 years of age. Had he voluntarily left the Service at that particular time, he would have qualified for a pension at age 60, but because he was dismissed from service he has had to forego the years he put in as a teacher, as a magistrate and as a Clerk and received no benefits whatsoever for that service he has rendered the country. I understand his pensionable service would have totalled 23 years and 11 months at the point of his dismissal.

The Ministry of the Civil Service has done some computations as though Mr. Boyce would have voluntarily left the Service on the date he was dismissed. What I am trying to say, Sir, is that based on his 23 years 11 months' service - the numbers that are shown in the Bill are based on those years' service - what we are seeking to do is to give Mr. Boyce a gratuity, set out in clause 2 of the Bill, of \$32,538.63, also an allowance of \$4,809.96 per annum with effect from 1st November, 1987. I believe that that second amount has become payable. That is the accumulated approved additions to the pension if he had become pensionable at the date when he would have been pensionable. In other words, Sir, from 1st November, 1987 he would have been 60, as I said earlier, on 11th October, 1987 and the accumulations to his pension from that date would have been \$4,809.96 and an annual pension of \$7,809.27, which is a little less than \$600 a month, with effect from 1st November, 1987. That amount is payable monthly in equal instalments.

As I said earlier, Sir, we believe that the amounts set out here would assist to redress a problem and what we consider to be a wrong that had been done against Mr. Boyce during the time that he was serving as a Clerk of this House.

I therefore move, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, just a few very brief comments on this particular matter. I see the Act will be cited as the Boyce Pensions Act, 1990 and then various

authorisations for the Accountant General to pay certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund.

I do not have any problems with this particular piece of legislation, particularly in the light that it is being done lawfully, that is, a Bill comes before Parliament, Parliament's approval is obtained and then thereafter the funds are paid out of the Consolidated Fund by the Accountant General in accordance with the spirit of the law and in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. Therefore, in light of the fact that the whole thing is being done within the four walls of the law, to which this political party of which I am a member is very committed, we have no problems whatsoever.

I do not know the details of the specific circumstances surrounding Mr. Boyce's dismissal, however I presume that this matter has been thoroughly investigated and that there is adequate justification for taking this step.

Now, Sir, I believe that there may well be other public servants who might be in a similar position in relation to having their service terminated not necessarily with good cause, in the view of everybody else. I wonder whether or not the precedent being established here should not apply in the future to any public servant whose pension rights have been compromised because of an act of dismissal which might not be fully supported by the Government of the given day. So, I think that if there has been an injustice certainly, I feel very strongly that injustices should be corrected and that they should be corrected lawfully. 12.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, Mr. Chezley Boyce is a constituent of mine, but that of course does not influence my views in this matter in any way because I feel that these things must be done rightly and in accordance with the law. So I don't have any particular problems with this. As I say, I do not know in detail the precise circumstances which led to his dismissal and if he has served and there is a view that his right should be restored then I have no difficulty with that position. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a pity that this Bill has come so early in the day because it is a matter of which this branch of the Opposition would have wanted to have done a little research by way of checking the appropriate Hansard at the time when Mr. Boyce demitted office or was terminated. I have a difficulty that I seem to recall and I ask the Minister of Health what year it was and I am advised that it was about 1977. I seem to recall that there was a joint sitting of both Houses. Was it? There was some debate - I mean this is 13 years ago, Sir. A joint committee of both Houses. I don't even remember if I was on the committee or if I voted or not but it is 13 years ago and it seems to me that there are two aspects to this matter.

I want to indicate that in the circumstances, not having been able to do the appropriate research I am going to abstain when the time comes for voting. But it seems to me that there are two matters, one of which should engage our attention today. As I see it, having regard to what the Leader of the House says the first question relates to the termination of Mr. Boyce when it was done, which said termination disentitled him to qualify for these various rights which we are now seeking to give. I think it would be inappropriate to reflect on the vote of the joint committee taken in 1977, because there were circumstances, I have a vague recollection, which led to the termination of the gentleman as Clerk of Parliament and I am not going to reflect on that circumstance now. As I said, I think it is wholly inappropriate and it may lead to rancour which we can do without, but if any act was done by Parliament or a Committee of Parliament which had the effect of divesting Mr. Boyce of his true rights to pension and so on, that would have been very unfortunate and indeed wrong. If it is that, that we are cleaning up today, then I think there is support for it because one should never legislate by Bills or indeed otherwise to divest a person of his true rights and one can think of few rights which mean more to a worker than his rights to pension and so on.

But as I said, Sir, I will abstain, having regard to the fact that we have not been able in a short time since we got these papers, on Saturday, so I came yesterday afternoon at live thirty and some came today and it has been difficult to deal with the papers that have been circulated.

I have known Mr. Boyce for at least twenty years at the personal level, we always got on well when he was Clerk of Parliament. I didn't have any problems with him, others may have had, but I think that a man who has put in his service as a teacher and as a magistrate and then as Clerk, those years ought to count for something.

I am concerned however, as the Leader of the Opposition has himself expressed his own concern, that we have to be careful when we are not setting a series of precedents. There has been a case which I have spoken about in this Parliament of a civil servant who had more than 10 years service and who was summarily on one day's notice terminated - he is from the Prime Minister's constituency - and thank God for him, he has done nothing about the case and I am sure the votes will be suitably reflected at the appropriate time.

I raised the case in here last year of a lady who had worked in the Public Service, who ought to have qualified for a pension and was summarily removed after being shunted about the Public Service, on one day's notice, really because her only problem was that she was a chronic sufferer from sinusitis. Nothing has been done about that, but if needs be we will have to deal with that elsewhere.

As I say, I have nothing against Mr. Boyce and if this is to give Mr. Boyce as he is reaching the qualifying age for a pension a better deal and to ensure his pension having regard to his previous service, none of which was in any way dubious, except for the problem which he may have had as Clerk. In his public service as teacher and as magistrate, I don't think that there was anything that could be said about him in an adverse way.

I will give critical support to this and reserve my position by way of abstention.

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: This contribution relates to a point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and I believe in his contribution he referred to a public servant who had been dismissed from the Service and I believe he referred to a particular one since he mentioned "in the Prime Minister's constituency". That matter was thoroughly investigated and in fact the Personnel Administration's records would show that her probationary period in the Public Service had not been confirmed. 12.50p.m.

There was a question of her being shifted around but at the same time, at the end of one probationary period she was committed to another. It was never confirmed. Hence, within the rules of the General Orders they were quite within their rights to dismiss her, given the circumstances. I just wanted to clear that bit up. She was a temporary officer as far as the Service was concerned.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us not get this debate diverted away from its course. I rise to say that I am happy to be able to participate in the closing of a chapter of our history in Parliament since 1951 when adult suffrage was given which operated as one of the few blemishes on the record of this Parliament during that time. I believe that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West and me Honourable Member for St. Lucy are the only two other Honourable Members in the Chamber at the moment who could have participated in the situation as it occurred. Therefore some Honourable Members may be without background information.

Let me state that the position which I took then is the position which I take now. The record will show that on the day in question that the Democratic Labour Party members who were in Opposition indicated that they could not participate as a matter of conscience in the vote once the procedure which the then Prime Minister was visiting upon the House with the concurrence of the then Speaker was going to be the order of the day.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South at the time drew to the attention of the House the procedure which was about to be engaged in arising out of some so-called joint meeting of both Houses of Parliament for which there

was not then and is not now any provision in the Laws of Barbados. Arising out of that so-called joint meeting a decision was made to dismiss Mr. Chezley Boyce whose alleged error was that -1 quote from page 1857 of Hansard - the speaker was J. M. G. M. Adams. After going into some detail he said:

"The Report states that the Committee considered the charges and the evidence given in support and in contradiction thereof, and found the following charges proved:-

- (a) That the Clerk, Mr. Chezley Boyce did fail to disclose to the Debates Committee during its meeting on November 22, 1976, a letter from the Secretary to the Cabinet dated November 1, 1976. The references are given, Sir, together with enclosures on the subject matter of the revision of salaries of the staff of Parliament. The Committee found that the Clerk falsely inserted in the Minutes of the said meeting that the said letter and enclosures had been placed before the meeting."

There is no (b) or (c). Mr. Adams went on to say:-"I will pause at this point, Sir."

He then went on to prosecute Mr. Boyce. I say these were the days of high level victimisation. I make no apology for saying that now as I made no apology for saying it then. These were the days in 1977 which some people choose to forget now but which will always be remembered by those who suffered and those who discussed their suffering.

I must say in passing that I was a little surprised that the Leader of the Opposition on this occasion did not find himself able to expound at any length on these matters with the kind of detail and the kind of fervour with which he dealt with them in those days.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not discussing the House. I am discussing the question of victimisation.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You cannot dismiss him for something he did in 1990. I am nothing to do with what he was in 1990. He was Clerk of Parliament. As a matter of fact since the Honourable Member is talking in those terms I feel that there are some matters which have to be ventilated.

The Clerk of Parliament cannot be dismissed, in the terms of Frank Walcott, "knocked off like a hoe handle". When you have given 23 years of public service and it is claimed that you have committed some particular indiscretion which, in the opinion of the members of the Democratic Labour Party had not been proved, but the issue had nothing whatsoever to do with the charge that was brought. The issue had to do with the attitude of the then Speaker who, as Chairman of the Debates Committee, managed to do a number of things to the dissatisfaction of the Clerk and who felt that it was his duty to get rid of the Clerk, and who said so in the presence of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. He told us 'you could talk "whoosey" he is gone.'

Following that - I hate to do this because he cannot defend himself... In fact, I would not go into any details of what the then Prime Minister said except what is written because he is not here to defend himself and I do not ever interfere with dead men if I can help it.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If he came in now you would leave? He would not be the first duppy that come in here. They had duppies that came in here before.

Mr. Speaker, the point is we drew to their attention that Mr. Boyce was entitled to due process, that he was entitled to be heard, that he was entitled to have representation and that because the circumstances were unusual in the context of the Clerk of Parliament that the attempt to have a joint meeting of a committee which would comprise in its majority members of the part that had said he must go, that by itself was an assault on the due process and assault on the principle of natural justice. All of that fell on deaf ears and the Resolution was passed.

It can only be described, Sir, and those who will recall it in detail and I invite Honourable Members to read it because it cannot be for our comfort to air the dirty details and put them into Hansard afresh. I have no particular interest in that especially since many of the principal actors have now gone to the great beyond. I merely say that the best word that could describe the circumstances would be "sordid". I am very happy to participate in the correction. The principle is more important than the man. 1.00p.m.

I have no brief for Mr. Boyce. I do not know him in the kind of capacity where we are friends who talk to each other. I do not know him, as a person, other than that he was Clerk of Parliament and he is someone whom I know. But he is no friend of mine and I have no brief for him. As a matter of fact there were times during his tenure as Clerk of Parliament, when we, on our side, had reason to be concerned about his methodology. As a member of the Debates Committee, I participated in the discussing of this

matter. That is why I speak about it, for the record. I do not believe now, as I did not believe then, that he was given due process. I do not believe that his rights were protected.

If you look at judgements which have been made by the courts, in Barbados subsequent to that, about persons who hold substantial posts in the country and how they ought to be dismissed, if you look at what the person had to say, the principle has been upheld that when someone holds a responsible position there is a process which ought to occur, and that the weight of evidence, if there is any doubt that the doubt should go towards the accused.

When we, as Members of Parliament, drew this - you would recall, Mr. Speaker, that at that time some of us were taking an even keener interest in the concept of rights and duties - and when it was drawn to the attention of the Parliament, I recall some very prominent members of the Barbados Labour Party at the time who were Attorneys-at-Law said, "This is Parliament. Do not bring anything to us about procedure. Do not come in here talking to us about rights. We could do anything." I am not going to that kind of detail. They reminded us that Parliament could turn a man into a woman, if necessary. They went on to turn Chezley Boyce into something. They reduced him from a man, from a person around town looking. From 1977 he was a man who had been dismissed. No one has ever considered and no resolution we pass can rectify the position that was taken on him.

If the courts decide that someone has reached the point where he should be dealt with, in a particular way, whether you agree with the judgement or not, you can conclude that the person had a fair chance. But when you come to political decisions that are being made on a political basis, which is what happens in this Parliament, we believe that when in doubt that the persons concerned, in this case, a man who had served 23 years as a teacher, as a magistrate, as a public servant ought not to have been treated in that way.

Mr. Speaker, after the resolution was passed, I recall the Honourable Member for Christ Church West participating in the procedural debate primarily to confirm that something the then Leader of the Opposition had said about offering Mr. Boyce a job in the Attorney-General's Chambers was not true. That was the extent to which he participated, as I recall it.

But the major brunt of the debate came from the then Leader of the Government, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister who went so far as to indicate that there was no question that either he or Mr. Boyce was going. In the end, everybody went. Sooner or later, as you make your progress in this House and you come to a point where something happens to you... But Mr. Boyce did not have that opportunity. He was summarily dismissed.

There is something fundamentally wrong, when you are dealing with a person's livelihood, if you do not afford them the opportunity of a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the whole procedure is available to Honourable Members in this House. They can read the debate. But the Democratic Labour Party members said that they would not have been able to participate in the debate. In fact, we walked out of the House and we did not participate. I just wish to crave your indulgence, Sir - it is not a good thing to quote yourself - but on page 1854, I said - and I am reading from in the middle of what I said, since I do not wish to bore the House - I got up merely to put on the record:

"that I myself will not participate, cannot participate in what appears to be a case of sheer exposure of naked power. If they have the numbers, it is their right, I suppose, since it is their right to proceed how they wish, but I would hope that they would allow reason to go into their deliberations, and it is useless for anyone to get up and say that I should be aware of how other Governments or other Parliaments behave. This is my first Parliament and I have come to believe that there are certain principles which apply in this House of Assembly, and among those principles must be an appeal to reason; among these principles must be the concept that the wishes of the minority must be protected, even though as I once heard in here the majority must have its way."

That is the position I took then and as we come, many years later, and I am a little older I can only say that I thank God for having given me the opportunity to help correct this wrong which was perpetrated against a citizen by the Parliament. The Parliament has a majority and a minority. We have citizens who vote for us to put us in here and sometimes we have to go against the wishes of citizens who vote for us, to put us in here, if we believe that they are not right.

But I believe that in any situation where it is the State versus the individual that the State must not use its massive might to crush the individual. That one of the reasons why we have a system of democracy is that the individual can come to trust the State sufficiently that it will not use its power to take away or usurp his or her rights. There is nothing more blatantly improper, in my view, than for the Parliament as such to be operating against a single individual. It is entirely wrong for Parliament to pass legislation affecting an individual, except on occasions such as this when the legislation is affecting the individual in a positive way.

We sometimes referred to the Bible when we used to discuss the late Right Honourable Member for St. John,

who used to say, "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away." Today, Sir, the Lord took and the Lord is giving back. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that I should enter into this debate if for no other reason that I have been for more than 20 years now involved in the process of representation in the interest of working people and throughout that period I have never been so saddened as I was on the occasion of the representation which we endeavoured to put forward on behalf of Mr. Chezley Boyce, and the manner in which the livelihood of a person was withdrawn from him without any care whatsoever for all the tenets or any of the tenets of due process or of respect for trade union right, or even, Sir, for observance of human rights. 1.10p.m.

One of the reasons that has attracted me to wanting to serve at this very high level, Sir, has been my recognition that being a Member of Parliament puts me in a position where I have several rights given to me by the people of Barbados, rights which are mine because I have undertaken as my colleagues have undertaken to work without fear or favour and to protect the rights and interests of all of the citizens of Barbados. It is a right, Sir, that we have claimed at the moment of our taking of the oath, a right which we have claimed under the guidance of Almighty God to follow, allowing ourselves to be dictated to by no other source or force other than our concerns for what is right. But that right, Mr. Speaker, also places upon our shoulders certain responsibilities, the responsibility to ensure that in whatever we do that we recognize that we have a responsibility in our performance to respect the interests and the concerns of other people. During the time of the "hearing" that there was for Mr. Boyce, I was sadly made aware that sometimes we can have a situation where we take onto ourselves what we perceive belongs to us but we can completely disrespect our need to be concerned with and to be governed by our interest in and our concern for others.

Mr. Chezley Boyce, Sir, was a member of the Barbados Workers Union at the time, and as such, since we had recognition by the Debates Committee of this Honourable House, we thought it only right and proper that we should endeavour to represent him in a matter where the Debates Committee had ought against him. I do not wish to deliver a chapter and verse account of what transpired on that occasion because that has been chronicled. But I only wish to say to you, Sir, that it is my hope that employers in Barbados and indeed employers anywhere, whereas they would normally want to take example from Parliament that they would not wish on this occasion and in these circumstances to take example from what transpired in

relation to the so called hearing that was to deal with the termination of Mr. Boyce.

If an employer wants to be governed by Labour Management Relations, then the only advice we could give that employer is that if he were to read what transpired that would represent a classic case in what not to do if you are dealing with an employee against whom you perceive that you have a grievance.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that every person is innocent until proven guilty. We believe as well, that there is the need for due process and we think that in a situation where a person is being dealt with in any incident that is considered to be a matter that is aggrieved, that person should be given the opportunity properly to challenge whatever the evidence is against himself or herself. In all of these instances Mr. Boyce was denied his rights. Of course, the trade union had their presence. But where the trade union attempted on this occasion to present a position which was different from the employer's, we had a classic case of the employer determining that he had no need to hear a trade union position especially in so vital a case as one where a worker's livelihood was under challenge.

What amazed me, Sir, was the kind of way in which the matter was done. Mr. Speaker, I am no attorney but I have been indebted to the Member for St. Thomas once or twice for guiding me in these areas and I heard him speak on one occasion to something called an *ad misericordiam* plea. He never explained what it meant to me, but I got the distinct impression that it related somewhat to where people take positions before the fact that would seriously prejudice any position they could adopt during a hearing. I am obliged to him. He guided me very well in that case where we had "Perry Mason" before him, the Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, and he was a very fine Chairman of the Board. He understood that as Chairman he had to take a position of impartiality.

But in this particular case that was being dealt with by the Debates Committee we had situations where before the hearing it was made absolutely clear by the people who were the judge and by the people who were the prosecutors that whatever the defence would say in this matter the worker was going to be dismissed. Now that is what I understand to be a situation classically set up by what the Member of St. Thomas was kind enough to explain to me as the *ad misericordiam* plea. What was so unpleasant about it, Sir, is that there was a certain calvaricriness about the whole thing that suggested that the life and livelihood of a working man in Barbados in so far as these people were concerned could be snuffed out like a candle is snuffed out when we have no further use for it. That is what has sadden me ever since and which remains for me a position of very grave concern. Until then, Sir, and since then too I have had nothing but the greatest respect for the Barbados Labour

Party which formed the Government of the day. The only thing I would wish to know is that there was a greater degree of denunciation by the party of that particular incident But I have the greatest respect for them and I believe they would now, if they were in a position to do something about it, support any reparation that is being attempted. I am satisfied, Sir, that this could not represent a full position of all people on this single issue. It must have been a single-minded situation to which other people may have given classic support even if they did so by their silence.

I think, Sir, that when we are faced with positions where the livelihood of a person is involved we have to be very careful that we treat that situation with all of the seriousness that we can bring to bear on the particular occasion because we ought not to take lightly the termination of employment of anyone and we certainly ought not to take lightly the termination of anyone who has placed in any organization several years of service. People may say, Mr. Speaker, that the service from time to time is not satisfactory or that the service is not service that people are pleased with. But it is my view, Sir, that if people continue to serve in an area for protracted periods during which they have no adverse reports made against themselves and their service and their performance do not come up for review and disciplinary guidance - I do not use discipline only to refer to punishing anybody, Sir - then in those circumstances we have to accept that the full number of years must be satisfactory service. 1.20p.m.

In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, and was concerned then, that 23 years of service were not being properly respected by the employer of the day. Whether that employer is the Parliament of the day, or that employer is the most reactionary person anywhere in Bridgetown, in Barbados, the general tenet should remain very much the same, that in the event of there being disciplinary action, certain accepted codes of conduct on behalf of the employer should be entered into.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that an effort is being made to correct this matter.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is, I think, unwittingly giving the House the impression that certain procedures - in breach of Mr. Boyce's rights - were not followed. The record of the House at the relevant time, at page 1857, says this, Sir, that the Joint Committee met in the presence of Members of the Government and of Independent Senators and over two days - Friday, October 14 and Monday, October 17 - it heard the Clerk of Parliament (Mr. Boyce), his representative and witnesses to charges laid against him by the Debates Committee. The charges were prepared, the Committee met on Wednesday, October 12 to decide certain procedural matters and on Friday, October 14 it

heard Mr. Maurice King, a counsel, assisted by Mr. Frank Walcott, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, a Mr. Trotman from the Barbados Workers' Union, a lady who took the notes and other members of the Barbados Workers' Union present, on behalf of the Clerk.

I just want it clearly understood that due process was indeed followed.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised and disappointed by the intervention of the Honourable Member, to whom I just indicated the very great extent of my respect. Of course the record shows that an attorney was present! Of course the record shows that the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union was present! Of course the record shows that a Mr. Trotman was present and that a lady took the notes! What the record does not show is that none of these persons was allowed to put the case for Mr. Boyce. Let the Honourable Member for St. Thomas deny that, Sir.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The official record of this House, not anybody's memory, says "It heard Maurice King, Counsel, assisted by Mr. Frank Walcott and Mr. Trotman. I can inform the House that the investigation lasted between 12 and 13 hours. There was an address by Mr. King which is reflected in the report." This was the Prime Minister at the time reporting to the House. I am going by what Hansard says and Hansard says clearly persons were heard and addresses were made. Those are representations. Do not let us distort what is here now from memory. I am going by that. That is the official Hansard.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Further to that point of order the Honourable Member has a duty to point out, when he gets up and says what is in Hansard, that he is saying what a person said. That is not a committee report he is reading from, that is what Tom Adams said and he knows that we had to treat everything said with reserve. He knows that, he himself used to treat everything the man said with reserve. That is what he said, that is not the report. He was at the meeting.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I can safely say, and I would like to think that you would accept, that during this entire first period of what is intended to be a long term of office that I will have here, I have never attempted to play the game of semantics, nor will I attempt to do so today. I do not want to make the observation I am making to score any cheap political points, nor will I have anybody attempt to make any cheap political observations in an effort to change what took place. I do not want anybody to believe that what they are quoting from represents any report that was accepted by all the parties as representative of what took place on that occasion, and if any Honourable Member wants to come in here and because he wants to argue a particular line try to make out

that what did not transpire transpired, then I am most disappointed.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, is this, that everybody who was there and who knew what took place is able to know and to say that this represented the greatest travesty that there was calling itself justice, and we have to be able to see it and recognise it. I am not now saying so because I want to blame the present members of the Barbados Labour Party, I have said I have the greatest respect for them, but I am saying that in so far as an employer in his relations to an employee is concerned, it ought to serve as an example regarding what we ought not to do. There is no point anybody coming now and telling me any cheapness about a report said that one Maurice King made representation and one General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union was present, because that does not reflect what took place, Sir.

It is not that the representations were made and were improper, or that the representations were made and were incompetent. Completely to the contrary, what took place is that the people who were there representing Mr. Boyce were never allowed to put the case that they wanted to put for Mr. Boyce. I was there, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: It was not a question of representing badly. You were before an employer who had given recognition, but at the same time he had given recognition you were meeting in his house and he made it clear he had absolute power, power to the extent that he could even imprison his employees who were representing the case. That is the kind of analogy I am drawing, and it was a shameful exhibition of power abused. There is no denying that. As a matter of fact, the Barbados Workers' Union had another member of staff at the time on whose talents we would have wanted to draw, but the same abuse of power made it impossible for him to be there to give representation. So nobody needs to tell me what there was or was not in this situation. I know and I saw it. I am saying that I would hope that no employer, whether the employer is a BLP employer, an NDP employer or a DLP employer, will again ever in the history of Barbados be guided by this non-respect for law, order or indeed justice.

I was making the point, Sir, that this is being corrected now and I am hopeful that in the same way that we are endeavouring to correct this, that in other areas where there have been errors that efforts in due time will be made to correct them. In closing, Sir, I am referring specifically to the urgent need for us to correct that error that relates to the extended period of lay-offs during which people have to wait before they gain National Insurance payments and can claim severance. 1.30p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Speaker, what I want to say at the outset is that in my opinion a nation exhibits its greatness, when having recognised wrongdoing, it seeks to correct that wrongdoing. What I can gather from all that has happened is that some wrongdoing was committed and this Parliament in its wisdom is moving to correct that wrongdoing. No attempt is being made to reflect on any Member present and as far as I can see the members of the Barbados Labour Party would be fully in support of this legislation when the time comes for voting.

But, Sir, having said that, I would also want to say something else and it has to do with victimisation. The problem as I have observed over the years is that persons, not only in the public service of Barbados, but also persons who have worked elsewhere have from time to time been the victims of political or other persecution in Barbados. I have noticed throughout my days of observing political happenings in Barbados that whenever one political party is elected to office up to this time, Sir, that someone who might have rubbed that political party wrong is made to pay for having committed the unpardonable sin.

We have heard it all the time so I don't want to point any fingers at any person but I can point to a number of people who have been victimised by the Barbados Labour Party and persons who have been victimised by the Democratic Labour Party. I am not calling any names here today, Sir, because I haven't given you any notice that I would call names today but I would hope, Sir, that the time will come in Barbados when people would not be victimised for holding political views that are not in keeping with the view of one political party or the other. I do not like wrongdoing, Sir. Persons who hold political views that are against the views that I hold, I respect for holding those views and I would defend those persons for holding those views and you must respect me for the view that I hold. Respect is not a one-way street. It is a two-way street. I think that it is a waste of parliamentary time over the years for us to come in here and start pointing fingers. I would hope that that time will come when that will stop and this is why it is our policy, the National Democratic Party policy, that that kind of victimisation is wrong and it ought not to be allowed to continue.

I have to say something about it, Sir, because I have known Mr. Boyce for some time. I could vaguely reflect on the debate at the time as I followed it in the newspapers and I was against what was happening. I do not remember much about the details except for what the Member who just took his seat said and also for what the Member for St. Michael West said. I don't remember much about it but the impression I formed at the time that the debate was being conducted was that here was a person who was being victimised. It might have been alright because I understood the gentleman in question to be a member of the Democratic Labour Party. The Barbados Labour Party

forming the Government of the day might not have been comfortable with him as a Clerk of Parliament. But that is not the point, Sir. The point is that it has to be assumed that everybody would conduct and proceed with their business in a very dispassionate manner and not have any bias.

When the gentleman was fired, I thought it was wrong. That was the impression formed without having much recollection of the Debate, but, there are other public servants who were fired over the years.

I remember, Sir, that many casual workers at the MTW were dismissed having served 9 years and 10 months and 9 years and 11 months and as such they would not have been eligible for... A matter was referred to me in my professional capacity, one of my constituents as recently as 1983-84, worked for 9 years and 11 months and he was dismissed from MCW as it was then called. He made an appeal to the Severance Payments Tribunal and he was awarded a severance pay. I do not believe that under the law he could have collected. Maybe the Severance Payments Tribunal acted in error. But, my view about it, Sir, is that the money was a significant sum of money because he worked there for 9 years and 11 months and up to now I have written several letters when the Barbados Labour Party formed the Government and when the Democratic Labour Party formed the Government and up to now he has not received any money. An award was made for him and he did not get it. There were several people, as I said, who were dismissed, not in circumstances amounting to victimisation but certainly, Sir, it was wrong because of the policies that were followed at the time. This is why, when you are talking about a precedent, I believe that this is a good precedent to set. If people have legitimate rights in the future and people were dismissed in circumstances like these, I believe that having petitioned the Government and properly making out a case they ought to be paid their money.

The law might say you should not be paid but I believe that when a man has given as much a service as this in the rehabilitation of our roads and has worked for the Government for all these years then they have to be paid.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I just want to draw to the Honourable Member's attention that the intention of the establishment of an ombudsman is in fact to help correct these kinds of errors and without prejudice to the legal representation. Where the ombudsman had reviewed a case such as this, the ombudsman can recommend to Parliament, because he reports to Parliament that some kind of reparation be made in the circumstances. I remind the Honourable Member.

Mr. R. P. BYER: When it comes to matters of public law, I trust the advice of the Member for St. Michael West. What I would want to tell him is that if that is the position I have no reason to doubt him. This is an area that he is very

good in. I have no reason to doubt that the ombudsman is following the law or what ought to be practised because I have another case that I am dealing with at the moment where a lady who was put on suspension for - it was suspected that she was putting her hands in the till - but yet, Sir, when the matter was heard at the Magistrates' Court at the preliminary, when the D.P.P. came to consider the case to find out whether it ought to be sent on to the Assizes, the DPP said that on the evidence he had no charge could be made out against the lady. A discontinuation was suggested and the matter was not prosecuted at the Assizes. What has happened to this lady is she was dismissed from the Civil Service. Up to now she has not been able to get back her health. The Minister of Labour knows about the case because the lady went to him. 1.40p.m.

Here we have a case where the Director of Public Prosecutions is saying no charge can be made out against this lady on the evidence here before us. Yet, she has not been given back her job. At the moment I am dealing with the matter in a professional capacity so that I can have the matter brought for judicial review before the courts. What I am saying is there are many more cases. I have a very good friend who gave his life for the Democratic Labour Party.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: He is still alive, barely so, Sir. Giving your life is an expression that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West fully knows about. He gave his all to the Democratic Labour Party and because he said something about a member of the Democratic Labour Party, who sits in a high position, he was dismissed. A whole department that used to function from the West Wing of Parliament was abolished. Everybody was reappointed except him. Now, the Democratic Labour Party through the brother of the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is now trying to entreat him back into the Democratic Labour Party to do work for them at the moment.

When we are talking about victimisation, Sir, we have victimisation here and we have victimisation there. There is no victimisation here at the moment. I hope it will never happen because I would talk about it. We have to do something about this whole thing of victimisation. It is not a good thing. There is no point in victimising a citizen of your country because that citizen reflects certain political views.

If I have something to say about the Prime Minister of Barbados I will say it and I have said it, Sir. I sat behind him there in 1988 and I said certain things about the Prime Minister of Barbados having to do with his policy. I was victimised in the Democratic Labour Party. My life was threatened. You want to tell me that in this Barbados...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. As a member of the Democratic Labour Party, now in the hierarchy, could the Honourable Member be a little more specific? Was he victimised by any Member of this House, Sir? Did any Member of this House threaten his life? I do not think I ever threatened his life.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I did not want to do was to stop the Member. I would give Members opportunities to make reference to certain areas but certainly, in some debates it is not necessary to expand beyond necessity.

Mr. R. P. BYER: No, Sir. That is what I was trying to avoid. The intervention of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West at this stage might force me, with your permission of course, to go a little further. I am not speaking of anyone in here from here down, Sir.

Let me put it this way. Bob Marley says "who the cap fit let him wear it." That is all I have to say about that. There are things that were said by those Members that I will never forget Lord help me to know my friends. My enemies I can take care of. Little does he know that the four best friends he had are these four here and he kicked them out of the Party because we had the courage to get up and tell him that he was wrong. They have a lot who did not say that but knew he was wrong. That is what I am talking about.

The point I am making, Sir, is that if an act was done - this is what the Honourable Member for St. Thomas said and I would like to echo it - by Parliament which had the effect of divesting Mr. Boyce of his benefits, then that was wrong. I would caution us as a nation because we are becoming tribalised. When I get in it is my turn to commit acts of wrongdoing against you. When you get in it is your turn to commit acts of wrongdoing against me. It seems to be almost like a religion. That ought not to occur. That is all I would like to say.

I certainly would support this Bill because, as I said, it seeks to correct a wrong that was done many years ago. A nation that has the courage to do it, there is hope for the nation - not for the leader of the nation - even though we have so many things happening today.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by stating that this Bill which is before us was delivered to us, certainly to me, yesterday in the afternoon. The Government has been in the habit of bringing bits of legislation and measures at the last moment to such an extent that Members have not had proper time to do the necessary research. The Government who would have had the benefit for a long time of studying the records would then find themselves making wild charges and accusations against the past Government and normally against people that have passed away from the land, making allegations to

such an extent that they would allege that what appears in Hansard happens not to be the true facts.

Now, Sir, I have asked for a copy of the Report which the record of Hansard for 1977 at page 1845 shows was laid in here of the joint committee on October 18, 1977. I am told that there is not a copy of that Report in the records of the House.

Whilst Members were speaking I jogged my memory and there was a document laid in this House on October 18, 1977. I am not going to accept from any Honourable Members that a document representing the findings of a joint committee of the House and Senate was not laid in this Chamber. Indeed, I would very much like to see, in order to refresh Members' memory because we are 13 years...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. No one has said anything about any document not being laid in Parliament. The Honourable Member for St. Michael Central was speaking about an experience which he had personally. No one who spoke in here so far talked about the laying or not laying of any document. The Honourable Member is very subtly suggesting that he is not going to accept. Well, since the debate has only embraced the ones who have spoken, and since no one has so spoken, he is misleading the House, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not misleading any House, Sir. The Honourable Member will jump up many times in this House to take points whether or not they are valid points. That is his function now, apparently. He and one other are the only two, who, according to them, are now in the position of defending the Government so that is his function. He will jump up on several occasions. You see what I mean?

Hon. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. I am not defending any Government on this particular point. 1.50p.m.

The Honourable Member got up and made a misstatement and I drew it to Your Honour's attention. I am not defending the Government if he misspeaks in here. If he misspeaks, the Government does not need defending. We only have to defend, when he tells lies, outside.

Mr. SPEAKER: My position is that I am only concerned with points of order and nothing to do with defences. If an Honourable Member rises on a point of order and I say, "I do not give any consent", one can take it that it is one of those points which I have doubts about. Certainly I would not take it that one is taking a defence.

But certainly my position is not to determine whether one is making a defence, but primarily to assess whether the point of order is relevant or not.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I understand you very clearly, Sir, when sometimes you do not get right into the arena.

But let me get to the point. Mr. Boyce had charges laid against him by the Debates Committee. The Debates Committee, under the relevant rule of Parliament was his accuser. It would have been his prosecutor and it would have been part of the mechanism for passing judgment on him.

The procedural point which arose was whether or not, given the state, I think it was Section 3 or Section 4 (3) of the Parliamentary Debates Act, whether it was proper for the Debates Committee only to be the person charging Mr. Boyce, prosecuting Mr. Boyce and finding him innocent or guilty, judging Mr. Boyce. That was the position, Sir. The position was taken that, instead of that procedure, since the Debates Committee was Mr. Boyce's accusers, the correct form, to follow was for their to be a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament, since eventually Parliament would have had to pass on the matter. All that is reflected in Hansard, 13 years ago. That legal difference between the two sides of the House then was argued. It was made absolutely clear that the reason for following the procedure which was followed was so that the Debates Committee would not be Mr. Boyce's accusers, trier and sentencing him.

I know there is another statutory board that has followed such a procedure, in relation to the Director of that statutory board and who have accused her, tried her even before she was accused and came to a decision at a private meeting, at a house, that she should be dismissed. That was the final decision taken, under the Democratic Labour Party, in this session too. You talk about victimization. And, eventually, dismissed her! So you have that position.

You know, when I hear these charges of - now that people are dead - talking about it is the pinnacle of victimization and what not, that is the position that has occurred.

When it comes to this I think the Honourable Member said that those were the days of the highest level of victimization. I have seen the Democratic Labour Party resort and use Parliament to legislate people out of jobs. Use Parliament to legislate and I did not hear one word from any of the trade unionists in this country. When I see the former Right Honourable Prime Minister, at the time, come down here with legislation to legislate a woman out of her job, not one word from them. If they talk about victimization, that is the pinnacle of victimization. The records of the House show that too, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member is going to....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member would know, Sir, the pinnacle of victimization that they did, at the time. Not one word! Maybe down in the corridor to say they do not agree. They may, when they take people and transfer them for different reasons, say they do not agree. But none of them have the guts, like men to stand up.

As I have said in the debates in 1977 whenever I have heard these charges made - I was just looking at a passage and I answered the charges of victimization then, against the then Government

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: The Member for Christ Church West, in my view, is misleading the House, Sir. He has indicated that the Prime Minister of the day came to Parliament and legislated somebody out of a job and that the members of the trade union on this side did not say anything and allowed it to go.

I reject that, Sir, as being untrue, inaccurate and misleading.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the Honourable Member point out what he said, Sir, I would be willing to withdraw it. If he objected; if he wants to say that; if he wants to say if any of them voted against it, let him get up and say if they voted against it.

Mr. C. L. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Member would give way. I am saying that this Member is totally unaware of any position, as described by the Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member was not in the House. But I have not heard a word from them. Do you mean the only way they could talk is in the House?

This is the season that you are going to hear all sorts of allegations about liars. But the Democratic Labour Party has some of the biggest liars in the country when it comes to falsifying positions. They will talk about liars, whenever it suits them, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member would know who is a big liar. He is the best person in Barbados to know who is a big liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I at this point make this position very clear. I have ruled before that if an accusation is made against an Honourable Member, he is bound to be defended, by the Chair. If an accusation is made of a particular body and that Member feels aggrieved of that allegation, he should certainly make sure that the Member who made the statement made special reference to him. Then, one is able to determine whether that statement is true or not.

But I will not permit statements to be made and Members just get up and make general statements without myself being in a position to judge the whole thing.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not going to object to anyone, Sir. He can say whatever he likes because I am prepared to stand up to anyone of them on any point they want to make, Sir.

I want to get back to this particular issue. The procedural issue was how should the House proceed to deal with a situation, where allegations were being made whether founded or unfounded, about the conduct of the Clerk and the Debates Committee itself was making the accusation.

The decision was taken to proceed, by way of a joint committee of the House, on which the then Opposition....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member would give way, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not giving way at this stage, Sir. I have given away on many occasions.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As you wish.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: on which, Sir, the....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member was not in his Chair when I spoke. The Honourable Member is therefore misleading the House because" he is unaware that we pointed out that it was a debate in which the Debates Committee had made certain recommendations but that we objected to the procedure. He is going on as if none of that has been said to the House. We objected to the procedure of the joint committee and we did not participate.

Therefore for him to be talking in those terms suggesting that he is speaking from now must be misleading, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: With respect, Sir, again the Honourable Member takes the point that I was not in my place when he spoke. I was fully in my place when he spoke. That is one. I took notes. The Honourable Member

also said that my only intervention was to deny that the then Clerk was offered a job in the Attorney-General's office.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member came in when I was speaking, Sir. Hansard will show that. Do not tell me he was in his place. When I started, the two of you were there.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the first statement I have in my notes is blemishes of records of Parliament. The Honourable Member was speaking - Procedure out of a joint meeting of Parliament. Decision made to dismiss Boyce. He was reading from Page 1857. You can have my notes, Sir. One thing I do, Sir, is to keep notes and take them very carefully. The position is, Sir, and the records will show therefore that Mr. Boyce was being given, out of an abundance of caution an opportunity to present his case to a body that was not his accusers. That was the position. That is reflected in Parliament, Sir. 2.00 p.m.

Now Sir, the Opposition chose not to sit on the Joint Committee. As I recall, the Joint Committee was composed of Members of the Government and two Independent Senators. A meeting was held and that is the record and that is why I asked for the Report. A meeting was held and this Hansard shows that. I was not a member of that Joint Committee. The Report was laid, I believe, before both Houses of Parliament and that Mr. Boyce was not the only person who appeared before the Committee.

Sir, among the persons who appeared according to the record was Mr. Boyce, his counsel - Mr. Maurice King, assisted by Mr. Frank Walcott, General Secretary, Mr. Trotman from the Barbados Workers Union, and a lady who took notes. We have heard from the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central that he does not consider what happened as providing a full opportunity. That was his characterization of the events which took place. I was not at that event. But it goes on to say, Sir, that various persons gave evidence. Now who were the people who gave evidence? The then Cabinet Secretary, Sir Frank Blackman, gave evidence. The present Clerk of Parliament gave evidence and other independent persons gave evidence. The Report indicates that evidence was given. I am reading from Page 1857.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member if he is going to quote from Hansard has to indicate that he is quoting from Mr. Adams' speech. What he is doing is quoting from what Mr. Adams said to Parliament. Let him bring the Report and quote from the Report and not get up and read Mr. Adams' speech over again. That is what Adams said to Parliament and we used to treat what Adams said with the greatest reserve, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am reading from the Official Debates of Hansard of Tuesday, October 18, 1977 at Page 1857. That is what I am reading. Now those Minutes have been approved by the House. There is nobody who has moved to set those Minutes aside as representing the Minutes of the House.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House even more when he gets up and says that those Minutes were approved. You and I know, Sir, that the Minutes, only record who spoke and who did not speak. That is Hansard which is a verbatim record. Do not talk about those Minutes were approved. That is what Tom Adams said. He is talking about the Minutes. As you know, Sir, we approve Minutes everyday and the Minutes say the Honourable Member so and so spoke. He is reading from Hansard which is a verbatim record.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I can start by asking Your Honour to postpone debate to give us an opportunity to bring the Report. But I am not going to ask that now, Sir. The House should have a copy of the Report. The Honourable Member is going to shout a million times. If he says the Report is not correct, let him bring the Report. I have asked for the Report and I began by saying that I would have wanted the Report. If the Government chooses to organize its business in such a way that it throws to Members of Parliament at the last minute matters that should come before earlier...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I object to that. Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I say it was at the last minute and you can object a million times.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He can read and write. He is a lawyer. If he does not understand, that is his business. But do not come in here and give the impression that somebody organized for the Report not to be here. We do not keep the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to rule that that is no point of order because of the length of time. But what I want to say is this if I can help the debate. Hansard reports accurately what is being said. That is as far as it can go. It cannot go beyond what has not been said. The question of interpretation is probably a different matter and I would ask Members even if they want to debate those points to debate them within the context of the Resolution before us rather than to carry the debate into another debate which will not help the Bill itself. I am going to ask Members to operate within that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I began this debate by saying that I would have wished to see the Report and I repeat the Honourable Member may wish to interrupt on many occasions legitimately or not I repeat that I began by saying that I would have wished to see the Report to refresh my memory that we on this side received our Papers late yesterday and that it did not provide enough time for Members if they are to contribute in a meaningful way to the debate to have an opportunity to study their Order Paper and to do the necessary research. That is where I began this debate and I do not resile one inch from my position on that, Sir. I want to say that had we had available the Report of the Joint House of Parliament then a lot of the semantics which are being argued by the Honourable Member who is so anxious to prove a dead member a liar, that would not have taken place.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, it appears in this Parliament that people do not even know the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot accept that the aside's are within the limits prescribed by the Rules. I am going to ask Members to keep their asides beyond the ears of the Chair. I have not heard them neither will they be reported and neither will I take responses from them.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: One of these days you might not be able to hear my asides in the House, Sir. But Sir, the persons who gave evidence were Mr. George Branker, Acting Clerk of Parliament, Mr. Frank Blackman, now Sir Frank Blackman the then Cabinet Secretary, the then Speaker, Senator Nigel Barrow, Mr. Boyce himself, the Leader of the House, the then Honourable Member for Christ Church South Central. Evidence was taken as far as my memory goes and I have to say subject to seeing the Report. I believe that documentary evidence was also submitted to that Committee at the time concerning the allegation of falsification of records by the then Clerk. As I understand it, the Joint Committee consisting of Independent Senators and the Government found a charge to be proved. Sir, I wish to remind the House of a statement at Page 1859 by a then Cabinet Minister who said the following, Sir:

"Mr. Speaker, when this matter first came to a head, I told my colleagues in no uncertain terms that I was not going to vote for the termination of the employment of the Clerk. These are not very popular because there is a certain unanimity of you on one such aspect. But after the nature of the evidence that has been brought against the Clerk during the past week, I believe that I would be doing a gross injustice to my conscience and to my responsibility as a parliamentarian if I did not support this Resolution." 2.10p.m.

That was the statement of the then Minister of Education, so that there was an independence of views as to how persons approached the allegations which were made and persons had to be satisfied that those allegations were proven before they were prepared to vote *en masse* or *en bloc* for a joint finding from both Houses of Parliament. So that the Honourable Members protesting and shouting and wanting now to prosecute the Labour Party for something 13 years ago is, as usual, the Democratic Labour Party on show. I am not saying that one Honourable Member, representing Mr. Boyce, as a trade unionist may not have differed at the time and had a genuine difference. I am not querying that. I was told before I came here that we are going to hear some fireworks today. That is usual. I expect that, Sir.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, perhaps unintentionally. He is saying that he heard there were going to be fireworks and he is saying that in the same breath that he is associating the Member for St. Michael Central with a statement that he is making about showing off and representation. I believe that in that juxtaposition of language and sentiments he is trying to make out that the position which I adopted here was not a position where Mr. Boyce was denied the opportunity to put his case, and that whenever people tried to put a case on his behalf they were shut up very peremptorily by the people on the other side.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I said no such thing, Sir. The Honourable Member is so anxious at the moment that he is not bringing his usual objective approach on these matters, because he probably feels very strongly about the events that have happened, so that he is not being as objective and listening to what I am saying in the debate, Sir.

I do not want at this stage to have to reap up all of the matters that were being canvassed at that time. I do not think it would be appropriate and I do not believe that it is in the interest of Mr. Boyce or anyone else that they should be reaped up and brought before the House, because that trial is past, but if the Government believes that it is going to make all sorts of allegations about victimisation in the debate and get away with it, then of course we will have to reply to the Government in kind.

This Government cannot boast of any record of not being victimisers of people in Statutory Boards, in the Public Service and elsewhere, so what are they going to talk about? They can talk as much as they like, the Government has not got any unblemished record of lack of victimisation. I remember that we had to settle with several persons when I was Attorney General out of court to stop actions being brought, because they were set out for political reasons, and I repeat every word I said in 1977. They were the archangels of victimisation. In fact, I made the point that to get a job with this Government you had to send the person

sometimes to join the Democratic Labour Party to carry the card.

I will give you two examples from my own constituency. I have not given you notice of the name, Sir, but a prospective candidate for the Democratic Labour Party was canvassing in Forde's Road outside of the area he should have been canvassing, because he did not know the boundaries of St. Michael South Central, and this candidate came around and said to a young man who lives in Forde's Road, "do you want a job?" He sent him for a job at the St. Joseph Hospital. As soon as it was found out that he was a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party they dismissed him from the job.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has to be misleading the House, because they do not hire anybody down at St. Joseph Hospital, they have not dismissed anybody from down at St. Joseph Hospital. St. Joseph Hospital is a Statutory Board under the Ministry of Health, and as Minister I give this House the assurance that what the Honourable Member just said has not occurred.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not surprised the Honourable Member does not even know what is going on, because when we got in here and said that he was in a position where he could not open the Hospital in time, for various reasons he denied it. The records of his own Department will show that he is wrong on that. That is the first thing he has to find out, Sir.

The second position, the same gentleman I talked about, Sir, was one morning in King's Village, which was formerly part of my constituency and is now part of St. Michael South, and a prospective member for the Democratic Labour Party running for St. Michael South came walking through the area, saw him and asked what he was doing around there. The gentleman said he wanted a job and he was sent to work with a contractor doing work, I believe, for the National Housing Corporation in St. Michael South. They found out within a few days that he is a member of the Labour Party and the contractor dismissed him and told him, "I'm sorry, fellow, but you know the position." What are they talking about victimisation? Do they want details? I would bring the man and give evidence in the House. All of a sudden they are holier-than-thou.

Certain remarks made by Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I think many of us could bring instances from life experiences of our constituents and others.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is breaching the rules relating to the

length of time a Member is allowed to speak. The Honourable Member has exceeded his half of an hour, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any Member has the right to draw to the attention of the Chair when the rules are breached. I will now ask the Clerk to verify whether that is the case or not. The Clerk has said it is the end of time, but I reserve the right to give the Honourable Member a few minutes to wind up his debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, it is not the length of time one speaks but the quality of the speech that matters eventually, and history will prove that the quality of the speech shows that this Government are the worst victimisers of people for political reasons in this country and they are replete with examples of this having occurred and continuing to occur in statutory boards and within the Government itself. 2.20 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that the Members on this side understand the rules very well.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Those matters will be responded to, Sir, in due course. I move, Sir, that this sitting be suspended until 3:30 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I rise to second that Sir, and to draw to your Honour's attention that the Leader of the minority Opposition victimised this House today, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. Is there any other Member who wants to speak on this?

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I heard my name mentioned in the course of this debate. I did in fact represent Mr. Chezley Boyce as his counsellor. The Honourable Member for the City is perhaps suggesting that provision should also be made now for payment of legal costs. I did represent Mr. Chezley Boyce with Mr. Frank Walcott and the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central but the questions have been raised as to the procedure that was followed and all that. The fact is that the proceedings were almost, as it were, like a kangaroo court. True enough the General Secretary, myself and the Member for St. Michael Central were there but when you have what

was in fact the political opposition and that's what it was, mounted in numbers on the other side and you can't get a point made effectively - laughing at you and harassing you. You remember I made a point some time ago that the last man who made a lot of fun at my size didn't last terribly long? It was Mr. Adams, and Sir Arnott Cato was in the Chair and had to pull him up and tell him that that is nonsense and he should stop that. All in that trial, so that all that was being done throughout those proceedings was hurling insults and antagonism. I was there and I know what happened so I am saying that a trial in those circumstances, that the Clerk of Parliament didn't stand a ghost of a chance. There was no question about it and I have no doubt in my mind that he was railroaded.

I am talking about the proceedings in the Chamber where we appeared. I am saying that one didn't have a chance to air the merits of the thing. All I am saying is that on grounds of natural justice those proceedings couldn't really stand. I know the pressures that myself and the General Secretary and the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central had to go through in the course of those proceedings. I have no doubt that a serious injustice was done and it is good that that is being rectified now and I am happy to support this Bill which is before the House. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It seems as if Members have run out of things on this particular matter but there were a few comments made, Sir, which I do not think should be allowed to stay without a refutation on the part of this side. I refer particularly to the statement made both by the Members for St. George South and Christ Church West about victimisation. That is not the policy of the Democratic Labour Party. I want to make it absolutely clear. Anybody can point to any particular matter and say he was victimised. The Member for St. George said he was victimised by the Democratic Labour Party and making a lot of money out of the Democratic Labour Party to this day - the Member for St. George South... Don't say nonsense. Don't say it's foolishness. You think we don't know?

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We have not raised one finger to interfere with that.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I don't know who was the flying squad. I haven't got a clue but I know Sir, that the flying squad was discontinued. People are speaking about an individual as though an individual constitutes a flying squad. It had about at least half a dozen people, Sir.

Any lawyer will know why he is doing what he is doing. Anyhow Sir, that is beside the point. It is silly to

accuse the Government of victimisation by disbanding the flying squad. He had less than a year's service in the flying squad.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am not interested. I have no interest in how many years he was with the Democratic Labour Party. It is of no interest to me whatsoever. As far as I know he might still be with the DLP. Mike Walker is probably still a member of the Democratic Labour Party and still with the DLP. So are you telling me now that we are victimizing our own? The whole thing, Sir, is silly, it is baseless and has absolutely no foundation whatsoever. That is not a policy of the Democratic Labour Party. When we came in, we did not fire people like the School Meals servers that were fired in 1976; CBC - Gerry Richards. Sorry I didn't want to call names, Sir. A whole host of people, Sir. Who is Peter Scott?

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: As you know Sir, it was a policy of the Barbados Labour Party that if you did not belong to them that you would starve. That was a stated policy of the BLP that if you did not belong you would starve and that was stated in this House. 3.40p.m.

Sir, when we come to talk about victimisation, watch it. The beam is in your eye. We do not fire anybody. If the Public Service Commission does not fire anybody you are going to say it is the Government. Practically, Sir, we do not control the Public Service Commission. It is well known.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Those words should choke you. Sorry, not you, Sir. Judging from the sense of the debate if one were to take the positive aspects of the debate into consideration I got the impression it will be substantial, if not totally supported in here this evening. For that reason there is no need for me to say anything further on this particular matter.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative with abstentions.

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask that the abstentions be noted.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, that is not the way you are going to do it. When I asked for a second time and abstentions are taken then a division would have to be taken because one

would have to be clear. If there is a division to be taken then well...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Divide.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division has been called for.

The bell was rung.

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

Ayes: Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. B. M. TAITT; Hon. M. A. KING; Hon. E. E. GREAVES; Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN; Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN; Hon. N. K. SIMMONS; Hon. W. W. HALL; Hon. C. V. WALKER; Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN; Mr. R. L. MORRIS; Mr. C. A. NEBLETT; Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON; Dr. R. C. HAYNES; Mr. P. J. M. MILLER and Mr. E. BOURNE - 17

Abstentions: Hon. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR-2

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that and am speaking. Sir, on Clause 2.1 am very glad that the Attorney General appeared as a member of the Tribunal. He was the representative of Mr. Boyce. I am discussing the figures which have been worked out after meticulous arithmetic. The Barbados Labour Party led by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West who is now not in his chair and the Honourable Member for St. Peter abstained on the paying of this sum of money which is in clause 2.

I was very happy to hear the Attorney General say, and I hope that if they provoke me that he will get up and say it again, that it was like a kangaroo court when he appeared to represent Chezley Boyce. I was very glad to hear him say that in second reading because those Honourable Members sought to give the impression when I was discussing the merits of Mr. Boyce getting this sum of money that appears in clause 2, that we were telling lies about the Labour Party Government. I was glad to hear the

Attorney General whose integrity has never been questioned in this country and cannot be now questioned, use the language which he used to describe what occurred to say it was like a kangaroo court. Since the members of the Barbados Labour Party want to abstain on this, let me say that the then Speaker of the House, Burton Hinds, - they say that we want to vilify people who are dead - you cannot vilify Burton Hinds. He was the principal witness against Mr. Boyce. He was Speaker and Chairman of the Debates Committee.

When I hear the Leader of the Minority Opposition, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, talking about how the man had due process, I am disappointed because he !< js held himself out to be a champion of human rights. For him to know how Burton Hinds used to behave as the head of the Debates Committee, of which I was a member, so I speak of my own knowledge. He was the accuser. He was the prosecutor. He was the executioner. He was joined by the late Tom Adams who stated categorically that there was no way Mr. Boyce was not going to be dismissed.

They have the temerity to come in here today and try to give the impression that the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central, a distinguished president of a regional organisation, a trade unionist, whose integrity has never been questioned, came and gave an account of what he remembered, what he witnessed and what is a negative memory in his mind, they tried to give the impression that we, for political reasons, were trying to give people impressions. It was a sordid chapter in the history of this House.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to tell you in this committee that it was an embarrassment to see how they took a man and treated him like a dog. I am sorry that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West is not now in his seat. The Honourable Member for St. Peter can tell him that I said so. I want the Honourable Member for St. Peter to write down every word I say and speak.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am not on show. I am disappointed that an attempt would be made to suggest that we would attack and vilify men who are dead. Anything I have said about Tom Adams when he was dead I said when he was alive in here. As for Burton Hinds there is nothing that can be said about him dead or alive that had not been said before. You the Honourable Member for St. Peter know that. Do not come in here and try to give people the impression that somebody is trying to talk... 3.50p.m.

I was going to speak in great detail and the Member for St. Thomas indicated that we should not go down the road. Then after I sat down, they got up on their feet and started giving you the impression, as they always do...

Disreputable vagabonds from the Barbados Labour Party! Now, God rest them in their graves. I say they were disreputable vagabonds, in relation to this issue. I make no apologies for saying that It is on the record. I said it then. I will not have anybody suggesting that I am talking behind somebody's dead back.

They took Chezley Boyce and wiped the floor-with him, made fun of Maurice King, made fun of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, made fun of myself, Sir, and Members of this House because they had the numbers, bragged, walked around and laughed and said, no matter what we say, he was going to be fired. And you have the temerity to come in here to defend them.

I am ready, Sir. We are in Committee. I would have a chance to speak again. I am ready to take them on, toe to toe, head to head, nose to nose, eyeball to eyeball, spittle to spittle on these matters. I do not understand them. The Honourable Member has a right to defend his Party. I understand that.

But when the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central said that he was there and it was railroaded, and when the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central says that it was a kangaroo court, do not give the impression that the two of them would lie just to make a political point.

If you were not privy to Tom Adams' methodology, if you were not privy to Burton Hinds' criminality, then I understand that. But from that Chair, I was terrorized in this House.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You would know about the criminality better than anybody else. The Leader of the Opposition himself has put in the record about that criminality, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition himself was an arch victim.

Certain remarks made by Hon. B. M. TAITT and Hon. H. deB. FORDE were ordered, by Mr. CHAIRMAN, to be expunged from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2 stand....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, in the process of a presentation which I thought was unworthy of himself made the point that the Democratic Labour Party would not like to make a political point. Because the burden of his argument, Sir, is that the House is not to believe a contribution made to this House by a former Prime Minister, Sir, who is dead, as regards matters that took

place in a Committee of this House. The Democratic Labour Party would have us reject everything that was said, on the basis of the case and the case alone, that the Democratic Labour Party would not like to make a political point.

Of course, Sir, I know better than that. I know that it was the same Democratic Labour Party that would not like just to make a political point which had engaged a person to go to Trinidad and pay \$28 000 to have him dress like a rastafarian merely to make a political point in my second by-election campaign. That has been said in public about the Democratic Labour Party, that you all were prepared to do that, to lie to make a political point

As regards, whether or not the Democratic Labour Party would attack and vilify persons who are dead...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Eric said that about you all, that you were prepared to pay a person in Trinidad \$28 000 to dress up as a rastafarian to pursue the argument you all were putting in St. Peter, in the first by-election, that I was a rastafarian. You all would do that. And you called me a rastafarian, knowing that it was a lie, in order to make a political point.

Two points are coming through from all of this Sir.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: One is the question of procedure. We have been led to believe...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: One hundred and fifty thousand dollars, "most of which was contributed by Mr. Juman. Juman financed the campaign in St. Peter, against me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, one part of the case being put and in fact the only part of the case being put is that the gentleman was subject to a kangaroo court type of proceedings. That matter is being put by the Member, the Attorney-General and the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central. They are not are now arguing that they were not allowed to represent. What they are asking this House to believe is that because of the manner in which people reacted to them, during the process of the

representation that due process was not allowed to take place.

What this House is not being told, Mr. Chairman, is the substance of the matter, the substance of the charges that were laid against the person who the House is now being asked to vote money on behalf of.

As I understand it from the records of the House, Mr. Chairman, the Clerk was charged with falsifying the Minutes of meetings. That is also what is contained in the Report. If members of the Democratic Labour Party at that time knew that the then Prime Minister was lying, they have a responsibility to get up, in this House, and ask that those things be struck from the record.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. What the Honourable Member does not understand is that all of the protests which we made were ignored by both the Speaker of the House and the Chair.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the report of Hansard is here. The Committee recommended that, on the basis of evidence provided to it, Sir, that there was a strong case for the dismissal of the Clerk. There is no record, in these things, where the former Prime Minister said that the charges were not proper charges, Sir. In point of fact, he was the person pressing - if we are to understand the argument being put by the Member for St. Michael West - hardest for the charges to be accepted, as being proper charges.

But now we have this division in the camp of the Democratic Labour Party where, the Acting Prime Minister would want us to believe that the former Prime Minister, Mr. Tom Adams said that there was no virtue in the charges and the Leader of the House, on the other hand, would want us to believe that it was the same Tom Adams who was pressing hardest for the charges to be applied. That is the kind of foolishness that you have in the Democratic Labour Party, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is all a political campaign. The Democratic Labour Party is seeking to create issues. That is all they are seeking to do. They are seeking to create foolish issues. The issue they want to create is an issue about victimization going back 13 years.

The argument that has been put by my two colleagues is the argument that the Democratic Labour Party would do better to focus upon victimization of late, Sir. It would do better to focus upon the vilification of people, as recently as Sunday, as my colleague spoke about, when a Member of this Cabinet could be welcomed into a church where I was

invited to stand as a godparent for a child in Barbados to say that my presence at the church was darkening... 4.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member. Could we have order please?

. Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Those same remarks were made by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas earlier. Not only were they struck from the record but the Speaker said that there must be no comment on it. In other words, nobody was allowed to comment on it and now you bring it up again in Committee on the same matter, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that we are dealing with Clause 2 of this Bill. I have allowed some latitude and I am not prepared to broaden it any further.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I insist on my right, Sir, to respond to the points of issues as raised by the Member for St. Michael West, Sir. He had a lot to say about the Barbados Labour Party, Sir, and we have a right to defend ourselves. I insist on the same latitude, Sir, as was given to the Member for St. Michael West.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic Labour Party is not prepared to deal with the charges that were laid against the Clerk. This House is still to hear from the Democratic Labour Party side, Sir, of what were the charges that were laid against that Clerk that led to his being dismissed. We are being asked, Sir, to take a decision in this matter purely on the grounds of procedure. My colleagues have explained the Barbados Labour Party side in the matter, Sir, that we felt then that the Debates Committee which was bringing the charges against him was not the proper body also to try him and that from a procedural point of view the matter was referred to a Joint Committee of the House. I have not heard, Mr. Chairman, anybody on the Democratic Labour Party side dispute that. But there was a Barbados Labour Party position that says if a man is to be accused by one body, the Debates Committee, then let somebody else examine the evidence and report back to the House.

Therefore, from a point of view of procedure, it seems to us that a due process was gone through. The Attorney General may want to say now that he was treated badly by the Committee. We are treated badly in this House, Sir, by Members of the Government side. We are treated badly even in here by Members of the Government and that is the point. Talk about vilification. He said that he was mocked, Sir, in the Committee and the whole burden of the argument put by the Government this afternoon is that because the Attorney General was mocked and laughed at, then the charges had no substance to them and we are to take a decision as a responsible House merely upon the basis of

the question as to whether in the judgment of the Attorney General a "kangaroo court" existed because he was mocked. That is the argument, Sir.

I want to hear the Government speak in defence of what they regard as the lack of substances and charges. I am satisfied, Sir, from what I have heard from my honourable colleagues who I trust that the Member for St. Michael West would not want to be vilified in the same way as he vilified the departed former Prime Minister, Mr. Tom Adams.

Certain remarks made by Mr. O. S. ARTHUR were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, more seriously the Democratic Labour Party has come to this House and made a song and dance of the matter. All I have heard, Sir, is a lot of parlous argument about peoples' judgment as to whether they were treated badly or not and whether that was a "kangaroo court" situation or not. The substance of the charges brought against the man, Sir, has not "been properly aired. I, too, would be glad if I were in a position to be able to see the report of the Committee in which the charges are itemized, Sir, including the evidence presented to that Committee by the then Cabinet Secretary who is now the Ombudsman of -Barbados together with other people. I would like to see what the evidence was, because in essence we have been acting as a Court of Appeal on the basis of an opinion given I think, Sir, more for political reason than any other reason as to how the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central was treated.

I want to say, Sir, that the late Tom Adams was not the only person who made sport at the Member for Christ Church West Central, Sir. The people of Silver Hill are making sport of him, Sir, and all through his constituency. The police make sport of him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has this got anything to do with Clause 2 of this Bill?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty whatsoever with my abstaining. I have not heard enough from the Government side on the question of substance to believe that a case did not exist. What I have heard about the procedure, Sir, is flimsy argument in my view put purely for political effect. I am obliged to you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Peter demonstrates his ignorance of what I was speaking about. You can misunderstand people either by accident or because you are ignorant, deliberate and

wicked, malicious. Those are some of the reasons which may form the basis of misrepresenting what persons said.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I insist that those remarks be withdrawn.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: He said that I am ignorant I am repeating the same argument that you can be ignorant for whatever reason, Sir. He was merely explaining the basis for which a person can be ignorant I am asking, Sir, that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member making the point that the Member for Christ Church West Central referred to the Honourable Member?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not my understanding.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am ignorant and I explained why I am ignorant. That is what he did. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am asking that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not my understanding that the remark referred to any Honourable Member in this Chamber.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with the basis on which one can misunderstand or misrepresent what people say. I said that the trial and the proceedings in respect to which the Clerk, Mr. Boyce, was tried was like a "kangaroo court" and the basis of my comment was not because of any mocking comments made by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Adams. That had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Precisely, because you do not understand what a "kangaroo court" is all about. It is nothing to do with mocking of persons who appear at the "kangaroo court". It is nothing to do with insulting them. It is a matter of whether appropriate procedures are followed. It is a matter of whether justice appears to be done and is seen to be done.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Clause 2 of the Bill.

Hon. M. A. KING: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that I said the proceedings were like a "kangaroo court"...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order please?

Hon. M. A. KING: ...because the procedure was all wrong. You had the principal witness against Mr. Boyce, being the Speaker of the House. You had not the mocking comments about me but the mocking comments about the proceedings that whatever you do and whatever you say do not matter because whenever you are finished he is gone. Now can that be justice when you make up your mind long before hand and you are going through procedures just for the sake of a "pappy show"? That is what I talk about when I talk about a "kangaroo court" when they mock the very proceedings. That is what I am talking about. I was present and I saw what was going on. The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union was present and he saw what was going on and the Deputy General Secretary.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: You know as well as I do. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West knows as well as I do that proceedings can be faulted on the grounds of faulty procedures and that in many cases you do not even reach the substance of a case. That is what natural justice is all about. The procedures were all wrong. 4.10p.m.

The substance of the issue cannot matter when the procedures are so faulty as to be defective, and they go to the root of the whole proceedings. You cannot even begin to address the substance. That is what the complaint is all about.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West is obviously in a little mischievous mood. He realises that he does not have a case to stand on, so he is trying to divert me into dealing with the substance of an issue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not admitting at all that I do not have any leg to stand on. The Honourable Member is arguing a procedural point and I was asking him whether the substantive charges were dealt with.

Hon. M. A. KING: That is precisely the point I am making, Mr. Chairman. I am dealing with procedural issues and the Honourable Member wishes to divert me from dealing with procedural issues, because he realises that that is the area on which I am strong, and he wants to turn me to the substantive issues. Even on the substantive issues, Mr. Speaker, the case probably could not stand, but those issues were not addressed. I am saying that on procedure alone the proceedings were faulty and the whole proceedings should thereby be vitiated. That is the only point I wish to make.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The other foolish point made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter about people in Silver Hill mocking me, I do not know where he is getting his information from.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Precisely! If he is getting his information from one Harry Russell, it just shows you the quality of the information which he is....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just let me say that I think we have given a lot of scope in so far as procedure is concerned and that we are now on the quantum in clause 2.1 would like us to get closer to that

Hon. M. A. KING: Except, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member should probably have been stopped when he got into his nonsense about Silver Hill, because that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Except that we have to stop it at some point

Hon. M. A. KING: Yes, but not at the point, Mr. Chairman, where he says something that affects me and I am about to respond to him. After all, it is my constituency.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order, please?

Hon. M. A. KING: I should have a right to respond to his nonsense, especially when it is irresponsible, when it is misleading and when it is totally untrue. The results of the election will categorically show what the truth is.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, on the question of quantum in clause 2, there are three parts to clause 2.1 have not worked out the arithmetic, I do not know if all of it has been worked out as yet, but I make it that 2(b) should be \$4809.96 by 37 and clause 2(c) should be \$7809.27 by 37.1 do not want to do the long multiplication, but I want to know exactly whether these sums of money are subject to taxation, because I am mindful of an Act which was passed, 1986-25, which excludes severance payments from taxation, and also I am mindful of a Supreme Court decision last Wednesday which extended the principle in the 1986-25 Income Tax Act to damages for wrongful dismissal.

You see, Sir, sometimes these matters are not very clear, because at times we could be ignorant - sometimes abysmally ignorant - we could be stupid, we could be foolish, we could be lacking in understanding the fundamental issues in the matter, and in an attempt we could be wicked and sometimes even bare-faced liars. It

would have been very helpful to me if the Member for St. Michael North had got up just now and addressed himself to some of these issues, about the quantum contained in clause 2 and whether or not taxes would be deducted from the amounts of money. I am not so clear on that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. It is the Barbados Labour Party that taxed severance pay. The Democratic Labour Party very early determined again, as it had done when it was in office before, that pensions are not taxable. It was the wicked Barbados Labour Party that taxed pensions.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I do not know if it was the wicked Barbados Labour Party or what, but the Member for St. Michael North would have better spent his time just now, rather than trying to attack me, on things that I said in here just now. I just want to set the record straight. I rose on a fundamental point attaching to clause 2, a proper point that can be made in Committee, Sir - all the speeches that went before cannot be made in Committee, and I am not questioning you, Sir - but his time would have been better spent dealing with the issues contained in this and not trying to attack me on irrelevancies, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I did not even want to mention what happened to me after I left the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That would not be in respect of clause 2.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The quantum, Sir. He said that I got a lot of money, quantum.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I have some order, please?

Mr. R. P. BYER: I did not even want to speak about the victimisation that attended me, Sir, because immediately after I left the Democratic Labour Party I was given a notice terminating my appointment as Chairman of the National Insurance Appeals Tribunal, which has to do with my leaving the Democratic Labour Party. That is my opinion. It was a public service I was doing, Sir, it had nothing to do with Neville Smith and the Minister who called him in with him to sit down and dismiss him. He is now working at the Transport Board. I would like the Minister to deal with that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I do not understand what kind of logic this is we just heard from the distinguished Denutv

Leader of the NDP. I do not understand how the Deputy Leader of the NDP could be so esoteric in his approach. 4.20 p.m.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the Honourable Member said we victimised somebody, chased them away from somewhere and hired them somewhere else.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: He belongs to you. He belongs to us. Oh, he is an independent. Well, Sir, one of the independents on the front bench harried them again. Now you can't be talking victimisation. When you are talking victimisation you have to go to the Barbados Labour Party where there was real victimisation. When they victimised them they stayed victimised. You can't talk about the Honourable Member for St. Michael South - St. James South - called him in and dismissed him and then the next two weeks another member from the same front bench called him in and you use that as evidence of victimisation. I think that is misplaced. I was responding Sir, as I am entitled to respond if points have been made and go into the record.

.....

The final point which he made, Sir, was that something happened to him as he was Chairman of some Board and he was removed. I think, Sir, that even he would agree that philosophically the Chairman of a Board representing the policy of a Minister would have to be capable of carrying out his policy as articulated by the Government of the day. If the Member identifies himself in such terms and states that he is unable as did that Honourable Member to carry out the policy of the Government it stands to reason that in the same way he relinquished the position which Your Honour has gracefully shown him how to adorn in a way that is acceptable to all sides, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. p. M. TAITT: Precisely. He was his best friend and he is now showing him, but at least he would have had the grace to and it was assumed, so he can't call that victimisation. Surely that is not the classic victimisation of which we speak from time to time. I think that the record should be made clear that he was happy to leave the onerous responsibility once he had given up his theory at that time of representation and accommodation. Now that he has given it some thought and realises that his point of view is no different from the point of view he has always held, I think Sir, that he will recognise that that is not victimisation. That is the only point I want to make, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and the title read and agreed to.

Order No. 1 was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given the Or.x called.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have risen on a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no matter of privilege after I have called for the Order to be done.

ORDER NO. 1 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR FINANCE RE SUGAR INDUSTRY BONDS

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker I wish to draw to your attention the very important conventions which I am informed is the practice of parliamentary democracy and which have applied to this Parliament at all times in the past. I have researched this matter in some detail. That principle is, Sir, that whenever there is a no confidence motion before the House subject to the exigencies of Government's business that motion is proceeded with and that the convention is that it should be disposed of as soon as possible in the public interest.

Sir, I have sat down for some time through other sessions of this House. I have understood that Government had pressing business on the Order Paper for example a matter of a loan and so on. I have made no protest. I believe that the Government has cleared all its business that was on the Order Paper at a time when that motion was brought before this Honourable House. Today it has embarked on new business. I understood that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was not in the House and therefore I did not raise the matter earlier, but I believe, Sir, that in keeping with the traditions of Parliament that the privileges of this Honourable House are being breached. I go on further, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the Honourable Member...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir, let me establish my case.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of establishing. I have already told the Honourable Member that I had given the House the authority to deal with Order No. 1. I understood the Member to be rising on a privileged motion in respect to that Order No. 1. The matter that you are raising.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am rising on a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the matter on which you rise does not refer to this matter and my understanding from the ruling I gave last week was that the matter was discussed between yourself and the Leader of the House who gave the assurance as to what would be done in respect of that matter. The question of conventions which you are raising does not arise at this point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not finished what I am saying, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already made my ruling.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But how can you make a ruling before you hear me, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already made the ruling that you have not risen on a matter of privilege on the question before the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will not hear them on anything until they respect the conventions of this Honourable House. There is a Motion of No Confidence before the House. I have tried to rise on a matter of privilege, Sir. I have told you I have not completed my case that I am presenting to you as a matter of privilege and I demand the privilege of completing my case. I am demanding to be heard, Sir, on a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I allowed the Member to be heard.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not completed. You have interrupted me, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed you to be heard.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am asking you. You can rule afterwards but let me complete what I am saying.

What I am saying, Sir is that there are certain conventions. One of those conventions, Sir, is that behind the Speaker - the Leader of the House and the Leader of the opposition should decide and determine how that matter would be dealt with. We have tried and I was under the impression that that motion would be debated this afternoon. The convention resides in the fact as stated in

May's that the Leader of the Opposition is considered to be a fundamental part of Government and when he brings a No-Confidence Motion he must be treated as such and we cannot allow these conventions just to be swept under the carpet and I am not satisfied.

It is my feeling, Sir, that my privilege and therefore the privilege of all Members of this Opposition are being compromised and the matter should be dealt with not only as a matter of convention but in the public interest and the Government should not be heard until matters are disposed of from now on. We have been patient. We have allowed them to bring all their business. They have brought new business and we have sat and we have not complained. We have been extremely accommodating and extremely gentlemanly in this matter. We have tried very hard, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already made my ruling. I said I did not accept that as a privilege at the present moment in respect of the Order I gave. 4.30p.m.

Well, if you are nothing to do with the Order, I am in charge of the rules and procedure in this House. Therefore, when I give a ruling, I will allow Members to make their points. The point I am raising is that the Order was called. I gave the House the permission to proceed with that Order.

The Honourable Member said he rose on a point of privilege. I understood him to be rising on a point of privilege in respect of the particular Order. But then it is not a point of privilege because the House itself dictates how the business of the House must be done. Therefore, there is no Member, other than the Government, who determines Government Business. That business is directed to me as to how it is to be done. Order No. 1 was called and I called Order No. 1 as Government Business.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In defence of the liberties of this House and its conditions I will not hear them. I will not sit and hear them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has his right to make a point but I have made the ruling in respect of the officer who is presiding in this House.

Order No. 1.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution seeks Parliament's approval for the guarantee of a loan of \$10 million to go towards the Sugar Support Price Fund. This Price Fund was set up in 1982. Since then we have had a look and saw the need to inject funds into the Fund.

At June 30, 1988, the sinking fund, because of an injection of \$3 million which, formed a component of the

1986 Sugar Price Support package showed a surplus of \$2.7 million. By December 31, 1988, the position changed to a deficit of \$3.5 million because of the redemption of \$4 million of bonds. Improvement occurred at June 30, 1989 but the financing position of the fund thereby gradually worsened as it was projected to reach the cumulative deficit of \$5.4 million at June 30, 1990. As a result of that, a decision was made to market \$10 million in bonds including taxable and tax-free tranches.

Messrs. Colybrand Co. Services Ltd. was the firm retained by BSIL to handle the bond issue and has verified Central Bank's approval of return for the sale of the sugar industry bonds. The industry is therefore seeking the Government's guarantee and the concurrence of the Ministry that the \$10 million of bonds to be opened for subscription in 1991 should be the following series:-

Series "O"

- 9.875% taxable bonds redeemable at par 1997-2000

"P" -9.375% " " 1996-1997

"Q" - 6.75% tax-free 1994-1995.

The directors have given the undertaking to allocate not less than \$2 million in each of the above series. As a matter of interest to this House, this bond issue by BSIL and the Government's guarantee is the sixth in the series which began in 1982. A total of \$73.7 million of sugar industry bonds have been guaranteed by Government to date mainly for the purposes of sugar support.

I move that this Resolution do now pass. I am prepared to answer any question asked after we have gone through it.

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

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on February 9, 1988 the Government came to the House to seek permission for \$21 million price support for the sugar industry. The matter that this House is being called upon to deal with this afternoon could have been adequately handled on that occasion if the Government was not so flippant and if the Minister of Finance himself who likes to dither on matters like these was prepared to take some guidance.

Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Agriculture has been, in my view, very woeful in his presentation of this matter, let me give the House a background to what is happening here. Since 1982 the Government of Barbados has been guaranteeing bonds raised by the sugar industry on the understanding that the sugar industry would set up a sinking fund into which it would commit the proceeds of price increases which were to be granted from the sugar industry from time to time.

The policy was that the Government itself was not giving the sugar industry money. The Government was guaranteeing monies raised on the market by the sugar industry on the understanding that the sugar industry would establish a sinking fund into which it would commit monies to redeem the bonds. The interest of this House surely has to be in the adequacy of the sinking fund since to the extent that we guarantee the sugar industry bonds, they will only become a real liability to the taxpayers if the sinking funds to redeem them were inadequate for the purpose.

The debate of February 8, 1988 concerned itself with the question of the sinking fund at that time. Prior to 1988 the sinking fund to redeem bonds issued by the sugar industry were adequate. In the 1988 round of price support the Government brought to the House a price support of \$21 million, \$3 million of which was to be put to the sinking fund to redeem bonds that had been issued previously.

I brought to the Government's attention that obviously there was a fundamental problem with the adequacy of the sinking fund since we had to be including in a price support of \$21 million, \$3 million to put to the sinking fund. 4.40 p.m.

It was clear then that the sinking fund could not redeem the bonds that had been issued before, far less to redeem the \$21 million that the House was being called upon to approve. The Government laughed off the issue.

I remember the Minister of Finance arguing that if it were the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to allow the increases in the price of sugar merely to repay the debt of the sugar industry that he and his Party were not part of that policy and, that in due course, he and his Minister of Agriculture were going to find some new way of putting funds into the sinking fund to redeem these bonds.

The point I want to make is this, that this evening this House is being called upon again to guarantee a loan, by the sugar industry, not to go out as a price support to farmers - let the House understand that - but it is being called upon, Sir, to guarantee a loan to be put into the sinking fund to redeem past loans. The question therefore arises, Mr. Speaker: "What arrangements are we also now going to make to ensure that the sinking fund that has been inadequate in the past will be adequate in the future to repay this loan that we are now also guaranteeing?" That is the point that I tried to raise in February 1988, when I was making the point to the Government that the sinking fund is there to protect the taxpayers from having not just to be contingent guarantors of the bonds but to be the people who actually have to repay them. Every time we guarantee bonds to the sugar industry, this House has a responsibility to ensure that the sugar industry takes the

necessary steps to create a sinking fund to redeem the bonds when they fall due.

In 1988 the Minister of Finance laughed at my proposal that the House had a responsibility, if it were guaranteeing \$21 million in bonds to be issued by the sugar industry to tell us how it was going to repay those bonds when it fell due for redemption. This evening, Sir, we are getting the answer, that having refused then, you are now coming to this House to ask the House to approve an additional \$10 million to redeem what you guaranteed in 1988.

The question I am raising now is this: You are raising an additional \$10 million to put into the sinking fund to repay past bonds. What provision are you making to redeem this loan you are guaranteeing when it falls due, some time in the future? Does the Government of Barbados have a policy to protect the adequacy of the sinking fund through the sugar industry to prevent the debt of the sugar industry falling, as they were not intended, squarely on the shoulders of the taxpayers of Barbados? That is the issue.

There is no point the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture running from the issue. He runs from too many things. In the 1989 Budget he promised that he would have shortly brought down a land development duty that has not yet been brought down, to collect funds from persons who occupy lands along the highway. He promised then, in the 1989 Budget - because your Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance has been talking about tax reform - he made the point in 1989 that the tax system was ripe for review. Two years ago. Nothing has been done about it. In the 1989 Budget, we were told that there was need for an international advisory committee to make fundamental changes in the offshore sector. Nothing has been done. And in 1988, when this matter was brought to the Government's attention, the Prime Minister, in winding up, was very scathing in his comments making the point that we are now going to find another method of dealing with the problem of the sinking fund, in a way that was foreign to the approach that the Barbados Labour Party had used for the purpose.

I am saying that no way yet has been found and that what the Government is doing now is guaranteeing the loans of the sugar industry to pay back former loans and, that some day, the piper has to be paid. Who now is going to repay this loan? The House has, at some time in the future, to come here again and guarantee another loan to repay this loan which was used to repay another loan. When will the cycle stop? The cycle can only stop when there is a decision taken to commit resources, of some kind, to help repay the sinking fund.

If the Government is not happy with the use of domestic increases in the price of sugar every two years, very modest increases, that was the policy.... Small

increases in the price of sugar were used and the proceeds of those small increases were used as the means by which the sugar industry paid back the debt. There is no mystery about it. But it had to be paid back from some source if the industry is not earning the foreign exchange to pay back, Sir. Then the debt has to be redeemed, in some fashion, otherwise there would be a claim on the resources of the taxpayers.

The Government made light of the issue in 1988 and refused to deal with the issue then. We are now back to the House again to have to replenish the sinking fund which even then was inadequate. We are not hearing a word from the Government about how this overall situation will be managed.

I think that it is, in fact irresponsible for the House this evening to want to guarantee a loan to replenish the sinking fund without, in itself, creating a sinking fund to repay the loan that you are now guaranteeing. It would be irresponsible for us in leading this House, not being in a position to say that when we are guaranteeing this loan of \$10 million to be repaid by the sugar industry, somewhere in the future, there is not some fund being created, by the sugar industry, to repay that loan rather than have it repaid by the taxpayers of Barbados who ought not to be the persons to repay it directly. That is the point I am making.. You ran from the issue in 1988. But the Government cannot be allowed to run from the issue this afternoon.

I want therefore to hear the Minister of Agriculture speak in a more forthcoming manner, Sir, about the totality of the financial situation facing the loans, as regards the loans guaranteed, by the Government, for the sugar industry. I want to hear the whole situation.

This \$10 million, Mr. Speaker, is not going to go out to a farmer. It is not going to benefit a grower, nor an agricultural worker. It is not going to benefit any of the people who depend upon agriculture for their livelihood. It is just simply to repay former debt. Therefore, it becomes important that if we are going to be guaranteeing \$10 million that is not going to benefit an entity, at all, presently engaged in agriculture, we need to know the extent of the problem facing the Barbados sugar industry.

I want to say this, Sir. The time has come when a broader approach has to be made, in relation to the guaranteeing of loans to the sugar industry. I believe, and the Barbados Labour Party is committed to the policy that, in future, price supports to the sugar industry should not only be price supports for capital but they should include, within them, an amount that will allow the sugar industry to be able to employ people, rather than the 2-day or 3-day basis that has been the case of late, that it should be in a position....

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ... I am going to talk about that shortly too ... that we have to include in the price support what I would call a wages fund, as well, that will allow the sugar industry to maintain more stable employment for the workers of rural Barbados,

There are some estates, in my constituency, on which the workers have not worked in the course of the last 2 weeks. That is a fact. Those persons engaged in agriculture in St. Peter are facing a bleak Christmas precisely because of the inability of the agricultural sector to employ them.

I am saying that if we are going to have price supports, in the future, to stabilize Barbados' agriculture, it must not only be a price support system to stabilize the earnings of owners of capital, it must also be a price support system that is broad enough and generous enough to stabilize the employment and the incomes of rural people. We are sadly missing that situation in Barbados, Sir. I am not accusing the Democratic Labour Party of having created a two-day week, but it is a reality, in Barbados, that is bearing very adversely upon the welfare of people in rural societies.

I think that we have an opportunity, through the instrumentality of price support mechanisms, to redress that situation which I think is a very distressing situation for the rural people.

I am not saying that the Democratic Labour Party invented a two or three-day week. I am not saying that. But I am saying that it is a reality that has to be dealt with and it is a very serious reality; and that if we are going to give price support, Sir, let us also support employment stabilization in Barbados' agriculture. I am prepared to support future price supports that would allow the sugar industry to be able to give people a better deal. The fact that there is now a shorter crop season because of a smaller tonnage means that there is a longer hard time. It is bearing very, very distressingly on people in my constituency, on whose behalf I speak this afternoon.

If I may sound the thrust of my argument, I am saying that, in my view, the Government is now trying to deal with a problem that was brought to its attention in 1988 that it could have dealt with in 1988, if it had a policy, as regards how it would keep the sinking fund for the sugar industry in cash. It had no policy then, Sir. I am satisfied it has no policy now. Because it is not now saying, Mr. Speaker, how it is going to provide the industry with funds to redeem what we are now guaranteeing. 4.50 p.m.

I want to hear the Government therefore speak specifically on the state of those sinking funds and the policies that it will want to institute to ensure that what did

not happen before 1985 becomes a pattern of financial behaviour in this country. I also welcome the Government's position on the whole question of price support and in particular, Sir, would want to urge and commend to the House that we must embark upon a policy of price support that is sufficiently enlightened and sensitive as to capture the needs not only of the owners of capital in this country, Sir, but more particularly to the workers in the sugar industry who are now in my view carrying an excessively heavy burden. I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I listened to the contribution of the Honourable Member for St. Peter but it is a matter of choice. The Barbados Labour Party's approach to the Sinking Fund was that the Sinking Fund was topped-up as a result of any increase of domestic sugar over the 1982 price. So every year you increase the price of domestic sugar to suit the requirements of the Sinking Fund.

The Democratic Labour Party's approach was this and we had to look at it. What are you doing when you increase the price of domestic sugar? You are passing on the Sinking Fund to the same taxpayers you are quarrelling about. Who are the taxpayers? The users of domestic sugar and the Sinking Fund is made up from the increase of domestic sales and not overseas sales. When you take the importance of sugar as a multiplier in the economy in the use of all pastries, soft drinks, *et cetera*, we were of the view as a Government that the continuing increase in the domestic price of sugar would cost an increase in the cost of living because it will have a multiplier. Government has to be careful. Look, it is one pot. You either allow the consumers who are the same taxpayers to pay for it by an increase directly which would multiply itself through the economy by way of soft drinks, sweet breads, cakes, sugarcakes, *et cetera*, or you to take and put a direct injection from the Consolidated Fund into the Sinking Fund.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: No, we are not every year. We are of the view that we have to examine the domestic cost of sugar. When we are of the view that the price is reaching the stage where it could create a hardship, we would do it by injection. We are always examining the two whether or not to increase the price of sugar or have a partial increase in sugar and a partial direct injection. So we examined it and we were of the view that we should not allow the domestic price of sugar to go any higher at this particular time because we wanted to make sure that the cost of living index does not spiral too much. You know how it is. You increase the price of domestic sugar by a penny and the people making sweet bread increase it by four cents. People making soft drinks increase the drinks by three cents and when you multiply it that goes right into the economy. As a result, you have more an adverse effect on

the overall taxpayers than if you take it directly out of the Consolidated Fund. That is how we have been doing it.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Is the Minister of Agriculture saying that it is the policy of the Democratic Labour Party to take monies out of the Consolidated Fund now or in the future to repay the bonds that the Government has guaranteed? I still am not clear, Sir, as to what Government's policy is, or is it Government's policy to allow the industry every time a bond falls at redemption for Government to guarantee another loan to repay a loan? That is the question I am asking now, Sir.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The Government at the moment has a mix. In other words, are you suggesting that we allow the price of sugar to increase every year?

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, we are of the view that we have to examine the situation on a yearly basis and we reserve the right as to whether or not we will allow a small increase in sugar or a direct injection or full injection, and as we go along we leave our policy options open. At this particular stage we decided to deal with it by a direct injection into the Sinking Fund.

As a matter of general information, we are seeing that the sugar industry is beginning to take some of the recommendations of the Landen Mill Report and putting them on board. They are rationalizing this year, for the first time, the transport system. They will be removing the forty trucks on the road and replacing them by four trailers. They are looking at rationalization of the harvesting systems and overall they are trying to increase the efficiency of the industry to enable the industry to be more viable.

As a result as I said, our option will remain open how we are going to deal with the Sinking Fund and the bonds to redeem the Sinking Fund with either a mixture of increasing the domestic price and small increased injections or direct injections. We have not decided as a policy which of the two options we will renew. On every two year cycle we will have a look at it. The last time when we looked at it we decided that the price was getting too high and, therefore, as a policy option we decided to do a direct injection into the thing. We are still of the view that now is not the time to raise domestic price of sugar any longer. With this injection of \$10 million the Sinking Fund is good I am told up to about July 1991 and we will continue to examine the options.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

MATTER RE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before I call the next Order, I think it is important that I should recount for the benefit of Members generally, Sir, based on the undertaking I gave to this House, the discussion that I had with the Leader of the Opposition as regards his particular Motion.

Sir, I called the Leader in his office on Saturday morning and I told him that we were going to set aside Friday. Sir, this House was adjourned for today. But I told him that we were going to set aside Friday for doing his Motion but that we would start it today if we could but Government Business would have to take priority. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition laughingly agreed with me. He said that was okay with him. About 4 o'clock this afternoon, Sir, as he was walking out and I was standing in the back of the Chamber I again told him that the Government Business must take priority. His words to me were, "I do not want to start this evening when no Reporters are there".

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, that is what I am saying, "When no Reporters are there", not, "When no Reporters are not there." He does not want to start when no reporters are there but if it came to that he would do it on Friday morning. I was the most amazed person, Sir, following all of that that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should speak as he did, which was after what took place about 4 o'clock, Sir. I was surprised, Sir. I really was because we had agreed that, okay, we would do it on Friday morning first thing.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: No, it was not after lunch. Let me repeat. I spoke to the Honourable Member on Saturday morning and I told him that we were setting aside Friday to do it but that if we were able to do it on Tuesday depending on Government Business which must take priority, we would start it on Tuesday. I spoke to him again about 4 o'clock this afternoon, Sir, when a Permanent Secretary was out there and I told him, Sir. He said that he was not prepared to do it today if there were no Reporters in place and that he would do it on Friday morning. Subsequent to all of that, Sir, we hear about this matter of privilege. We had agreed. That is the whole point. We had agreed, Sir. It is not like we had not agreed. We agreed. That is all I am saying, Sir.

I am now calling Order No. 4, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 4. *Aside.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I noticed that the Honourable Member is asking that Order No. 4 be called. I wish to point out, Sir, that the Sexual Offences Bill and the Domestic Violence (Protection Orders) Bill were given to me yesterday about lunch time. I would expect they are Bills to make very significant changes in the law and I believe that if Honourable Members are to make constructive criticism and contribution to a debate that we should be given at least 24 hours if not more in order to study the Bills and look at the necessary precedent. 5.00 p.m.

I do not believe that it is fair to the constituents whom we represent that we should be asked here to come in and debate Bills of this nature without adequate and proper notice. I speak as a lawyer, Sir, with some years' experience and I feel there are other Members in the House who are not lawyers but who would also wish an opportunity obviously to study these Bills properly. I am going to urge on the House, the Leader of the House and the Minister with responsibility to take into consideration that point.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Sir, I have taken account of what the Honourable Member for Christ Church West has said. Although I understand that some matters went out over the weekend, but when you receive it is a different matter. However, Sir, what I am prepared to do is to let it be introduced and then I will move that further consideration be postponed so that we can do it probably on Friday.

ORDER NO. 4 - THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (PROTECTION ORDERS) BILL, 1990

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the Domestic Violence (Protection Orders) Bill which is now before this Honourable House has been prepared apparently in response to the concerns expressed by the then Minister responsible for Women's Affairs, who was the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, along with the Bureau of Women's Affairs on the subject of domestic violence against women and children.

They raised considerable concerns about what they perceive to be violence against women and children in the society, and as a result I directed a Committee to be formed comprising the Chief Parliamentary Counsel, one of the Senior Parliamentary Counsel, the Director of the Bureau of Women's Affairs and an Administrative Officer of the Bureau to discuss all the issues relating to the law on violence against women and children that arose out of the seminar and to make recommendations for the reform of the law. So that what we have before us is largely a result of the recommendations made by that Committee for the reform of the law.

The Domestic Violence (Protection Orders) Bill recognises the importance of the family unit as the natural and fundamental group unit of society. The rationale behind this Bill is that if violence is to be effectively controlled throughout the length and breadth of our society, we have to start at the core of our society and try to control things within the family. We are aware that psychologists who analyse issues of violence and deviant behaviour in persons as adults have come to the conclusion that the genesis of violent and deviant behaviour in persons can result from family backgrounds and environments.

What this Bill seeks to do, Mr. Speaker, is to provide the appropriate legislative framework for protecting the victims of domestic violence. What we hope to achieve in the process is that the Bill itself and the consequences that follow from it will provide a catalyst for changing the public and private attitudes which have not discouraged violence in the home and that ultimately the result will be an end to violence in all the homes throughout the length and breadth of our land.

One of the significant features about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides for the Police Force, a statutory authority, to enable them to go to scenes of domestic violence and to deal effectively with complaints of such violence. We hear time and time again of situations where violence occurs in homes and where for one reason or another the police decline to enter and it is usually heard that it is a family dispute and therefore the police do not want to get involved in that, perhaps sometimes for good reason, but what this does is to provide the legislative basis for them to be able to intervene and to deal effectively with all complaints of domestic violence which are reported to them.

Another feature about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a neutral gender Bill and it seeks to protect all victims of violence, irrespective of whether those victims are male or female. Once violence occurs in the home and a man or woman or child is a victim of that violence, then that person, irrespective of age or sex, is protected by the provisions of the Bill. Another significant feature about the Bill is that it is not limited to the marriage situation, but it covers informal unions as well and goes beyond the provision of the Family Law Act which relates to unions of five or more years and it may cover unions less than five years once there is a union where people are living together in a unit as a family. Where people live in that kind of environment then the provisions of this Bill will apply. 5.10p.m.

The conduct against which this Domestic Violence Bill is aimed is conduct which constitutes criminal offences under the Offences Against the Person Act, against a spouse, a former spouse or a child of the person complaining. It is aimed at conduct which is an offence

under the Offences against the Person Act and we also hope to introduce shortly a Sexual Offences Bill as well and it will be directed at the conduct also which is an offence under that Bill. Under the present state of the law, sexual offences are governed by the Offences against the Person Act. Apart from criminal offences which are direct proscribed in law by statutes it is also aimed at conduct by a spouse which may reasonably be regarded as harassment of the other spouse, of a former spouse or of a child. Now harassment is particularly defined in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, as to include intimidation of a person by persistent verbal abuse, by threats of physical violence, by malicious damage of the property of a person or by any other means. It may also include the persistent following of a person from place to place, the hiding of any clothes or other property owned by or used by a person or the depriving of a person of the use of or the hindering of a person in the use thereof or the watching or the setting of the house or other place where a person resides, works or carries on business or happens to be or the approach to the house or other place, so that those types of behaviour and actions which I have just described will constitute harassment in respect of which the provisions of the Bill will apply. So, that if a spouse is found by the Court to be guilty of harassing another spouse then the spouse or child who is harassed can apply to the Court for a protection order and if certain conditions are satisfied, the Court may make a protection order.

The effects of a protection order once it is made by the Court is that the person against whom the protection order is made may be restrained from doing a number of things. That person may be restrained from being, for instance on the premises where the person who was complaining lives or works or from being at the school where the child is being educated. It may prevent the person restrained from being within a specified distance of a child who is the subject of the complaint. In certain circumstances the offender may be asked to leave the premises, if he is living there, and in other cases as well the offender can be restrained from depriving the innocent party to the proceedings of the use of property or of damaging property of the complainant or of the child who is affected by the complaint.

So that those are specific orders which the Court is empowered to make once a protection order is applied for and the Court is satisfied that a protection order should be made. Now, a useful and significant feature about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, once it becomes law is that it requires that wherever a protection order is made that order shall provide in every single case that the parties attend the Family Services Division of the Welfare Department or such other agency as the Court specifies for the appropriate professional counselling and therapy. It seeks to involve the Social Welfare agencies in all matters of domestic violence and seeks the cooperation, participation and assistance at this early stage so that at all times the best possible

assistance and help can be provided for the parties who seek the Court's assistance in matters of domestic violence.

Now, clearly, Mr. Speaker, where a person who is subject to an order of the Court commits an offence under the statute and is liable if he is convicted of the offence of breaching the protection order he is liable to a fine of \$5,000 or to imprisonment for a period of twelve months or to both fine and imprisonment.

Another feature about the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides for a power of arrest in certain circumstances to be attached to a protection order. Before that power of arrest can be attached to a protection order it must have been specifically applied for by the complainant. Not only must it be applied for but notice that a power of arrest has been applied for in the protection order must always be given to the party against whom the power of arrest is to be directed. Once a power of arrest is attached to a protection order a police officer may thereafter without warrant arrest any person who breaches that protection order, because the power of arrest had been attached to the protection order, he was aware of it, because one of the conditions of the attachment of the power of arrest is that the person against whom it was directed must have been given notice that the power of arrest is being sought. So, he would have had all prior opportunity to appear before the Court and to make any representations that he cared to make in relation to the use of the power of arrest. So, that is an extension of police power in this regard to give them some clout in dealing with the problem of domestic violence.

Another extension of police power relates, Mr. Speaker, to the power given to police to enter private premises to protect victims of violence and they may do so in this situation on the invitation of a person apparently resident there or where they reasonably suspect that a person has suffered physical injury or is in danger of suffering physical injury. So that in those circumstances a police officer may without warrant again enter into premises in order to deal with the problem of violence in the home. That power is indicated at Clause 14 of the Bill. 5.20p.m.

The other point I want to make about this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that a protection order, once it is made under this Act can remain in force for a maximum period of 12 months only. The orders made under this Bill are not orders that can last *ad infinitum*. They have an outward limit of 12 months. After 12 months they cease to have effect but during that period they may, except in certain circumstances, be varied or revoked during that 12-month period. The situations where they may be varied or revoked are set out at section 18(1) of the Act.

Another important point to make before I close this presentation, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bill provides that spouses to proceedings are compellable witnesses.

Previously the law provided that they were competent to give evidence but may not be compelled to do so. This Bill provides that spouses will now be compellable as witnesses. This is a trend which is growing a lot today in relation to family law matters because the experience in a number of cases, particularly in family cases generally, and in cases of domestic violence in particular, is that the successful prosecution of offenders is often frustrated and has to be abandoned where a spouse refuses to give evidence that is critical to the successful prosecution of the case against the offender.

This provision in the Bill for making the spouse a compellable witness seeks to address that problem. If the essence of the problem is dealing with problems of violence in the home and the protection of the victims of violence to children it is important that all evidence which can reasonably be brought before the courts be brought before the courts and that the matter be addressed as fully as possible.

Perhaps, a point to make at this stage is to note that although the Bill provides that persons might be excluded from premises where they live, the Bill does not have the effect of altering existing rights to ownership and property. One of the final clauses of the Bill expressly preserves the rights of ownership in relation to property. Nothing in this Bill should have the effect of affecting rights to ownership which either or any of the parties to domestic violence proceedings have under the legislation.

A final point I should make, Mr. Speaker, is that in determining whether a protection order should or should not be made, the court is required to take a number of things into account. Those matters set out in clause 7:

- (a) the need to ensure that persons are protected from violence and harassment;
- (b) where the members of the respondent's family include a child, the welfare of the child;
- (c) the need to preserve and protect the institution of marriage or a union other than marriage and to give protection and assistance to the family as a natural and fundamental group unit of the society;
- (d) the accommodation needs of the members of that family;
- (e) any hardship that will be caused to the respondent or to any other person as a result of the making of the order; and

- (f) any other matter that in the circumstances of the case, the Court considers relevant to be considered.

A lot of discretion is left with the court to look at all circumstances in considering protection orders and determine on the totality of the case whether in any particular circumstance it is just and appropriate to make a protection order and to determine what conditions should be attached to that order. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is an important bit of legislation to deal with the problems of domestic violence in the society.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time?.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

I also beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

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

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

ORDER NO. 8 - THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT (AMENDMENT AND VALIDATION) BILL, 1990

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill seeks to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act. As is known, Cap. 5, section 25 of the Administration and Audit Act of the Laws of Barbados sets the limit for borrowings at 10% of the estimated Government current revenue as provided by Resolution No. 17 of 1971. The Act itself makes provision that the sum should not exceed the amount set. That particular amount has been exceeded on a number of occasions. For example, Sir, in May and August 1981, in June and September 1982, in August and December 1984, in September 1988 and in January, February, October and November of 1990.

Sir, the legislation and the Resolution clearly indicate that the limit is set and state what that limit is. The limit has been from time to time observed more in the breach than in the actual following of the legislation. I would like to make that point clear, Sir. The limit has been breached on previous occasions to the extent that in the years which I have indicated, 1981, 1982, 1984, 1988 and 1989, we have been in breach of this.

Sir, we have had to validate previous breaches. I recall not so long ago when this House debated the question of the raising of the limit under the Local Loans Act I pointed out that also had been breached by the previous Barbados Labour Party Administration. We validated that particular breach which occurred at that time. We have a breach or

breaches now, Sir. This particular legislation is seeking to validate those breaches.

I suppose we will hear arguments that this Government has breached something. That is true. The main argument I wish to make is that there have been several breaches before. Also, Sir, Ministers of Finance have also operated at the very limit of the Ways and Means. 5.30 p.m.

I think, Sir, it should be recognized that we have to be very prudent in whatever we may do, from time to time. We have a situation in which previous Ministers of Finance have found it necessary, from time to time, in order to accommodate Government expenditure, to exceed the limits that have been provided.

No Minister of Finance - I think I can say this without any reservations - in this country would wish to breach that 10%. It is a fact that it has occurred.

What we are seeking to do is to validate those particular actions because I believe we should operate within the framework of the rule of law. I know of no other way of bringing this within the framework of the rule of law, without passing validating legislation.

It has been urged, Sir, that we should ignore this, that we should ignore the breach, just go on as though nothing has happened.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am telling you I have heard those arguments advanced. I have not heard Not over there. I am very glad this particular measure will get the support, maybe, in rectifying and validating the breaches that have occurred. I am dealing with the 1980s, throughout the decade of the 1980s.

But I should like to make it clear that we will seek, and it is our intention to seek to maintain the actual operations of the account within the 10% limit, as set by Parliament. This is the objective, that we will try to keep the ways to operate the account within that 10% limit.

We have said here 17½% in order to rectify the breaches that have occurred already. But prudent fiscal policy will seek to maintain the account at 10% and below.

But, as I said, if these actions have occurred, we cannot just leave it there and ignore it. I do not believe that that is the proper thing to do, just ignore the fact that the breaches have occurred. So we are seeking to rectify that particular position.

I believe all persons who approach this in a reasonable manner would see what we are seeking to do. It is a step

that is being taken in order to bring the operations of Government within the framework of law, where it should be, at all time. It is an attempt to point out, by indicating that we will seek to operate within the 10% limit which has traditionally been there from 1971, because we believe that prudent fiscal management should seek to keep the ways and means within a reasonable limit, Sir.

We are conscious of the problems that can arise, if fiscal indiscipline were to result or to manifest itself. But we have been very prudent, up to this particular time, given the circumstances, in managing the finances and, therefore, we will seek to operate within that 10% limit.

Sir, this is a short measure here. What this legislation will do is to substitute 17½% of the estimated current revenue instead of the 10% which is in the existing legislation. But as I have pointed out and I have repeated, we will seek to operate with the 10% limit below - the 10% limit - and to keep it within that regime, as far as possible.

The two reasons for this, Sir, are to validate what has happened - we are seeking to validate those breaches which have occurred at various time during the decade of the 1980s and also on stipulated occasions in 1990 - and also to indicate that we will seek to keep it, as far as possible, at the maximum of 10%. We are validating previous borrowings in excess of 10% of the estimated current revenue, as authorized by resolution of Parliament. The second purpose, as the Objects and Reasons state is to increase from 10% to 17½% of the estimated current revenue the amount which the Minister responsible for Finance may borrow, by means of temporary advances from a bank or banks to meet the requirements of Government for a current financial year.

Sir, it is really the Government's overdraft with the Central Bank. That is what, basically, the Ways and Means is about. I believe there may be Members in here who operate on overdraft. Anyone familiar with a business would know that they have to operate on overdraft.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You go over that limit. That happens, from time to time. It is to obviate...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Perhaps if you are a good customer, you would. That is it, Sir. That is the position, Sir. I wish again, and I cannot repeat it more often, that we will be seeking to operate within the limit of the 10 per cent even though we have done this Amendment in order to validate the excesses that have occurred throughout the 1980's and now, and we will certainly seek to have that. 5.40p.m.

Sir, I believe there has been circulated a new Objects and Reasons for the Bill. The Bill remains the same but instead of the Preamble there is a new Bill with the Objects and Reasons. I think all Members understand the reasons for this piece of legislation, Sir, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker, and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mn Speaker, it is my humble opinion that this is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation to come before this Honourable House and in the course of my address which shall last several hours this evening I shall demonstrate such detail that every Member of this House who recognizes his responsibility as a law maker and who recognizes that he has a duty to deal with law breakers as far as can be done at the legislative level that they should have no difficulties in beginning to understand the seriousness of this piece of legislation.

What has the Honourable Prime Minister told this House? He relies on and seeks justification, as far as I can see, in the fact that the Ways and Means has been exceeded on some occasions in the past, certainly not during the period when I was Minister of Finance, but on several occasions under himself as Minister of Finance. He recounted the years 1981 through 1983 when the Ways and Means was exceeded by the previous Barbados Labour Party Administration. I sincerely hope that the Barbados Labour Party members in this Honourable House would not catch at that bait but deal with the current issues. The reality is, Sir, that when the limit was exceeded in the early eighties the quantum of money involved was significantly less since Government's estimated revenue would have been some 50 per cent of what it is today on the one hand and, secondly, Sir, the impact of such actions on the Barbados economy would be significantly different because of the status of the Central Bank in terms of the fact that the Central Bank had liquid foreign assets at the time. However, that is absolutely no justification whatsoever for any breach of the law. I would also like to point out that breaches of the law in respect to a Ways and Means account may occur under different circumstances and which under the traditions of parliamentary practice different levels of Ministerial responsibility arise. Let me explain.

On a daily basis the management of Government's accounts is a matter between the Treasury and the Central Bank, the banker of the Government. What happens on a particular day depends very much on the in flows and out flows of cheques and other instruments. If there is any breach that arises out of the inadvertence of Public Officers, I do not think that can occasion the same kind of strictures at Ministerial level as where you have a deliberate instrument of policy of a Government breaking the law and now coming in here seeking to validate their unlawful activities. I say that for this reason, Sir. I distinctly recall on

the floor of the House in the 1980's raising that particular matter. The question has been asked why did I not bring a "no confidence motion" then. The answer is very simple. I was shadow Minister of Finance. I was not Leader of the Opposition and only the Leader of the Opposition under the traditions of this Parliament can bring a "no confidence motion" in a Minister of Finance who is also a Prime Minister. So that criticism is either a criticism of the then Leader of the Opposition or the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Michael. South and not for me. I believe in observing the traditions of this Honourable House and I have tried to do so and defend them with all my might. Indeed, Sir, if there is one responsibility that the Leader of the Opposition must never resile from is that of ensuring that the traditions of this House and the laws that it passes are observed in every detail. That is my commitment to this House and my commitment to this country, and of these things I feel very strongly. If you check in Mays, you will see the procedure in relation to a no confidence motion. So any criticisms should be directed at your Prime Minister, not at me.

So that, Sir, these things may arise as a matter of inadvertence and such a matter, Sir, would not either attract a motion of no confidence nor in fact would it necessarily attract a validating legislation for this reason. For most of the time, Sir, in the seventies and eighties the Government of Barbados maintained two accounts with the Central Bank of Barbados, a deposit account and an overdraft account. So at any given day once there was money in the deposit account then that discretion could be exercised by the Bank as to whether to transfer the money to the Ways and Means and so reduce it. Those things are not at the level of Ministerial responsibility and that is not what one is complaining about.

There is one other point I want to make about the 1981 through 1983 period and I want to be fair about mis. I was one of the most vocal critics of what was going on at the time, and that is a fact: but I will say this. The then Minister of Finance in this Honourable House indicated that he would do his best to get that overdraft down within the legal limit as rapidly as possible. By contrast repeated complaints have been made here on the floor of this House over the past weeks, also inside and outside, and it did not attract one comment from the Minister of Finance. One Minister over there in a *sotto voce* remark looked at us over here and said, "So what?" That is the kind of reckless cavalier attitude taken towards the laws of this country and that is what this complaint is all about.

He also cited, Sir, breaches of the Local Loans Act. My recollection is that when that validating legislation came before this Honourable House it was quite clear that the level at which that breach took place was not at Ministerial level. 5.50 p.m.

As you know, Sir, the Central Bank of Barbados is the designated agent for the management of Government loans, and if they put an issue out on the market and did not seek an amendment to the Act before that was done, again that is not the kind of thing you would want to bring a motion of no-confidence in a Minister for.

The third thing is this, Sir. It is usually recognised in parliamentary practice that there are qualitative differences in terms of the levels of ministerial responsibility. Just as in law you have the M'Naghten Rules, there are rules that apply in this matter of ministerial responsibility. Of that I am very clear. What we are dealing here with is something that is completely different. What is clear to me is that the Government intends to continue to perpetrate this kind of action, and I will tell you why, Sir. When the Minister comes in here and says that he is going to try to keep it under 10%, but fixes the law at 11¹/₂%, when it was 10% and you went nearly to 17¹/₂%, do you think now it is 11¹/₂% he is going to bring it back to 10%? You are looking more like 25% and we do not accept any such assurances from the Minister of Finance, because the financial condition of the country and the way he is managing the country can only lead us to believe that he will exhaust the 11¹/₂%, which is approximately \$175 million for this year so far, and go beyond that. I will explain to this Honourable House a whole lot of manoeuvrings that took place in Barbados in respect of this matter over the past ten days, which gives me every reason to believe that I can have no confidence or take no satisfaction whatsoever from the Prime Minister that he will bring this down to 10%.

i We all know that every single officer in the Ministry (of Finance has objected fundamentally to what is being I done here. We all know that the Director of Finance and Planning has clearly expressed and recorded his objection to what is being done here. We all know that the Director of Finance and Planning, when he was instructed to prepare the Cabinet Paper, left it with his juniors and left the country and his juniors had to prepare it and send it up through the Ministry, so bitter do people with a sense of responsibility feel about this kind of disgraceful manoeuvring that is taking place in respect of the laws of Barbados. These things should be recorded and the people of Barbados should know what is going on, because in due course I will set out all the details.

I heard the Honourable Prime Minister on a radio broadcast saying that I operated at the limit of the law. That is true. On one or two months. What he did not say was - and I will point this out later - that in the other account in the Central Bank, which the officers could debit at any time, at one stage I had up to \$179 million in deposits there, when I was allowed an overdraft of \$68 million. In other words, I could wipe the overdraft to zero the following morning and still have \$80 million left in the deposit account. But there was a reason for that, Sir. The reason for keeping that overdraft at the limit in those

circumstances was to make sure that when demands were made on me as the Minister of Finance I could tell them that we were up to the limit with our overdraft. That was the first thing. In other words, to impose fiscal discipline on the system on the one hand, and also to ensure a reasonable level of revenue to the Central Bank of Barbados. That was also an important consideration. They were the two considerations.

I did not keep it there just for the fun of keeping it there, but I will go through this month by month in due course and I will show you that in most instances I never borrowed a cent from the Central Bank, because the condition of the Central Bank was such that it would have been irresponsible for any Minister of Finance to rely on Central Bank financing of the order which is going on today. I was a net lender to the Central Bank for most of the period I was Minister of Finance, and for a good reason, in the public interest and to protect the financial integrity of the entire system.

This piece of legislation, Sir, is going to have widespread effects. The first error that is made, and I will urge the Attorney General to look at this - I have not had enough time to study the associated legislation - but it is quite wrong to put this kind of amendment in the body of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. The Financial Administration and Audit Act is what it says, an administrative Act. It is not an Act to deal with loans or anything like that. What it does is to set out the framework in which other legislation might be required in order to cover different areas of governmental activity, and by picking it out of the Resolution and sticking it here in the Financial Administration and Audit Act, several things are going to begin to happen.

First of all, all the safeguards and guarantees which were built into that Resolution automatically go by the Board. I will point them out one by one as I go along. Secondly, what is being done here is to create another significant debt instrument. You know we have the Special Loans Act and we have the External Loans Act that covers specific areas of debt. What is happening here now, there is no definition whatsoever contained in here as contained in the Resolution, so now you are creating the possibility of a hard core of Government debt by way of this amendment without paying any regard whatsoever to the constraints which were built into the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the Resolution. Resolution No. 17/1971 reads as follows:

"WHEREAS it is provided by section 23(1)...." Section 23(1), Sir, is now section 5, or section 25, whatever it is, as a result of previous amendments -

"....of the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1964 (1964-3) that Parliament may from time to time by Resolution authorise the Minister responsible for finance to borrow by means of temporary advances from a bank or banks money to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate the sum specified... in that behalf in the resolution to meet the current requirements of the Government: 6.00 p.m.

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable that the Minister responsible for finance should be authorised to borrow money from a bank or banks by means of temporary advances, money to meet the current requirement of the Government to an amount not exceeding 10% of the estimated current revenue of the Government for the financial year in which the advances were made:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the House of Assembly authorise the Minister responsible for finance to borrow in any financial year from any bank or banks, by means of temporary advances, money to meet the current requirements of the Government for that financial year to an amount not exceeding 10% of the estimated current revenue of the Government (as contained in the Estimates passed by the House of Assembly) for that financial year, and that the Senate be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

30th March 1971

Theodore Brancker
Speaker

Concurred in by the Senate on 30th March of 1971.

E. S. Robinson
President

I assent,
A. WINSTON SCOTT
Governor-General
31st March, 1971."

The point I am making, Sir, if you study the body of that Resolution carefully, is that there is always implicit and explicit a requirement that those borrowings be liquidated or be liquidatable within three months of the end of a financial year. In other words it has never been hard-core debt as distinct... In other words you have to define

somewhere within the legislation the fact that you are dealing with a situation where the level of borrowing not only relates to a percentage but also relates to the capacity of the Government to liquidate that debt.

Oh yes, the Honourable Attorney General does not understand the point. The point I am making is this. When you are dealing with an overdraft situation, you will see there is never a definition of overdraft anywhere whatsoever in form of Government debt. It is not part of the national debt. It is not considered hard-core debt and it is considered debt that should be liquidated within three months of the end of the financial year.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It's not in the Resolution, but I am just giving you the spirit of the Resolution which is not captured here. The spirit of this resolution is not captured in the amendment to this Bill. You have just plucked out one or two things here and substituted that 17¹/₂% but somewhere in the legislation there has got to be a period when that money can either be liquidated or be capable of being liquidated and that is a major constraint that is put in this area. Or if you wish, bring down another set of legislation to accommodate this borrowing outside of the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

If you look very carefully - yes, that three months' rule. I will continue my debate and I will show you later on where the assumption is that it should be brought under control within three months of the end of a financial year. I will bring other documentation later in my speech.

Now, Sir, when that resolution was passed before this Honourable House in 1971, it is interesting to see how far this lot have departed from the spirit and the sense of responsibility of the founder of the Democratic Labour Party. In 1971 when that resolution was introduced in this Honourable House by the late the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, and I read from Hansard, page 2984; in introducing the resolution, the first point he addressed in relation to the borrowings was that:

"the security which we have for this, is of course our securities in the United Kingdom which amount to maybe some £6 million, and we borrow against the Revenue Equalisation Fund and various other investments that we have, and similarly our surpluses, which we have, may be borrowed by other Governments."

In other words, when this was introduced in this Parliament, he not only brought in the capacity for Government to borrow 10% above estimated revenue but he indicated to the Parliament at the same time exactly how the borrowings would be secured. There is nothing whatsoever in this new and major departure for borrowing these

borrowings here that tell us in any way how will these borrowings be secured. Against what? Against a Central Bank that hasn't got a cent in liquid foreign exchange? Against what are you going to be borrowing it? What's the security? This is no longer a Financial Administration and Audit Act It's as if you have made it a Financial Model Administration Act That's what you have done by introducing that clause inside there. Not one word, Sir, about securities and later on I will go through the Central Bank Act, chapter by chapter and show that you are not only in violation of the laws but you are violating a whole series of laws that have been passed under the aegis of the Constitution of Barbados and the Financial Administration and Audit Act and other Acts. Section by section, we will go through tonight because this will not pass this Honourable House unless I fully carry out my duties as official spokesman for the party that I have the honour to lead and also, Sir, even more importantly in this instance as Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition and one that is committed to law.

Never, Sir, would I dream that I could see the day when there could be some question that any Member of this Honourable House would have any doubt as to his commitment to law and order. He goes on, Sir. It is amazing, Sir, that in 1971 on page 2985, he made the very same point, a point, Sir, which I will deal with in detail. He said:

"I do not like selling Government securities in order to meet short-term fluctuations in revenue. I think this is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs."

Who, Sir, has been selling off Government's securities on a day by day basis in the current revenue? Shortfalls and current revenue. The evidence, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: These are already documents of the House, I think, the Economic and Financial Statistics of November 1990.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you look, Sir, at the assets of the Central Bank of Barbados on the appropriate page and you look at Government's money market securities you will see, Sir, that they have dived from 59.1 million in March this year to 9.5 million dollars and that probably represents fixed deposits that they can't break. From 59 to 9.1 million dollars. The Government's foreign securities, that's what it is, sold off. Against what do you bring this legislation into Parliament? 6.10 p.m.

I daresay the only securities that have not been sold are those that you probably cannot break. If anyone had any doubt as to the extent to which the Honourable gentleman on the other side has strayed from those principles which inform the founder member of the party that they purport to represent, you can get no better example than this.

On page 2990 in the same debate Mr. Ernest Mottley observed as follows:-

"Let us hope that the Prime Minister will not find himself in the position that when the \$10 million are borrowed, all will not be liquidated at the end of the year because this Bill would have to be amended. I hope the Prime Minister has heard what I am saying. This Bill stands once and for all. It is not for this year alone."

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He meant "Resolution" but he said "Bill". What was the response, Sir, of the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow?

"Until the House changes it. The House can change it downwards or upwards by another Resolution but until the House changes it remains the maximum which the Minister is allowed to borrow."

He must be turning in his watery grave now.. That Minister has gone ahead and broken the law for several weeks and months. Having broken the law, he now comes in here to try to adjust the limit without indicating to this House at any time any of the kind of precautions or supporting situations within our financial system to justify what was done then. This debate is very instructive.

This was a debate in which another former Minister of Finance and former Prime Minister talked about the programme of electoral works. What is interesting is that you had a clash of two former Prime Ministers and Ministers of Finance in this debate. They all agreed on the sense of responsibility that should inform a Minister of Finance not only in the law but also as to the level of those short-term borrowings from the Central Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have set out, except for one point I promised the Attorney General I would clarify later, generally the kind of legal and moral assumptions in relation to what has taken place so far and the implications of this Bill. Now, Sir, what are the implications of this Bill in current terms? What does 17½% mean? Seventeen and a half per cent means that the Government's overdraft will now be legally \$175 million.

Over the weekend a notice of a Treasury Bill issue appeared in the Press for \$50 million. Some 8 days earlier, Sir, there was another Treasury Bill issue for some \$80 million plus. Now that \$80 million plus concerned the commercial banks. That is the normal roll over of Treasury Bills. What was the purpose behind that Treasury Bill issue? That Treasury Bill issue was designed to do one thing, to reduce the Ways and Means by \$50 million without in any way affecting the extent of indebtedness of

the Government to the Central Bank of Barbados. All that would happen is when you look under the column "Loans and Advances" in these Statistics, you will see Treasury Bills rising by \$50 million and the overdraft going down by \$50 million. Over and above that we now have this legislation. This means that as of today the Government can literally print \$225 million legally.

When the Central Bank is called upon to provide money for the Government it has to relate to their asset portfolio. Every cent that they lend the Government will be printed money because I am telling this House, I am saying again that the Central Bank's net foreign exchange available position is in the red, has been in the red for weeks now and it is quite clear even from the last statistics that were published, they have now reached a point where they cannot even do end of month adjustments. It shows that they are in the red now if you look at the foreign assets and foreign liabilities.

What does that mean, Sir, to Barbados? Let me tell you what that means to Barbados. It means that the Central Bank would have to go out there borrowing more and more foreign currency. Can it borrow? We know that the available lines are about \$112 to \$115 million and they have all been utilised long time ago. They could only drop them by a \$5 million here and a \$10 million there and back up again.

They cannot enter into any long-term borrowings. The longest they have had is about 3 to 5 years short amounts of money. What else can the Central Bank do? All it can do is just print the money as demanded by Government and nothing more. The appropriate policy position of this Government should be to try to build up the reserves of the Central Bank of Barbados and the reserves of the country. What they are doing is, they have destroyed the reserves of the Central Bank and going further now, they have destroyed the reserves of this country by creating this capacity to print more money. Every cent paid to public servants over the past month, for example, is printed money. When they go out there and spend that money they will be "spending that money on things imported into the country. What foreign exchange do you have to support it?

The very loan, the \$27 million that might have come into the economy a few days ago, will go through this economy like a dose of salts because he has printed more money than even that \$27 million can support. You had \$27 million in debt and still no foreign exchange, and come here to ask this House to agree to increasing the limit and to give us an assurance that he will keep it down to 10%? I do not know for whose consumption that would be. That would have to be the consumption for people who clearly do not understand in any way what is going on.

Sir, this is really a serious matter. What is being done here has the potential of ruining and destroying the

financial system of this country. There will be no recovery of Government's financial situation unless this kind of thing is corrected. It cannot be. Once upon a time in Barbados when you spoke of printing money you really talked about a Minister really introducing \$15 million, \$20 million in new money into the system or something like that. Now you are talking of over \$200 million. I think this is most disgraceful. I think that we will be viewed from now on as nothing better than one of the South American banana republics where you can break the law as you like and come in and pass laws again.

Some time ago, I think it was in Nicaragua or in one or more of the South American states arising out of their experience, out of this kind of thing, Ministers of Finance disobeying the law and doing whatever they like, they actually passed legislation fixing a limit and making it an indictable offence punishable by imprisonment for a Minister of Finance to conduct himself in this way. 6.20 p.m.

There are laws in states of South America that have that legislation arising out of the disastrous experiences they have had in the past which have ruined their currencies, which have put up inflation to 200%, 300%, 400% and have created hell with their financial system. This is one of the worst things that can happen to Barbados. I am not surprised to see that the public officers have put their foot down. They really had no choice. The Government stands alone in this matter.

There is no group in Barbados, and I am quite sure of that, that will offer them any kind of support in this kind of conduct because they all know for sure that what is going on here, can only lead to destruction of the Barbados financial system. This is one category of laws, Sir, which it would seem to me, Sir, that the Honourable Attorney-General may have focussed on. Clearly he did not do his homework and did not recognize that these things have to harmonize with other laws that relate to Central Bank lending.

When the limit at 10% was fixed, I think the amount, at the time, was something like \$10 million, 10% would be equivalent to \$10 million. That bore a very specific relationship to what it was felt that it would be prudent for Government to borrow from a bank or banks. The reason why that said "bank or banks" is this, that Government at the time was in a changeover from the use of the commercial banks, as their banker, to the Central Bank. That is why the initial resolution said bank or banks to cover its commitments or its outstandings to the commercial banks whilst, at the same time, to accommodate the new relationship with the Central Bank of Barbados. That 10% was roughly equivalent to what it was felt that it might be prudent for the Government to borrow. On that basis, Sir, a series of other laws, in this country, were entered into.

The interesting thing about this whole generation of laws - I have said this before - is that these things are direct derivatives of the Constitution of Barbados, all laws. But there is a kind of genealogy that goes through this financial administration law which is something that you cannot hurry and do overnight

The problem that the Attorney-General of Barbados had is this, the Central Bank having agreed to go with the \$50 million issue on Friday, little did they know that the Government was going to come to raise the limit as well. No wonder they are so upset and feel they have been double-crossed. Because what the Central Bank now has done is that they have been an accomplice in facilitating Government to print more and more money, by removing that \$50 million from the Ways and Means and the Government has now gone and increased the amount that they can borrow by \$75 million. I hope members understand how I arrived at the figure of \$225 million, \$50 million plus \$175 million.

Let us look and see what are the laws that are the first cousins. Very important. Sir, where:::, this is not a direct derivative - and much of financial legislation is not done and specified in that way - if you look at the Central Bank Act, Section 45, and I am going to show you how the law has been consistently breached and how the answer must not be to come inside here and raise the limit but to try to function within the law. If all the officers relating to the financial management of this country would exercise the laws and the powers available to them, under the laws, we would not have this kind of problem.

Section 45 (1) of the Central Bank Act reads as follows, and I shall go through them sequentially and then go back and make the points one by one, it says:

"The Bank may make temporary¹ advances, subject to repayment within three months"

Sir, the Honourable Attorney-General was wondering where the three months came from. That is why I tell you, you have to look at this legislation not in isolation. You cannot look at it in isolation because those things that come through the Financial Administration and Audit Act... What has happened now, Sir, is that the Central Bank is the only Bank that makes temporary advances to the Government So that you have a situation where - and this is what the law says:

"The Bank may make temporary advances, subject to repayment within three months following the end of the financial year in which they were granted, at such rates of interest, as it may determine -"

Is the Government capable of repaying \$175 million within 3 months of March 31?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, but you had deposits which are liquidated.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No. You would probably find that, within the Central Bank system that they actually liquidate it in one day and built it back up. They would have done the accounting devices in there.

The point I am making is that, within this legislation, the amount loaned to Government should be of an order that the Government can repay within 3 months of the end of the financial year. I am saying to you that if the Central Bank enters into any arrangement with the Government of Barbados where it is perfectly clear and unreasonable for them to be in a position to liquidate it, within 3 months, then they are breaking the law. Full stop! Section 45 (1).

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am sure you thought it would be an easy passage just to come in here and change... You thought it would be an easy passage. No, no. And there is a lot more to come too.

In other words, what I am saying is that this does not restore the legality to the financial system in the way in which it should. That is step one.

I continue Sir, Section 45 (1), Cap. 323C of the Laws of Barbados:

"The Bank may make temporary advances, subject to repayment within three months following the end of the financial year in which they were granted, at such rates and interest as it may determine -

- (a) to the Government;
- (b) with the approval of the Minister, to government institutions, agencies and statutory boards.

(2) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1), the Bank is expressly authorized to make advances to the Government, on such terms and conditions as may be agreed, in respect of subscriptions and other payments resulting from, or incidental to, the membership of Barbados in any internal bank or international monetary authority established under governmental auspices, the participation of Barbados in any account thereof, and any transactions and operations undertaken in connection therewith." 6.30p.m.

That is the full 45.

I move on, Sir, to Section 47 and Section 47 says this:

"The Bank shall be consulted by -

- (a) the Minister on the total amount of credit to be extended by the Bank to the Government during the Government's financial year."

That means, Sir, that the Central Bank if they agreed to lend the Government in excess of \$100, million they would have been in breach of the law and they could not enter into any agreement, composition, or otherwise with the Government which is not consistent with that particular section of the law.

So not only, Sir, has the Financial Administration Act been broken unlawfully, but another Act here has gone through the window because of the lawlessness of the Government of Barbados. I am ashamed to think that the Honourable Attorney General would give his approval to this kind of shifting around of the law without proper examination of what is involved. This Bill should be withdrawn and proper evaluation of the Laws of Barbados should be done and see how they relate to the other Laws of Barbados.

I am not a lawyer, Sir, nor have I had the opportunity to seek legal advice. I only got the Bill I think Thursday or Friday. It could not be Thursday because Cabinet met on Thursday. It would have to be Friday or Saturday. But instinctively, Sir, I knew that something was wrong. Then it continued, Sir, Section 47(b) reads:

"The Government, its institutions and agencies, and statutory boards at any time when either domestic or foreign credit operations are contemplated and in the event that, in the opinion of the Bank, such operations individually or collectively appear to be of a magnitude inappropriate to prevailing economic conditions, the Bank shall report to the Minister, drawing attention to the situation and recommending measures to remedy the situation."

It is not "will, may or otherwise". It says "shall". Has that been done? Has the Central Bank of Barbados taken that step under 47(b) of the Central Bank Act? I know, Sir, that they have been writing letters. I know they have been calling on the Minister to exercise some level of responsibility. I know they have been calling on him to reduce Government's expenditure in drawing to get the overdraft down. But these things have reached a proportion now where it is not a matter of a telephone call or sending a memo to the Ministry of Finance. The law prescribes the steps which the Central Bank of Barbados must take.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an insignificant matter. The Central Bank of Barbados under the Banking Act of this country, the Act that underpins all the legalities of banking

establishments in Barbados, and within the body of the Central Bank Act itself in some of the earlier clauses they have specific responsibilities under law. There is one thing, Sir, that a Central Bank cannot be seen to be doing is either breaking the law or failing to observe the law. Sir, they are the bankers to Government but they are the custodians of the integrity of the dollar in your pocket and the dollar which is not in my pocket at the moment. Sir, they are the people who protect the value of the properties of the people of Barbados who have worked for years to earn those properties and by their actions they can either contribute to the destruction of the financial system or they can put it back. These laws, Sir, which are very similar to laws in other countries have been so designed to give a group of professional people who are outside of the political process significant authority in order that they can use that legal authority to control a Minister who indulges in squandermania and destroying the resources of the country. That is what these laws are here for.

So that the Amendment that is being brought today, Sir, actually flies in the face of this, because there is no way that I could think anyone in the Central Bank could agree to allow the Government to borrow \$175 million. I am quite sure they have difficulty in lending the Government \$5 million as far as lending the \$175 million.

If I may continue, Sir, Section 48 and this, Sir, is where the powers of the Central Bank reside. I am showing you, Sir, how this particular bit of legislation can even frustrate existing legislation.

Section 48 says: "Whenever the total amount of credit being extended by the Bank", Central Bank that is, Sir, "to its institutions, agencies and statutory boards by advances under Section 45", which I adverted to earlier and quoted from, "the acquisition of evidences of indebtedness under Sections 32(b) and 46", which I did not quote from, "and the acceptance of securities as collateral under Section 32(c)", which I did not quote from, "(1)(D) threaten either -

- (a) to exceed the amount agreed under Section 47(a)."

Section 47(a), Sir, states you may recall, Sir

"The Bank shall be consulted by -

- (a) the Minister on the total amount of credit to be extended by the Bank to the Government during the Government's financial year."

It says here whenever it threatens to exceed the amount under Section 47(a). What is clear, Sir, since the Bank cannot enter into any agreement or composition with the Minister in breach of the law and since the law is absolutely clear on this, then we have another legal problem.

Secondly, Sir, I said, "(a) to exceed the amount agreed under Section 47(a) or (b) to endanger monetary stability."

Now there cannot be any doubt, Sir, unless the Bank had entered into an unlawful composition and agreement with the Minister of Finance under Section 47. Then the law has been breached in respect of 48(a) and there can be no doubt that this action endangers monetary stability judging from the positions taken by the Central Bank of Barbados. What does the law require the Central Bank to do? The law says, "The Bank shall submit a report to the Minister drawing attention to the situation, analysing the causes which have led thereto, and recommending measures which it deems necessary to forestall or otherwise remedy the situation." That is Section 48(b).

Now Sir, I will put my neck on the block. Even in the days of levitation and meditation, that no one in the Central Bank would have recommended to the Government that to increase its borrowings under the Ways and Means would be a solution to the threat of our monetary system.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said that I will put my neck on the block. Even in these days of levitation and meditation that no one in the Central Bank would have recommended to the Government that this is a possible solution, certainly none of the professional staff, that this could be a solution to the problems facing the monetary system in Barbados. What does the law go on to say, Mr. Speaker? The law says and again it does not say "may", it does not say "might", it does not say "should". It says "shall". It is mandatory. It is a command of this legislature. 6.40 p.m.

Section 49(1) continues: "If, after consultation with the Bank, the Minister is of the opinion that the policies being pursued by the Bank are not adequate for, or conducive to, the achievement of the purposes of the Bank as set out in section 5, the Minister may issue a written order to the Bank determining the policy to be adopted by the Bank, and the Bank shall thereupon give effect to that policy while the order remains in operation."

For the benefit of all, what this is saying, if there is an impasse between the Government and the Central Bank, if the Central Bank has written, if the Central Bank has begged, if the Central Bank has taken the steps under section 48 and nothing is done, then they can tell the Minister "you write us and take over the Bank." This is where the moral and legal authority comes into play. That is what that really means.

It continues at 49(2): "The order acknowledging the Government's assumption of responsibility for the policy

shall be published forthwith in the *Official Gazette*". That was not done, they just continued breaking the law.

Section 49(3) says: "The Minister shall cause to be laid before Parliament, as soon as may be after the Minister has informed the Bank of the policy determined, a copy of the order determining the policy, and statements by the Minister and the Bank in respect of the matter which occasioned the issuance of the order."

Sir, the law is absolutely clear on this matter. The Governor of the Central Bank - I will get to the Governor later, Sir, and only in the capacity in which I have written you and not beyond that - but the Central Bank clearly has a specific obligation under the law. The law imposes that responsibility. There is no one in the Ministry of Finance, there is no one in the Ministry of Economic Affairs, there is no one in the Central Bank of Barbados who is not aware that the stage has been reached in Barbados where a Governor of the Central Bank has two choices. I have called on the Directors of the Central Bank to examine the law and examine carefully what their responsibilities are in relation to those laws and to the Act. On the Floor of this House I am calling on the Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados either to put these legal steps in place immediately or resign from office. We cannot fool around with the future of our country. I could understand a situation if a Minister has been in breach for small amounts of money and there is some level of accommodation. I could understand it if the Central Bank was in a position to deal with those small amounts of accommodation. I cannot understand it in a situation where the Central Bank has been totally raped by the Government and the Governor remains silent. It cannot continue, the law is clear.

What we are being asked to do here by this piece of legislation is to create the objective lawful conditions for the Minister of Finance to even continue and do more damage than he is doing. That is what we are being asked to do. Not only is it grossly defective law, not only is it a misuse of a fundamental administrative Act, which should only be pointing out the areas of legislation that should be drawn up under other Acts, but it is a complete failure to relate even to the Central Bank Act. You cannot just go and stick that inside there like that, it is quite wrong. I am trying to get across that there is a multiplicity of laws that have been broken by the Minister of Finance, not one or two, and what is unfortunate is that the Central Bank has now been caught up in this situation. How on earth they would have got into the business of trying to shift Ways and Means debt into Treasury Bills, I do not know, in this kind of situation, whilst at the same time increasing the limit. It boggles the mind! It is most disturbing, Mr. Speaker!

In order to get across that idea even more firmly, I want to draw the attention of this Honourable House to what has been happening to Government's relationships

with the Central Bank over the years. Many Members do not read these columns, but they are very important. As I said some time ago, one always heard the observation that mathematics was a very precise language, and it is one of the reasons why you see many mathematicians speak very well. Someone could probably write ten books out of these numbers, if he really understands what is going on. I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter will agree with me. If you take any one of these monthly statistics, on page 1 where you will see claims on Central Government, which is subdivided into advances, Treasury Bills and debentures, debentures being the longer term debt, Government paper which the Central Bank holds, the Treasury Bills being the shorter term debt under that specific Act, and the advances, commonly referred to as the Ways and Means account, there are three columns that you will see there. If you want to see what has been happening over the years, you also then look on page 3 of any of these documents, under Government - the one which is dealing with the Central Bank's assets, because your loans from the Central Bank would be an asset for the Central Bank, whereas your deposits would be a liability to the Central Bank - you will see what the Government's deposits are there and you balance the two out. The point I was trying to make earlier is that for the first time, and for a long time, those deposits have all been spent and the Ways and Means are up over the legal limit; and this Sir, is reflected immediately, Sir, as you go to page 5 and 6 in the foreign assets of the Central Bank. One continued disaster. So that when you look, Sir, at page 1, you will see • Sir, that between 1973 and the end of 1984 those advances were in the region of between \$23 and \$59 million, 1985 between \$7 and \$69 million, 1986 between \$52 and \$69.6 million which would have been the legal limit and between 1987 again between \$36 and about \$69 million and then, Sir, we get the big take-off thereafter going into 1990. But at the same time if you look at the corresponding column you will see that in 1987 for example where the ways and means was in the region of between \$36 and \$69.8 million, the deposits in the Central Bank were between \$73 million and \$179 million. Not one cent borrowed from the Central Bank. Go month by month. You go back, Sir to 1986 and you will see, Sir, that apart from the months of July and August that the net position in relation to the Government of the Central Bank was positive - the Government lending to the Central Bank not the other way around. You go back, Sir, even to 1985 and you will see, Sir, that the same situation existed in 1985. Where is the Minister taking this country, Sir? What it means, to put it in a nutshell: he has blown the \$179 million that I left in the Special Deposit at the Central Bank two years ago. He has blown all the money that he has borrowed externally and locally. He has borrowed up to the hilt on the local market. He has gone to the international market on one or two occasions. He has imposed unprecedented levels of taxation on this country and all the increased revenue he has also blown. He not only has the highest overdraft legally, he could borrow up to \$100 million. All previous Ministers of Finance were constrained to under \$73 million.

He had the opportunity to borrow more than any other previous Minister of Finance lawfully and yet he has broken the law. And all that has gone too? Does that sound right, Sir? Isn't that squandermania, Mr. Speaker? If it is not squandermania, what other definition can be used? Out of respect for you, Sir, I will not translate the abstract noun squandermania into a personal noun because I am not sure whether that would be within the provision of the Standing Orders and I don't want to do that But nevertheless, Sir, it is squandermania of the worst order. 6.50 p.m.

When the British Government intervened in Grenada to put an end to the squandermania by Gairy, he wasn't doing things half as bad as this. This is serious, Sir. You are talking, Sir, of huge volumes of money. I am asking Members of the Cabinet on the other side, I am asking the backbenchers: Ask yourselves where has this money gone? What are the constraints that you exercise as legislators, as Members of a Cabinet? Can't you see where we are going? Now you are faced with a situation where you have to come in here and pass validating legislation arising out of deliberate acts of policy. That is not what you should be doing. You know what you should be doing over there? You all should be looking for another Minister of Finance, not coming in here and associating yourselves with this kind of legislation. Most of you know that what I am saying is right. It is quite clear to me that with the kind of increases in revenue that the Government has extracted from the public of Barbados they should not, Sir, have frittered away the kind of sums that I am talking about. You end up now in a situation where the laws are violated and instead of the Democratic Labour Party taking steps to see what is fundamentally wrong, look and see what they are getting up to. This is the kind of situation, Sir, that we are faced with in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone only through so far section 1. I will have to deal with the other things later on. Sir, there is a whole heap of laws that have to be taken into consideration and there is no way that this House could countenance or in any way support this measure, when you look and see the totality of what has been going on in respect of the laws of Barbados. Mr. Speaker, I have only dealt with one or two aspects and I want to perhaps summarise the situation in relation to the Central Bank at this point There are other aspects that we have to deal with in far more detail. Sir, we have pointed out for a long time that the available asset position of the Central Bank has been seriously compromised over the period.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The Chamber was very quiet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We have also pointed out, Sir that the present level of Government borrowing from the

Central Bank has forced the bank into a position where its available net foreign assets have become highly negative. As a result, the Central Bank has to limp along on a day to day basis. Could you imagine the Central Bank of Barbados could not meet its obligations to Trinidad and Tobago in respect of a bond issue because of what the Minister of Finance has been doing - printing money and destroying the foreign reserves? Then to go on television and say the Central Bank of Trinidad made a deposit with the Central Bank of Barbados. You know what that means, Sir? That is Central Bank talk. It means borrows. They borrowed the hard currency and the Central Bank advanced the T & T dollars. But Sir, I could have told this country before what was going on. That is not the first time they had to lean on Trinidad & Tobago.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying it is a matter of fact that under the bilateral clearances on several occasions in the last 18 months that they have only settled half their debt and rolled over the rest

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: More documents. A real document? 7.00p.m.

The point I am trying to get across is that to make excessive borrowing from the Central Bank legally is not prudent and it certainly does not make it right. It will do absolutely nothing to reduce the culpability of Government in respect of the devastating consequences of such borrowings. To resort to retroactive legislation is to extract from a similar type of debate that took place in Guyana when this was done there.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Breaking the law, printing money, coming in with validating legislation and raising the limits of borrowing and you see the results today. The same thing was done in Guyana. I am not reading from extracts of it here. I am looking at it, Sir. I am not reading faithfully because I am not going to make it a document of the House. Following my notes closely. To resort to retroactive legislation to legalise prior illegal acts in circumstances where such acts are indefensible is to make a mockery of the rule of law and undermine the integrity of our system of Government. Indeed, Sir, what I am going to say to Honourable Members over there through the Chair is that to support this Bill would be to display either a total lack of political responsibility or unpardonable ignorance of the issues involved and shows an alarming disrespect for this House of Assembly.

I believe, Sir, that all Honourable Members on the other side, all reasonable Members because I do not believe that they have all reached the point where they can be described as worst than senseless things. I do not think they are totally impervious to reason and logic to think whether you should not try...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Prime Minister has said that they have no stones or balls. I do not know what he means. If I may continue, Sir.

The point I am making is that in this particular debate we all have a duty to place the interest of Barbados first. There is no question about that. Those of you over there have to decide whether you are going to vote as we vote in this matter or place your support behind a Minister of Finance who has demonstrated such extraordinary levels of incompetence. Indeed, I have said before during the debate that the focus of attention of Members on the other side should be seeking to regroup and find a new Minister of Finance. If the parliamentary system of Barbados worked that is what would be happening now. What would be happening now is that the five of them who are backing you would be able now to get enough support to replace him as Minister of Finance.

We on this side can take comfort in the knowledge, that this debate is taking place in two major fora. The debate is taking place inside here and the debate is taking place outside there. I know that when it comes to breaking laws as a matter of policy and then coming in passing validating legislation I know what the people of Barbados would think about that.

I do not know of any situation where this House was called upon to pass validating legislation where you could honestly say that this was a matter of policy that resulted in the law being broken. I cannot think of any. I know there have been many instances where the law was broken, for example, the failure to bring a tax bill down to the House at a particular time, but it usually operated within that area where there was some doubt anyhow as to the ministerial responsibility but not what one would consider a level of irresponsibility that would result in a ministerial resignation. These have been the categories of validating legislation that I have seen before. What you are seeing here is a completely different kettle of fish. What is quite clear is this - that those of us who still believe in the integrity of our laws and our financial system have a duty to send a clear signal to Barbadians, to the local financial community and to the international financial community.

I want to give this House a firm undertaking that when the people of Barbados confer on us the responsibility to form the Government of Barbados, we will make sure that

this amendment is repealed and that the level at which it is fixed again would be consistent and consonant with the associated legislation which I went through step by step earlier showing the extent to which the Government has been operating in breach of a whole range of laws in Barbados.

We will be fortunate to have an Attorney General who would look at the relationship between these laws and not come in here with this kind of defective amendment. As I say, the only reason why I have not applied for more severe strictures on the Attorney General so far is because I realised he only had a couple of days in which to get things in order because between the double cross of the Central Bank he only had a few days to get it in place.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Go and get called to the Bar. Now, Sir, I have spent quite a time dealing with the legality of this. This is not a matter of politics. 7.10p.m.

I am telling you, Sir - make no mistake about this - that already there is a very negative feedback in the international community about this piece of legislation. Let me explain. One banker said to me: "It is a good thing that the Prime Minister ran up there fast and signed the loan before this piece of legislation became public." This is serious. I think that, as all of you know, there is no point walking around cursing the Director of Finance and Planning and the officers in the Central Bank and in the Ministry of Finance. What is important is to listen to what they are saying.

What I am trying to tell you...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I never left because of a man. I left because of a principle.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Give the Honourable Member a little rest. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I heard the Honourable Member say something about a post which I cannot mention but he mentioned. But that is the same person - he is now saying how much integrity the person has - when that is the same person he said he left because he was appointed over him and the person did not have any integrity or any sense.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I never mentioned the word "integrity". I choose my words very carefully. Do not put words in my mouth.

What I said is that you all can curse as much as you like. That is what I said. But the fact is....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that the Director of Finance and Planning, to his everlasting credit, and had shown that he is a man of tremendous integrity, *et cetera, et cetera*. That is what he said about 2½ hours ago.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, a former Member of this House, a member of the Barbados Labour Party initially and then the Democratic Labour Party has been credited with a very wise saying, that "even a clock that stopped is right twice a day". The point is this, that anyone can be right, once or twice in a lifetime. Okay? I have nothing more to say.

Sir, if I may continue. The point that I am making is that already the financial community nationally and internationally is reacting adversely to this. I will tell you why. Financiers like to feel that whatever happens to the economic or political life of a country that the law endures. Secondly, when they see a government is prepared to use their majority, in a Legislature, to make lawful, illegal acts, they begin to wonder what can happen to their investments, loans and so on. Because, in the long run, make no mistake about this, I have said it before, nobody lends money to a country because a country is doing well at a given time or withholds it because a country is not doing well, or because they like a given Prime Minister or Minister of Finance. They are not the considerations. The fundamental consideration is the integrity of the legal system and their belief that that will endure. When you start messing around with the laws, when you start breaking the laws today and legislating your illegality tomorrow, that kind of instability is introduced, into the thinking of people.

Sir, if I may continue. I want to show this House what has been happening to Barbados since the Government has started this printing of money. This disastrous situation has been going on for most of this year. But let us look and see what is happening. I said before that the Central Bank of Barbados has a negative net foreign exchange situation. I am going to prove to this Honourable House, beyond a shadow of doubt, what this illegal printing of money has done to the foreign exchange situation of Barbados.

I want to draw your attention to the balance of payments of Barbados, 1990 and I want to turn to page 32. Page 32 reads as follows:

"Table 15 - International Reserves

The international reserves are foreign assets, available to the authorities for financing or regulating a payments imbalance. That is a clear definition of what constitutes a foreign reserve."

The next paragraph continues like this:

"The foreign assets of the commercial banks are deemed to be under the effective control of monetary authorities through the exchange control regulations and are therefore available for balance of payments purposes."

I say that is poppy cock! The net foreign assets of the commercial banks are, in fact, the property of the commercial banks not the property of the Government of Barbados.

I am going to show you what they are doing. The next point I want to establish is this. This also sets out what are non reserve assets. These are foreign assets, held by the Central Bank, which are not readily available for balance of payments purposes. They include sinking funds for foreign debt and other liquid securities.

When we go from here, what do we find? We find that this Government has got the Central Bank in a situation where it is estimated that we have two or three weeks of imports, that they are including, in those numbers, those foreign assets which, by definition, they have excluded as reserve items. In other words, a foreign asset is only a reserve item, if it can be used to regulate a balance of payments. All that means is if it can buy a loaf of bread that you are importing. That is all it means.

Now, Sir, since they have started printing money...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not one cent. The foreign reserves of this country have been wiped out. They cannot understand the one to one relationship between a printed dollar and U.S.Oc. in reserves lost, otherwise they would be laughing and making sport. They recognize that they are doing a major disservice to Barbados now and in the future. It is going to take about 15 to 20 years to repair the damage that this Government has done to the foreign reserves of Barbados with the most prudent and careful management. 7.20 p.m.

Sir, I think it is important that people should understand what this kind of fiscal mismanagement has done to this country. Let us look, Sir, at Page 64. This is the International Reserves of Barbados. Of what do they comprise or of what do they consist, or what comprises them? Sir, if you look at the first three columns, and this was in September when things were good compared with now, these were the total assets of the Central Bank of Barbados. The second column is foreign assets and the third column is foreign liabilities adjusted. Now that foreign liabilities adjusted simply takes out all the debt that has more than one year maturity and that should be more like \$112 million. So that on the very three columns you will see that the Central Bank has not got a cent. The Central Bank, in fact, is minus forty something million dollars in

liquid reserves. The assets they talk about here, Sir, if you look back over the composition of those assets under the Central Bank column, you will see the main item is \$140 million which by the Central Bank's definition is not a reserve item but they have them in the reserves. They have defined it not me.

The Balance of Payments of Barbados 1990 Central Bank of Barbados makes it quite clear that these are non-reserve assets. These are foreign assets held by the Central Bank and these are not readily available for balance of payments purposes. There is no way you can buy a loaf of bread tomorrow with the same CF debt. You can regulate nothing with that. You can buy nothing with it. But that is included here. It has been included here. Yes, but you had a hell of a lot more of liquid reserves and you have none now. That is the point. The point is that your gross figure should not be showing \$213 million. It should be showing something like \$401 million as it showed in March 1989 or \$405 million as it showed in June 1987 and then you have reserves.

The point I am making, Sir, is that with a figure of \$213 million that this country has no liquid reserves. None. Sir, when you then go and look at the Sinking Fund of \$12.4 million and the net between the adjusted foreign liabilities and foreign assets of the commercial banks, that is about forty something million dollars here - not one cent.' That is the situation. How did this come about, Sir? If you take that decline, Sir, and take the figure of \$333 million in June 1989 and if you relate this, Sir, back to Page 1 to the extent of Government's borrowings from the Central Bank, you will see that when the reserves were up to \$400 Government's borrowings from the Central Bank were down to \$32 million. As that climbed up, the reserves did the exact opposite. It is a classic picture of how printing money destroys a country and yet they would not stop. Yet they have come here to get permission locally to borrow another \$75 million and expect any reasonable person to agree with it. There is no sense of shame, Sir.

Sir, there are some other interesting and fascinating things that can demonstrate what this Government has done to this country. They have wiped out the reserves. There is no question about it. On top of the fact, Sir, when you consider that a country has a problem with exports - We are not going to deal with those economic things today yet, probably more like 11 or 12 o'clock tonight - to some extent, this is now what we call in medicine oestrogenic when the doctor actually creates the disease. Anyhow, it is the leakages or destruction of the reserves caused by the Minister of Finance and the way in which he has handled the economy of Barbados and the financial situation. Sir, this is a classic case of disaster,

Now we have gone and we have shown the legal side of it. We have gone through to show the importance of doing a proper evaluation of the laws and there is no point coming inside of here and making an isolated amendment without reference to the other laws. We have shown that even if this law is passed today and with the respect for these laws as they relate to Sections 45, 47, and 48 of Chapter 323(c) which is the Central Bank Act of Barbados that there is no way that we could have the problems that we are having today. Prudence.

I have also shown, Mr. Speaker, that if they had learnt anything from the founder of that party by quoting him extensively right to begin with in terms of fiscal responsibility that this country would not be in this situation and they would not be in here having been caught red-handed trying to dodge a no confidence motion by trying to get validating legislation through in advance. This is the kind of thing that is going on. But Sir, we will continue...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, we note the tactics. We are fully aware of what is going on in trying to dodge a no confidence motion and hiding from the House until late in the afternoon.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House and attacking the Chair, Sir, to suggest that we are trying to dodge a no confidence motion that has been set down and is to be debated. The Honourable Member and Leader of the House stated categorically that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition agreed that it was on Friday but that it would have been done today if he could be assured that the Press was present. Now he gets up and says somebody is trying to dodge. There is nothing anybody wants to dodge from him. What no confidence motion could be dodged? I think it is an attack on the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Chair has made it clear that that is a matter between the Leader of the House and myself. The Honourable Member objects to the word "dodging". May I substitute the words "ducking, running from, and evading"? Sir, what is going to be the immediate financial consequences of this particular piece of legislation? We know at the moment that Government's borrowing from the Central Bank including the Treasury Bills will be over \$150 million. What are the prospects, Sir, of the Government not exceeding the 17.5% in the next few weeks? We know, Sir, that we have had some heavy land tax bills that have been sent out and in many instances - I am talking about the revenue side now, Sir - the reduction in the rate is not going to affect that very much. 7.30p.m.

I notice that the Honourable Member for St. Philip North and the Honourable Member for St. Philip South, both of whom have a very detailed knowledge of house spots in Barbados, have made sure that a certain person has had very significant increases in his valuations far and above the norm. However, that person will make his contribution to helping to relieve the Treasury in due course.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe that you are laughing down here. I hear that you are not smiling at all in St. Michael North.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am glad to hear that all is well there. If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, you can expect a little boost in revenue from the proceeds of the land taxes this month. We know, Sir, that Government's outstandings are very significant, over \$50 million, including people who have provided services for the Government, who cannot get any money from the bank and had to go and borrow money privately in order to pay their wages last weekend, so as not to send home their workers without a pay packet, and the Government would not pay them a cent.

We also know, Sir, that there are hundreds of poor black people out there working in the Public Service hoping for their Christmas loans. Not one cent! This is the first time that this Government since 1986 did not come down here and offer a few dollars for the persons in the Public Service at the lowest rung of the ladder. They can print money for other people, but they cannot print for the poorest of their employees, the people who would like \$100 to go and buy a ham and a turkey and a few bottles of beer and so on. You cannot help those. Caring and sharing? You cannot even care and share at Christmas with money that is not yours, and talking about caring and sharing? Caring and sharing what? Caring and sharing, my foot! So many of the poorest workers in the Public Service this year will not have the advantage of getting that Christmas loan.

I say this too, Sir. Those people always pay back their money, because it is deducted from source and it is all repaid within the financial year. It is all repaid by 31st March, so there are no arrears building up or anything like that, the money is deducted at source. To the best of my knowledge and recollection, looking at the statements of the Accountant General and the Auditor General, there were very few outstandings in that area.

The Honourable Member for St. Philip South - he is not in his place and I deeply regret this - came in here not so long ago and said how hard hearted I was that they had to beg me in order to get the Christmas loans going. They

had to fight me: At least they succeeded, Sir, although he did not have to do that Who is hard hearted now? Where is the Honourable Member for SL Philip South? He came inside here and said so, and I was waiting. I searched my Order Paper and I kept looking through my Papers to see whether the Government was offering the poorest in Barbados some kind of loans for Christmas. They have forgotten them. Many of them live in your constituency, many of them live in St. Michael West and I want them to know that in a *sotto voce* remark you said they got enough money in back pay, they do not want any loans.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The people of St. Michael West need no gratuitous inputs, advice or otherwise from the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition. If they can afford to pay their medical bills, they do not need any loans. I did not say it *sotto voce*, I am saying that the public officers from St. Michael West are sufficiently well off and sufficiently happy with the Government that they do not need any loans, otherwise they would be the first to tell me. The Honourable Member cannot give me any gratuitous advice on St. Michael West

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I knew, Sir, that there was a difference of opinion in the Cabinet as to whether the people should get their Christmas loans. I now know where the Honourable Member for St. Michael West stood. He was one of the people who opposed it, and the Member for St. Philip South too.

Now, Sir, so far I have only dealt with one aspect of this whole thing, the fiscal integrity aspect. I have not dealt with the causes of it or anything like that, and it is important for me to deal with the causes of it to demonstrate to this Honourable House that there are other remedies which would be far more effective and in the public interest.

Let us stan looking at some of the causes of the problem. The causes clearly reside in bizarre and wild mismanagement of the finances of this country by the Minister of Finance. The Minister brought estimates this year to this Honourable House. Those estimates showed an unidentified financing gap of some \$131 million. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that However, Sir, one expected that in the budget the Minister would have addressed the problem of how he was going to deal with the unfinanced deficit as demonstrated in the estimates, assuming the estimates were right, which have turned out to be quite wrong. In fact, it looks as though the revenue estimates will be down by \$100 million or so, which now pushes the true unfinanced gap to something like \$231 million. It is the height of irresponsibility for a Minister of Finance not only to come in here with estimates showing an unfinanced gap of \$131 million, but to proceed to do nothing about it in his budget, when he was already seised

of information showing a significant decline in his revenue in the first four to five months of this year.
7.40p.m.

But he thought he could have held the elections in June but when the Opposition stepped out, they started to back off when we swung into action. Then, Sir, four months later he had information that his current account situation which he projected as a surplus of \$12 million had already reached the point of something like \$61 million deficit, not surplus in the first six months of the year. So far from a surplus of \$12 million we end up with a deficit now of about \$121 million on current account. Yet he did nothing.

Now, Sir, this is where I have a fundamental, moral and philosophical difference between the approach of the late Tom Adams when he was faced with these kinds of situations and there is no point telling me... Yes, I criticised Tom Adams bitterly for what he did but at least he did two things. Faced with that situation, he gave his supplementary budgets in 1981 and 1984 and made the appropriate fiscal adjustments. They are incontestable facts. What did this Finance Minister do? Nothing. Hope that it would go away. All this information, Sir, was in the Ministry of Finance that by the end of August he was looking at a deficit of some \$260 million and hardly any financing for it. On top of that, if you look at the selection of capital projects, like turning Nelson around and moving him four feet to the right or to the left. Now the situation in Broad Street has got so bad that even Nelson now shows you not to walk to Broad Street now; things are so bad down there.

The point I am making, Sir, is this. The Minister of Finance had the information available to him as early as March this year that he had a deficit of \$131 million for which he made no budgetary provision in his budget of this year and he had the information that his current surplus of \$12 million would be more like a deficit of \$120 million and he did nothing. That is inexcusable, Sir. Compounding that now, Sir, what he does is that he goes and picks capital projects for electoral reasons mainly. Not part of the capital projects of Government, not part of the current expenditure projects of Government but the electoral expenditure projects of Government which are all financed locally. If I may continue, Sir...

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Do not interfere with me. Should I talk about CPS? Leave me alone. I am not troubling anybody. If I may continue, Sir. I am just demonstrating the level of irresponsibility of the Minister of Finance. Every Minister of Finance has a duty to use his budget to show how he is going to generate fiscal balance in the country's affairs. That was not done. Fair enough, let's say he made an error then. Certainly at the end of six months of the financial year, it was clear to him that things were going the

wrong way. Did he take any steps? No steps. What did he do, Sir? He continued to borrow from the Central Bank of Barbados. Did he decide to address the expenditure pattern of Government? No. He did not. Expenditure continued to escalate. Did he look for a better selection of projects or did he accelerate those projects that had a borrowing exchange component to make sure at least the identified portion of his financing would be met? No. He did not do that either. I will tell you what his response was. His lack of response has put the Government of Barbados into a state of insolvency. They can't pay their debts. I am saying that the Government of Barbados is insolvent. I am not the only person who is saying that. I know that the international community is saying that as well. Indeed, I have a little document here if I can find it which certainly indicates that Barbados is now having the rare experience of insolvency where the state is having difficulty in making...

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you quoting or is that your...?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not quoting, Sir. No, Sir, I won't quote. If I was quoting Sir, you know I would indicate the document I am reading from, because I am quite sure, Sir, there are some people who would like to get their hands on that document.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, faced with insolvency, I want really not only to look at the legality but the morality of this kind of behaviour. Faced with a situation of insolvency in August this year, what did the Government do? Any other reasonable Minister of Finance would have come to this Honourable House, Sir, with a new financial statement, would have pointed out the difficulties, would have set different parameters for Government expenditure and would indicate "to this Honourable House precisely how he proposed to finance the deficit. Not this Minister of Finance, Sir. He spent the months going to the wrong people in London and at the international markets, sending the wrong people to meet the wrong people in the international markets, could not raise a cent and now ends up with a disaster as a loan. Can you imagine a loan that you could only get less than 25% when you need it? What is bothering me, Sir, is this. I was talking to a couple of people in the London market recently and they have indicated to me certain concerns. Anyhow we are working a strategy to deal with that in the event that we have the opportunity and the responsibility to deal with it.

But what, as I have said, would be the responsible thing to do? The responsible thing to do would be to come here with a financial statement - I am not saying that he has to raise any taxes. He may have to lower taxes to get more revenue. That's a possibility. He may have had to do that.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That's not the point. The point is that this is what should have been done at that point in time. It was not done. Instead what was his response to insolvency? Step 1, Sir, - Break the law. We don't have any money; we can't borrow any money; we have messed up the domestic financial system therefore we have to get money. First thing - break the law. Step 2 - print money. Step 3 - decide on a policy not to pay their bills. In other words, let Barbadians carry the Government debt involuntarily. That is the third thing they did. What is the fourth thing they did? They refused to give people their Income Tax refunds holding on to people's money involuntarily. Fifthly, they sold off the country's hard earned securities at significant losses, because I have a record of each security that was sold... 7.50 p.m.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You do not know? He does not tell you anything. Sometimes I believe that my strictures are misdirected. I have just demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that this country's securities were sold off by the Central Bank of Barbados. The securities that built up to \$59.1 million by the end of May were sold off and are down to \$9.5 million at the end of October, quoting from the Central Bank of Barbados Economic and Financial Statistics.

The Honourable Member was not in this Honourable House. If he was in this Honourable House quite early in my presentation I quoted chapter and verse to show that the underlying support for the temporary overdraft of Government via the 1971 Resolution under the Financial Administration and Audit Act that in that debate at the very outset the former Minister of Finance, the former leader of that party, the founder of the DLP indicated quite clearly the source for the security for his borrowings. It is those same securities that he has now wiped out to \$9.5 million and wants to borrow \$175 million. That is additional. He has borrowed the \$100 million. It is this kind of thing that is going on.

Now, Sir, I tried to indicate what he has done. Some time ago in this Honourable House I spoke about non-payment of travel allowances as part of a policy. I did not know then and I allowed the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to get up and say that all civil servants in Barbados were getting their cheques regularly on a monthly basis. That is not true. There are several temporary officers in the system who are being paid intermittently over the past year. What you said was carried either on radio or on television or in the Press. They called me, gave me their names and told me "Branford Taitt is... you know what", Sir. They meant he is not telling the truth.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You said it was untrue to suggest that temporary officers in Government were not getting paid regularly and that the only thing that was wrong was that some people were not getting their travel allowances and that was a thing that was going on for years. When you said that, all I am saying is the people called me. I can call the names of the people.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Please, please. I would appreciate that. On a point of order, Sir. I recall the debate. We were discussing persons within the Ministry of Health. I remember that distinctly. I made a statement with regard to travel which was a situation that had occurred from time immemorial in the Civil Service. I made a statement at that time in connection with alleged incidents in the Ministry of Health. The Honourable Member is now seeking to import the entire country in the ambit of the statement I made. He should desist from that. Do not mislead the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. When those people call me again and tell me that you are a so and so I will tell them that they did not hear you correctly. You were only referring to the Ministry of Health. I promise you I will defend you. I will do that.

Now, Sir, this was totally inappropriate. I think that every single Member on the other side would recognise that this was a totally inappropriate response. There is not one of you that I feel deep down inside could be satisfied with being involved in this kind of thing being embarrassed day after day. I am quite sure you feel badly about it. I feel embarrassed, quite frankly, on behalf of the Government of Barbados that they cannot do better. I really feel embarrassed on their behalf because I would like to come in here and argue with them at a different level and in different areas. Let us argue about priorities. Do not let us argue about major departures from fundamentals of law, fundamentals of morality and fundamentals of propriety in the financial management of the country.

Now, Sir, I have already indicated some of the catastrophic areas in the area of the fiscal area. I have not dealt with the monetary area yet because that area will probably take me about 45 minutes to get through the monetary profile as a result of this printing of money. I have already indicated, Sir, that the tale of illegality spreads far beyond that and the various bits of legislation. I have indicated beyond any doubt the extent and the direct relationship. If anyone ever doubted that direct relationship existed, there it is.

Now, Sir, one point I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance. When the Central Bank lends you this money, how is the Central Bank going to replace the foreign reserves that it needs to place there to deal with the money that they are lending? I would like to know. Just tell me how are they going to replace it?

My understanding is, and certainly my memory is that our long-term lines were somewhere in the region of \$34 million. These are lines to maturities of two to five years. The short-term lines are quoted here in September as \$72 million. As far as I know the Central Bank only has about \$110 to \$112 million of negotiated lines so that normally when the Central Bank is called upon to advance money to Government like this and the Government does not have any foreign exchange, as in the present situation, then the Central Bank has to find the foreign reserves to support it. Where are they going to get it from?

Aside.

I promise you something. You would just have to do without dinner because I am not stopping. If I have to talk until 5 o'clock tomorrow I will talk until 5 o'clock tomorrow. If I may continue. We dealt with the delays in other payments and the net available foreign exchange of the Central Bank.

Earlier on, I dealt with the Central Bank from a different perspective. All I have done so far in respect of the Central Bank is to demonstrate what the law is under the Central Bank Act, what the responsibilities of the bank are under that Act, indicate their failure to comply with the law; for if they complied with the law then this particular Bill that is before us would be totally unnecessary because they simply would not lend them more than \$5 million.

There is another aspect to this too. The other aspect of the Central Bank I want to deal with now. I have set out the legal basis so that the House would be thoroughly informed of the relationship between this Bill and the Central Bank Act, informed of the violation of the Act and the Central Bank Act. I am going to deal now with the framework in which I think the Central Bank must respond to this situation which is being created here today.

First of all, Sir, I believe that the Central Bank of Barbados must obey the law. The Central Bank of Barbados must attach a higher priority to obedience of the law than to accommodating the Minister of Finance. 8.00 p.m.

I will tell you why, Sir. Even if the House agrees to this 17.5%, there is no way, under the Central Bank Act, that the Central Bank of Barbados can accommodate the Government, within the meaning of those clauses in the Central Bank Act. In that situation, I would think that the Governor of the Central Bank has a duty, as of today, to start bouncing Government cheques, if they continue to write cheques illegally printing money. That is a duty and obligation that they have.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It would not be against the law. He can do it. Bounce them. The Central Bank cannot break the law.

I am calling on the Governor of the Central Bank to obey the Laws of Barbados. Every single bank in Barbados has to operate within the law. The Central Bank of Barbados has to operate within the law. If the law says the Government's ways and means shall not be more than X, and the Bank allows the Government ways and means to go above that, they, too, are in breach of the law.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not a strange interpretation. Let me tell you why, Sir. If you were to look at the Banking Act and the provisions which I adverted to, in the Central Bank Act, you will see that two things happen. That the Banking Act deals principally with the capital requirements and the asset liability ratios and Government and so on. However, there is a range of other things which the Central Bank Act will have to regulate. So that every bank, in Barbados, has to operate within the law. Therefore the Central Bank which has an even greater responsibility than any other bank in Barbados, in that the Central Bank has an inspectorate which inspects the other banks to make sure that those banks conform with the law. How on earth can they be in a situation where they are breaking the law and then say that they are inspectors of other banks? There is no bank, in Barbados, that can lend money in excess of what the Central Bank says they should lend. There is no bank that should lend money in excess of what the Banking Act says should be their asset liability ratios, or what their reserves should be. They cannot do it.

How come then, that the Central Bank of Barbados can find itself in a situation where it can break the law, when it is supposed to be on behalf of the Minister of Finance and the Ministry of Finance?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. We must not let these things slip. The Honourable Member is indicating, by his statement, that the Central Bank has broken the law.

I submit that that is not a statement of fact and should not be in the record. The Honourable Member should withdraw that. He said the Central Bank has broken the law. It is not so, Sir. The Honourable Member should not say that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have read the laws. The Honourable Member was not inside here. I went through the various sections of the Act, in detail, because I knew that somewhere along the line, I would have to deal with that kind of uninformed intervention.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member cannot discuss uninformed intervention. The Honourable Member can say, "in his opinion". He cannot state and put in the record that the Central Bank has broken any law. He can say, "in his opinion".

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, now would be a convenient moment to have a little break and I am moving that the sitting be suspended until 9.00 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am very disappointed, Sir, that the Honourable Member thought it necessary to interrupt me, at this stage. I do appreciate that we have been sitting for a long time.

The question that this sitting be suspended until 9.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 8.08 p.m. 8.08 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr. DEPUTY

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the break was taken, I was making a very important and very critical point in order to substantiate my argument. I believe that this is absolutely critical whether or not it is prudent and desirable for the Government to increase the level of borrowings by way of the Ways and Means Account since the substance of this Bill gives the Government the authority to borrow another \$75 million under the law. I made reference on one or two occasions to the fact that the Central Bank in Barbados is in no position to lend the Government of Barbados one cent, far less \$175 million.

I believe, Sir, it is incumbent on me to establish the facts related to that matter. In order for the Central Bank to be in a position to lend, one must understand the structure of the asset portfolio of the Central Bank of Barbados. Whereas these matters are kept secret, I am in the fortunate position, Sir, to have available to me a document which I shall not read from but it is the daily position of the Central Bank of Barbados. I will only deal with those matters which eventually come out publicly in a consolidated fashion and I shall exclude from the debate anything which I consider to be of a highly confidential nature. As I said, I will not read from it so that I will not be required to make it a document of the House. But sufficient to say, Sir, that the Central

Bank boasts of a figure of some \$589 million in total assets. Now the amazing thing about this, Sir, is \$94 million alone is tied up in fixed assets, this is the building, and another \$25 million in other similar type of assets. That is money not available to lend. About \$20 million is in its expenditure account. Again, that is money that is not available to lend. Then, of course, there are the advances which they have to make to banks and financial institutions under the law. The Central Bank is the bank of last resort and anytime a bank is short of cash, in order for that bank to meet its obligations, then the Central Bank must meet any demands made on it by the other commercial banks of Barbados. So that the asset portfolio relating to banks and financial institutions is not available for lending to anybody and in any event, Sir, they really constitute part of the sequestered deposits of the commercial banks under the reserve requirements as specified by the Central Bank itself. Then, of course, there are the ordinary shares held in the Barbados Development Bank. That itself is insolvent. So that \$7 million in shares are not available for lending. Of course, there is the Government's Ways and Means which was over \$140 million on this particular day where I am examining the assets of the Bank. The Barbados Government Treasury Bills, Barbados Government debentures, Barbados Development bonds amounting to \$31 million is money not available to lend because if the Central Bank should shed the Treasury Bills that they are holding there are no takers. As a matter of fact, the Central Bank in this environment has to be in a position to take up shortfalls in Treasury Bills on behalf of the Government of Barbados.

When you look at the local asset situation of the Central Bank, there is really no scope for the Central Bank to lend to Government one cent against those assets, not one cent. How then is it going to lend it \$175 million? When you look at its external assets, the foreign asset situation of the Central Bank, what do we find? You find that there is about \$5 million in reserves, zero in gold, special drawing rights - It looks as if they sold off the gold on that particular day too - which is down to \$27,000, and \$184 million which I have pointed out already represents reserve assets that are not assets that can be used. If you look at the total Central Bank Balance Sheet, Sir, there is no reason that anyone can deduce from this that the Central Bank can really lend the Government one cent and what the Government should be doing is placing its resources behind the Central Bank to build up some kind of a better and sounder asset portfolio.

So I think that with this information now before the House it is now in a position to evaluate the statement which I made earlier that the Central Bank is in no position to lend the Government one cent. That, Sir, is the kind of disastrous situation which the present Minister of Finance has landed this country's Central Bank in. That is the harsh

reality. It is there and it is documented. I am not prepared to make it a document of the House. But if I am challenged I will consider whether it is worthwhile making it a document of the House, because in any event every three months or so the Central Bank is required to publish in the Official Gazette information in relation to its asset position. I am just a little ahead and it will come out certainly for December anyhow and it will be available in the next Annual Report of the Central Bank of Barbados even in a more complete form. I do not consider that by making this information available to the House that this creates any particular problem. How then, Sir, can we in any conscience come in here and support a measure where you know that the only institution from which the Government can borrow this money will be the Central Bank of Barbados and knowing that by doing so the Central Bank can only do it through money creation, and they cannot do it by utilizing any assets at all.

I believe, Sir, that these are things that Members must address themselves to and must understand that this is what the Minister of Finance is asking this House to agree to, and then they will have some sympathy and understanding" as to why the Senior Public Officers in the Ministry of Finance and in the Central Bank have a grave difficulty in agreeing to this. No professional person with the slightest understanding of financial matters can look at the balance sheet of the Central Bank and believe that it can accommodate a loan by way of the Ways and Means of anything in the region of \$175 million.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I am almost sure that when the Honourable Member for St. Peter would have got that information on Saturday or something he would have been thrown into a deep depression just as I happen to know that a whole lot of other economists in Barbados are so shocked that they cannot believe that a Government would take this step and take the step in isolation and against the advice of the whole spectrum of their advisers. This is a very serious matter because we are now going to be faced with a situation in the future, as I said, to look at a 15 or 20 year situation in trying to bring back that Central Bank's balance sheet into any kind of respect, Sir. That is the balance sheet that we have to go to the markets with year after year and to go with a shattered balance sheet like this is a very serious matter.

Sir, why do I believe that the Government will be making use of the full limit of \$175 million and why I will not accept that the Minister of Finance would even seek to control it under \$100 million? I tell you why, Sir. I do not believe that shifting the excess in the Ways and Means into Treasury Bills was an honourable thing to do to start off with. All you are doing is trying to conceal debt. All you are trying to do is to fool people by getting up and saying that you reduced the Ways and Means by \$50 million. That is not an honourable thing to do. It is still the overall short term borrowings from the Central Bank of Barbados.

The second point is this, Sir. The Government at the moment, I believe, has two debt instruments out there in the market place. 9.10p.m.

They have either two or three debt instruments in the market place. Today this Honourable House has passed a further Resolution which will result in a further imposition on the market place in order to meet those bonds for the sugar industry. So now you have about four instruments out there in the market place. We know that the last bond issue was very slowly subscribed, we also know that the Government has had several shortfalls in their Treasury Bill issues in recent times, and we know that the liquidity situation in the banking system is low. Therefore, when you look at the total circumstances, what will you find? You will find that the Government will really be restricted to the proceeds of foreign borrowing or to printing money.

What I am trying to establish, Sir, is that the local market, first of all, is severely contracted, that there are at least four competing public sector instruments in the market place at the moment, that the liquidity levels are low in the market place, so you are going to have four competing instruments in the market place and the Government therefore will have to rely on foreign borrowing or printing money to continue to finance its operations, since it cannot rely on a weak revenue situation. We know that the foreign borrowing situation has been severely compromised, because at the moment the only access the Government has to foreign borrowing would be the \$27 million which it will get out of this first tranche of the \$31 million loan, plus the proceeds of any project funds, which means that unless the Government very rapidly negotiates another major foreign loan, it is going to have to rely very substantially on borrowings. We also know that Government already has commitments in excess of \$50 million.

I am quite sure that there is no way they could maintain this overdraft at \$100 million, so there is no point coming in here and telling us that you expect to keep it at 10%. It is like coming and telling us that you believe that it is Government's policy that you should have a surplus on the current account and do not understand that it is your responsibility to put that policy in place. You are not in the Opposition, you are in Government, and when Government says this is its policy, it is its policy that is being effectuated, not a policy that is a dream, not a policy that is a hope. So we will hear that the overdraft is \$175 million and hear at the same time that it is Government's policy to keep it under 10%, like in the case of the current account. This kind of thing we have to deal with, and deal with very decisively. I do not see any prospect whatsoever of the Government being able to contain that overdraft at \$100 million, unless it continues the disreputable practice of switching more and more of that liability into Treasury Bills.

The second point I want to make is this, Sir, that the Government also has a large number of supplementaries in respect of money already spent I have complained on the Floor of this House that it is virtually impossible for this House of Assembly to monitor Government expenditure if it has to come here and approve supplementaries for monies already spent. The last time I made that observation was during a recent supplementary for the Ministry of Education and there was a denial on the Floor of the House. You only had to look at the jump in the Government's ways and means during the next 48 hours to see that the \$18 million had to be paid out immediately because the commitments were there to be met. I am saying that there is a whole range of other similar commitments that those supplementaries, some of which are approved already and are in the Ministry of Finance, some have not been approved and are in the various Ministries and they have not been brought forward so far to be dealt with.

Given the scenario which I have described and the scenario which I have set out here in relation to the Central Bank of Barbados, there is no way that the Government would not have to continue to print money, and that means relying on Central Bank accommodation to an extent that bears no relation whatsoever to the assets, particularly the foreign assets, of the Central Bank. As I said, the only way I see that situation can be avoided is by another major foreign loan and I do not see the Government being successful, bearing in mind the serious statement of lack of confidence in the Government as contained in the structure of the last loan which was obtained.

I am very pleased, I am learning every day that there are other people on the other side who feel the same way. Their constituents tell me things, all sorts of people tell me other things, their concerns. I have not yet heard from the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, but I know that he is smart enough to understand the true significance of that kind of loan.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not know if everybody is experiencing what I have been experiencing, but I feel like I am in the North Pole. We could get the air conditioning turned down a bit, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think other Members have expressed that. Perhaps the Marshal can look into that for us. The Honourable Member may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Sir, I have established beyond the shadow of a doubt that the asset portfolio.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of privilege, Sir. There cannot be just one person in here who should get the temperature turned up. The fact is that the Honourable Member's speech is so dead that in here feels cold, but

there is nothing wrong with in here. It is like a morgue and that is why he feels cold, so you cannot just go and turn up the temperature. He wanted to say that, Sir, but he does not have the courage to say it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In the words, Sir, of a famous Ambassador of the United States to the U.N., I am going to talk until I get the firm impression that I am making some dent in the rock stones over there, or until Hell freezes over. So I will continue.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That's right. Adlai Stevenson.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very careful to establish my speech in appropriate sections. 9.20 p.m.

Section 1 of my speech so far has been to establish beyond any doubt my charge that the Central Bank of Barbados was in no position to lend the Government one cent and this Bill is giving the Government the authority to borrow \$175 million from the Central Bank of Barbados.

Section 2 on a related matter when the House was suspended for dinner, I was talking about the need of the Central Bank to obey the law and I heard the most extraordinary statement that the Central Bank cannot break the law or has not broken the law. What I tried to point out is that like all other financial institutions in Barbados if a law exists in relation to lending and that Bank lends in excess of a Regulation or a Law, it is breaking the law and the Central Bank is as much under obligation to observe the laws of Barbados as the Minister of Finance. They are both equally obligated, and as a matter of fact, in a sense the law places more facilitating powers with the Central Bank in terms of ensuring that there is not a breach of the law. Whereas the law in its good sense had presumed that you would never come across a bunch of legislators in this Parliament who would come in here and try to justify illegality of any kind, and I believe that the lawmakers always felt that if there was any policy directed to a continuous breach of the law that Honourable Members of Parliament would so respect the law as to put an end to it, therefore it did not set out any particular procedures that Parliament should take whereas it set out procedures which the Central Bank should take, not having accorded the same kind of assumptions in terms of responsibility to the Central Bank.

Why is it important, Sir, that Government should respect the law? Why is it important that we have these laws at all? There are some clowns, Sir, who would never understand that those laws are there for the protection of all of us. I spent so much time at the beginning of my speech trying to point out that they are not accidental and it is not

something that one should view... Sir, if I just wanted to see the Government collapse, I would say nothing.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Sir, let me tell you why I feel very strongly about this. Earlier on I spoke from a very important speech made at a time when this same "kind of thing was being done in Guyana in the early days - the validation of illegality by a Minister of Finance and the increase in the level of borrowings. It is interesting that I got a call from Guyana from someone who was involved in the system at the time. He said: "You know it is a funny thing. This same kind of thing happened in Guyana before we went down that road."

We have to hammer it home because it will happen unless it is corrected. I feel strongly about this. If I may continue, Sir. We must struggle hard not to go the route of Jamaica and Guyana. Trinidad, Sir, came close by going down this route after the last elections. You may recall the confusion in Trinidad between the new Minister of Finance and Prime Minister and the then Governor of the Central Bank, Mr. Eric Bobb. What was the essence of that quarrel? The essence of that quarrel was that the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago ignored the legal limits, that the Minister of Finance of the day ignored, and hundreds of millions of dollars were printed which did severe damage to the foreign exchange situation in Trinidad & Tobago. The result of that was the resignation of Mr. Bobb and his subsequent replacement by Mr. William Demas who has imposed a new era of discipline in terms of the operations of the Central Bank of Trinidad & Tobago. Trinidad & Tobago now is fortunate in that it is getting the kind of foreign exchange inflows through the Central Bank because of the nature of their foreign exchange earnings. They earn a lot of their money through petroleum, through state-owned operations and that money goes fully through the Central Bank and you will see some correction of their asset portfolio in respect of the Central Bank. But the same thing that is happening here, happened there, and we saw the kind of problems. I am saying, Sir, this matter is so important that you will see that around the world, every third-world country that didn't have a central bank, that they are better off today than those that had a central bank.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What it is? You check it out. Look at Eastern Caribbean countries. The fiscal discipline involved in the Eastern Caribbean where you have one Central Bank serving several Ministers of Finance and not one of them can really exercise the kind of manoeuvring in respect of that Central Bank.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not saying so. You make a mistake in the way that you use the Central Bank. It is a fact. It is that fiscal indiscipline that destroyed Jamaica. Let's go back to Jamaica in 1970, Sir. Mr. Deputy Speaker you may recall the problems which the then Minister of Finance, Mr. David Gore had with his Prime Minister and the problems which he had with the Governor of the Central Bank after printing millions of dollars in similar circumstances. Arthur Brown decided that he was going to pull out and then David Gore pulled out soon after that. Don't you remember that? It was the same problem and no other problem.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That was the fundamental problem. The problem was that the Minister of Finance was surrounded by Ministers in his Cabinet whom he could not get to control their expenditure, which had to be financed by the Central Bank, wherefore he had to lean on the Governor of the Central Bank. The Governor of the Central Bank had to take a stand in the matter after a while and the whole thing gradually went down the drain. Every third-world country that has got central bank facilities, it seems to me, they go down that route, all of them that have abused their central bank facilities.

What we are seeing here, is a matter of naked abuse of central bank facilities. You cannot get your colleagues to understand that a central bank is different to another bank. When there is no central bank in a country you can only use the currency and the money that is available to you through a banking system basically that is not yours. The moment you establish a central bank, you have introduced another important aspect in your financial system. That power to create money is an enormous power that can help you finance your development but it is one that can destroy you overnight. And, that is the key to it. That is what is happening here and it is so difficult to get people to understand that very basic concept 9.30 p.m.

What is illogical about that? I am saying that every Third World country that has got into serious trouble is by misuse of the Central Bank.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is saying that is what is happening here. The amendment which we are bringing is to amend a piece of legislation that was passed in here when there was no Central Bank. The Honourable Member is now saying that is what is happening here when all we are doing is extending a principle that was established when there was no Central Bank. What foolishness can he come in here and tell us that is what is happening here? That is what is happening and you know that too, a lot of foolishness all day long trying to confuse people about the Central Bank. All we had was a Currency Board and a Minister of Finance

who decided to put a 10% on the Ways and Means and you come in here and spend seven hours to tell us that is what is happening here. What do you know about central banking?

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You lie. I beg your pardon, Sir, I withdraw that. It is foolishness. I introduced this to Barbados and you come in here giving people a lot of foolishness about central banking, talking over and over again about nonsense, total complete nonsense, ignorance.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member continues...

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please, just a moment. Honourable Members must recognise that this is perhaps the highest chamber in this land. I believe really that Members should recognise that their conduct, particularly when exhibited in view of the public, must be more exemplary than what we see here today.

I do not expect that I should have to intervene in these kinds of matters particularly on occasions like this. I am very disappointed at what I saw occurring just now, very disappointed. I do not expect Members to shout across the Chamber from their seats. If a Member is addressing the Chamber we expect that other Members will listen while that Member is speaking. If a Member wants to make a contribution, the rules provide a means whereby a Member should stand in his place and address the House.

I believe when we see this kind of conduct we must warn Members that it is reprehensible. I think on this occasion I should allow Members to recognise that The conduct which we saw just now is not the kind of conduct I would like to see continue in this Chamber. The Honourable Member may continue.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member said he did not speak from his seat. He always speaks from his seat. If I may continue, Sir.

At the very beginning, the Honourable Member gets up and seeks to make the point that when the 1971 legislation was introduced there was no Central Bank, therefore, nothing that we are saying here today relates to the Central Bank. If the Honourable Member happened to be in here he would realise that the very foundations of my

argument related to the fact that when that Resolution was introduced into this House by the late former Prime Minister, Mr. Errol Barrow, that he made the point (i) in the body of the Resolution it spoke to "bank or banks" because he anticipated a transition where he would reduce his use of the commercial banks and begin to use the Central Bank, hence you had bank or banks. Bank or banks now, in fact, becomes "bank" because the Central Bank carries the entire Government overdraft.

Secondly, the figure of \$10 million which was allowed at that time - that is what the 10% was - in his very first statement he made the point that it would be secured by Government's securities of £6 million against the Revenue Equalisation Fund at the time.

The point I am making is when that law was passed, it was always envisaged that there be adequate and continuing security for the temporary borrowings. The point behind what I have just established in relation to the Central Bank of Barbados is that its asset portfolio has been so shattered that there is no security for the temporary borrowings of one cent far less \$175 million. That is the point I am trying to make.

Enshrined in all that legislation were two principles (1) security for the borrowings; and (2) a point at which those borrowings would revert to zero which is now being eliminated by the inadequate amendment that has been brought to this House by the Government which has missed out that very important point

Now, Sir, I have established that the Central Bank is in no position to lend. Then, I have continued..

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, the only source of Government borrowing on the Treasury account which is now the Ways and Means, the only source of lending is the Central Bank. The Government does not borrow. Government cannot borrow today in any market in Barbados. The money is not there. It has always been the case. What I am saying is that the Central Bank does not have the asset base to lend the Government because it has been destroyed with his record of printing money. That is the point I am trying to make.

It can only be restored by serious expenditure control or in the alternative, foreign borrowing. A couple of \$100 million in foreign borrowing would change the picture overnight. A couple of \$100 million, for example, would reduce the overdraft to zero and leave about \$50 million in liquid assets there. That is one way you could change it. The other way is to cut back on the printing of money, cut back on the expenditure and hope that over time it would somehow balance out or both. The important thing to recognise is today when we are being asked to support this

we are asked really to support the Government printing money.

9.40p.m.

Let us face it. We just have to face it. I believe that the responsible thing for the Minister of Finance to do and what was the responsible thing, since October last year, is to come to the country and say, "Look, we have a revenue expenditure problem and these are the steps we are going to take, in terms of curtailing Government's expenditure." I am going to go through these Estimates and I am going to show the areas in which you have thrown away a whole lot of money and what can be done.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I never said so. I said that a budget can be brought but I said that that budget need not necessarily be a tax increase budget. It could be a tax reduction budget. That is what I said. A tax reduction budget might generate even more revenue.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I never said so. I know what I am talking about.

I have argued, all along, that the over taxation, in this country, is resulting in a reduction in revenue.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, that is where we are, in relation to the Central Bank.

The question is, what should we as legislators be doing? First of all, I believe that on two grounds we should indicate that we cannot support this piece of legislation. Firstly, that we consider it to be an abuse of Parliament to be disrespectful of the institution for a government to 'deliberately, by policy, flout the laws and then come in here and seek validating legislation.

Secondly, I have said before what you should be doing. You should be getting rid of the Minister that did it. You should not be endorsing it. You should not be doing that. That is what I said. What I said is that what you should be doing is looking at the resources, within the Government, because I think here we are dealing with a direct and deliberate policy decision to flout the law.

I have supported validation legislation in here before. But I believe, in every instance, it was one where the law was broken accidentally. This is the first time I am seeing validation legislation, as a result of a direct policy decision. I have traced that back, Sir. I have traced it back to the Estimates of March of this year showing clearly the deficit

which the Minister had and showing clearly how that was exacerbated in the first six months of the year. I showed clearly how we did absolutely nothing about it and showed clearly how we must rely, extensively, on Central Bank finances.

How can we assist the Government in finding a solution to this problem without breaking the law or without seeking to increase the limit? I believe that there are certain important steps that have to be taken. One area relates to the wastage of Government funds.

First of all, I feel, for example, that those people who stole some \$12 million in CARSICOT should be identified, prosecuted and somehow try and get some of the money back in the Treasury. That is step one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just want to caution the Honourable Member even though we are dealing with a Bill which has no relationship whatsoever to CARSICOT - not to carry the debate too wide outside the ambit or the context of the Bill.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking, Sir, about the steps which the Government can take, in order to reduce expenditure without costing any jobs.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just one minute. Because the argument always has been that if you reduce expenditure, it is going to mean a loss of jobs.

If I can demonstrate to the Government how they can save \$75 million, then they would not need to increase the overdraft by \$75 million and Barbados would be a lot better off. That is what I want to do now. I am starting off with CARSICOT. That is about \$12 million, in total. I am including the implications for ADC, what has happened there.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not through the ADC. You are joking.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is now \$15 million. It is worse than I thought. You check out the transfers through ADC to CARSICOT. I am not talking only of the BLP liabilities.

Talk about illegality? Let me tell you something. You came inside here and talk about you personally...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No. My good friend. When I told you that you should go and check out those people in Canada, you told me they were checked out and that I should spend some of my money and go and check them out myself. Do you remember?

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. I never said that. I deny that categorically.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment. Do you want to make a point of order?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I denied what he said. That is all I did, Sir. I never said that I never said that in here nor anywhere else. I never said that inside this Chamber nor outside of this Chamber. I never said that

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: No. I have not forgotten. Not me.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Anyhow, Sir, I remember when I referred to a certain person, as a crook, I was forced to withdraw it. When I insisted that it should be checked out, I am quite sure. It may have been in an aside, that you made those remarks.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was forced to withdraw those remarks, right here, when I objected to the Government guaranteeing it.

And talking about illegality, Sir?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Who I called a crook?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Ask the Honourable Member. He objected to my calling him a crook.

Sir, somewhere among these documents here I have or had the interim report of the audit, the interim audit at CARSICOT. Do you know something, Sir, do you know that this illegality that has encompassed the Ministry of Finance has actually stretched to the institutions, as well? Part of this expenditure, we are dealing with \$6.5 million....let me explain to you why. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, some years ago, in a landmark

opinion given by the court here managed to save someone something like \$1.5 million, because the court ruled that the loan made, I think by First National City to the particular corporation was improperly made because the Articles of the company were not complied with, under the Companies Act

. You will find that all the loans made, by the National Bank, to CARSICOT, that not one of them has been complied with, under the Companies Act. Therefore, the Barbados National Bank cannot demand one cent All \$6.5 million is down the drain, and approved by the Minister of Finance. Do you want to know why? Because under the Barbados National Bank Act, all loans over a certain amount must be approved by the Minister of Finance.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sue them and get it back. You would not get back one cent, I tell you. That is \$6.5 million.

What I would tell them now, Sir, is do not start another company on the same basis, on the same salary scale. The \$1 million plus that you spent already, I was saying that you can probably save about \$5 million to \$6 million, if you deal in that particular area.

I am going to point out to you \$75 million. I will get to the St. Joseph Hospital, but later on. Not just yet. I am going to show you ways and means.

Sherbourne. Cut back on the expenditure there. Already a lot of people have had to be laid off. I gather that only a few people are working on the project now. They have shifted from Sherbourne into other areas. They are still employed and nobody has been laid off, as far as I know. Cutback on the outlays in that area. That is two areas. 9.50 p.m.

3. No more trips to China.

4. The money you are throwing away on Nelson down there turning him around for what reason nobody knows - try and cut back on the money you are spending there in a different context.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I really regret having to rise on this point of order. But I am constrained to draw to Your Honour's attention the rule about repetition. That is about the fifth time the Honourable Member has referred to the turn around of Nelson.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: So Nelson turned around five different times? The rule says that you should not repeat yourself and I really should try now and see if he can move

us away from this part of the repetition and move on to the newer areas.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have sought to caution the Honourable Member that the Bill which is before the Chamber is a specific Bill. I know you are making examples, but try not to do too much padding because it can stretch us very far.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Oh, yes! I am giving specific example, Sir. You take for example, Sir, the money thrown away on the Supreme Building where the IDC paid four times as much for quotations which turned into \$40,000 and spent \$120,000 on the windows. Do you hear what I have told you? Anyhow, on an IDC building that was being renovated, the amount deliberately spent was \$80,000 more for the same job, giving it to PS Security, a firm who also got a contract recently for twice the amount. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these documents are downstairs you know. But they will come back again. Anyhow, the figure was somewhere about \$300,000 to \$400,000 and they paid about \$600,000 plus to PS Security. Let me see what the exact amount was, Sir. Oran Limited bid for \$349,000 and PS Security \$605,000, and they got the job when, Sir, the report concluded that both samples satisfied the requirements specified by the consultants.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not read nothing. I know what you want to know.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member just got up and quoted from a document, Sir. He did not have his lieutenants to help him as fast as they should. So he just quoted from a document and Your Honour is fully aware, Sir, that the rules require that if he quotes from a document that he should make it a document of the House, Sir. Let him make it a document, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not quote from any document and that is that. I looked at a document I referred to my notes. It is a different thing than from reading from the notes. When I am ready, I am going to make that a document of the House because I happen to know a lot more about the same PS Security in relation to work that they are doing for Government now at two or three times the cost without any kind of tender and contract whatever. All the carpeting, tiles, and windows - I know what I am talking about but I am holding it. You cannot let go everything at one time. He is the godson of the economic guru, the economic voodoo guru of the DLP. I have just picked two areas, Sir. I have already identified several million dollars. I know what I am talking about You cannot let go everything at one time. I will let go in due course but I have the documentation here..

Sir, take what is going on at NCC. Do you believe, Sir, that it is right that a member of the DLP can go in town and order fencing and send the bill to the Chairman of the NCC and get it paid? Could you believe that, Sir?

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My apologies, Sir. I did not have the time to write to you in advance and let you know that I would be mentioning the name, Sir. Never mind, Sir, I am just showing you what happens and how this thing escalates. I believe, Sir, that if much greater care is taken with Government expenditure that we would not find ourselves in this kind of situation that we have at the moment. You take my good friend, Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. Could you imagine, Sir, that he allowed an aircraft worth \$4 million to be auctioned for \$7 million?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The Honourable Member is not speaking the truth. I own no aircraft. The Government owns no aircraft and has not auctioned off any aircraft. I allowed no aircraft to be auctioned off for any money whatsoever, zilch, or a million dollars.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Caricargo, a company in which the Barbados Government has a substantial shareholding and an even greater responsibility in terms of its management that was reflected in its shareholding... Sorry, I must apologize, Sir. I said that it was worth \$4 million. No, Sir. It was worth U.S. \$7.5 million and was auctioned off for \$7 million.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member knows. If he would want to speak the truth, he can speak it. There are a few things here in connection with that. (1) Barbados has no more say in any matter relating to Caricargo than the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. We are two equal shareholders. I cannot tell Trinidad what to do and Trinidad cannot tell us what to do. I cannot stop something from happening if Trinidad wants it to happen and vice versa. If the Honourable Member is saying that Barbados should take up its money and put and save the plane from being auctioned off...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, you are saying it. Those are not your words, but you are saying that. If you say that is what we should do, he is now arguing against himself. He is talking about all kinds of over expenditure. He is talking about squandermania. That would be the essence of squandermania, Sir. Caricargo lost nothing by their aircraft

They had two aircraft, one was sold for \$4.1 million, the best price they could get, and the other one that was auctioned off was also sold for \$4 million and the amount owed to the trades, nearly U.S. \$4 million, was written off. So in point of fact, even though it was auctioned off for \$400,000, in fact it was worth to Caricargo the U.S. \$4 million; because the \$4 million owed to the trades was written off because of that 10.00 p.m.

I think we have been here for a long time, Sir, and rather than having to bring in some legislation to validate what we are doing beyond the legal limit, the time provided by the Standing Orders, I am going to move in a minute that this sitting be suspended, but before I do that, Sir, I wish to give notice of some documents.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a proposal that we revert to Government Notices. If there are no objections, we shall proceed.

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am commanded, Sir, by the Cabinet to lay the Land Registration (Suspension) Order, 1990.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am commanded to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Land Registration (Suspension) Order, 1990. Also, a Bill to provide for the seizure and impounding of straying livestock and for related matters.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Bill to provide for the seizure and impounding of straying livestock and for related matters be read a first time.

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

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

POSTPONEMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of the Financial Administration and Audit (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1990 be postponed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am now about to move the suspension of this sitting. I am going to suggest that we meet again on Friday, but I want to say that I have given an undertaking that we will do the Resolution standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition on Friday, but after we have concluded the matter we have just postponed and maybe other matters as well.

At this point, Sir, I am moving that the sitting be suspended until Friday, December 21, 1990 at 9.00 a.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 10.10p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on the motion for suspension on last Tuesday, I was at the time completing my introductory remarks on this particular matter, and as a matter of courtesy, and in order to ensure continuity of the debate, I thought I would very briefly mention the points that I made at that time.

I dealt, Sir, with thirteen matters which in a very brief summary related to:

First, the impropriety of validation legislation where there is evidence that the law was breached as a matter of policy. The second point was the fact that in other mature...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could I draw to your attention, Sir, the rule against repetition?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am not repeating myself. I am just mentioning in linear manner, one line, the points that I made in order to pick up my debate.

The second point, Sir, is that the appropriate action in other jurisdictions would be to remove the Minister from office.

The third point was the defects and impropriety of including a limit in the main body of the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

The fourth point was the failure to recognise the need to harmonise that amendment with other legislation relating to the same problem.

The fifth point was bringing to the House's attention, the provisions of the Central Bank Act *itself*.

The sixth point was the need for the Central Bank to obey the law as set out in those provisions.

The seventh point was to call on the Governor of the Central Bank to act in accordance with that Act or resign from office.

The eighth point was to outline...

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are going to tell me what is repetitious? I am summarising the points that I made. That is your business. I am not telling you what to do. When you get up, you have unlimited time. Good.

The eighth point, Sir, was the incompetence of the Minister which led to the present situation.

The ninth point was the extent of insolvency of the Government.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Order. There is a rule against repetition. We have heard all of that *ad nauseam* from the Member already and I am submitting that he is repeating himself unnecessarily and that he should be prevented from breaking the rules of the House in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: In response to the submissions, I took it that the Honourable Member was concluding what he said was the first stage of his presentation and he wanted to insert that. As I understand it, the first part of your presentation is what you said you wanted to lay before the House. I think the Honourable Member can carry on and get on with the Resolution before us.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I intended merely to make those few points as a matter of courtesy to this Honourable House. But sometimes, Sir, we find that being courteous to certain people would bring about the kind of response which we have just heard. Not everyone appreciates acts of courtesy.

Essentially Sir, they were the basic points that I tried to make. I also indicated, Sir, when I was about to finish that I had a duty and an obligation to point out to the Government how they can proceed in ordering the financial affairs of this country without going down the line of increasing this limit by \$75 million and thereby create further monetary instability and undermine the financial integrity of the country.

Now, Sir, this section of my speech. I want to be very clear about this because I see the line which the Government will be taking. We will be dealing specifically

with what this Opposition feels should be the measures that the Government should be taking and the background reasons why those measures should be taken as an alternative to increasing the limit.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the option of raising that \$75 million by fiscal measures is not available to the Government for the following reasons: The impositions of 1989-90 generated a situation where the Government was able to obtain its maximum revenue yield from taxation and thereafter there has been a significant decline and in those circumstances it is quite clear that the Government is in a situation where revenue measures cannot help them to raise that \$75 million.

Now, Sir, this is the first time in the history of Barbados where a Government has reached a point in taxation which has resulted in a negative revenue yield in any given fiscal year and where, indeed, the option of avoiding printing money by revenue measures is no longer available to the Government of Barbados, because, Sir, however you look at it, if you were to try to do it by means of direct taxes that would simply now put even further depression throughout the society, particularly on the middle class and the poor. So, there is no possibility of raising that \$75 million from that source.

I would just like to point out that any time in Barbados you are talking about increasing direct taxes on personal incomes, it means taxation on the middle class and it means taxation on the poor, because there are less than 5% of income earners in this society with net taxable incomes of \$50 thousand and more. Apart from the Ministers of Government I don't think there are that many other people in this society with that kind of salary.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Should I say, and the Leader of the Opposition, if that will please you?

The other point, Sir, is that I think that the level of indirect taxation has reached a point of negative returns and therefore that option is not open to the Government. The only other revenue option open to Government Sir, is the option of capital revenue. Capital revenue, Sir, to the extent of \$75 million in the short term, is not available to the Government of Barbados for a variety of reasons. We have just seen the disastrous intervention of the Government in the foreign market place - so that option is not available. This particular Bill, Sir, if it is passed, would even make it even more difficult to raise capital revenue. The third thing Sir, is that the other source of capital revenue would be local borrowings from the local commercial banks and that is not available to the Government. So, therefore, Sir, the Government is left with what it has done, that is, Central Bank financing, and my submission is, Sir, that this attempt to generate revenue by printing money is a total disaster and

will be made worse by the impact that it will have on the country as a whole. So therefore, Sir, the alternative of revenue measures as I have set out are not available to the Government. So, we cannot raise money. There is no mechanism for raising money by taxation as an alternative to this \$75 million and the \$75 million everybody accepts is a disaster to the country. My task Sir, now, is to proceed to set out what other options are available to the Government. 9.10 a.m.

Normally, Sir, when the Government is in this kind of situation, it either has fiscal options or monetary options available to it. Are there any monetary options available to the Government? The answer, Sir, is also "No". They have exhausted every single known monetary option that could be available to them. Let me explain.

The Government cannot increase the reserve requirements of the commercial banks. That is the money which is sequestered by instrument of the Central Bank in order to modify liquidity in the system. It is used in situations of excess liquidity. When there is no liquidity it would be utterly irresponsible of them to attempt to increase the reserve requirements of the Central Bank so they can get no money from that source. If it were possible to increase the reserve requirements of the commercial banks, it is possible that Government could generate some liquidity from that source and avoid printing this money and increasing the limit. That is not available to them.

The other alternative, as has always been the case, is to go to the local market by way of debentures, bonds, or other wise and try to raise money. We know that the Government has two instruments in the market already. There is now an additional instrument as a result of a Resolution of this House which will be in the markets shortly, that is the sugar bonds, and there is no room particularly in a situation of tight money that the Government can raise this money.

I am just trying to point out, Sir, the kind of bind that this country and the kind of difficulties which the mismanagement of the Minister of Finance has brought this country into. This is a terrible situation, an appalling situation where none of the instruments normally available to regulate and manage the economy is available to the Government and the only one is the despised instrument of printing money.

The other area would be to look and see what credit is available in the system and by what other measures Government can tap that credit. But there is not credit in the system.

The other area - here now this is a big problem - is the impact which this measure now is going to have on interest rates in Barbados. This measure is bound in the

long run to push up interest rates in Barbados even further and create major problems of the entire Barbadian society. Apart from Government it is going to spill over into the society. How is it going to generate increased interest rates?

I have already pointed out that all the traditional instruments which would lead to some kind of control within the system have already been exhausted and the only one left would be interest rates. Therefore, according to the Minister's policy, as he has enunciated in this House on several occasions, it is quite clear that he is prepared to use his interest rates to influence the flow of foreign exchange. In the short medium term and in the long run we can expect serious increases in interest rates in Barbados if this measure is proceeded with.

On that ground alone where the Government has exhausted all other monetary instruments that could be made available to it to bring a measure inside here...

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the Honourable Member now is venturing into a breach of the rules. I carefully listened to the Honourable Member who said that he was going to give solutions on this second section of his presentation. It appears to me you are gradually going off course into something that you have said before. I have heard you mentioned printing of money many times, about four times this morning. I am warning the Honourable Member to keep on course.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a meaningful contribution. I am setting out the background to the suggestions that I will be making by first dealing with those that are not available.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but you have made some of that already in your previous presentation already.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir. I have not dealt with the impact of this on interest rates. What I have done so far is very simple that is to exclude the fiscal and monetary options available to the Government. There are not many more, Sir. If I am going to make a recommendation I can only do that on the basis of setting out why the traditional measures are not available to the Government. I will be very careful and in each point along the way I will bring to your attention up front exactly what I am planning to do.

What, therefore, are the measures that I would like to suggest to the Government? Having excluded monetary or revenue measures as a possible source, we are really left only with what should have been done long ago, that is, expenditure control measures. There is no other instrument available to the Government. It is my duty to set out the full range of areas which I can identify and demonstrate to the Government of Barbados how it can save money and not get this country involved in this particular measure. That is how I will proceed next.

Sir, in order to facilitate this, it is my view that a responsible Government in view of the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of this measure, would bring to this House a Budget instantly. Such a Budget would not involve any increased taxation or any monetary measures as I have pointed out the constraints and will concentrate on expenditure control.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. The last time the Honourable Member spoke on Tuesday he said so. He is repeating himself. I wish to draw this to the attention of the House once again. He has said that already.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I did not say so. I said he should have brought a Budget last autumn in September. I am saying what you need to do now. You are not going to tell me how to conduct my speech. You can get up and speak for 10 hours. Are you afraid? 9.20 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no need for that. I am in control of the Chamber and I will allow the debate to go on, within the Rules of the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have set out the parameters of my speech very clearly. I am saying that the appropriate step would be to bring to this House an instrument by way of a budget that would be dealing with expenditure controls. This is what I will be concentrating on, right now.

I am going to identify several areas of expenditure which need to be addressed immediately. I am quite sure that if those areas are addressed over the next three months then the \$75 million can be realized. I would also want to ensure that any expenditure cutting budgetary measures would not impact on employment opportunities in Barbados. Therefore my recommendation would seek to examine those areas where expenditure can be cut, without in any way, affecting employment.

Sir, let us look at some of these areas. Take for example, Sir, the increase in the vote recently for travelling overseas by Ministers. I say that the Minister of Finance should put an embargo immediately on all travel abroad by Ministers, except in a dire emergency. You would knock off about \$1/2 million. You are already \$1/2 million on the way to the \$75 million. All travel by all those whose travel expenditure is incurred, under that vote, whether it be Ministers, public servants or whoever.

Moreover, Sir, I believe that that can be applied, throughout the public service, as a national emergency measure to cut back on expenditure that is not absolutely necessary and which does not involve loss in jobs in Barbados. If you have a crisis on your hand which makes you come to Parliament with this kind of measure then you have a duty and an obligation to look at those other areas first and see what would happen. I am quite sure if you take

the entire Public Service, including Statutory Boards and the lot, you are talking about an overall public sector saving, in the next three months, of within three quarters of a million dollars and \$1 million. That is step one.

There is no way that you all are going to get me to take my seat in here, unless I carry out my duty and demonstrate to you how you can save money.

Another area which has not come to the attention of this Honourable House and I am very concerned about how public funds are spent without any kind of approval of this Honourable House. Recently it has been drawn to my attention that this Government, without even informing this Honourable House as to its plans has been disbursing a considerable amount of funds to a company called Caribbean Cotton Industries Incorporated, C/o Peat Marwick Associates, 1st and 2nd Floors Nile Street, Bridgetown.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Caribbean Cotton Industries Incorporated, C/o Peat Marwick Associates, 1st and 2nd Floors Nile House, Nile Street, Bridgetown. I am going to make it a document of the House because what I am saying is that this expenditure must stop.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am saying is that you repeated that twice already.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: The item you just mentioned. You repeated that twice, within the last minute.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir ...

Mr. SPEAKER: What I want to tell Honourable Members is that the Honourable Member is not addressing other Members. He is addressing me. Therefore, I do not need to hear the same thing twice.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have set out because I feel that millions of dollars can be saved here over the next three months. I anticipate probably about \$3 million to \$4 million can be saved over the next three months. I propose to make these a document of the House. I am going to read them and the reason why I am introducing them as documents of the House is to call on the Government to stop the activity in this area so as to save \$3 million.

"June 19,1990,

Mr. Rawle Harris,
Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries,
Graeme Hall,
CHRIST CHURCH.

Dear Mr. Harris,

Re: CARIBBEAN COTTON INDUSTRIES
INCORPORATED

Caribbean Cotton Industries Incorporated has held three board meetings at which we have been able to have all the normal legal requirements satisfied, except agreement on the by-laws which are currently being reviewed by Nitel Bosaiiki Co. Ltd."

It goes on, Sir. I would not bore the House too much with all the details because I have so much to say, I do not want to run out of time because of hoarseness or anything like that. But it sets out the structure of the company and then, Sir, it goes on:

"Shares of \$250 000 have been acquired by the Government and a Share Certificate has been issued. Please ensure that the sum of \$438 500 is deposited shortly. This represents the remainder necessary to complete the Government's purchase of 51% of the first call. This would signal to the bank that we are serious."

This House never approved any expenditure of this kind. This is a letter to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture. I do not know whether the money has been disbursed but my understanding is that well over \$1 million has been spent in an area that has been shown to be a disaster and will result in further waste of money. I have great pleasure in making this a document of the House.

The second letter I propose to make a document of the House is as follows:

"Caribbean Cotton Industries Incorporated,
C/o Peat Marwick Associates,
Nile House,
Nile Street,
Bridgetown.
August 23,1990.

The Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries,
Graeme Hall,
Christ Church.

Attention: Mr. Albert Brathwaite

Dear Sir, Re: Request For Further Share

Call

During the past two months we have been discussing the projected development programme for the industry with the Ministry, representatives of Mitel Bosaiki, at various governmental levels in Antigua and Barbuda, St. Kins, Nevis, Montserrat and within the organization.

In accordance with the understanding reached, during these negotiations, a further share call is being made and I am to request your assistance in arranging the transfer of \$300 000 to the company's Account No. 02200355. Share Certificates should be issued in acknowledgement of this equity injection. Your early attention will be appreciated.

Yours Truly, Caribbean Cotton
Industries Incorporated,
A. W. Knight,
Managing Director."

All I am doing, Sir, is presenting to this House information to show that there is room in that single area where, at least another \$2 million to \$3 million in expenditure can be saved, because I happen to know that there have been subsequent demands for more and more money. Nothing is being produced for more and more money. I am ashamed that public expenditure could be committed in yet another cotton venture after we have lost and stand to lose a lot more money, because I will be dealing with the money we will lose in CARSICOT in another three months' too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the end of that...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER:... particular document?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, no. Of that company. I am identifying \$75 million. I am only at \$3 million now. I have \$72 million more to go. Let us be clear, I intend to remain within the parameters of this resolution and do my duty to Barbados. I have just dealt with that one area. 9.30 a.m.

The second area I want to deal with, Sir, is also in the Ministry of Agriculture. I believe, Sir, on a previous occasion when I tried to bring to the attention of this Honourable House the risk to Government expenditure and taxpayers' money involved in CARSICOT, there was quite a problem. Sir, now we are faced with a situation where within the next three months this country might find itself having lost vast sums in CARSICOT and having to come up with \$40 or \$50 million. That is right \$40 or \$50 million

to satisfy breaches of contract. I think this Honourable House must be aware of what is going on because this \$75 million could be used almost exclusively in satisfying that.

Sir, I was told that I was talking foolishness when I dealt with the guarantee that it has cost this country over \$12 million in relation to CARSICOT. I am not going to be told today that I am talking foolishness. I am going to deal with it

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is right Apart from the ADC's \$15 million debt, I am going to deal with that too. Sir, I want to bring to this Honourable House a situation which might cost this country \$50 million in damages in the next few months where the Government is setting about to renege on a contract. I am going to present to this Honourable House documentary evidence that the Cabinet of Barbados met and agreed to the lease and I am going to make it a document of the House, Sir. If those arrangements are frustrated, then you might well find that \$75 million of this will go to satisfy that I will read, Sir:

"Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries
P. O. Box 506
Graeme Hall
Christ Church, Barbados

Our Ref: 2114/5 Volume 1

YourRef:

Letter to:

Mr. Nitin Amersey,
President Scothalls Limited
466 Court San Antoine
Westmount, Montreal
Quebec, Canada H3Y2JD

Dear Mr. Amersey:

Re: Establishment of An Integrated Sea Island Cotton
Industry in Barbados

The Cabinet at its meeting on July 14, 1988 considered Note 88623/MAF46 on the subject of the establishment of an integrated sea island cotton industry in Barbados."

To save time, I will exclude Sections A, B, C, D, and E of this matter.

"The Cabinet noted that Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company Limited proposes to enter into negotiations with the Barbados National Bank for the lease with

option to purchase of lands comprising Congo Road, Bushy Park, and Vineyard Plantations."

Section G, Sir:

"The Cabinet concluded that the Ministry of Housing and Lands should obtain a valuation of the land at Spencers Plantation, Christ Church and arrange for the lease of that land to Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company for 25 years as part of the Government's equity participation in the company."

I go on, Sir, in this same document. I will just quote the relevant part, Sir, because I do not want to detain the House or bore the House.

"The Ministry of Housing and Lands has also been advised of the decision, that is the decision of the Cabinet, and requested to indicate the value of the lease or the amount of the annual rental charge for the land at Spencers and provide a draft lease for your consideration."

Mr. Speaker, as in the past - this is a document of the House, Sir - we were ridiculed when we made the point in this Honourable House that the Government was embarking in this cotton business on a matter that will cost the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars. We will be ridiculed today but we will make our second point, Sir.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I continue, Sir? As further evidence, Sir, of the same, I shall make a document of this House a letter from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Industries to the Director of Finance and Planning dated July 28, 1988, Reference MP21145/Volume 2 also a document of this House. In conformity with the spirit of trying to be as conservative in my words as possible, I will also make this a document of the House - "Establishment of An integrated Sea Island Cotton Industry in Barbados".

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member may very well within himself believe that he is doing the House a service. But the Minister of Agriculture, Sir, spoke at length in this House and gave this House full complete information during a debate in this House in which all of the information which the Honourable Member is now regurgitating was presented to this House. I wish to submit that the Honourable Member is reflecting on a matter that has already been dealt with in this House by bringing the same information to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: In response to that, even though the discussion may have taken place, my understanding is that

it was not under a Resolution and, therefore, a reflection of a vote would not have arisen if it was taken place in a normal debate.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, with due respect, I draw to Your Honour's attention that it was on the basis of a motion brought by the same Honourable Member a vote of no-confidence in the Minister of Agriculture, Sir. I draw it to the Honourable Member's attention. It was therefore a Resolution of this House and it was in this same session brought by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East. I beg your pardon, Sir, and therefore it was a vote that was taken in this session. Therefore, the Honourable Member is reflecting by propounding to do that, Sir. 9.40 a.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The sole and only reason why I am dealing with this matter is because I am absolutely convinced that the taxpayers of this country....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. We have a lot of business to do and I am permitting the Honourable Member to get on with the Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am trying to point out, Sir, how they can save another \$50 million. If I may continue, Sir, Section (f) of this particular document again recites what was quoted in the other document, and as a matter of courtesy I will not even read it, I will just make it a document of the House and indicate that it was signed by C. E. Maynard, Permanent Secretary.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I go further for Your Honour and I draw to your attention rule 28(3), which reads:

"Reference may not be made to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending, in such a way as might in the opinion of the Chair prejudice the interests of parties thereto."

I know of my own knowledge, Sir, that documents which the Honourable Member is now making documents of the House, which would therefore make them public documents, form part of an affidavit that has been submitted to the High Court. I am saying that with the Honourable Member's continuing insertion of documentation about a matter is not only reflecting on a vote that was already taken, but he is in breach, I submit, of rule 28(3).

Mr. SPEAKER: It is clear to me that if a Member raises a matter of that nature the Speaker is not always aware that matters may be before the court, and in that sense the Chair is always willing to abide by any submission from any Member who is clear in the view that

it is a matter *sub judice*. If the Honourable Member and other Members assure the Chair that this is so, then I will ask the Honourable Member to refrain from that, but the Chair is not aware that such is the case.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will give you my assurance, Sir, that the Honourable Member is seeking to mislead the House and what he is saying is not correct. If I may continue, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I submit that what the Honourable Member said cannot be said of another matter that breaks at least four rules and I ask that the matter be withdrawn and struck from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure he is clear on that. Just withdraw it and get on.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, if I may withdraw that remark, I have made this a document of the House, and if the Honourable Member feels squeamish about those documents, to satisfy him I will move away from them and will bring a document to reinforce the same point, which was not laid in this Honourable House, which has not been the subject of debate in this Honourable House and which deals with the sequential point to this matter.

I would like to make a document of the House a report from Coopers & Lybrand, April 27, 1990 to the Secretary, Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company Limited, Trident House, Bridgetown, and I will look at page 3. The point I wish to make is this. Based on the letter of June 29, 1988 written to Scothalls by the Permanent Secretary, which is that letter I just made a document of the House: -

"We understand that the Government's intention was to partly satisfy its equity participation with a substantial cash injection and this was to be achieved through the leasing of certain plantations and the assignment of Spencers Plantation from the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and the assigning of the ginnery at Spencers. We noted that the company took possession of Spencers."

That is enough for me, Sir.

Now, Sir, what does this all mean? This means that the Cabinet of Barbados is on record of entering into an agreement, it means that that agreement and evidence of it was further given effect by an act of possession, and it is my view that the taxpayers of Barbados could be held liable up to \$50 million for any breach of contract on the part of the Government.

Sir, I now turn to an area where the Government can save about \$10 million in expenditure over the next three months, within this fiscal year, and thereby reducing the need for any \$75 million by this mechanism. I turn to the

Ministry of Health. There can be no doubt that a large amount of money is being wasted at the St Joseph Hospital, and up to \$10 million can be saved in the next three months. I would suggest that the St. Joseph Hospital is one of those projects exclusively financed from local sources where the Government can cut back on their expenditure over the next three months and probably save another \$5 million.

We are at over \$50 million already, which gives you an idea of the kind of things that have been going on. Can you imagine, Sir, they issued an electrical contract for St. Joseph Hospital and there was no planning for the electricals?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is saying that the Government issued an electrical contract and no electrical planning, and I am stating that he is misleading the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will accept what the Honourable Member is saying. What I am saying is that the cost of electrical works at the St. Joseph Hospital was about four time what it needed to be because there was no planning for the electrical installation in the hospital. That is in a document to the Minister.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Your Honour would be aware that the St. Joseph Hospital is an existing building, that it is being refurbished and so the talk of planning for electricals would apply to a new building. The Honourable Member will know that a firm of consultants was engaged to discuss and to work out and to plan for the electricals, that it is an in-house arrangement that is going on at St. Joseph Hospital. The Honourable Member knows that and he is therefore misleading this House. It is an in-house contract under a consultant that is subcontracting with everybody for the services, and the Honourable Member knows that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I would have heard that if you are rewiring an old building you do not need a plan. That is the basis of.... 9.50 a.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is not what he said, Sir. He said we awarded a contract without planning, Sir. That is what he said and now he is getting up talking about rewiring. When he is talking about rewiring, he has to know, Sir. He has to tell me exactly. It is not like geography where he is going to talk flamboyantly, talk and utter words. I could give him chapter and verse on every single cent spent at St. Joseph Hospital. I will bring it for you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am not Sir, an electrical engineer, nor is the Minister, but I believe Sir,

that I would be bound by the consultants whom he employed, ADeB consultants, and that is if you....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I am not going to let him get away with that, Sir, because ADeB Consultants as he knows, anybody can mention their name, because there are only two in the country and it is either one or the other and he knows them. What is going on at St. Joseph's is public knowledge.

So don't talk about he would be bound by ADeB Consultants. ADeB Consultants have been invited into St. Joseph recently to re-examine the electricals. The Honourable Member is seeking to mislead the House by throwing out names, Sir. I repeat it is an in-house contract. The engineer who has been responsible for the St. Joseph Hospital is the Hospital Engineer of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and therefore I would be bound by what the Hospital Engineer advises me and not what the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition tells me. He cannot mislead on that, Sir. I would not let him.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am not accusing the Honourable Member of any impropriety. All I am saying is that ADeB Consultants have said - ADeB Consultants, your consultants, the best in Barbados you said - that there was no thorough planning for the electricals at that hospital in terms of the renovation and it is costing us four times as much.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: At the time it was built Sir. I state categorically that it is not costing us four times as much because it would have to be four times as much as something. I am stating Sir, that he is quoting partially from what ADeB Consultants said about the Hospital when it was originally built, Sir. The Honourable Member is deliberately misleading this House, I submit Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Another area, Sir - I am trying to deal with the areas where I see money could be saved, Sir, to cut down on this \$75 million. One area is the St. Joseph Hospital. The second area with St. Joseph Hospital where I think substantial savings could be made is in the area of the sewerage, in the areas of the plumbing and in the planning of the work, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Just for the record, Sir, since the Honourable Member said he is going to be on a marathon. I have to take him as he said it. He said that we could save \$2 million. The estimates will show that we had less than \$5 million so I don't know how he could save ten out of five. The Honourable Member is also aware Sir, that I told this House that we were purchasing a new sewerage system which has been purchased, which has been built, which has been installed and the Honourable Member knows that and the sewerage system was not included in the estimates because it was not anticipated that there would be a sewerage system.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member bases his case on something not in the estimates. He says first of all that expenditure was not included in the estimates so it could not have been incurred and now he winds up by saying that he incurred expenditure that was not in the estimates.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. I never said that. I said that he was saying that we could save \$10 million and he mentioned sewerage and I pointed out that I told this House before that we were putting in a new sewerage system.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member, Sir, keeps provoking. The Rt. Honourable Prime Minister has winked at me and indicated to me he wants me to go after him, but I am trying not to do that.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to keep the record straight. Even when, Sir, we were very close friends, I never winked at him. I am not in that - not winking at you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was under the impression that we are still close friends.

The point I am making, Sir, is that despite the protestations of the Honourable Member the St. Joseph Hospital is an area which is entirely under the discretion of Government as to the pace at which it can be concluded and if the Government is faced with a cash crisis of this order rather than coming to the House for this then they can lop some of the money that we spent in this financial year off that. All I am doing, Sir, is showing areas where I think there has been a considerable amount of wastage and I could point out more. Do not provoke me. If you get up again...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have reached a stage in this House where Members are starting to forget that they are addressing the Chair. No one can provoke me. Neither will I allow anyone to provoke me. My sole duty is to keep the debate within the four corners of the Resolution.

I am going to ask Honourable Members to desist from those kinds of remarks because I believe it is a reflection on myself and I am asking Members just to keep within the Resolution. Continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. Now, Sir, I am saying that that is another project that we could deal with.

Now, Sir, another area where it is quite clear that substantial savings can be made in the next few months

without hurting anybody is in the area of defence and security and maybe, Sir, I think that if certain recommendations made to the Government were put in place immediately, I believe that there could be a substantial saving of some \$3 to \$4 million on capital and current expenditure in the next three months or so of this financial year.

Certainly, Sir, they should start off by saving expenditure on transport by not allowing a Minister who has no local standing in law in the matter to order the Defence Force, in contempt of Court, to unlawfully remove goods from the care of the Marshal as was done in Barbados..

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Those goods were not removed from the Marshal in any unlawful way. It was in pursuance of an Order of the Judge of the High Court that the goods be delivered to the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Agriculture instructed the Defence Force to accept the goods on behalf of the Ministry. It was not done in contempt of any order of the Court. At the time it was done, it was done at the order of the Court and no other order had yet been served on the Ministry of Agriculture.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am at a loss to discover how a point like that could be considered a saving device. It is purely a legal matter.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will deal....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I submit Sir, that the Government's decision to ensure that the cotton was not burned was a saving device.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to be involved in that kind of discussion. I am not encouraging that kind of discussion and I would like Honourable Members to continue on the Resolution as it stands.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would accept your gentle hint and I will not go further in that area.

Another area where I think the Government could save about \$2 to \$3 million before the end of this financial year is by making an adjustment in fuel charges, Sir. I see, Sir, that the Government of Dominica has now reduced certain fuel charges fairly substantially only this week rather than face an Opposition motion on the matter.

Now Sir, I indicated to the Minister of Finance earlier on, that when those costs go up as he has put them up, that

immediately that impacts on Government expenditure because the Government's fuel bills, Sir, throughout the country would have gone up substantially and therefore a modest reduction even in the area of fuel oil only could save about \$1.8 million between now and the end of March. I am talking Sir, about half a cent a litre could save about \$1.8 million. In that alone and nothing to do with the other areas. I can identify another \$5 million that the Government would not need. Do you see, Sir, how we are progressing gradually and we will reach the \$75 million in due course. I will come back to that later on. 10.00 a.m.

Now, Sir, Sherbourne. I went up there and had a look to monitor progress of what was going on. I think they could bring the entire project to a halt except for the section that is near completion. You would probably save another between \$5 and \$8 million by the end of this financial year. By not spending money revenue is coming in.

The next one is to look at the employment practices of the Honourable Member for St. James South at the NCC. Look there and see what is happening and see whether or not by a restructuring of the expenditure at NCC whether a substantial saving could not be made. Furthermore, the Government should immediately restructure the expenditure at the NCC to ensure that there is a capital component to that expenditure.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Take your time. Order, please. I cannot allow a debate to go on within a debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, for many years I have indicated that expenditure at the NCC should not be seen solely as a method for generating jobs in the society but that the work of the NCC should be so organised that it would have within it projects, projects that are income generating like the beautification of certain gullies as tourists spots. In the long run over time the NCC would, in fact, be generating almost enough income to pay its workers. It can happen.

I looked at this in one or two American cities. There are several cities in the United States where organisations similar to the NCC are, in fact, self-sustaining.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not talking to you. I saw some lovely spots in....

Mr. SPEAKER: Have I heard the Honourable Member say he is not talking to me?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Have we reached that stage in the debate?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will just ignore him, Sir. What I was saying is that the Government should take immediate steps to look and see a restructuring of the whole programme of the NCC because I think we should go beyond the point now, Sir, of allowing a Minister to abuse his authority at the NCC hiring and firing people as he likes and using the employment potential there for his own political gain and for that of his party.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member just said that I hire and fire. I have no control over who is employed at NCC. I am asking him to withdraw those remarks.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I would love that to remain on the record so that it would stand out by itself. Just leave that statement there.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying that the Honourable Member is reflecting on your onus?

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: If he is and he has no proof of that I would ask him to withdraw that statement

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I would not ask him to withdraw the remark that I was abusing nurses at the Hospital. That is not true because as far as I know he was not a nurse at the Hospital at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am becoming disappointed at the level of debate. I would have thought that a debate of this nature would have brought out the intellectual ability of others to be an example of what is going on. The debate is gradually declining. I am going to ask Members to raise the standard of the debate.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, if I may continue. We have some luxury coaches in Barbados at the moment. I believe they cost \$1.2 million. I believe the Government could sell off about five of them at least. I gather one is used by the Police Band. That would yield probal ly about \$800 000 to \$1 million. That is another possible source.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No. We are about \$42 million. That is on the expenditure side in part. As you have asked, Sir, and request that we take the debate to a higher plane, I will try my best. It will also be necessary for the

Government to save on that money by making an appropriate fiscal adjustment in the short-term. 10.10a.m.

I think the Government would need to look over 15-months to a fiscal adjustment of somewhere of \$150 million. If those policies were put in place right now \$150 million targeted fiscal adjustment over a 15-month period where the adjustment can come by say \$37.5 million a quarter over a 4-month period, we would see that, by the end of the first quarter, we would be pretty near our target of \$75 million, in terms of the impact. In other words, you would cut back approximately \$40 million in expenditure and you would achieve that adjustment \$37.5 million of \$150 million adjustment which is required over a 15-month period. But in the first three months, by making a \$37.5 million adjustment which is roughly equivalent to the loan that you are getting then I think there would be a substantial improvement in the area.

The other point that would immediately start to generate some revenue in terms of that \$37.5 million adjustment I am thinking about is that I think there is a need for relaxation of credit controls in Barbados and for the Government to move out of that market We cannot continue because that is having the opposite effect, in terms of the fiscal imbalance in the country. Sir, we have shown how you can deal immediately with about \$42 million and how you can deal with another \$37 million.

The other area that we have to look at is that the Government...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What I said, Sir, is that the Government needs to make an overall adjustment, fiscal adjustment of \$150 million. That is the difference between their expenditure and revenue over a 15-month period. If in the first three months of those four quarters - I am not functioning IMF style or anything like that - that is the first quarter of the four quarters you could save \$42 million and by the measures I am outlining here generate \$37 million in revenue stimulation then I think that you are well on the way.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not in taxes, Mr. Speaker. One of the most serious problems you have in Barbados is the failure of people to understand that revenue is not the same as taxation levels. You can have high taxation levels and get low revenue. You can have low taxation levels and have high revenue. The two are not the same.

What I am saying, Sir, is that given the present tax levels that if the Government relaxes strategically its credit

controls then its revenue base would automatically begin to expand. This is one of the measures.

I would say that in a three month period....

Aside.

LJ, '': C. AYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have never said lowering taxes, i never addressed taxation. What I said is that assuming you maintain the present tax levels at the moment, by the strategic relaxation of credit and the stimulation of the economy that you will get a significant portion of that \$37.5 million.

It is amazing. You put on credit controls in order to suppress economic activity and to damp down economic activity and you cannot understand that if you relax them, the reverse will happen. We are dealing sometimes with a level of ignorance that I find totally alarming. It is unbelievable, Sir. Because one of the problems that we are facing at the moment, one of the reasons why Government is facing a major revenue failure which has caused this particular measure to be before this Honourable House is because of the monetary policies in place. It is obvious. What you do is strategic relaxation there with the almost certainty, you are sure to probably get about \$2 million to \$3 million.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about revenue stimulation.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How much money did you spend? I would say in the short period of three months you would get about \$9 million. You would get about \$9 million between January and March because that is a period of restoration of inventory. The major contribution to that \$9 million would be the area of domestic consumption taxes which would be significantly stimulated. Domestic consumption taxes, yes, and general consumption taxes are about \$9 million. That is what would happen.

If I may continue, Sir. If the Government gets its overdraft at the Central Bank down to say \$80 million in the process, rather than go up to \$175 million, I would think the saving there could be about \$4 million. Let me explain. The government has to pay the Central Bank a rate of interest on its overdraft. The higher the overdraft, the more interest it has to pay. If it can keep its overdraft down to about \$80 million, well within the law, it then would save, I think, about \$5 million. At the moment the borrowings are over \$150 million between Treasury Bills and overdraft. I would not know particularly at what rate.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is not faulty because you are already up to \$150 million. If you reduce that to \$80 million, that is the kind of savings you will make. You are paying interest on the Treasury Bills. What is the Treasury Bill rate?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are paying 7.5% interest on \$50 million in Treasury Bills, plus you are paying on the overdraft That is around \$100 million and over. What I am saying is that if you liquidate that and get that down to \$80 million, we would automatically save about \$4 million in expenditure.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You save more. Precisely.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have to bring it down.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, up to you. Keep it there. My position is that it never got there before, it should never have been there and it has to come back down. As simple as that. 10.20 a.m.

You are going to be paying more. I suspect that you are paying more on the Treasury Bills than you are paying on the overdraft because the Ways and Means, Sir, usually attracts a lower rate than the other one.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir. The aim of the Government should be within the period of 15 months to get Government's borrowings from the Central Bank down to zero as it was before on several occasions. Government was a net lender to the Central Bank not a net borrower from the Central Bank and over a period of 15 months we have to aim to get back into that situation.

The other point, Sir, that I feel the Government can do now to get some more capital revenue is this. I indicated, Sir, certain capital projects that could be slowed down. But there are also other capital projects that can be accelerated and I will tell you which ones that should be accelerated in the next three months. All those capital projects which have a significant foreign exchange component in their financing should be accelerated because two things will begin to happen, Sir. You would retain the job component aspect of it whilst at the same time you would be accelerating the foreign exchange component and saving the same jobs. So you would not lose any jobs. In other words, what you are

talking about, Sir, is trying to stabilize your foreign exchange situation whilst at the same time you are trying to restructure your capital in a way that demands less local dollars. I am quite sure that there are a number of projects involving foreign financing that can be accelerated and the balance in the capital programme can be adjusted immediately.

Sir, I firmly believe that if those steps are taken right now that there would be absolutely no need for this \$75 million. To raise the limit by \$75 million, there will be no need for it.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, if you burst your limit when it was \$100 million, what do you think you are going to do now? You want me to say that. That is all.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I believe that this is one of the most important contributions I have ever made to this Parliament. I understand, Sir, that there are very few people on the other side who have begun to understand even what I am trying to say because of the very high level of density in certain areas. But generally speaking, Sir, I think it is important for the record because I know for sure that if this Government goes in there and increases those borrowings to \$175 million I know what is going to happen to Barbados in the short and in the medium term.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Since he is speaking for the record, Sir, let me put on the record this point of order. The Honourable Member perhaps inadvertently is misleading the House because every now and again he is slipping from the intent of this Resolution which is to raise the limit and he is seeking to suggest that the minute that this Resolution is passed the Government is going to borrow an additional \$75 million. That is the gravamen of the point he continues to make. Perhaps he has been talking so long that he does not realize that he is doing that but "he is suggesting it. Let the record show that all we are doing here is validating acts that have occurred before and raising the limit to \$75 million to allow for the normal flow of activity commensurate with 1990 and beyond to occur.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I understand what the Honourable Member has said very clearly. I have no doubt whatsoever as to what will happen given the present structure of Government's revenue.

Sir, there is another project that I want to deal with. I think, Sir, the expenditure on several IDC buildings, Sir, needs to be controlled and I believe that the Minister responsible should look and see the considerable areas of wastage that have taken place. Sometime recently, Sir, I

made reference to the way in which they are handling certain expenditure items. I believe that if this is stopped I could see us saving another half million dollars in that area. I found a note at home last night - I am trying to search for it here - relating to a specific matter which I wanted to bring to the attention of the House and show how money can be saved. But later in the debate I am sure that I will be able to identify it. It specifically refers to a particular pattern of contracts which one of them, Sir, was most alarming where the Government funds involved something like \$80,000 more for the same job and some precautions have to be taken in that kind of expenditure when a \$40,000 quote, Sir, is exceeded by \$80,000 and given to somebody else. I think it is the Supreme Court building or something like that and relating to windows.

The Ministry of Education also can save a considerable amount of money if you give instructions in your Ministry to make sure that certain precautions are taken and certain standards are employed. I refer to another situation where for almost double the price window frames and other items eventually were ordered at twice the cost of what they could be obtained from a reputable source in Barbados and all by the same company. Sir, this adds up because it means that every single day in Barbados, when you think of the multiplicity of Government outlets, Government is probably spending about \$1 million a day more than it needs to spend because of the lack of supervision and failure to observe criteria as set out under the Financial Administration and Audit Act. They may be small amounts. It may be a \$5,000 here or \$20,000 to \$30,000 there.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not say that he would save. What I am saying is this. Listen to me carefully.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not say so. What I said was with the kind of savings you can make on that it would be substantial at the end of the year. Let us face it that we always say that there is wastage in Government and nothing is done. I am saying that if during the immediate three months period we recognize that we have a crisis and some kind of emergency action is taken by the Cabinet in order to supervise all expenditure in Government then a substantial saving will be made.

Sometime ago, Sir, the former Governor of the Central Bank of Barbados indicated that Government has to look at that area of transfers to commercial public enterprises and he had indicated that the figure involved was somewhere in the region of \$100 million a year. I believe he may have included a few areas which cannot be corrected as easily as the others. But for sure the Minister of Finance should make it quite clear to places like CBC, the cement plant,

and the full range of them that during the next three months they will not be getting one cent. Try and put their houses in order. Tell them they are not getting a cent and you will see the kind of savings that you will make overnight, Sir, during the next quarter. You just cannot continue escalating expenditure in the face of falling revenue with the kind of gap that you have and relying on the Central Bank. You have to take steps and important steps.

Sir, in the whole area of public enterprises, there is a tremendous opportunity there for the Government to make substantial savings and start a process that could redound to the advantage of this country over time. 10.30 a.m. .

Sir, in other words, this would be used by the Government as an opportunity to tell the public out there "yes, we are broke, we do not have a cent. We are not prepared to rely on the Central Bank, we will take these emergency measures and get back almost to zero budgeting in these particular areas." I am sure, Sir, I never had a doubt in my mind that there is sufficient fat on Government expenditure that if it is closely examined it can be trimmed considerably without hurting a single person employed in the public sector. I have no doubt in my mind about that, it has always been crystal clear, because I have been convinced for a long time that there was never any need to push up Government expenditure by over 50% of what prevailed only a few years ago. There has to be some reason, and I think it is a lot of looseness and slackness involved in Government's expenditure patterns in this country.

The other area which I think needs immediate attention, and I believe could generate about \$2 million over the next three months, is the area of improvements in revenue collection. There is a lot that is going on in the Customs - it must have been going on for a long time, do not get me wrong - and in other areas which need attention. These are areas where with a little effort on the part of the revenue collection agencies and the appropriate directions to them another \$2 million over what would normally come in can be garnished in.

We are not trying to cause a collapse of Government, we are not opposing this matter because we want to make it difficult for the Government to survive. We are opposing it because we believe that there are sounder and better ways in which the matter could be corrected, but it requires hard work, dedication and control of the Ministers of Government by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. There are very few of them over there who would understand that there is an urgent need in this country to control expenditure, and that their performance should not be measured by the amount of money they can spend. Very often it is the Ministers that make less demands for money who are the ones who are far more prudent and efficient in the management of their Ministries. I gather that you have

to be pushing some Ministers while there are others who are demanding money every day.

Now, Sir, I spoke of the area of rescheduling those Capital projects. The final point I wish to make - and I think after this I will conclude what I am saying - relates to the problems in the eyes of the international market which legislation of this kind generates. I would urge the Government to seriously think about this piece of legislation. The validation component is something that is not desirable, but when you link that validation with a provision to increase the limit, the signal that is being sent to the entire world is that the Government has no intention whatsoever of controlling its borrowing from the Central Bank of Barbados.

And so, Mr. Speaker, my case rests on those points. I have been patient in putting the case, I have been as comprehensive as I possibly could, because I really feel that this matter can destroy the integrity of the financial system of Barbados, and I would urge Members on the other side to give some serious thought about this matter before casting their vote. I believe Honourable Members on this side are fully seised of all the dangers.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your patience.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has in a very comprehensive contribution covered many of the substantive points raised by this particular measure which is before the House.

At the very outset, Sir, I really do feel that I must couch my contribution within the context of two very pertinent pieces of information. The very first thing that goes to the desk of a Minister of Finance in Barbados each day is a daily position of the Central Bank of Barbados in which is contained a statement of the country's foreign reserves, the form and the place where they are held, as well as a statement of Government's Ways and Means Account with the Central Bank. I must establish first of all, Sir, that a Minister of Finance in Barbados is in a position to know on a day by day basis what Government's overdraft to the Central Bank is.

The second pertinent piece of information that will help me frame the context of my contribution to this debate is that the Central Bank has various instruments at its disposal by which it can lend the Government. It can lend Government under the auspices of its Ways and Means Account with the Government, which is what we are discussing, Sir, but it can also lend Government by holding various types of Government securities, principally Treasury Bills, Treasury Notes and Debentures. The point of substance in all that is that the only one of those instruments by which the Central Bank can lend the Government that is in and of itself subject to a limit *per se*

vis-a-vis the Central Bank is Government's Ways and Means. The others are subject to general limits. Government's overdraft to the Central Bank is subject to a limit, but there really is no limit on how much Government can borrow from the Central Bank by way of its holdings of Debentures, Treasury Notes or Treasury Bills, subject only to the limitation specified in the various pieces of legislation governing those instruments.

The Minister of Finance of Barbados, Sir, who was in a position to know on a day to day basis what Government's overdraft was, chose to draw credit from the Central Bank not by the other instruments like the Treasury Bills, Debentures and Treasury Notes on which there is no limit, but precisely by the use of that instrument on which there is a limit, to the point where he exceeded the limit and kept going.

Certain remarks made by Mr. O. S. ARTHUR were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The point I am making, Sir, is that the Minister knew what Government's overdraft was. The Government had other options open to it to borrow from the Central Bank that would not have put it in the position where it finds itself today, where it is in breach of a limit, but yet it chose the one option which caused it to have to breach a limit that is set by law. If the House does not want me to say that that is being lawless, then I do not know how else I can put it, but they were acting in a manner that is contrary to law. One wonders why, given the other options, the Minister of Finance chose that one option which would put him in conflict with the law.

He drew reference, Mr. Speaker, to precedents as an assistance in this matter. I think the House, like lawyers, would make a distinction between a petty crime and a capital offence. There have been times in the past when the overdraft would be \$1 million here, but the important point is that if you would have checked the records, you would see that whenever it was breached, Sir, it was immediately restore[^] within the limit that was set by law. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister told us that in 1984 it was breached, but the information at our disposal does not at all show that that is the case. What one senses that was operating here was not so much a financial arrangement but an attitude on the part of the Democratic Labour Party that norms and conventions do not apply; that the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, can do anything and get away with anything in Barbados. We have seen it, Sir, in relation to their attitude on their own manifesto. Their own manifesto was drafted as a social contract between that party and the people of Barbados and the same party that drew a manifesto as a social contract would today tell the people of Barbados that that manifesto was thrust on the party at the last minute without the party having a say in it. 10.40a.m.

We have seen the same attitude, Sir, the same approach where one does not respect conventions adopted by a Senator from the other side towards the income tax affairs of this country, Sir. That he is not supposed to be in a position to talk in public about people's income taxes. It is against the law, but yet, Sir, he can do anything in Barbados. We have seen the same approach in the attitude of the Prime Minister's Personal Assistant that he can live in a National Housing house which he should be paying rent for Sir, but he, and only he in Barbados, unlike people in your constituency, Sir, in the Farm and Deacons Road and Ferniehurst can live in an NHC house. He can enter into an arrangement whereby he would repair the property in lieu of paying rent - something that is not open to any other Barbadian citizen, Sir. So that no rules apply. One can understand therefore, Sir, why it could be that a Minister of Finance seeing the overdraft day by day, having other options that he could pursue with the Central Bank would follow the very one that causes him to be in breach of the law, precisely because it is part of the general pattern of administration that one has come to expect from the Democratic Labour Party.

But I want to add some more substance of what was raised in this House by the Leader of the Opposition by trying to get the House to seize on the significance of the breach that has been committed by Government. It is a fact, Sir, that Government's overdraft to the Central Bank rose to almost \$170 million at one stage and that between May of this year and the end of November, Government got almost \$100 million of net financing through the use of the overdraft of the Central Bank.

Now, two important points arise from that, Sir. That the amount by which Government's overdraft exceeded the limit at some time Sir, was almost tantamount to Government's total expenditure on current account in particular months of the year. I want to repeat that Sir. The amount by which Government's overdraft reached the limit, exceeded Government's monthly expenditure in some instances, Sir. That is to say, that there were some months in which Government's total current expenditure for housekeeping, one would think, is tantamount to being financed by bounceable cheques. And secondly, Sir, that Government's total current deficit since May, Sir, has not been \$100 million but its use of financing through that overdraft has exceeded a hundred, the implication being that Government had to be financing some of its capital works by use of that overdraft facility over the limit. Now what is the significance of that Sir? The House will recall that in the early 1980's there was a furore in this country to which the DLP contributed when a private sector entity, the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited, had the temerity to finance the construction of capital works in the form of the Portvale Factory by use of an overdraft. The Democratic Labour Party, Sir, was critical then, as they had every right

to be, or anybody in Barbados indulging in the financial madness of financing capital works by use of an overdraft facility. They were critical of the Sugar Factories Limited. When we are saying now, Mr. Speaker, that in the same way that it was financial madness that had to be corrected for the private sector industry in the form of the Sugar Factories Limited to finance a capital works programme by use of an overdraft facility, similarly it must be financial madness for the Government of Barbados to do likewise. That is the point, Sir, and that is the financial significance of the irregularity that Government has perpetrated in this case, that it has reached the point in Barbados where Government now has to finance capital works, not only by use of overdraft facilities but also by use of the overdraft facilities which are in breach of legal limits. That is the new depth to which financial administration in this country has come to and that is why, Sir, we feel that we have to speak in this manner on this point because the Democratic Labour Party administration can never show a situation, although it wants to point to precedent, where the overdraft ever reached a stage where the amount over the limit could finance a whole month's expenditure in Barbados or where a Government of Barbados had been put to the necessity of financing capital works through the use of the overdraft facility. But that is where the financial administration of this country Sir, is coming to. Our greatest danger in this House during the course of this Debate, Sir, would be to deal with the smoke and not with the fire. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, and I will say this on behalf of the Prime Minister, that the Minister of Finance was happy about having to break the overdraft. I don't feel so, Sir. I think he is sorry and I feel that during the course of this presentation he will say to the House that he is sorry that he had to do it. I truly feel so. I am sorry - and I will say so publicly - that the Barbados Labour Party in its past had at any time to exceed the overdraft. I feel that the Prime Minister, Sir, would have had to be sorry that he had to break the overdraft limit and we therefore must ask the question and this is what the Government must concern itself with, what are some of the circumstances that would have our Minister of Finance and Planning who is seeing the overdraft every day continue to use the overdraft, continue to be, not lawless as he wants to call it, but irregular in his application of financial practice, above the protests of the Opposition which was bringing this matter, Sir, on a day by day basis? I am saying to the House Sir, that the Minister would only be put to that kind of dire necessity if the financial position of this country, Sir, is truly in desperate straits and I would really welcome it if the Minister would take this House more into his confidence and let us know what the true position is.

I would challenge the Minister to deny for example, Sir, that it is not true that, for example, in the month of November of this year, Government's overall fiscal deficit, using the method of the Accountant General when the greatest use was made of the overdraft facility amounted to \$59 million; and if the House wants to seize the

significance of that, Sir, it could understand the significance of a deficit of that order of magnitude by taking account of the fact that last financial year the Minister of Finance congratulated himself for the fact that Government's overall deficit for the whole year amounted to \$66 million. He asked to be congratulated for good management by having a deficit of \$66 million for a whole year but in one month, November, Government's overall deficit was almost as it was for the whole of last year and hence, Sir, the underlying reasons why the Minister of Finance had to persist with the use of this overdraft, even to the extent of being in breach of regulations, is because of the underlying financial situation that faces this country. Sir, it is in dire straits.

I want to say, Sir, that it has to be a sad thing that in a year when the Democratic Labour Party brought a no-tax budget to this House that it had subsequently to finance part of its operation by the issue of bounceable cheques. It has to be a sad thing. Those cheques had to be issued precisely because the situation is dire. The direness of the situation is borne out in the fact that Government revenue on a month by month basis this year is now less than its revenue for almost every corresponding month in the previous financial year except as far as I am aware for the month of September. There are some months this year where Government's revenue is as much as \$10 million less than it was last year. 10.50 a.m.

Now, Sir, a shortfall or a contraction in Government's revenue is not in itself enough to cause a financial problem. It causes a financial problem, of course, in circumstances where you forecast that your revenues should have been increasing and they are not which is the case this year, that is why when I tell Honourable Members on the other side that forecasting is not about soothsaying, it is a science, you either have the science or you do not have it and they laugh.

It becomes a problem when as has happened this year the Government forecasted a growth in revenue but it is not getting a growth in revenue precisely as the economy this year is far weaker. It has weakened at a more ferocious and dramatic rate than Government anticipated.

I am saying, Sir, that the decline in the Barbadian economy will in most probability be greater than the 3% and that the clearest evidence of it is in the serious contraction in revenues which is one of the factors that has given rise to the Government to be constantly issuing those bounceable cheques through the overdraft.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But the Central Bank could have bounced them the same way your manager would bounce them. They are bounceable. If your bank gives you an overdraft limit of \$10 000 and you let it go to \$15 000 believe that your cheques are not bounceable.

The second argument. Sir, is that Government, obviously, has been doing precisely that which was forecasted by the former Prime Minister Tom Adams in 1971 when the whole question of an overdraft facility for Government arose in the first case. He said he hoped that the Government of Barbados would use it not to finance capital or current works but to finance electoral works.

Basically, what has happened here, Mr. Speaker, is that while Government's revenues have been contracting, Government has allowed its expenditure to accelerate, the clearest example of which we saw very recently in the case of the Ministry of Education which has, over the course of the last year, spent on average \$15 million in the course of the financial year. This financial year they asked for \$50 million, spent it by October and came back to the House for \$20 million more. All of those are the kinds of considerations that have given rise to the build up in Government expenditure that has forced it in the position that caused the Government to do what the Minister of Finance knows deep in his heart he should not have been doing. There is an argument that this House has to deal with. The use of this kind of facility by Government, the forcing of the Central Bank of Barbados effectively to print money is a way by which the Government of Barbados is effectively debasing the currency of Barbados.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: That is the point that the Government of Barbados is effective debasing our currency and the kind of financial irregularities with which it is indulging with the Central Bank of this country.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I am sure the Honourable Member does not wish to use the phrase "the type of financial irregularities". The connotation goes beyond the point he is making. I submit that he might want to withdraw the phrase "financial irregularities".

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of causing offence. I said it was lawless. They do not like the word "lawless". I said "financial irregularities", they do not like that. If my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, whose form of intellect has now been pressed into service as being that of the cheerleader of the Democratic Labour Party in this House rather than doing the kind of services that we know he can perform, if my friend could just give me the form of words to use rather than irregularity or lawlessness I would be glad to oblige him.

The essential point I was about to make before I was interrupted by the Democratic Labour Party's cheerleader, a post which I really do feel that he should allow either the Honourable Member for St. Lucy to perform since his skills are more comfortable to the post, or better still, the

Honourable Member for St. John who in every respect was cut out to be a cheerleader.

The point I was making is that Barbados' currency is effectively devalued. The Government is effectively debasing our currency. The House would understand the point I am trying to make if one does a bit of background analysis to it. There was a time when our currency had to be fully backed by the holding of foreign exchange so that you could not, under the old currency board system, increase the money supply in Barbados unless we held foreign exchange. To every Barbados dollar there had to be an equivalent amount of sterling.

That system changed and the new system that was put in its place is one in which our currency came not to be backed fully by foreign exchange but it could now in part be backed by the extension of credit either by the Central Bank or by the banking system. That is to say, the way in which to expand the money supply in Barbados is either by expanding your holding of foreign exchange or by the banking system expanding its credit.

Mr. Speaker, you debase your currency if you increase the domestic credit component of the money supply faster than your holding of foreign exchange. All that has been happening in Barbados is that Government's use of this instrument has been pumping out more and more Barbadian dollars out there that people can use to buy sardines, corn beef etc., effectively reducing the value of each Barbadian dollar in relation to the foreign exchange that is payable to the country. This is precisely the way by which countries find themselves eventually having not only to devalue the dollar when you increase the domestic component backing your money supply at too fast a rate.

The House will understand the point I am making if we were to allow the Central Bank tomorrow to issue each Barbadian citizen with \$1 million. Each of those Barbadian dollars issued by the Central bank for that purpose would effectively mean less and less in terms of foreign exchange.

There is a point that comes when you are debasing the value of the currency in terms of the foreign exchange that you purchase but you are still having the domestic printing of money. We are saying that the use of this mechanism by Government in this instance and on the scale that it has been practised has been tantamount to an effective debasing of the currency.

I want in this debate to say that I do not believe that the Government of Barbados has adopted the practices and the infelicities that have been practised in this particular matter with the approval of its profession. I do not believe | that the professionals in the Central Bank and the Ministry

of Finance and Planning in any way supported Government in the financial practices that it has been following of late.

I cannot, however, say that I can hold the Minister of State for Finance entirely guiltless for this development. He has been anxious and expressed his anxiousness for the longest possible time to increase this overdraft irrespective as to the consequences of the Barbados economy. He is a person of whom I have said in this House before that does not enjoy the respect nor confidence of his professional colleagues. His performance has dragged the reputation for Government's financial management into disrepute. His influence on economic policy in the Democratic Labour Party I am saying to this House has been ruinous.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member said "just like yours in the tourism sector". He should tell the House that one of the Swedish charters has been cancelled as of January. 11.00a.m.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I would never have the opportunity to advise you since you only work for half an hour a day. I agree that nobody can advise you because nobody can advise you, because nobody can advise a Minister who works for only half hour a day. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that one of the ways in which we can save money in this country, Sir, is by paying the Deputy Prime Minister - not to stay home - but to pay him on a *pro rata* basis in relation to the number of hours that he performs. I feel that we can save money in that very direction.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But the point I am making, Sir, is that the person who holds that position as Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance is a person whose financial judgement has been, I think, ruinous to the Government and the Government would do well to ignore the kind of foolish advice that he is giving and that he talks about freely, among his colleagues. He is a disgrace to financial management, Sir.

I also want to say that I am beginning to have less and less confidence in the soundness of the Governor of the Central Bank of the country. I really must say that. I have recently heard the Governor of the Central Bank make statements as regards how the Gulf crisis should be resolved that do not lead me to believe that if we were to apply those same precepts to the management of Barbados that its affairs would be soundly managed. The notion that several thousand people could come together and meditate and a problem would go away, in the Gulf, would lead one

to believe that he could also feel that if you were to get together in a room at the Central Bank and just think about it that the problem could be resolved. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that our problems will go away merely by thinking about them. It is our submission, from this side, Sir, that they are instances already in which the Governor of the Central Bank has failed to comply with what the laws governing the operation of the Central Bank....

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to caution the Honourable Member. If you want to be critical of that officer, you know very well what to do. You make a reference but if you want to be critical of that officer, you know the rules.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The point I am making, Sir, is this, that Section 26 of the Act governing the Central Bank requires the Central Bank and its administration to do certain things where there is a drain on Barbados' foreign reserves. One gets the impression that those things were never complied with. In this particular case, there is also the very clear impression that the Central Bank did not exercise the leverage that it has in law. I think, Sir, that it is part and parcel of the kind of slack administration that seems to have overtaken the Central Bank of late.

I am of the view that the whole Board of the Central Bank, if they had any self respect should resign, including the Senator from the Other Place, Sir, given the nature of the infelicity that has occurred in this particular matter, because this is one of the most grievous assaults that we have ever seen in this country on the integrity of the Central Bank and its role as lender to Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think we should leave this debate unless we were to put forward suggestions for the reform to make sure that this kind of infelicity does not occur in the future. Our Financial Administration and Audit Act Mr. Speaker, allows for public officers to be surcharged in circumstances where the public officer shows contempt for this House by allowing expenses to be incurred that have not been approved by Parliament. Parliament as well, sets a limit for the overdraft. I think that the principle of the application of a surcharge must be applied to make public officers understand that Parliament is not here to be mocked, that if Parliament lays down a law saying that the Central Bank cannot allow an overdraft of more than 10%, a public officer would have to know that he can conspire with Government in breaching the law, if he is prepared to be surcharged. Because part of the problem now is that we have these limits and laws but we do not have any penalty to stop a Minister of Finance or the public officer from making sport at Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time has expired but I will give you a little time to close off.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Secondly, Sir, in other jurisdictions, there are not only limits on the Central Bank's

ability to provide credit to Government by way of overdraft, but there are limits on the Central Bank's overall capacity to provide credit to Government.

I believe that the whole history of the Third World is replete with instances where countries have been brought to penury by the abuse of the powers of the Central Bank to create credit.

I wrote a paper that I have made a document of this House citing the experience of 1976 and 1981 where the Central Bank's creation of credit to Government caused problems in this country. That was under a Barbados Labour Party's administration.

I am saying that if you were to go to the OECS Central Bank, you will find that there is a 5% limit on their overdraft facility to Government and a 10% limit on what they can lend Government by way of other debt instruments. I am saying that we have not only to apply a limit on the Central Bank's overdraft facility to Government but we have consciously and deliberately, if we are going to manage and properly manage the financial affairs of this country to put a limit on the amount by which the Central Bank can lend Government by other instruments. I regard the use of the other instruments as being damaging to the overdraft because the Central Bank, if it were to acquire Treasury Bills, can also sell them and in selling them help to reduce the purchasing power in the country, if it is part of its policy the securities that are marketable and have a less damaging impact on the money supply growth than the use of the overdraft. You cannot sell the overdraft. But if Government were to get financing by way of the issue of Treasury Bills through the Central Bank, it could quickly bring back order to the system, if it so desired by selling it to the public and taking funds from the public.

But the point I am making is that we have a responsibility, given what has happened in this instance, to apply a sensible limit on the amount of credit that the Government can get from the Central Bank in any year bringing it in conformity with what happens now in the OECS countries and even in West Africa. The West African Monetary Union has an overall limit of 20%.

I am saying that, as the situation stands now, where if we were to approve this at 17% we are going to be creating a facility by which a Government of Barbados can contemplate the possibility, in the future, of having wider access to Central Bank's financing by way of the overdraft which will, in itself, rise every year as Government's estimated revenues rise and at the same time, have powers also of borrowing additional funds from the Central Bank through recourse to Treasury Bills and Debentures. 11.10a.m.

We have, Sir, in the interest of proper financial management to see the system as a totality, agree that the long-term viability of this Barbados economy is too precious for us to sacrifice it on the alter of political gamesmanship such as is occurring now, and that a sensible system must be instituted where what has happened of late, the abuse of the credit facilities at the Central Bank in support of a bloated public bureaucracy, be put behind us once and for all. I am obliged to you for your indulgence, Sir.

Applause.

Hon. B. M. TATTT: I am not sure if part of the applause was carried over into the fact that I had arisen, Sir, so I wanted to let it properly sink in before we move. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member who has just spoken finished with what can be called an oratorical flourish in which he suggested that the Resolution before us is the result of political gamesmanship. I have a lot of difficulty, Sir, understanding what is the political gamesmanship of a Minister of Finance who is also Prime Minister, who in the face of a potential election and in the face of at least three years of vilification up and down the length of this country would have brought a measure before the House of Assembly for a full airing and discussion if in fact he wanted to engage in political gamesmanship. Bear in mind, Sir, that this House has already been given the information that this limit which we are seeking to raise has been exceeded not once, not twice, not thrice, Sir, but in fact it was exceeded in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1988, and 1990. Sir, I am not sure if I can understand how we can discuss....

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. There is no record that an overdraft limit was exceeded in 1983, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure the Honourable Member would know that it was indeliberate. Is it 1984? It is all right All right, I said 1983 so it is 1984. 1981 May and August, 1982 June and September, 1984 August and December, 1988 September and 1990 we are discussing. I hope that this satisfies the Honourable Member. I said 1983 inadvertently. I apologize for that error of saying 1983 instead of 1984. I said 1983. I withdraw 1983 and substitute 1984. Well, I have 1984. I have on the Ministry's files 1984. So if you are still in the Ministry, we had to choose between the information we have here from the authentic place. As for the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, he should be the last to produce any kind of document or any kind of information because I had to choose between the Ministry's information and his information, Sir, we know the credibility which he has for producing information.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Man, I am not going to be diverted. It is sufficient to know that across the country the Honourable Member for Christ Church West's credibility has been laid bear.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mrs. Ram. You see the Honourable Member wants to talk about Mrs. Ram. He would know about Mrs. Ram better than anybody else. The Honourable Member and some other Members on that side are fully seized of all of the matters connected with Mrs. Ram and, if they wish us to discuss Mrs. Ram outside of the House, we will discuss her. That is not a problem. I say that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West knows her better than I do, Sir. I say that. Do not come to me and throw up to me ends of words because none of you are in a position to take me on on credibility and integrity inside or outside of the House. My position with Mrs. Ram is the same as it has always been - free and clear. I challenge....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that none of us on this side is in a position to take him on on credibility. None of us so far as I am aware, and I speak for all seven on this side, ever oiv a public programme asked if the public thought that we were "on the take" meaning corrupt. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Well, I ask you now do you think that I am on the take? I ask the Honourable Member - do you think that I am on the take? It was a question. I asked the question. No one asked me. I ask any Honourable Member in here now not just David Ellis. I ask any Honourable Member - do you think I am on the take? Just get up and say so. You have privilege. I challenge anybody in here. I challenge you. Do not wave your finger at me. Those tactics do not work with me. Anyone of you if you know that I am on the take get up and say so. He is saying Mrs. Ram. Do you think that with an election coming up anybody can say Mrs. Ram and I am going to get frightened? I do not beg Mrs. Ram for anything. I have never got anything from Mrs. Ram and Mrs. Ram does not frighten me so feel free to mention Mrs. Ram. I challenge each of you individually to get up and say the same thing.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mrs. Ram is an attempt to give the impression because it has been thrown around and I am willing to take it on in this House and outside. You did it last week. Everytime you feel that I am in a debate you jump in with Mrs. Ram. Mrs. Ram is not my mother, sister, and not my woman. She is not my friend. She is nothing to me. I challenge all of you to get up and say the same thing. Mr. Speaker, I rest my case.

I was saying, Sir....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I hope you remember Mrs. Ram.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to remind Honourable Members that they only have thirty minutes.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am fully aware of that, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying, I am disappointed that the Honourable Member who just sat down, Honourable Member for St. Peter, when he started to talk about political gamesmanship, would suggest that of an Honourable Member who brings a Resolution here to validate actions that have already occurred. I heard the Honourable Member speaking and he started off by talking about petty crime and major crime and the inference one could draw from what he was saying is that when the Barbados Labour Party exceeded the limit between 1981 and 1984 that was somehow petty, but when the limit was exceeded in 1990 that was somehow major. Now one of the things which the Barbados Labour Party never tells the population of Barbados is that in 1981 just before the General Elections that this country was at its worst, in terms of its foreign exchange and its holdings ever in its history. This Honourable House has never been given the details of a situation in which the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Tom Adams, was known to say on the night of election and subsequently that he wondered if the people of Barbados were aware that we did not have enough money to pay for imports for two weeks, if they would have voted for the Barbados Labour Party. The Honourable Members must remember that in 1981 this country was in worse shape then ever. 11.20a.m.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. That was never said publicly nor privately to that Member. It is not true. Do you want to hear me talk about Barrow not paying taxes from 1984 and filing returns? I will talk. Get me vex this morning!

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member continue?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am saying categorically that no one has ever told this House what Mr. Adams has been reported by more than one of them, more than one Barbados Labour Party person, who said in the presence of witnesses that Tom Adams said that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Member is alleging that Barbados' reserves in 1981 were the lowest in history. Information on Barbados' reserves is published in the Central Bank's Reports in

Barbados, as we know, and the Member can make reference to the Central Bank's documents to show that it is not true that Barbados' reserves of \$149 million in 1981 were the lowest in history, because in 1972-73 and almost every year before they were lower than that. I think the Member should not mislead the House. It is here.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member can cite as many statistics as he wants to, I am saying, Sir, that I have heard with my own ears a responsible member of the Barbados Labour Party saying that Tom Adams said to him that he wondered at the time of the 1981 election - that he said it in the presence of other people - if the people of Barbados knew of the parlous state of their finances, if they would have voted for the Barbados Labour Party. I state that and I stand by it, Sir. I am saying that, because to hear him talk about petty crime and major crime in relation to this extension, to give the people of Barbados the impression that the Minister of Finance has somehow been engaged in some nefarious activity, when all he seeks to do, all this Resolution seeks to do is to put activity that has occurred within the framework of the law.

Now, Sir, in that context the Honourable Member for St. Peter went on to make some references about the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I do not believe that the Honourable Member should be permitted to mislead the House deliberately or otherwise. In September 1981 the net foreign....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now,....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: ...the Honourable Member said....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me intervene here.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not making a speech, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member was making a statement that he heard. He did not dispute what was written in the report, so it is on that basis I will accept what the Minister said, because he is saying that he heard so.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I make my point of order, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but if you are going to develop that, it is not going to be in response to what the Member said.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not accepted any such matter. All I am saying is that the Honourable Member made a statement and if the Honourable Member rose on a point of order, it is an alleged statement he has made, he has not in

any way challenged the statistics in the report, so I do not see the point

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

Mr. SPEAKER: What point of order are you going to make?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not said anything yet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Make the point of order.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, one of the columnists who is an adviser to the Leader of the Opposition recently wrote in the newspaper that the Barbados Labour Party in 1981 had an overdraft of \$183 million when the limit was \$50 million. They have not denied that, but they want to jump on me. I stand by what I said, Sir, and I am going on to make the point. The Honourable Member said that the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance does not enjoy the respect of people in financial circles, or I think he said in economic circles.

I have no doubt that he himself has managed to garner all of the respect from his colleagues, but I want to say this. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance was a senior officer in the Ministry of Finance 25 years ago. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance 25 years ago held the highest position of anybody his age in the Ministry of Finance 25 years ago. I want to say, Sir, that he is one of the people who has had experience with a real reserve system, one of the people who has worked in a banking situation where he understands the movement of money, the money markets and a number of things which the Honourable Member for St. Peter has not yet been exposed to. I think it is disgusting that they have this way of pinning a reputation on someone because that someone does not go around beating his chest and announcing that he is important, and because he does not engage in constant intellectual masturbation, that he is regarded by some of them as not being one of them.

I say that the present Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance is much more knowledgeable and much more competent in public finances than any of the Honourable Members on that side. I state that categorically without fear of contradiction, and I say his record outside of this country speaks for itself.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Probably, because that is his field, it is not my field, although I will make bold to say that I will take on any Honourable Member over there in the field

of public finance, because I have been trained in it too, but I go further. The Honourable Member for St. Peter had the temerity to raise questions, and again they do it very subtly, about the Governor of the Central Bank. I am not speaking about him, Sir, in a derogatory manner. I want to say that the mind of the Governor of the Central Bank is superior to any mind on the Opposition benches. I want to say that the Governor of the Central Bank's public service in the Caribbean region is not open to ridicule, and if he chooses to practise transcendental meditation, it is not different from how some other people choose other pastimes or religions or other matters that are of personal satisfaction to them, and I think it is disgusting for a public official to be ridiculed for the position he takes in his personal understanding of his self. Any one of us is entitled to practise anything we wish to practise so long as we carry out our public duty in a manner that is commensurate with and acceptable to public decency. 11.30a.m.

To try constantly to ridicule the Governor of the Central Bank, a man who was able to get an external degree in Mathematics in 18 months from London University at a time when it was virtually impossible for anybody to pass the exams in this country, a man who had he been given the opportunity would have been as much a Barbados Scholar as anybody else, a man, Sir, who in the process of getting his doctorate got straight "A"s at Columbia Graduate School in Economics, a man who was able to tutor the former Governor of the Central Bank and help him to reach the level of understanding of public finance that he had reached. They have the temerity to be constantly casting aspersions on a man of that calibre. I am saying, Sir, that his mind is among the finest minds that have ever been grown in Barbados and I think it has to do with the comment made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter which is one of many comments which suggest.. He said that he is losing - I want to quote him: "the soundness of the Governor's judgment is becoming suspect" with him. I am saying for the Honourable Member's benefit that if a person who has been an advisor to a previous government and who is known as an economist makes that statement on the floor of the House, it will undermine the confidence of persons who are to invest in this country if they believe that the Governor of the Central Bank's judgment is false, is fraught with danger.

They believe that they can make all kinds of wild statements about public officials, that these wild statements have no impact or have no effect. I am explaining for the benefit of the Honourable Member for the City why it is necessary to take the time to point out that the Governor of the Central Bank is a man of sound judgment and clear understanding with a clear mind.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to one or two of the things said by the Leader of the Opposition. The question of the movement of the cotton from Spencers by the Defence

Force, Sir. It has not yet been said and I want to say it. It appears that there are some people who would have been much happier had the cotton gone up in flames as it became obvious....

Mr. SPEAKER: I made a ruling on that matter in respect of the matter with the removal of the cotton.

Hon. B. M. TATrT: Yes, Sir. I am not dealing with the moving of the cotton, I am dealing with the reason why the Government has made a public statement. The Ministry of Agriculture made a public statement The Attorney General made a public statement and I am taking the opportunity in my presentation to add further to that statement. I am saying that there are some people and I am not making any reference to anybody in particular. I am saying that there are some people who apparently would have preferred to see the cotton go up in smoke as some of us had come to believe it was quite possible out of an abundance of caution. There are a number of things connected with CARSICOT, Sir, which defies the imagination. There are a number of things which have occurred. People broke into CARSICOT at 7 o'clock in the morning when no people were there. All kinds of mysterious activities. If you are part of a government, and you have a precious cargo - because Sea-Island cotton for Barbados is a precious cargo - if you have evidence that it is likely to be burnt it is the Government's duty to take all precautionary measures.

The Ministry of Agriculture has already explained that at the time when it gave the order for the cotton to be removed that it did so when the cotton was in its jurisdiction and was in its control. The Ministry had sought the police's assistance and they have so said. I am one of the people who believe, Sir, that if the cotton had gone up in smoke, that many of the same people who are now talking about the illegality of having the Defence Force protect it, would have been saying that a government that has at its disposal a defence force ought to have taken better precaution than to leave the cotton at Spencers to be guarded by two or three or four security guards. It was done in the interest of the country, Sir.

On the question of the raising of this limit, Sir. During the course of my extending my library, Sir, I came across an old clipping - it is not a newspaper clipping that I intend to make a document of the House - so I am not going to quote from it, Sir, but I just want to authenticate that I did in fact come across a clipping of this nature.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I just wanted to show that I have real clippings and when I speak of documents that they are real. Sir, the point in this is, and I can let Your Honour see it in due course, that this was a thing dated New York Times of February 18, 1971, and in this, Sir, the United States Treasury was seeking to have its limit raised by a

substantial sum and Mr. John Connolly, who was then the Treasury Secretary was indicating how happy he was to see the limit for Treasury Bills issue raised. In 1971... It's not a different matter. The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition can't tell me it is a different matter. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition would know that he discussed today the interchangeability of Treasury Bills and the printing of money. The Honourable Member knows that the United States as an economy functions differently from how the Barbados economy would function, because it is a producing economy and its way of doing basically what Ministers of Finance from 1981 and before that have done, is to issue more Treasury Bills. There is a limit on the amount of Treasury Bills that can be issued and the point I am making Sir, is that from time to time if you are administering an economy you have to go and make emergency changes sometimes and sometimes you have to change your own system to accommodate the growth of your economy for the expansion of your system. Seventeen point five percent, it could be argued, should have been reduced to 15% or it could have been raised to 20%. The 10% which was imposed in 1971 by the then Minister of Finance was arbitrarily decided, Sir. The 10% as the then RL Hon. Member for St. John himself said in the debate, was a figure that he had chosen because it seemed a convenient figure. When he explained to the then Member for the City and....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Not you. It was 1971. He explained to the then Member for the City and to some other Honourable Members of this House who were concerned that they were making the borrowing from the commercial banks in Bridgetown. At that time, Sir, we did not have a Central Bank and when the Ways and Means required additional funds, loans were had from the commercial houses in Bridgetown. You can't call them houses. They were commercial banks and at that time and still to some extent, the Banks in Bridgetown are no more than branch banks. So, whenever the Government wanted to borrow some money, if it went beyond a certain limit, they had to get approval from their head offices in either London or in Montreal or wherever. In those days, Sir, it was a simple matter of picking up the telephone, calling the bank manager, making the arrangement, and the Ways and Means advances occurred. That had happened from time immemorial.

The securities which a Government has in the final analysis is its capacity to produce the believability in its capability to produce goods and services over a period of time. If anyone asked what is the security for the outstanding sum of debt which the United States Government has incurred over the last twenty years with all countries every where, a massive debt, Sir, such that the United States Congress is now in the process of imposing

ceilings to avoid what they perceive as calamity 20-30 years down the road....

11.40a.m.

If anyone were to ask what is the security which the United States Government has put up for these 330 trillion dollars in debt no one would pay any attention to that kind of question because everyone would recognise that unless someone is going to obliterate the United States with a series of atomic bombs that the United States will always be in a position to repay its debt if for no other reason than that it has a convertible currency. Only those who envisage that some time in the future the United States currency would not be a convertible currency would worry unduly about the deficit and the debt of the United States, more particularly the debt as opposed to the deficit

When we hear theories about debt I recall one time the Honourable Member for St. Peter used to be very high on the ratio of debt to the GNP. He used to say that Barbados can withstand a certain level of deficit in relation to its Gross National Product as long as it does not go beyond a certain level. It is the Gross National Product, it is the capacity of the country, it is the potential of the country, it is the methodology and management of the country, all of these are factors which have to be taken together. It is not simply the arithmetic. Only the neophyte will take the arithmetic and seek to make the arithmetic itself the issue. The issue is much more than that substantively. It has to do with what is perceived by those who are going to be the beneficiaries or the victims of a policy some time down the road. Let us therefore not get bogged down in whether it should be 10% or 17%. Let us accept that none of us can be happy when it is necessary to go even 1% over the limit which has been set

Let us not become bogged down in what the limit should be because I make bold to say that there is no one in Barbados at the moment who can speak with authority and say what the limit must be, should be, or ought to be. I say further that if the Minister of Finance had come down for 12.5% the Leader of the Opposition's debate would have been exactly the same as it has been for 17.5% because the Leader of the Opposition in performance of his perceived duty is required to pillory the Minister of Finance and the Government.

Now, Sir, it may very well be that the Resolution to increase the limit would have caused some misgivings in his mind for entirely different reasons given his plan of attack over a period of time and knowing the methodology which he would for a plan of attack over a period of time. What, in fact, this Resolution has done is put a spanner in his planned works. The result is therefore that he has had to bring forward some of the argumentation that he would otherwise have been putting down.

We understand that, Sir, but what we do not understand is why if he is in pursuit of a political objective he must also include economic charter which can only confuse those who might not be sufficiently seised of the whole motive as some of us are.

Now take, for example, the recitation of how we might save some money. Anyone not listening closely to the Honourable Member would believe that in order to save money in the Government sector all one has to do is to announce it and then proceed to do it. The fact is that if you look at the pressures that have been brought on the financial situation in Barbados, those pressures were brought about because the Government deliberately decided that it would not (a) send home large numbers of people; (b) stop persons from getting their salaries and wages; and (c) cut back on the social services for the old and young in this community. These are the methodologies which the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition does not spell out but which are the natural consequences of the policies which he - I would have to say - now adumbrates because he has been preaching these policies off and on in a different way from time to time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have been most careful in this Honourable House to make clear that the areas in which Government expenditure can be controlled would not relate to personal emoluments and so on.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, and I am very careful in the language I use, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time has expired but I would give him time to finish his contribution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I think the Honourable Member would agree that I have not accused him of not doing anything that could be considered contrary to public utterances. Let me leave it at that. I am just saying that there are natural consequences which flow out of the policies which he adumbrates on a continuing basis. Those consequences include cutting back of social services for the young, the poor and the indigent. It includes the sending home of people as did the Barbados Labour Party articulate a policy and implemented that policy between 1981 and 1986 when large numbers of people were sent home.

I finish, Sir, with the point about the National Conservation Commission. The National Conservation Commission expenditure is an investment which is obvious to all and sundry across this country. If we earn U.S. \$700 million from tourism and we invest 1% of that in the beautification of this country, that in itself would justify the investment. But it is more than that. If we have a community of persons who have been told that they have a right to a high quality of life, it is our responsibility in preparing that and making them fit to participate in the

economic life of this country to give them an environment in which they can live, work and be happy, that is what the National Conservation Commission is about.

I consider that raising this limit does not break the law. On the contrary, raising this limit seeks to put all of the activity that has occurred between 1981 and today within the ambit of the law. It gives the flexibility to ensure that we will not have to come back to this House in another two, seven or a few years, whatever they may be, to ask for further validation because it is a principle that none of us as legislators ought to like the idea of having to validate law subsequent to the action which has taken place.

I will support this, Sir, because it is in the solid interest of this country Barbados which we all love so well, Barbados. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I at the outset am going to make it very clear that we will not be supporting this. I am always very concerned too when I hear speeches made by that Honourable Member who just took his seat like the one that he just made because he is one of those persons to whom I, as he might want to term me, a neophyte like myself in politics, used to look up to and who one had hoped would set example for those of us to come after him. I find that in recent times I see more form than substance.

I understand his difficulty today especially and I would understand the difficulty of most of them on the front bench, with the exception of probably one who does not understand anything anyhow. The difficulty would be simple. It would be, if I had to tell you, Sir, what I thought the difficulty was, that the Honourable Member who just took his seat knows what is right and wrong with regards to this. He knows that the argument that this Opposition so far has put up is sound. But, Sir, what is his problem then? He has a political problem. So he spent the time during his speech dealing with the political points that he felt he had to score, rather than dealing with the substance of the matter, or rather than speaking from his own conscience. That is my opinion. Let me move on. 11.50a.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has implied that I spoke other than from my own conscience. Sir, I submit that that is contrary to the rules and I ask the Honourable Member to withdraw the remark or rephrase it. I do not mind what he is saying.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Okay, I will withdraw that, Sir. I believe what I said just prior to that would clearly indicate to the Honourable Member who knows within himself that he was very much more concerned with the political points that he had to score than with the fact that he knows that I knew what is wrong with this.

On Tuesday last, I like other Honourable Members over here and over there too, because between Tuesday and now, quite a few days have passed and I happened to speak with one or two of them, they felt like I did, a certain amount of pain for the Right Honourable Prime Minister when he got up and....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: tried very hard, in the words of the Honourable Member for St. Peter, to confess and to ask forgiveness because after what I saw was a very short and weak defence where, all the Right Honourable Prime Minister did was to say, "Okay, look I am guilty. But others before me were just as guilty. I admit I am guilty." But, Sir, I believe he could have said that and sat down at that point. Of course, he went on thereafter to tell us many things after that, that he was guilty, but that it was because others had done it before.

We have had promises from that Right Honourable Prime Minister, promises of fiscal prudence before. He came again on Tuesday and tried to give this Honourable House the assurance that he would try a little harder this time to be more prudent. But I do not know if I or anybody in this Honourable House or anywhere else in Barbados is going to take that very seriously because what we saw the last time that we got that promise of fiscal prudence was squandermania. All hell broke loose. People went spending as they liked. Fiscal irresponsibility. Ask the Honourable Member for St. James South. He is very good at that.

I honestly believe that the Honourable Minister of Finance and his administration does not understand what one means by fiscal prudence. I doubt that very much because at least the Honourable Member for St. Michael West would understand that. The first argument that they do not understand what fiscal prudence is would not hold water.

We must believe then, Sir, that they are allowing their narrow political interest to cloud their vision with regards to what is best for Barbados, whether fiscally or otherwise. I would go on later to show you how I came to that conclusion.

We heard on Tuesday, as I said, a short contribution from the Right Honourable Prime Minister, a contribution which left us not clearly understanding the point he was trying to make, which left us feeling some sympathy for the fact that he had to come in here and ask forgiveness, as he did. But what did he say about the abuse of the credit facilities at the Central Bank? I still wait to hear what his feelings are on that, whether he in fact agrees that the credit facilities have been abused or not, whether he understands that they have been abused or not.

As I said just now, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West clearly showed that he had a difficulty really defending his Finance Minister's ability to manage. He could not. The type of person he is, he could not defend it. What did he do? He spent 90% of his speech on attacking the Barbados Labour Party, a party who when in Government and when he was in Opposition, a party he spent most of his parliamentary life telling myself, yourself and all and sundry that they never did anything right. Now today, he wants to say that it is okay to raise the limit because the Barbados Labour Party did it. This is the same party that he said never did anything right. Now today, because it suits him, he wants to refer to what they did to justify what you are doing now. If they were not right about much before....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I just want to clarify for the Honourable Member that my references to the Barbados Labour Party were only in relation to the Member for St. Peter signifying that when they did it, it was a minor crime but when it happened, under the Democratic Labour Party, it was a major crime. I did not seek to justify anything, on the basis of what had been done, by the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I believe then, Sir, that the Honourable Member would then agree that we are not talking about oranges and oranges. We are talking about apples and oranges. The situation is much more grave now and you are dealing with a much weaker Central Bank.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I did not agree, I could not agree with that because that is why I spent a substantial amount of time demonstrating that the situation in 1981 was more grave than it is now. That is precisely why I spent that time, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker the Honourable Member never demonstrated that and he knows that the records do not demonstrate that anyhow.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: But let me move on, Sir, because to me, there is another dimension to all that has been said in here over the past day and a half. I believe that we are living in a society where there is rampant lawlessness in many areas. I believe that the leadership in this society at all levels must not demonstrate that they themselves are lawless.

I came across excerpts from a report in a newsletter called "Accountability" and the Comptroller-General of Puerto Rico, Ileana Colon Carlos in her proposal that there should be a corps of independent inspectors-general to fight government corruption and I quote:

"Corruption is contagious. If the government does not follow the laws then the seed of corruption is sown."

That is from a newsletter - if need be, Sir, I can make it a document of this House because I believe it should be - of the Financial Management Improvement for Latin America and the Caribbean called "Accountability". That is July 1990. 12.00 noon

I am sure, Sir, that like myself all Honourable Members on that side and on this side must appreciate that a large part of the social problems we are seeing in Barbados now are rooted in economic problems and promises of economic change that were made in 1986 and have not come to pass. I remember, Sir, a very popular social commentator in Barbados who spoke to the late Errol Barrow in 1986 soon after the elections and he told him that he believed that he had two years at least before a social explosion came. He told him that people in Barbados did not as much vote for the Democratic Labour Party as that they voted for fundamental social and economic change. The Democratic Labour Party at the time appeared to be the party who was pushing the most revolutionary ideas in terms of this social and economic change.

It is okay to say, Sir, when we come in here and to use favourite words of the Prime Minister, "toss bobs at each other", but not us on the Opposition because we are the new boys in town as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West said, "the new kids on the block". But it is okay for the two older parties who believe that it is just good enough to come in here and accuse each other of what they did or did not do in the past or now, and that the people outside there are going to sit still and tolerate this nonsense. I have said already, Sir, that we are probably seeing the highest level of cynicism among the public now with regards to politicians and it is precisely because of these kinds of things. You cannot get up as the Honourable Attorney General wants to do and make speeches about lawlessness among young people and various Departments of Government and then even to appear to be lawless yourself. We are supposed to be leaders and we are supposed to be setting examples, Sir.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition touched on a few areas. We have repeatedly heard this Government, Sir - everytime you have to speak to them and suggest that they are wasting the taxpayers' money and throwing away money - come up with the same spurious arguments about what do you want us to do, send home people? That is the favourite argument of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and the Honourable Member for St. James South, no other argument. We have tried, Sir. This side of the Opposition and that side of the Opposition have tried on numerous occasions to show where we believe you could restrain expenditure and to show where we believe you could increase revenue. I have seen the Honourable Prime Minister many times make notice of it. I do not know if he

has a difficulty controlling his Cabinet I do not know if because election is so near that he has a difficulty in doing what he knows is right. I do not know if this sort of atmosphere we are operating in with election around the corner has caused him to lose any political will he has.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You would like it to be a year because you have certain things to settle. But, Sir, the Honourable Member and Leader of the Opposition spoke about wastage at the IDC for instance. It is a fact that there have been several IDC buildings refurbished and one questions whether or not the cost for refurbishing these buildings could not have been much less. One questions whether or not the choice of fitting and fixtures could not have been purchased from elsewhere at substantially lower cost.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Member said *sotto voce* one quarter of the cost. I am comparing like -with like. I am saying that you could have purchased similar. Let us use the example of windows for instance. You could have purchased similar windows that you have been using for years. The same IDC has been buying those windows all the years. The same IDC has found it necessary to even praise some of the local producers of these windows. The EPC have given them awards for quality. But you purchased windows at four times the price.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The point is, Sir, that there have been other buildings. If the Honourable Minister of Trade who is not now in his place wants me to take him and show him where the IDC has spent money, I can. It has spent the kind of money that was not necessary. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition talks about a small amount of saving in the IDC. The savings at the IDC could probably be a lot greater. At NCC - everytime you talk about NCC the quickest thing they do is to shout, if you want to send home people. Do you know why that is so, Sir? The NCC is being used as a pork barrel. So if you pad it up with people the first thing that they will get worried about is - wait a minute. Well, these are the same people that I promised a job to get a vote. How are we going to send them home now? That is the quickest thing to try to shut us up by talking about sending home people, because politicians get very sensitive as soon as you start talking about sending home people. But nobody even mentioned sending home people, Sir. But there is a high level of myopia. I see the Honourable Member for St. John has returned now to take up the job as cheerleader whilst the Honourable Member for St. Michael West leaves, because he is the next best person to be cheerleader. I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: What is his name? Sweetcakes. That is what they call him.

We are not talking only about sending home people, Sir. For instance, let the Honourable Minister tell us what was the cost of renting those trucks, the trucks from St. Philip? What do you mean by which trucks? The Honourable Member for St. Philip South wants me to call names. You know he likes to interfere with people all the time. Man, that is not nice. Your friend's trucks.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: He was the Minister then. He was the Minister responsible then so he must tell you that at the same time I am told the trucks belonging to NCC were being repaired by the same people that they rented the trucks from. Oh, my gosh! You mean that I am going to keep the trucks as long as possible without repairing them if you are renting from me. Well, that is common sense. Subsequently, since that Honourable Member for St. Philip South was removed as Minister responsible for NCC, the other Minister has gone and bought a lot of trucks. That clearly shows that IDC does not need any trucks, I guess. We have got to look at things like that. There is no serious control over what is going on with NCC. For instance, Sir, a vehicle was taken up without permission, a brand new vehicle from NCC and driven to a moonlight picnic. It was damaged and kept a secret from the Minister. I do not know if he knows about it yet. I know that the Chairman of NCC knows about it. He got that sorted out. These are all areas, Sir, where you see things are happening so wild. Everybody is doing what they like and anytime you get a situation like that you have to lose money.

The Honourable Minister of Employment and Labour Relations who is responsible for NCC....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Task Force. Well, that is a whole day. He threw away that. He got up in here today and said that it was not true that he hires and fires anybody at NCC. Let me say then that he influences the hiring and firing of people at NCC in a very real way. He has a hands-on way of running the NCC and if he does not do it directly, he has it done by his chief canvasser, who happens to be the Chairman of the NCC. And so the situation is that you will find that in recent times several persons who have been employed by the NCC either come from St. James South or have a complexion that looks like DLP, or so he thinks. Then he wants to jump up, using the NCC, a national organisation, as though it is his personal pork barrel. He will dispense patronage through the NCC and then jumps up with mock indignation saying that he has nothing to do

with the hiring or firing of people at the NCC. 12.10p.m.

When you look at the National Assistance Board, Sir, again there is squandermania. The Minister again shows that he believes that poor people must be used for his and his party's political purposes. Let him get up and deny that. He actually goes around with the officers of the National Assistance Board to determine whose house must be repaired and whose house must not be repaired. He does not even understand that there are things that are happening....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Yes, Sir, he went with me when I complained and he took the Board to see if my complaint was valid. That was the only time he went. I would like him to get up and say he went with me, because he went into the City and told people that I never even told him about anybody's house that needed to be fixed. Now he is saying he went with me. He is an interesting study for any psychologist.

At the National Assistance Board, at another level, Sir, rather than the Minister ensure that the officers deal with the fact that we are not always too sure whether the houses which are repaired could not have been repaired at far less cost, that we are not always too sure if it does not take two and three sets of lumber to fix the same house....

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Not me and that. I do not know if he gets a kick back or a kick forward, but I know he is going to be kicked out.

People talk about the Defence Force, Sir, but my problem with the Defence Force is a little different. Talking about saving, we spend a lot of money on the infantry, to do what? Collect cotton and mash people with Government boots on Kadooment Day? You need to spend money on the Coast Guard, you need to spend money on the naval arm to assist you in dealing with a drug problem that your Attorney General does not believe is too grave. That is where we need to spend the money. I am not quarrelling too much with you for spending the money on the Defence Force, but I am saying the money is misdirected.

Everybody knows about what is happening with the Minister of Housing. There are wild employment policies now, because this is the time to catch votes. We have heard about that and he has not denied it, so let us move on. We have a situation with the houses in Princess Royal Avenue.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: And who put Michael Simmons in court? What did he do? Do you want to talk

about Mrs. Ram putting somebody in court? I am not a criminal, hear? Do not get into that. Tom Adams made you cry like a child with that foolishness already. I would suggest that you keep quiet about things you know nothing about. I want you to talk about drugs in the Orleans and about Simmons' son, your nephew. Talk about that. Let us talk about Nicey Belgrave's money at the Treasury.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. My name is Simmons and I have a son who has qualified as a commercial pilot. I want it clearly understood, when they talk about Simmons' son, it cannot be mine, he was iip in Macon, Georgia. If the Honourable Member would be more explicit I would be very grateful. This is Christmas time, I do not want any confusion. Drugs and Simmons' son, not mine!

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I have no problem with the Canadian borders. If he wants to try to mash me, I will show him that I have a storehouse.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nonetheless, I hope we will not go down that line in the debate.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am ready to move on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, move on.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: What is the situation with the houses on Princess Royal Avenue, the Pine, which are being refurbished and have been for over a year now? What is the cost of refurbishing those houses? Do you know you could have built the same amount of units by now?...

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Is that foolishness? Check it out. If you do not know, do not say it is foolishness. The last time you said something was foolishness you came back and ate crow.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I know you know everything that is happening.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time has expired. I will give him a little time to wind up his speech.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: In closing, all I would like to say, Sir, is that at this time there is more reason to control expenditure, because this is the time when it tends to go a little wild. This is election time. I would like to call on the Honourable Prime Minister to call the elections. It is now clear that the Honourable Prime Minister either cannot or

will not control the expenditure. It is also clear that he either cannot or will not control some of his Ministers, because they continue to embarrass him. There is a certain decency about him that will not allow him to deal with them in the way he should have dealt with them, and perhaps it is too late now. In the meantime, Sir, Barbados continues to suffer while these little games go on, and as long as Barbados suffers, you and I and the rest of the taxpayers will pay the high price.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of bringing the Ministry of Housing into this debate, but it was brought in at the end of the Honourable Member for the City's speech when he mentioned renovations which are going on in Princess Royal Avenue. 12.20p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what is going on in Princess Royal Avenue is not confined to Princess Royal Avenue. What is going on, Mr. Speaker, is that you had a situation in the Bayland - and I call the entire area Bayland - where houses were built in 1955 and almost in all of the houses people were using outdoor toilet facilities. What this administration and this Minister and this Ministry of Housing had decided to do is that those people who were using outdoor toilet facilities should be given indoor toilet facilities. We have taken the opportunity at the same time to put on an additional bedroom in most of those houses, because the people who live in the houses have families who are no longer three or four or five but are six, seven, eight and nine. So, it is a complete refurbishment, repairing in the entire Bayland. Jessamy Avenue - I don't remember all of the names. It's on the left hand side of the road and on the right hand side of the road. All of the houses. The blocks have been changed. Everything has been done; so it is not just Princess Royal Avenue and just for your information, the same thing has happened in the Pine where we had to refurbish some houses and the same thing has happened in Six Cross Roads where those houses were built in 1955.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Listen, the houses in Princess Royal Avenue and the Bayland were being done by personnel from the Ministry of Housing and we have now decided that those houses that had remained will be given to private contractors and they are almost oil finished. So the point I am making, is that in Six Cross Roads we had the same situation where there were 17 or 19 houses with people using outdoor toilet facilities. Despite many pleas by me, as Representative for St. Philip South over the previous ten years, to have indoor toilet facilities provided, nothing was done and we have taken the opportunity to do that and they are all finished. That is all I have to say about housing and the construction.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with legalising what has taken place over a number of years. It also deals with setting the borrowing limit at 11 1/2%. The first fact we have to understand and it has been stated by the Opposition, is that the revenue for this year is down. That is fact No. 1. Fact No. 2, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration as a previous administration had done has gone over the borrowing limit. The Prime Minister has also said in his introductory remarks that no Minister of Finance likes going over the borrowing limit. He has already promised in this debate that he will try as far as is humanly possible to keep the overdraft within the limit as set previously, not even the one that we are putting now.

Mr. Speaker, the limit of 10% was set by a former Minister of Finance. There is nothing magical about 10%. The former Minister of Finance set it at 10% of your current revenue. He could have set it at 12%; he could have set it at 8%; he could have set it at 15%.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I didn't interrupt you when you were speaking because in fact I did not listen to much that you said. I was outside because I don't listen to nonsense. So you don't interrupt me.

The point I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is this: The former Minister said 10% of current revenue. Are you telling me that if today we, meaning Parliament, agree to set this limit at 17 1/2% that 20 years from now or 25 years from now if a Finance Minister sees fit at that time to change it from 17 1/2% to 20% that your son should get up in here and argue that he shouldn't move it from 11 1/2%? Do you mean that it is set in concrete that you don't move the limit at all? It is purely a matter of politics in here that you all have been going around, the total Opposition, has been going around... Let me tell you what is bothering you all now.

Mr. Speaker, they have been going around saying that you couldn't get the money on the international market. We got it: They felt that there is no way, because some of them said it in here, when we came to Parliament to authorise us to raise the salaries of the civil servants, they wanted to know where we are going to get the money from. So the idea was that we would not have been able to pay the civil servants neither. We have paid them. They wanted to know where we would get the money to pay the back money from. We have paid the back money. So, every prediction that they have made they have realised that this Government has done. Everyone of them - gone through the window.

The point is now the Prime Minister had a decision to make. The Prime Minister does not like going over any borrowing limit. No Prime Minister, no Minister of Finance likes going over the borrowing limit but one has to make a

conscious decision. Your revenue is down. Would the Opposition have preferred if the Government had said to the civil servants we can't pay out any money. We can't pay any regrading, we can't pay you any back money because we don't have any. You would prefer that, wouldn't you? That is what this whole debate in here is about. It is all about the fact that you don't like to go over certain limits but circumstances dictate that you have to go over the limit because you have to decide what are your priorities and it has nothing to do with elections. Check yesterday's newspapers and you will see at the back of the newspaper that soft drink sales are up. The day before all the merchants in town saying that they estimate they will make 10% more money this Christmas than they had made before. Check today's newspaper, the BMA says that this year is better than last year and better than their predictions. So what has happened? The percentage of fixed deposits for 12 months are down 1%. The point is that despite all the shouts from the Opposition, the economy and the people... You doubt me? Go down Broad Street now and see how many people are down Broad Street shopping. You kept us in here all day Tuesday and again for three hours today and people down Broad Street are spending money like they have gone crazy.

Asides.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: It is a simple matter. Any Minister of Finance has to make a conscious decision. The point is - You see, that is a phrase that you always liked. You used it for years when Tom Adams was in here. You even went so far as to say that Tom Adams told you certain things. Now, I am not going to doubt that Tom Adams told you but I would like you to tell us if he told you before he died or after he died. I am not going to doubt you. But I want to know when he told you.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say since both administrations from time to time have found it necessary to go over the 10% limit my reading of this situation is simple and by going over the 10% both administrations have operated outside the law. My reading of the situation is this: The Prime Minister's view - I cannot speak for the Prime Minister - but if both administrations have found it necessary to go over the 10% and by going over the 10% you are outside of the law, what is the sense of leaving the limit at 10% when at some time in the future it is likely that you will go over the 10% again? The point I am trying to make is this. By putting it at 17 1/2% it does not mean that the Prime Minister will utilise all the 11 1/2% over the limit. He is putting it there to stop us from coming back to Parliament to do precisely what we are doing today legalising what had taken place when it was at 10%. That is why it is put at 17 1/2% because we believe that since from time to time you keep going over 10% you could have put it at 12%, 15% or even 20%. The Prime Minister in his wisdom decided to put it at 11 1/2%. The main reason for that is that since you tend to go over the 10% every now

and again, if you put it at 17¹/₂% you would not have to come back to Parliament to validate going over 10% because it would be already at n¹/₂%. 12.30 p.m.

What has happened is that both speakers for the Opposition - the Leader of the Opposition and the spokesman for Finance in the Barbados Labour Party - have been operating in the realm of prediction. They are predicting this and that will happen. We even had here today the spokesman for the Barbados Labour Party telling us now, like Saul on the road to Damascus, that the civil servants should be surcharged.

The Barbados Labour Party was in office for 10 years. They destroyed the civil servants in this country but today I heard a member for the Barbados Labour Party saying that the civil servants whom they used and manipulated and had them shivering in their boots, he is saying that they should be surcharged.

At least the National Democratic Party can say anything. I have said it in here on numerous occasions that the NDP never had an opportunity to run any government and they will never have an opportunity to run any government so they can say anything. They get an opportunity all the time to run their mouths but not to run a government.

The Barbados Labour Party who ran this country for 10 years know what took place under them. Suddenly you are hearing the spokesman for finance saying all sorts of things as though they have never run this country before. The people of Barbados know it. They know how the Barbados Labour Party operated in Barbados. The civil servants know it. The police know it but to hear them speaking now they are going to do everything for the police. I cannot understand this double standard.

This is a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that seeks to legalise something that has taken place. That is what it seeks to do. What bothers me is that the Opposition for the past month has been going around Barbados saying that we are breaking the law by operating outside of the limit. The Prime Minister did not have to come to Parliament to legalise this because it was done before on numerous occasions and was never legalised. The Prime Minister, a person who believes in the law, decides that since he is operating outside of the law, let me go to the House of Assembly and legalise it. Let me go to the House of Assembly and get permission, make it lawful.

There are people saying he should not have done it because an administration before this one operated outside the limit and they never came to legalise it. To engage in semantics that you only went over by 5% and by this and that whereas the other administration went over higher than that, if you break the law you break the law. It is simple.

The Prime Minister has come to make valid what they say we were doing in an invalid manner. When we are operating, as they say, invalidly, now we are making it valid we get attacked as well.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He does not He would not stop allowing the Leader of the Opposition to put him into things that he should not be in.

Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of things here today. We heard the Leader of the Opposition saying that it is going to take 15 to 20 years to rectify the foreign reserves position in Barbados and he wants to run the country. I have no doubt that he knows what he is saying because with all the promises that he has made, \$100 million to this group, \$180 million to that group, \$50 million to the next group he would need years to correct the reserves position. He will give free land, 100% mortgages, everything in the economy that he says does not have a single cent in it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I said it would take....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the Honourable Member is not sitting in his rightful place. That is not his seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member, as usual, misquotes me. I said it will take 15 to 20 years to restore the integrity of the Central Bank.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, even if he said that, which he did not say because I copied down what he was saying. Mr. Speaker, because I am not physically inside here, they believe I do not hear. Even when I go out I sit there and listen to the speaker and I write down. I wrote down this. He said it will take 15 to 20 years to rectify the foreign reserves position. I wrote beside it - nonsense when he said it. He will always deny it.

The problem that we on this side have when we have to speak after the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, is that he tends regardless of what the debate is about, to speak for three, five, six or eight hours no matter what he speaks on because it always end up on the economy. Those of us who only have half an hour to respond to him only respond to him. Those of us who speak have to respond to him, his deputy who just spoke, I am going to ignore him, we have to respond to the rest of them but you only have half an hour after he has spoken for so many hours, sometimes two and three days. How are you going to respond to him adequately? With the nonsense he comes up with all the time, he is always predicting what is going to happen and what is not going to happen. 12.40 p.m.

It is amazing, when the Honourable Member was over here, the Barbados Labour Party's spokesman for finance predicted that we were going to the IMF within 18 months and he said, "That is not true. No way."

He then left over here and went over there and he predicted from then onwards that we were going to devalue the dollar. It looks as though as long as you go over there, you will always predict that we are going to devalue the Barbados dollar. You only have to get over there.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1986 when the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was over here, as Minister of Finance, the spokesman for the Barbados Labour Party predicted that in 18 months, we were going to devalue the dollar. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central then went over there and he joined with them. They having now realized that all of their predictions, every one... You see what is happening in Barbados today is that the Opposition would like what they are saying to be self-fulfilling. People do not want to say it. I am going to say it. The Leader of the Opposition will be glad if we were to devalue the Barbados dollar or if the economy collapses. He would clap his hands, he would be proud. Every single person in Barbados knows him. He would throw a party, if we had to devalue the Barbados dollar because this is the way he thinks. He wants to be Prime Minister and anything that will help him to be Prime Minister, it is okay with him. It does not matter to him, if when he becomes Prime Minister there is no country, because when you destroy the economy, what country would you be governing when you are Prime Minister? I cannot understand the sort of thinking of people in here who could set about destroying a country.

You heard today people talk about CARSICOT. It is a simple matter, Mr. Speaker that this Government has to try, as far as possible, to retain the good name of Sea Island Cotton.

Certain remarks made by Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN were ordered, by Mr. SPEAKER, to be struck from the record.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have to understand we have Barbadians who do not seem to understand that they are destroying the country, only in order to run a government and to look after themselves. They will do anything to destroy this country.

We are to sit down and allow the cotton to be burnt or somebody to pour water on it or turpentine on it or something like that. Then the good name of West Indian Cotton would go through the door and then there would be more licks on the Democratic Labour Party again. That is what the Opposition wants. There are a lot of people in Barbados who understand as well but there are a few of them who, for reasons best known to themselves, prefer not

to understand what is happening in Barbados today, you have a group of people who have decided, at all costs, that this Government should be got rid of and would do anything to get rid of this Government. Regardless of what it does to the country they are going to do it and they will do it. I cannot understand how any person can be saying that when a government takes something in the interest of the good name of the West Indian Sea Island Cotton that the government has acted illegally and the government this and all sorts of things. You all will continue down that road.

You were predicting elections for the last eight or nine months. In 1971, the Barbados Labour Party went along that same line. They kept meetings all over Barbados. When the late Prime Minister called elections they said that they were not ready, 18 to 6. Do you remember?

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Were you ready? Sorry. I did not know you were ready.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I know about that very well, Sir. He is misleading the House. We were ready but we played out our hand.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: All that happened was that in 1971 you were over ready. You were too ready. Forced ripe.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that they have been predicting and so nervous about elections for so long has caused a lot of persons to do silly things. It has caused a lot of people who, normally, would be very calm and very analytical and things like that, they have caused those persons to be nervous, to speak out of turn cause a lot of trouble and throw caution to the wind. In fact, one member even had the date. He tapped the Prime Minister's brain. He had the date of the election.

Mr. Speaker, let me just get back to this Bill quickly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes you can wind up now.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am winding up. The Bill seeks to correct something that needed correcting. They attacked us, especially the Leader of the Opposition. He was up and down Barbados saying how we are outside the law. In fact, he said how he was going to take us to court. He was going to lock up some of us. He said we were operating outside of the law and if we did not do something about it, he was going to take us to court.

We have brought this Bill here today to do something about it, and you know, we got lashes for about seven hours from him because we brought the Bill.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: The newspaper reported that you said that you were taking us to court.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not going to get into that but if you are his friend, he does not have any enemies at all.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a Bill that seeks to regularize a situation that has developed on many occasions. I have no sort of reservation in supporting this because the Leader of the Opposition said we were operating illegally. We are trying to operate legally. How can I oppose it?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 1.45 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 12 JO p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think in some respects this Resolution and, indeed, the Bill accompanying it has tended to become trivialized with some of the comments emanating from the Government benches. We are here dealing with a very serious matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 1970, Sir, the Financial Administration and Audit Act was introduced.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It was 1964:1 am grateful, Sir. The late Prime Minister, Errol Barrow, used to say in this House from time to time that he introduced that Act. In fact, he went so far as to say that he drafted it. But obviously the Financial Administration and Audit Act was designed and implemented to bring a certain measure of propriety and rectitude to financial operations of the Government and the provisions are very strict and stringent. It does not only deal with contracts and the award of contracts and so on, Sir. It is to govern and to lay down the principles by which the expenditure of public funds can be properly regulated.

Now for all the years it has been the law that the Government was allowed - I speak as a layman - to have

overdraft facilities of the equivalent of 10% of Government's estimated current revenue for the particular financial year. That was so from 1971. In the same way as individuals and companies for the operation of their businesses are allowed overdraft facilities by their bankers with limits and in most cases....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I know John Austin. But I do not listen to "Tell It Like It Is". The Honourable Prime Minister when he introduced the Bill on Tuesday made analogy similar to those that I am now making, Sir. If the Honourable Minister of Trade was not in place at the time, then I forgive him, Sir. But I was only following the way the Prime Minister dealt with it and the analogy is appropriate in this case, Sir.

A bank will require of an individual or company collateral or security on the one hand to back the amount of credit extended on the other hand. It has always been the position in Barbados and certainly since the advent of the Central Bank that certain foreign assets would be held against the overdraft that was allowed to Government. What we have found, Sir, is that Government's banker, the Central Bank, had foreign assets used for the equalization fund or words to that effect. But in 1990 December we are in the state where Government's foreign assets are far lower. I better clarify that even further. Government's available net foreign assets and reserves are far less than Government's credit to its banker, the Central Bank. Government's foreign reserves have been depleted steadily in 1988, 1989, and 1990 to the point where I said last Tuesday that then there were only \$34 million of available foreign reserves at the Central Bank. So that the collateral or security against which we have become accustomed to Government's credit being balanced, those securities....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, you have to reply. Government's credit has so far outstripped its available collateral, Sir. Government has found itself having to go to London to borrow to prop up the foreign reserves and at the same time there has been a steady depletion of the foreign reserves. The Government's credit has been extended persistently, Sir, to the point where last week Tuesday, Sir, it was at \$165 million overdrawn. Now this Government has imposed heavy taxation, admitted in the Prime Minister's Budget Speech I think in 1989 that the tax take was then something like thirty-one cents in \$1.00 as against 27 cents that were taken by the Barbados Labour Party. The move to indirect taxes and to relieve the taxpayer from the burden of direct taxes has failed, Sir. It has failed to produce the quantum of revenue with which Government can be comfortable. I am going to give you some examples from the Central Bank's statistics.

April 1989, Government took \$74 million, 1990, that was down to \$67.1 million - all Revenue, Page 54 of the Central Bank's Statistics. This is for November, Sir, the Economic and Financial Statistics, Page 54. Check the first and second columns and you will see it there. May 1989, \$81.1 million, 1990 \$64.3 million. I am going through monthly. June \$69.8 million in 1989 and in 1990 \$63.3 million, July \$71.3 million in 1989 and 1990 they were better than last year \$75.7 million. Now this is where we start to get licks, Sir, in August In August 1989 the Revenue was \$81.4 million but this year it was down \$14 million to \$70 million and in October and November for which we have the figures available just as a sample, Sir, from \$110 million in October 1989 and this year we only took \$86 million. That is minus \$24 million and in November 1989 \$72 million as against \$65 million in November just gone, Sir.

It is clear that from those figures that there is a cash flow problem with Government Government has an income or revenue problem however you explain it It is just not collecting the amount of revenue that it needs to service its expenditure. Government is in a bind. I understand that it is dependent upon indirect taxation, but indirect taxation has consequences for the foreign reserves and the balance of payments. The more goods that come through the port the more consumption taxes Government will get. But at the same time for more goods to come through the port to increase Government's revenue there has to be a corresponding out flow of foreign funds to purchase those goods and you do not have them. 1.55 p.m.

The Prime Minister likes to speak in terms of everything being complex, but if it is any more complicated than that, Sir, he will give the House the matters that impinge and add to the complications. That in a nutshell, is the problem with Barbados now, because the sectors that should earn us foreign exchange are not performing to their maximum ability. I am not going into the reasons and I am not here to criticise the Minister of Trade for the failure of trade, or the Minister of Agriculture for the fact that agriculture is in decline, or the Minister of Tourism who cannot take criticism, so I am not going to criticise him, Sir, so we have a problem.

One concedes that from time to time countries get into problems. Let us not, however, believe that this problem which Barbados is experiencing has its genesis in the Gulf crisis. Barbados was in trouble before August, 1990. The problem will be exacerbated by the Gulf crisis, no doubt, and one has to be fair to Government and to the people, but the problem has not originated with the Gulf crisis. The problem has originated because of the failure of the productive sectors to perform optimally and because of Government's failure to restrain expenditure, because in the face of the figures and in the face of declining revenue, because Government's view is - and they are entitled to that view - that to restrain expenditure means that it is

going to impact on social services and the potential voters for the election around the corner, so there can be no cutback on expenditure. That is really the crux of the problem we have in Barbados.

Government, on the other hand, could be forgiven, and I do not believe that anyone in this House would have made a song and dance about Government bursting its overdraft limit by \$5 million or \$10 million if it came back within the limit in short order. Two Sundays ago the Honourable Member for St. Peter volunteered in the back page of the Sunday Sun the information to the public of Barbados that in our time we had gone over the top too. The one point of difference which the Government, from its spokesmen, seems unwilling to accept and appreciate is that when it went over the top in our time, quickly it was brought back within the limit and it never went over the top \$20 million and so on. We have the list here, Sir, and you will get a \$5 million, \$3 million, \$8 million, that sort of limit

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am even told that it never went as high as \$8 million, it was brought back within the bounds of financial propriety. In those days we were collecting \$500 million in revenue, we are now collecting almost \$1 billion, but the qualitative difference between the operations of the two administrations has been that notwithstanding the steady increase of the overdraft, or excess on the overdraft the Government steadfastly refused (a) to admit that it had burst the overdraft, and (b) to do anything to pull it back within the limit set by the law.

The two Opposition parties are at one in warning the Government and the people of Barbados for months now that the Government had overdrawn its limit and was doing nothing to reduce it The Prime Minister maintained a stony silence. The first time he has admitted, as Minister of Finance, that he has been wrong was when we got these papers circulated.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was never Minister of Finance and never will be. I do not know what happened in those years, you must check the debates and see what was said.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What is he telling me now? His attitude, as he began this debate, has been the Labour Party did it, therefore we can do it. A man can go and commit murder, therefore I must go and commit murder. That is his argument, that is the gravamen of what he is saying.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; The Honourable Member is making the point that I have maintained a stony silence and I am only now admitting it. I said that this particular matter is to validate the breaches, but the Barbados Labour Party broke the limit in 1981 and nine years later is the first time that they are admitting it Yet they want to put me on the pillory because within a few months or so I have come to admit the thing.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Prime Minister is not telling this House the truth. When I was shadow Minister of Finance I raised the matter on the Floor of the House and I was given an undertaking that it would be brought back within the legal limit as soon as possible.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am saying what happened. I am saying he admitted it, and that is the truth.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Right on the Floor of this House. I am trying to get the debate...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member may continue.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, that is three minutes of my time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You do not have to beg for it, I will give it to you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful, Sir. I thought I had made myself abundantly clear. I said that the two Opposition parties were at one in drawing to the public's attention that Government had been in breach of the Central Bank Act and the Financial Administration and Audit Act in allowing the overdraft persistently to go beyond the limited 10%. If the Prime Minister, as a member of the Opposition, had been doing his work in the years that he said that we burst the limit, he should have drawn it to our attention and that of the public in the same way as these two Oppositions did it in Barbados this year. 2.05 p.m.

If he didn't do it, you were in dereliction of your duty as a Member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. The greatest problem - I must say this publicly, Sir. I have said it on platforms and I am going to say it in here. The greatest problem - and I beg the Prime Minister now that Christmas is coming up and he may have a little time to reflect - with this Minister of Finance is that every other Minister of Finance in my experience has made use of this. The Leader of the Opposition, and the Member for St. Peter have made use of these on a weekly basis, that is, the Central Bank's

Economic and Financial Statistics. I have never been privileged to see that Prime Minister and Minister of Finance take up one of these in any debate in here and use the statistics to advantage. The Member for Christ Church East Central tries from time to time to handle these, to read and to understand.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But I am complimenting you.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Point of order. I don't try to do anything, I do.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right. Okay.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: But that point Sir. I want to establish that when a job is thoroughly done before you come to a situation you don't have to show the raw material.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You see, Sir. I was saying Sir, that there is only one Member on that side who uses the Central Bank's statistics. And what I was talking about earlier, Sir...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He is not the only person. I use it in order to quote statistics against the Member for St. Peter. Yes. To correct him.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Even two out of twenty. It was clear today when I read out how Government's revenue had dropped this year as compared with last year's, the Prime Minister was asking me what sort of book, where I got it from. If he were familiar with these... These are important. You have to use the tools of the trade. They are important tools and if he had been following the Central Bank yellow book, he would have seen a trend. Now, more than that

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes sometimes you read and don't understand. I agree with what the Honourable Member for St. John has said. Not this one. The green one is the Reports. The Honourable Member is talking about green ones. That is the Quarterly Report. The Digest is the mauve one and this is the yellow one. That is the quality of person we are dealing with in this House on financial matters.

Now, we have reached the stage where Government's excess on its overdraft is not \$5 or \$10 million but it's a whopping \$155 million - somewhere up in there - and as I was saying, Sir, there is a difference qualitatively between the two administrations because one would have to conclude there would have to be the inference that

Government was allowing the overdraft to continue to mount up as a matter of policy. That is the difference between the two, because they did nothing to bring it back down in short order.

Now, somebody once said that Parliament can do anything - make a man into a woman and a woman, a man by legislation. We can pass today that all people who wear jackets and ties and pants should hereafter be called women and those who wear skirts be called men and that would be the law in Barbados. So that Government has the ability in pursuance of the principle of the primacy of Parliament to come in here and say "Well, all that we did that was illegal, as from today shall be deemed legal." That is a nice technicality. A nice legal artifact, but it does not destroy the essential point that the Barbados Labour Party wishes to... and that it is a dangerous practice for a Government to carry on illegality and then take comfort later on by the legislative process to legitimize that which should not have taken place in the first place. We are sending wrong signals to the community. Do as you like. Break the law. Someday we can pass an Act, almost an Act of Indemnity scrubbing all that went before.

In the area of financial practices it is a bad example to set, Sir. I wonder what the Prime Minister is going to tell his Statutory Boards and Ministers who show no sense of restraint, who find it difficult to operate within the parameters of their individual budgets, ministerial estimates and so on. What is he going to say? I am asking you to hold strain? We know that after Estimates and after the Budget, invariably Ministers of Finance ask you to cut back from the allocation even 5% or 10%. How can he ask his juniors to show restraint when for months he has been going merrily along and then saying "I cleaned up all that with an Act of Parliament." It is a question of example. Leaders must set proper examples and I really have to say, Sir, that the Prime Minister has disappointed me on this occasion by letting this overdraft get so far out of hand and then coming in at Christmas time to try and correct it. It just isn't right. I think we must all appreciate that, Sir, if we have any sense of morality and propriety.

In those circumstances, Sir, where the Opposition has warned the Government of what it was doing, the Government refused to accept that it was doing anything illegal by positive comment and the Government has continued on its merry way despite the protestations and advice and the warnings of all and sundry. I include Dr. Michael Howard. I include Sir Douglas Lynch. I include the gentleman from the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Boos. All of these persons have looked at the economy of Barbados, Government's fiscal position and warned Government and despite the warnings, we now find ourselves in here at the last minute just before Christmas, the Prime Minister having to admit that "I have blown it. I want to correct it. Help me do it. Vote for it." That is the essence of what we are doing in here today, and he didn't even say I'm sorry.

Sir, as a lawyer yourself you know that when you plead guilty, or a person pleads guilty, there are some magistrates who will ask you: "That is all? You just say guilty? I mean no sense of remorse? No I'm sorry?" He could at least tell the country that he is sorry for the way he has mishandled Government's finances. In those circumstances, I will not be supporting this Bill.

I have to address now the comment of certain Members on the other side. The Honourable Minister of Health spoke about the Minister of State in the Senate and accused him of having a brilliant mind. I am not going to say what he said outside. He said he was more competent than any one else in his field. The Senator not in Agriculture, the other Senator in the Ministry of Finance. I can't quarrel with that. That's a value judgement. That is a subjective opinion, Sir, that the Senator is more competent than any one else in his field. He is certainly more competent than me. I was never a seller of encyclopaedias yet.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I heard him say that he was as knowledgeable as anyone else in his field and those were the words used "as knowledgeable". Not "more competent".

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am not going to quibble. I wrote down more competent. He says as knowledgeable. Let us say as knowledgeable and I say, Sir, that his field was selling encyclopaedias and I know that he is better than me at that. That is nothing low. The Honourable Minister of Health got up in here and made a brilliant defence of him. When Douglas Leopold Phillips cursed me today it was not low. I took it. The Honourable Member for St. John painted me today. I took it as a man. I take lashes and I give. 2.15 p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have not spoken for the entire day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have not said anything. I have, not said anything, least of all, about the Honourable Member for St. Thomas yet, but in due course I will.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member now has utilised his time. He has his three minutes that he so carefully asked for. I will give you the three minutes.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the Honourable Minister of Health also accused the Opposition parties of causing investors to lose confidence in Barbados. Now, we have duties as Members of the Opposition to expose shortcomings in Government. If anyone is a student of constitutional law and practice, he must know that is the

legitimate role of the Opposition. We cannot resile from our duty in drawing to the Government's attention and to the public's attention areas that are less than satisfactory to the Government's management.

It is not us who caused the African people who came here with a lot of money to invest in offshore business in Barbados, passed by their Central Bank to leave Barbados and go to Antigua. They went to a local commercial bank who told them they were not dealing with money higher than \$3 million. I will give the Prime Minister the information privately after. That has nothing to do with what the Opposition has been saying. I tell you because an Opposition person was working for the bankers and would have got a good fat fee out of it too and he is crying all like now.

The banking community of Barbados does not have confidence in the Government. It is not the Opposition. It is the banking community that would not bring in foreign exchange from their head offices to help the Government of Barbados. Let us face those facts. It has nothing to do with us. They read these and understand and interpret them.

On October 24 when the document was in circulation in Trinidad all the bankers in Barbados and Trinidad knew what was the position of Barbados. It did not take the leader of the Barbados Labour Party to say what was in that document. They knew it already but we will deal, with that later on.

Sir, I am obliged to you.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to make some comments on the Bill before this assembly. I find some difficulty with the argument presented by the Opposition representatives to whom I have listened to so far starting with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas whose main argument seems to be that the Barbados Labour Party's difficulty is not that the Government might have been in breach of the existing law, but that this breach went on for some time and the extent of the breach. Now, he is a lawyer. I am not. Therefore, my position will be a very simple one in terms of whether a policeman catches some persons speeding and if the person exceeds the speed limit by five miles as against 20, that there cannot be any serious argument based in law, at any rate, that one person is more guilty than the other.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. Let me help him. Both are guilty but if he exceeds it by five miles per hour the police use their discretion, issue a caution and do not charge you or the magistrate may give a CRD. If they exceed it by 60 miles an hour, you are going to get your licence taken away too. That is the difference.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that even though my colleague from St. Thomas rose to

speak, he did not advise me as a lawyer. He advised me as a politician. I would really have sought legal advice on this matter. My contention as a layman still is that both persons would have been guilty of the breach of the law. Even though, perhaps, one policeman might have felt that in his discretion he might have gone light, another policeman might have taken a different position.

I find it extremely difficult, quite frankly, to hear the Honourable Member for St. Thomas fulminations in trying now to castigate our side when I doubt that he would have used the same criminations against his own people at the appropriate time. Knowing the person he is I would have been more comfortable if he sat this one out. This is not one he can speak on at all. In fact, the Barbados Labour Party should be silent on this matter. They have no grounds whatsoever to castigate this side.

They should be glad that the validating legislation is covering their breaches also. We have nothing to hear from them. They have not a moral or a legal ground to stand on. The best thing to do is to sit this one out. The most they can do is to abstain because they should really support us in this legislation. That, to me, as far as I am concerned, I did not hear the Honourable Member for SL Peter but that deals with the position. I missed you. Sorry about that.

As far as the National Democratic Party and the Leader of the Opposition are concerned, there are two issues I wish to raise before I go on to my own presentation. The first one is that as a backbencher I felt quite insulted that this Chamber could have been exposed to a speech of that length precluding the right of all of us to speak on the matter.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I will establish my point. There is nothing wrong in the law in doing it. I want to establish that quite clearly because the law allows it means therefore that we can do everything. I understand that position. I have heard it more than once. There was nothing illegal in taking over the position of the Leader of the Opposition either; I respect the law but I understand there is more than one law in operation. There is the law of morality, there is the law of etiquette, there are all sorts of laws that operate at any one time.

I want to say that I speak for the people of Christ Church East Central when I get up here. When I do not speak I listen to the people of Christ Church East Central too because they elected me to be here. This is a debate that is a debate for all of us. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was trying to pre-empt our position to get in his No-Confidence Motion....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The rules of this House are clear. They give the person speaking

first for the Opposition the right to unlimited speech. Just for the benefit of the Honourable Member, this Parliament is accustomed to speeches of that order. These rules limiting speeches are recent invention. You cannot infringe my democratic right I have not stopped anybody from speaking. You can speak as long as the rules allow you to speak.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the Leader of the Opposition. Yes, he is operating within the Laws of Barbados. Yes, he is operating within the Standing Orders. I do not deny those things at all. I am saying there are always understandings that operate behind laws. 2.25 p.m.

Every one of you spoke. Listen. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact that we could speak from this side in the Estimates for a long time is because the people of Barbados put 24 of us against three from the Barbados Labour Party. The arithmetic of that tells you that 24 of us must be able to dominate the Chamber. We did not put ourselves here. We were put here by the people of this country. The people in the Opposition were put here by the same people who put them as Democratic Labour Party representatives. I do not want people to forget that. We have never used any position....

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

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...as 24 at the time or 20 now, except for the security of the security of the people of Barbados who put us here.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment. Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This House is supposed to defend and respect the Constitution of Barbados. The Honourable Member is propounding a perversion of the Constitution to suggest anyone comes in here as a DLP or BLP person. You come in here as an individual representing a Party. That is not part of our Constitution. Political parties are not part of the Constitution of Barbados. Get that straight.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker I am going for the root of some of these discussions now, as a logician. I will admit what the constitutional position is on these matters. Go and tell anybody in St. Michael South Central or St. George South or Christ Church East that they did not vote for you all as members of the Democratic Labour Party. You tell them the constitutional position. I have made it very clear that I understand the Constitution, I understand the law, I understand morality and a whole lot of codes that dictate behaviour, including the code that talks

about social contracts too. I understand all of these very clearly.

But the point that I was making was that even though the Standing Orders and the law might give you the right to get in here and talk, there is no difficulty with that I am not saying at all that the Leader of the Opposition is in breach of anything. What he did was legal. There is no question about that

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that we are not talking here about intellect We are talking about tactics. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was really rolling in his No-Confidence debate along with the Bill before us. I understand the tactic and so on. I am telling you how I feel. I feel you could have made your point in half an hour very solidly, because you made a solid point, and give the rest of us a chance to talk. We have a lot of business to do in this House and we need to do that business, go out on holiday and come back and fight. I really feel a sense of being oppressed and brutalized by your use of the time when all of us here want to talk. That is my point I want to get on, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: All the other things that in Christmas we want to do, all the journalists up there, all the recorders for Parliament and all the people sitting down there having to hear you for all these hours repeating yourself.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: We all have things to do.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: We have business to follow.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment. Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The Honourable Member could have made some economic points and finish there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members are on their feet.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Is he on a point of something?

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Oppositions cannot be held responsible for the fact that Government has crowded the Order Paper with 13 items,

the first time in four years that the Government has brought more than three or four items. They have brought them now, the week before Christmas, and the Member is accusing us of trying to hold up the meeting. I think he is misleading the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: In five years we have done so much. We have so much major legislation here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member continues his contribution. We are having too many voices. It tends to disturb the debate. I do not know if it interrupts our Reporters upstairs but maybe if we can be a little more peaceful. You may continue.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, they are afraid at the volume and range of legislation that we are bringing into this House. They have not seen so much done by one party. I mean major legislation, wide ranging legislation.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in introducing the legislation, I thought that the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance established very clearly that the Democratic Labour Party was not happy to stand in breach of the legislation. I believe that that view is shared by all of us here on this side of the House, by yourself in, in fact, the others in the opposition. I do not think we are happy about it. That is what the Prime Minister said. He also gave an undertaking that he intends to stand within the 10%.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I know he said that. If I were talking with somebody else I would not have believed him. But I am hearing that from the Prime Minister. That is a different ball game. If I heard it coming from other places, I would not believe. I would take it as an impression. When I hear it coming from the Prime Minister, I would believe.

I want to make it very clear that a lot of the discussion that we are conducting in this Chamber, moving away from the high economics that the Honourable Member for St. Peter would engage in, if he had a debate on economics, fiscal and financial matters at the ISER or at the University.

I think people have to recognize that, in fact, the Democratic Labour Party has spent a lot of money. That is true. There is no question about that. We always talk about the relationship between expenditure and revenue. The difficulty we are facing now is because of expenditure patterns and revenue patterns.

I want to remind the people of Barbados that the Opposition was constantly saying to the Democratic Labour Party that the only capital project we had was the Arch. That is all they were saying to us that the only capital project we have in Barbados to boast of from the Democratic Labour Party is the Arch. They are saying at

the same time that we have been guilty of excesses in expenditure. Square those things together. Because they know that, in fact, we have a capital works project that is a very serious project

It is all right to get up and talk foolishness in the first 15 months of a Government's tenure, when you are now correcting the illnesses of the previous regime, to establish a basis for moving forward. But they know about our capital works project. Because if they are not deaf, dumb or blind, they will know the schools that we have built. Problems like Queen's College dogged them for years and they did not know where to start off. The children are in Queen's College now. All of the sentimental talk about people not wanting to move from one place to go to another, Queen's College is there. You have the Kingsland/Wotton School that was on the drawing boards for about 15 years. Mr. Bernard St. John -1 almost said the late Bernard St. John but it did not get out - late to politics, one of the recycled new ones that Henry Forde wants to bring back, the Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is aware of the Rules of the House and the Rules governing citing a person's name, particularly in that kind of derogatory fashion. I am asking, to the extent that he has not informed you in advance, about calling the person's name that the name be withdrawn, Sir.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw the name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: The former Minister of Finance now recycled as a new politician. The candidate for Christ Church South was, days before the last election, on television - or minutes - with a model of the Kingsland/Wotton School. That is now a reality. The Sherbourne Cultural Centre is there. A tremendous amount of work has been done in creating roads for Barbadians. I do not have to tell you about the capital works project.

But what I would tell you, Sir, is that you have to listen to them when they speak, because when they tell the Prime Minister of this country that he cannot rein in some of his Ministers like the Minister of Transport into a budget, what they are really telling the people of Barbados is that when they ask for a road in the tenantry, all of them over there who live in heights and terraces and their friends are saying to the people in my constituency in Christ Church East and all the other constituencies, "Who are you to be asking for roads? We have them already, but you cannot ask because you are asking the man to spend too much money." Let us understand what is happening in this country.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: It will come there too.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: This is not a....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...prelude of what is coming because I will come different ways.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member just pause for one moment, please. We want to have a good debate. Even though I recognize that Members will communicate with each other, please keep the voices down, particularly when you are speaking across the Chamber. 2.35 p.m.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am talking about a limit in which the Government can go to the Central Bank. When the Government goes to the Central Bank for accommodation, it is normally doing that because Government has expenditure. That is understood. I want the people to understand that what the Government is being pilloried for is spending money on their behalf. That is what I want the people out there to understand that they put 24 people in here to work for them because they felt that this party is the one who could do it. While we are not happy with having gone pass the 10% that is established, we are correcting that. But beyond that, what I want people to understand that you can stand up on the question of the legality of that motion. That is one issue that can be raised. But over and beyond that is the question of what was Government doing? How did it get there? Those are questions to be asked. They are serious questions to be asked and there is no better place to ask them than in this Chamber. That is what we are here to do. I will deal with it outside too. I will make it clear throughout the length and breadth of this country that issue of what Government has been doing in terms of spending in the last four years or so. Horse Hill being levelled, the rural development programme, St. John _ widening certain things under the St. John Development Plan. In St. Philip community centres, roads, skills training programmes...

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: ...not destroying Sayes Court. Do not tell the people in Sayes Court so. Do not tell the people in Sayes Court that by providing them with a skills training centre that everything is being destroyed. I drove in there yesterday. They are provided with basketball courts, housing, and house lots for people, street lights, and I am not giving the impression that any individual in Barbados should pull their pockets and put up street lights for this country, but that is a Government responsibility. I want to be very clear that the money has been spent on the people of this country bringing them from a level that they were at and trying to push them further.

In addition to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Government is the largest single employer in this country. As far as I understand, Government now employs about 17,430 in the Civil Service and another 6,000 to 7,000 in Statutory Corporations. Government employs about 24,000 people in this country. This particular administration has spent more money on the human resources that it employs in the public sector than any other administration. That costs. Now the Opposition has maintained all the time when it comes to salaries negotiations that we can give the people what they ask for. In other words, you are suggesting that we never gave them enough. But that is one of the reasons why we have to seek accommodation to get the money, because we gave them certain figures but they were always saying "give them more". They could probably tell us where the more will come from. But I will tell you that between 1986 to 1992 I have all the details and figures about settlement levels between Government and the workers' representatives maintaining the same kind of differentials between the top and the bottom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you hear some of the people on the Opposition giving the impression that in the regrading exercise that we were able to top up the well placed civil servants to the disadvantage of the ones at the bottom, that is not true. It will not be borne out by the facts. In 1987, the ratio between the top and the bottom was 1 to 5.9%. In 1991 to 1992 the ratio is 1 to 5.6%. These are facts. In 1986 to 1987, the person at the top was getting \$63,888 and the person at the bottom was getting \$10,776. In 1991/1992 the person at the top is getting \$72,427.35 and the person at the bottom is getting \$13,370.38. The ratio, as I said, went from 1 to 5.9% to 5.6%. So the impression that is being given that the regrading was to make the people at the top get a lot more and the people at the bottom did not get anything is not true. It is not borne out by the facts and I would argue these facts with anybody. They are substantial facts.

We changed Leave Passages so that women can now get their husbands to go on passages. When it comes to Study Leave, we reintroduced Study Leave all through the public sector. In 1987, we gave leave to 137 persons and in 1988-89 we gave leave to 246 persons. People from all through the public sector can go and study now and that has to be paid for. In terms of establishing posts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we established 202 posts in 1986, 440 posts in 1988, and 316 posts in 1990. Since we have been in as the Government of this country again, we have established 1,004 posts. That is the kind of work we have been doing on behalf of the people of this country. Do not talk about what we have done in terms of pensions. A few weeks ago we came in here and made arrangements in the Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1990 to give pensionable consideration to at least 3,000 additional persons. Do not talk about the cost of living allowances that we have given to pensioners. Everytime we come in here we make sure that the pensioners are better off.

When people are talking about Government spending, I want them to know where the spending went. It went on capital works projects. It went on the human resources that are employed by this Government and I am not making any excuses for that.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Salaries - that is what I am saying.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: It went on CARSICOT, because that is the next thing I want to get into now. I am glad you told me about CARSICOT now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the main problems we face in Barbados, the Opposition is not frank enough to deal with these issues. I am not going to debate on what it means to be in a small open dependent economy. The Honourable Member for St. Peter in another circumstance we will deal with that The problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we are not generating the kind of business development in this country that we have to seek. The whole question about export led growth is an area that we have to come to consonance with. I am not going to move away from that because in the long run that is what we are debating this afternoon. I want to be very clear that what we are debating is not an issue about whether Government should borrow 10% or more of estimated revenue.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: My colleagues will debate that I am not debating it but I am acknowledging it. That is the difference. I am acknowledging that and I am recognizing that that is a component. But over and beyond that we are looking at the structure of the Barbados economy and how it has been performing in the last ten to fifteen years. The fact is that the Barbados Labour Party wrestled manfully and were unable to do anything to move the economy to a different structural level. They could not get it manned. They ran away in the first few months to the IMF and since then they were really struggling until they were tossed out of office. Now with the NDP there is no problem with them because the Leader of the Opposition NDP was Minister of Finance for one year, anticipated what would happen if he continued to be Minister of Finance and he ducked out. He felt it would be more comfortable to be the Leader of the Opposition because he knew that the scenario would be so gloomy that he could attack. Now he likes being in opposition.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: He had a different motivation than the people who came with him. I want to be very clear.

He was the Minister of Finance. He saw the scenario. He knew that it was not going to be pretty with all of the load in terms of debt servicing and other things. He would have seen the effect of the 1986 proposals on revenue and he ducked out. He became the Leader of the Opposition. He felt it was very comfortable to attack. But the truth is that any Government leader in Barbados now has a difficult job in terms of moving the economy along and moving the country along. 2.45 p.m.

The major task facing Barbadian people now is how do we get enough people to take the risk that the Honourable Member for the City and people like him have taken. That is the biggest challenge facing Barbados at this point in time. How do we get people into manufacturing who will try to get into the export markets? How many Barbadian people who are already in business are willing to adopt an attitude that will propel them into taking on the challenge of the export of goods and services, whatever form that might take? Improving tourism services, data processing services, manufacturers,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have three minutes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I wish to make the point that there was no fall in revenue when I was Minister of Finance and there is a fall in revenue now. He misled the House.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question is not only in the area of the expenditure of Government, it is also in the area of revenue, particularly in the area of earning more foreign exchange for the country, and I am saying that the biggest challenge facing Barbados now, or after any election, is how can we make the people of Barbados sufficiently serious about this consideration. We have to recognise that we cannot be dependent only on persons coming from outside and bringing foreign investment here, but that we as Barbadians have to be very > serious at this point in time in terms of changing our economy structurally and in terms of establishing businesses.

The challenge I put very squarely on the young people of this country - because I think there might be a difficulty in the existing structure to deal with that question adequately - but I believe that our young people have to recognise the need to get out there to become entrepreneurs and that we have to get all of the advice possible, all of the guidance to give them to encourage them to try to get businesses established which will earn foreign exchange for this country. We will also have to try to persuade those who are already in business as far as possible to put that as their number one aim.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in concluding, I will say that we on this side do not relish the fact that we have today to be

bringing in this validating legislation. We are not happy that this is what has transpired, but we need to recognise that in fact we have to look beyond that to the structure and performance of our economy to get answers to where we have to go in the future, and I hope that that will be a matter that will engage the thinking of Barbadians as we move into 1991.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, sometimes the Member for Christ Church East Central can be very, very good, sometimes he can be good and sometimes he can be disastrously bad. That was one of the examples of that and I would be the first to tell him that. It is as though he was straining to make the point, to come to some accommodation, as it were, of what is before the House. The Member for Christ Church East Central and myself, along with the Member for St. Peter are probably three of the best friends in this Chamber and we are in the habit of making these kinds of remarks to each other, so I was very surprised that he did not command the kind of attention that he normally does when we come to debate matters of this nature.

I was very saddened by some of the things that he said. He started off by talking about the rules of debate and how they ought to be used, about the spirit of debates and things like that. The rules of this House - and he never denied this, Sir - give the Leader of the Opposition unlimited time to speak on matters brought before this House, except in certain circumstances.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me just put the Member on the right track. We are dealing with a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act

Mr. R. P. BYER: But there are certain points that the Member for Christ Church East Central raised in debate to which I think I have a duty, as a Member of the Opposition, to respond.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but the question he raised relating to the rules of the House was not part of the substance of the Bill which is before us.

Mr. R. P. BYER: If I may be permitted to argue with you on this point, Sir, he raised the matter and you did not prevent him from doing it. It is as though you allowed him to operate as though he was within the scope of the debate, and a similar accommodation must be extended to me, Sir, and I say so in all humility.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you want to take that course I really do not want to stop you, but what I am saying is that it does not form part of the substance of the Bill. In any event, I am in a better position to make judgments from here.

Mr. R. P. BYER: As I was saying, though, Sir, these rules give the Leader of the Opposition permission, whatever we are discussing, even the Financial Administration and Audit Act, to speak as long as he wants to in a matter like this. To say that he was trying to destroy the spirit of the debate and to prevent other people from speaking in the debate is totally without foundation.

It is unfortunate that Government has waited so late in the day to bring about 12 or 13 matters on the Order Paper, some of which are very difficult, some dealing with fundamental changes in the law as we understand it and these matters have to be fully canvassed. So to say that a Member ought to limit himself in speaking is not a very good point.

I remember during the Estimates debate when the Opposition was frustrated in getting matters into Committee, when the Ministers of Government thought they had the right to get up and defend themselves in advance because statements were made about one or two things. That was not immoral, Sir, that was all moral, good and right. Also, a Resolution dealing with the Financial Administration and Audit Act was laid in this House a long time ago and is being debated today, but what has happened is that this no-confidence motion is being debated after a Bill is being considered as it were to try to knock the bucket out of that no-confidence motion. All of this is not immoral, there is nothing wrong with that. When the Leader of the Opposition started to reply to this Bill, he was speaking long past 7 o'clock, when we know that we break for dinner at 7.00 at night, but the rules of the game changed as we went along and the Leader of the House admitted to me across the divide that that was so, the rules of the game changed, so do not let us talk about morality. Morality apparently is when we interpret it as morality. What is moral and what is immoral is a subjective judgment of most people. So, Sir, I cannot fall for that 2.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with one or two things. The Member mentioned the whole idea of CARSICOT. He said that Government is spending money trying to get the cotton industry going. I remember when a resolution to guarantee the CARSICOT debt, a portion of it, was brought before this House. My entire contribution to the debate centred on the whole idea of guarantees and I made the point, Sir, that it was not right for a minority shareholder to guarantee the debt of the CARSICOT company but that the major shareholder Scothalls Limited was not guaranteeing any portion of the debt. The wisdom in issuing Government that caution is now clear, because we have a situation where Scothalls Limited is now in a position where they can now levy as it were against Government and make Government liable for the entire debt of CARSICOT. Sir, this all goes back. When you come to look at what happened in the High Court and the fact that how the cotton was seized and how it was shifted from one place to another in contravention of

the High Court Judgment; when you see what happened in the Senate yesterday, the so-called revolt, which was no revolt at all; what was done as it were to influence matters currently before the Court; one has got to wonder in what position the Government of Barbados is putting the Minister of Agriculture. If I were the Minister of Agriculture, I would have resigned from my Ministry this morning but then again, Sir, nothing as dishonourable as that happens in the West Indies. They have expressed a vote of no-confidence in the Minister of Agriculture and then you had a Minister of Government - the first time I have ever heard about it - voting against major Government policy. I am talking about the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance and he is still a Minister? And then you are going to get vexed with all of us on this side for having made the same points and leaving the Democratic Labour Party. All of it was done to accommodate Government and to frustrate the plaintiff in the matter against CARSICOT. But yet, the Minister of Agriculture is going to sit down there and allow those kinds of things to happen when all of his fellow Ministers and backbenchers have not expressed any confidence in him. In the Senate, nine members in the Senate voted against a major plank of Government policy - Agriculture. And you are sitting down there and taking that

Now Sir, in relation to what I was talking, this document was made a document of the House earlier on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What document is that?

Mr. R. P. BYER: This document here from which I want to quote, Sir. It was a document that was made a document of the House earlier on. I am going to tell you what it is, Sir. Bear with me. It was a document MP2114/5 Vol. 2 from the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries to the Director of Finance and Planning, dated 1988-07-28. Subject Establishment of an integrated Sea Island cotton industry in Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I know but I want to let the shorthand writer know what I am quoting from;

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I like to see Taitt there when I am talking.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please, the rules of this Chamber.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I beg your pardon, Sir. I know what the rules are.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please let me speak. Don't shout at me. I am seeking to make a point to you. Please listen.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member may continue but I just wanted to make the point that the rules do not permit you to call names.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The Cabinet at its meeting held on 14th July 1988 considered Notes (88) 623/MAF46 on the subject of the Establishment of an Integrated Sea Island Cotton Industry in BARBADOS. The Cabinet at Note F noted that Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Limited proposed to enter into negotiations with the Barbados National Bank for the lease with option to purchase of lands comprising of Congo Road, Bushy Park and Vineyard Plantation.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members on their feet.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A point of privilege Sir. I want to draw to Your Honour's attention. I am a little concerned ever since some time two years ago the configuration of the Opposition benches have been four and three, Sir. I have noticed now Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition is there • and now the benches are now five and two. It puts a strain on me, Sir, to be able to understand what precisely is going on. It seems as though the Leader of the Opposition, having taken away the leadership of the Opposition, is now systematically denuding the Labour Party of its Members and I think as a matter of privilege the House should be made aware if there is a change in the status of Members on that side, Sir. It is causing me a little stress.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. R. P. BYER: It is unfortunate Sir, that Members can seek the umbrella of privilege to make non points.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I object most strenuously to that The Honourable Member knows that on the beginning of each session of the House that we repose privileges in the Speaker's Chair and I believe, Sir, that you protect the rights of the minority and I know you will protect the rights of the minority and therefore we need to know what the minority is. I think it is really wrong for the Honourable Member to be saying that I made a non point. You don't make a point in privilege. You get up. The Honourable Member has been an officer of the House and should know better. He knows that you get up and make your point of privilege. There is no point to be made. I speak because I have the privilege to speak given to me by the distinguished people of St Michael West.

Mr. R. P. BYER: You see, Sir, the problem with the Member for St. Michael West is that he would like to come over here, Sir. He is in a similar position over there. He is in the minority, Sir, and he is jealous of this camaraderie above here. Good friends.

If I may continue. Sir. I will repeat what I had to say because the point I was making might have gotten lost in privilege. The Cabinet noted that -1 am quoting Sir.

"Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Limited proposes to enter into negotiations with the Barbados National Bank for the lease with option to purchase of lands comprising Congo Road, Bushy Park and Vineyard Plantations.

G. - Concluded that the Ministry of Housing and Lands should obtain evaluation of the land at Spencers Plantation, Christ Church and arrange for the lease of that land to Caribbean Sea Island Cotton Company for 25 years as a part of Government's equity participation in the company."

The Cabinet of Barbados noted that this lease agreement ought to be entered into and one of the Members of Government who would have participated in this, Sir, and would have been subject to that rule...

Asides.

Mr. R. P. BYER:... that the Cabinet of Barbados made this decision and that the Member of the Cabinet should have stood by it. He went to the Senate and voted against it, yet he is still a Member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members on their feet

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member I know is fully seised of the rules that this House cannot reflect on the vote of another House. He knows that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Particularly with reference to another Member of that Chamber. I think the Honourable Member for St. George South will take the point and withdraw the remarks.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, that is not a reflection. That is a statement of fact. It is a question of interpretation. That is something that happened yesterday, Sir, and I can say that it happened.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment. Order please. I understood the Honourable Member to say that he

sat in Cabinet and agreed to something and then voted otherwise. I ask that those remarks be withdrawn. 3.05 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: What remarks, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just repeated it. You are not listening?

Mr. R. P. BYER: As close as I am to you, Sir, I cannot hear what you are saying. It is as though you are mumbling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will repeat it again. The Honourable Member said that someone sat in Cabinet and agreed to something which he read from a document, then he went to the Senate and voted against it. I am saying that to make a statement like that is a reflection on the Member.

Mr. R. P. BYER: You are telling me, Sir, that he did not vote?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am saying that the remarks reflected on the Member. I am trying to be as easy with you as I can.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, the words are withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you very much.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Now, Sir, in constitutional theory, members of the Cabinet are bound by the principle of collective responsibility. My argument is that if someone...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will remind the Honourable Member. We are debating a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act. I really have given you ample opportunity to stray far and wide. I want you to come close to the point

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am dealing with Government expenditure. I am laying the foundation for making the point, Sir. What I am saying is that a lot of money was spent in CARSICOT. Some of the money probably helped to cause the overdraft to be about \$55 million. This is the point I am making.

The point I am also trying to establish that in constitutional theory, if you might be patient with me, Sir, the principle of collective responsibility binds members of the Cabinet. In other words, if a member of the Cabinet participates in a decision of the Cabinet, then he is rightly bound to report that decision with a vote of "Yes" whenever that decision comes up for consideration by the Legislature. If a member of the Cabinet abstains in that decision, then I am saying that is a breach of the principle of collective responsibility. That is what I am saying.

Now, Sir, you have said that I should not reflect on any vote anywhere else and I will not do that. I think the meaning of what I am saying is pretty clear. It is unfortunate that it is not clear to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West

Sir, in a speech in 1988 in this House I made the point that Government was having problems with expenditure and that it ought to cut back on its expenditure. It is as though if every cent Government got it was spending willy nilly and it was entering into some very questionable projects. For example, shortly after CARSICOT you had problems with ADC and spending. Then something started to be built at Two Mile Hill. It was not clear at the very beginning what it was. Up to now I do not think that anyone is clear what that is up there. It should have been ready for October last year. This is December 1990 and nothing has happened to it. We are now being told that it is to be called the Sherbourne Centre. What will be done there is another matter.

There have been excessive expenditures in that area. There have been excessive expenditures in a lot of other areas. The question of excessive expenditure has to be linked to the question of decline in Government revenues which is really and truly where the problem lies. That is the point I am making. When you look at all of the revenues and compare them between 1989 and 1990, you will see that there have been significant decreases from month to month beginning in April up to November.

The only one month that you had any increase, and this was a marginal one was the month of July when revenues for 1990 were \$75.7 million and in July of 1989 it was \$71.2 million which was a \$4.3 million increase. Let us go back to April of 1989. Government collected \$74 million. In April, 1990 it collected \$67.1 million. In May of 1989 it collected \$81.1 million. In 1990 it collected \$64.3 million. This was a decline of \$17 million. In June, 1989 it collected \$69.8 million and June of 1990, this year, you had \$63.3 million. This was a minus of \$6 million. I mentioned July where you had the marginal increase in 1990 over 1989. In August of 1989 it collected \$81.4 million, in 1990 it was \$70.9 million, minus \$11 million. In September there was another increase again last year of \$62 million and \$69 million this year. That is an increase of \$7 million which contradicts what I said earlier. There ought to be two months, July and September. In October you had a minus \$24 million in 1990 over 1989. It was \$110 million in 1989 and in 1990 it was \$86 million. In November 1989 it was \$72 million and \$65 million in 1990. Over those two months, between October and November Government revenues fell by \$31 million.

Now, where does that leave us, Sir? There is only one suggestion. With the over-taxation and the credit squeeze wealth is not being created. New opportunities are not being made for people to get jobs. Unemployment figures are

disastrously high. That is where the problem is at the moment. When you have over-taxation coupled with a credit squeeze people begin to hide money. Not only do they hide money but businesses are stifled, they go into bankruptcy or liquidation. Businesses are stuck for cash. They cannot expand anything at all. That is part and parcel of the problem, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER Three minutes.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I remember, Sir, when we had the low tax Budget introduced by the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Finance, revenue grew steadily every month. People were not concerned about getting involved in tax avoidance schemes. They are not doing that. It could be that they are. People must be hiding money.

The example in India, Sir, I think it was about 1948, when they experimented with this low tax budget. The example was that revenues went up. Barbados is another example. As I said before, revenues will go up once you have low taxes or not too high taxes. 3.15 p.m.

Sir, what I am concerned about and the point I want to make is that you see a lot of lawlessness going on in Barbados now. You drive along every day, you see people going through red light signs. I believe that people might very well be saying that, "If Government is breaking the law as it likes then we can do the same thing."

The Member for St. Thomas talked about sending signals. I wonder if the Government is not sending that kind of signal. If the Government can break the law then people out there are doing the same thing. I am not condoning it.

To come in here and tell me that the Barbados Labour Party did the same thing in 1981 does not mean anything to me. It is as though you are trying to tell me - and this seems to me to be the level of politics in Barbados - if you do it, I can do it too. I cannot operate at that level, Sir. Nobody should operate at that level. So for the Prime Minister to come here and tell me, without even saying he is sorry for having done it

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I suggested to him, when he was speaking, that he should have said that.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I was not in here when he was talking. I was in Her Majesty's courts. I do not know what he said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have 15 seconds.

Mr. R. P. BYER: The point I am making, Sir -1 must have some injury time - is that Government is sending the wrong signals abroad. They are breaking the law and other people are doing the same thing, at the same time. People are breaking the law as they like. They passed a law the other day about stopping music on the minibuses. The music is continuing. Why? Government is doing the same thing. It is as though you have a free for all, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time. The Honourable Attorney-General.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am of the firm opinion that if elections were not anticipated we would not probably be engaging in this kind of debate, at this time and at this length, and in this kind of way. But that is so.

One of the principle points which has been made on the other side is that, it seems to me, there is something wrong in principle with passing validating legislation. Passing validating legislation is nothing new. Validating legislation is as old as the hills.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Silver Hill probably. Throughout history, validating legislation

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you get into the substance of your contribution, I have already warned members that it is very disturbing when they speak across the Chamber. I would prefer if Members would keep their voices down because it interrupts the debate and it disturbs the House.

I am asking again that Members would please keep their voices down so that the Honourable Attorney-General can make his contribution.

Hon. M. A. KING: I was making the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that throughout history validating legislation, certainly in the Westminster system has been used as a tool of parliamentary procedure. So let us get it out of the way to start with, that passing of validating legislation is nothing new. This is not a new departure.

The second point which one needs to make is that, if you look at the original resolution, in respect of which this Bill is being debated, you will see that from the comments of the Honourable Member who introduced the resolution on that occasion that what was being done then too was regularizing a situation which was irregular. If I may quote from the speech of the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, as he was then, at page 2985 of the Debate for Tuesday, 30th March, 1971. You will see he made the point, towards the end of his speech:

"We have overdrawn from time to time, but it was only drawn to my attention at times when, perhaps, the money has been repaid to the Bank. I should like to regularize this, so that we do have authority to make temporary loans from the local Banks, whether it be the Central Bank or the Commercial Banks."

The point I am making is that, even as far back as 1971, when the original resolution was being dealt with.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. There was no overdraft limit set by law prior to 1971. The overdraft that is being referred thereto refers to the level of lending locally in relation to the securities held overseas. In 1971, that was not correcting any illegality because there was no law dealing with the limit. It was an overdraft in the sense of a financial arrangement, not a legal matter.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, how ridiculous could the Honourable Member be? I never made any reference to anybody saying that there was any overdraft limit or anything like that. I am reading a quotation. If you are indicting anyone and if you want to indict anyone, indict the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow because those are his words that I am using.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered, by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, to be struck from the record.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was making the point....

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please. Just one moment. Please let the Honourable Member continue.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it is convenient for the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to read a part of the speech of the Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow and use it for his purposes, it is all right. It is like the saying which is used that, "The devil can cite Scripture to suit his purposes."

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: I said, "The devil can cite Scriptures to suit his purposes."

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Did you hear what I said?

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quoting the speech of the RL Hon. E. W. Barrow. I have given the reference already and I will repeat it. I am repeating his speech. I am reading it

"We have overdrawn from time to time,"

I did not say we have overdrawn. The late Right Honourable Prime Minister said:

"We have overdrawn from time to time, but u\was only drawn to our attention at times when, perhaps, the money has been repaid to the Bank, I should like"...

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Listen to the words of the man, please:

..."to regularize this, so that we do have authority to make temporary loans from the local Banks, whether it be the Central Bank or the Commercial Banks."

The Right Honourable Member was saying then that he wanted the authority of Parliament to regularize what had been done.

What do you think this measure is doing now, other than regularizing what has been done?

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: You want to curse Barrow. That is your problem, 3.25 p.m.

The next point I want to make is this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not going to dwell at any length on the aspect of the economic argument which has been addressed by Honourable Members, but there are a number of issues of law which the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central raised and I keep telling him that he should speak on medicine and not tread into the area of law. He seeks to convince. The Honourable Member wishes to convince this House and all you need to do is to make a statement, and when it gets out in the public domain, and the way the community is at this time when statements get out there, then one runs with it for what it is worth especially the partisan political voices saying, Government is breaking the law and Central Bank is breaking the law. A lot of references were made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, to the Central Bank Act. As one listens to him, one tries to find out what areas of the law were being broken by the Central Bank. The other thing is that the Honourable Member and Leader of the Opposition tried to give the impression that the provisions of the Central Bank Act were somehow

inconsistent with the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act which we are doing now.

I am not sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Honourable Member is making the point that the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act and of the Resolution which was passed in 1971 contradict or conflict.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I said that I am not sure if you are saying that because you cannot say that they contradict each other now unless you are prepared to say that they have always contradicted each other.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: No, you are the person making the allegations of conflict I am saying that there is no conflict. I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is no conflict. I am going beyond that and giving you good legal advice and you better listen to it. I am going beyond that and saying that if the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying that there is a conflict, he has to make it clear that he is saying that not only now is there a conflict, but there has been always a conflict in relation to the 1971 Resolution, Financial Administration and Audit Act before this amendment, and in relation to the Central Bank Act.

If he is saying then that there was that conflict, if he is saying that the legislation previously conflicted, then he is saying that even in his term as Minister of Finance he was operating under legislation which did not make much sense. What I am saying is that if you are saying that, you cannot say that these bits of legislation now are in conflict.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am making the point and I think the public should understand that the issues relating to the allegations of illegality by the Central Bank made by the Leader of the Opposition are no more than a red herring drawn across the trail of this debate in order to create impressions which are not really substantiated by anything which are facts.

Now those were the two major issues of the law which I needed to address, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Central Bank Act deals with the issue as to how advances and credits are to be dealt with and the essential point to note is that there is no conflict in the legislation. I do not have much else to say on the substance of the legislation and I have no difficulty whatsoever, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in supporting the provisions of the Bill which are now before us.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been listening for a long time to the several speakers in this debate. I believe that the reason you would want to increase your borrowing rate is because you would have run out of money and the only way you will run out of money that you

had carefully budgeted for is when you squander it or when you spend it badly. I know about people. I know about myself and I will tell you about myself squandering money. I know about squandering money. I know about over spending and then you have to borrow and this is the reason why you have to increase your borrowing rate. Here we have a situation, Sir, of over taxation. Then we were faced with a credit squeeze and these two, Sir, have put a lot of money out of circulation. Now most of you will look at coins and you will see that they are round, but I am quite sure that many of you never bother to think why they were made round. They were made round so that they will continue to go around and since the Government is the owner of all monies in the country, when it leaves the Government on its rounding circle, it would eventually end up back into the Government coppers again. But if you overtax it means the little you get you are keeping and then you put on a credit squeeze. Your credit squeeze is saying to the couple of pennies out there to hold on to that tight. Do not let them have it Well, then the result would be no circulation. Yes, *Sir*, it is like squeezing off your arteries in a leg then there will be no circulation of blood in the toes. The result will be, *Sir*, an amputation.

Laughs.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Sir, talking about wastage and squandermania, I really have to talk about the nonsense that went on with CARSICOT and this thing at Two Mile Hill. It bothers me. Up to now I do not know what it is, Sir. Each time I pass up there I see some other thing going up beside it. I would like to know for sure what the thing is really about. I am seeing a third building going up now. I was hearing once that it would have been two and now I am seeing a third set of steel going up. I would like to know what this thing is all about The last time I heard it was \$45 million and there was no third building. So in the end it may be another \$80 or \$90 million. You are telling me, Sir, that that is not wastage and squandermania when I was told in the first instance that it would cost only a mere \$12 million. I was told this and when we would have invited all of the parliamentarians from every Commonwealth country here that we would have had enough room to spare to put them in. The result was we had to use the old Dover which held everybody with room to spare and then we bought some coaches to drive these people around for two weeks. Lo and behold, one night at a function I was privileged to see these delegates being driven by local tour coaches, not the Government's fancy coaches. Nobody can tell me I am lying. I cannot see well, but I am very, very diligent. I look around for every little detail. The same coaches took these people to Sam Lord's. 3.35 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am speaking about a function at a particular place, so do not give me that..

Now, Sir, earlier I had been subjected to some idiocy. I was hearing about cotton burning and water being poured on cotton and all this kind of talk. I want to know, Sir, if you burn a house, would you be able to change the name of that house?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Me?

Mr. E. BOURNE: Yes, Sir. Well, Sir, I was hearing that the burning of cotton would spoil the good name of Sea Island Cotton. Sea Island Cotton will always be Sea Island Cotton.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member has given way and I want to elucidate the point I made. I said that Sea Island Cotton.....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I said it and you obviously did not hear.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But I said it and I am only elucidating.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Let the Honourable Member make his contribution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The gravamen of what we have been saying is that Sea Island Cotton from Barbados is a unique product in the entire world. It is a precious cargo and therefore it is to be defended with our very lives.

Mr. E. BOURNE: But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he wants to defend the name of Sea Island Cotton. If I plant Sea Island Cotton in my backyard, I reap Sea Island Cotton from my backyard and I bum the Sea Island Cotton in my backyard, would that have anything to do with the quality or the name of Sea Island Cotton?

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: But this is what I was hearing, and then the argument went on.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The point that I made, because I mentioned it as well, was that since Barbados needs to protect the Sea Island Cotton label and name, anything at all, whether it is burning, wetting, I even mentioned putting turpentine on it, anything to destroy the cotton, the people, like the Japanese, who want to purchase it from Barbados would say that you

did nothing to safeguard that grand product that you have, therefore you are not interested in it. That is the point I was making. If you burn cotton in your backyard, it is your cotton. If you want to burn, you can burn your house as well.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my argument is simple. He is saying that if you burn cotton you will destroy the name of Sea Island Cotton, and I am saying it is stupidity. He is saying that if you pour water on cotton you will destroy the quality of Sea Island Cotton. You might destroy the quality of the cotton you have at the moment which you poured water on, but you cannot destroy the quality of Sea Island Cotton in Barbados. This is what I am saying, Sir.

I want the Members on the other side to understand that when they get up to speak they must speak clearly.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Not only for me to understand, because they themselves do not understand what they are saying. I have been hearing about burning Sea Island Cotton and pouring water and even turpentine on Sea Island Cotton as though doing this thing to one bale or one piece of cotton would change the quality of Sea Island Cotton, period. All of this idle talk is just to justify themselves for bringing in the Defence Force to break the law. .

Mr. Deputy Speaker, since they want to save the good name of Sea Island Cotton, why was counterfeit cotton brought to Barbados, under the guise that it was Sea Island Cotton, to be sent to Japan?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: The same CARSICOT, and the Minister of Agriculture got in here when the no-confidence motion was brought and denied it. He denied that bogus cotton was brought to Barbados and his excuse was that there were three 40-foot container loads of cotton seed. Do you know how many tons a 40-foot container holds? 40 tons. We would be planting Sea Island Cotton for about a million years.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East is misleading the House. During the debate on the no-confidence motion I said that I had no proof, because when that cotton came here I was in Dominica, so I was not even in the Island. The person who was acting as Minister at that time was Senator Anderson Morrison, and when I came back he gave me the facts. He had already submitted a report to the Cabinet and the Prime Minister and instructions had already been given for that cotton to be shipped out. I said at that time I could not say anything

about whether there was counterfeit cotton or not because I did not know.

I never made any statement about three containers of cotton seed. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East is misleading the House. It is stupid to continue to imply that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened for a long, long time to those self-righteous ones over there implying, impugning, trying to suggest corruption and my participation in it and I have already made it quite clear that I want it cleared up just as much as anybody else. Whoever committed a fraud on that issue should be locked up. I have repeated that over and over again and I have given the House an undertaking on that and they must stop this imputation, led by the Leader of the Opposition, who takes delight in this country trying to impute improper motives to people and destroy their characters. I am tired of these imputations about any improper actions. I have said repeatedly what my objectives were and they are still my objectives, to see that we have a cotton industry in this country. Those were my objectives at the beginning and they are still my objectives, and I am more disappointed and hurt that they went off rail than any of you. None of you wanted to see it succeed and I would have done nothing to hamper the project because it was my project. 3.45 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member continues. Let me just say that we seem here to be repeating many points that have already been exhausted in debate and even though I don't want to appear to be short-circuiting the debate, I just thought I would caution the Honourable Member.

Can we have some order, please? I was saying that we seem to be repeating many points which have already been exhausted in the debate and I would prefer if we can just probably stick to the Resolution under consideration.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am speaking Sir, about squandermania in the Ministries and I haven't repeated anything that I have said before. I am saying Sir, that it was stated that it was not cotton that came in the containers. They were cotton seeds. In his defence he said they were cotton seeds and I will call for the records to prove that Sir.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never said anything about cotton seeds. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East is misleading the House.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Anyway Mr. Deputy Speaker, valuable money could have been made in the tourist

industry. Yes, the overdraft. The \$450 million we have to pay in interest charges, that is invaluable money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir...

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: You start with two whom you thought you could make me a Jesus between the two of them. You ran away one and now you bring another clown. Six and six.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we had a good thing going for us - a money maker, the ARC race. We fooled around with it, not being able to make a decision on whether we would have a marina or not. At one time, Sir, I suggested three sites to the Honourable Leader of this House in a conversation and I see now they have changed one for a place lower down but yet it is all talk. Do you remember when I suggested Six Mens' and Freshwater Bay and from the Esplanade down to the Bay Street Fishing Market? You did nothing on it. I am talking about my suggestion. You aren't doing the West Coast because I have seen in the newspapers that the consultants have recommended around the Harbour Police Station down to the Pierhead and you said you would not comment on it because the Prime Minister is not in the country. I saw that in the newspapers.

Asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: But you see, Sir, when we do things like this or fail to do things like this, it puts a heavy strain on the economy and then we are put in a position where we have to look for extra money because there is no money coming in to fill that gap.

Another thing that is responsible for the dilemma we are in today is the low production of agriculture. I want to know when we will take the bull by the horns to get agriculture moving, get many people employed and above everything else bring in a lot of valuable foreign exchange. We, Sir, have been exporters of agricultural produce for years. Agriculture has made Barbados' name in the early days and yet today with all this knowledge we pretend we have, we have to walk about now with cap in hand begging every Tom, Dick and Harry to lend us some money to keep the show going.

This is time, Sir, that we really do something about agriculture. When I look at the exotic fruit we have - papaya, guava, soursop and sweetsop and golden apples. Do you think that today if we had been really interested in agriculture that we would not have been bringing in valuable foreign exchange and making Barbados the number one again in the West. This is our problem, Sir.

I heard earlier one speaker saying that the United States borrows over the limit and there is nothing wrong

with our borrowing over a limit but while it is believed that the U.S.A. can pay its debt, the U.S.A. and the other countries around the world don't believe that we at this time can really pay our debts. There is where the difference is. Once upon a time they believed so; but today we in Barbados have gotten lazy. We got drunk with power. We got callous, lawless, everything. So the result is nobody cares and everything is falling into chaos.

What I would like to see is that we stop wasting the money which can be very hard to come by in times of need, in times like now and I hope that the Minister of Finance would not only sit there and listen to me. I would expect him to do something this time. He has to do something with the cylinders of the engine which will put this country forward. Some of these cylinders are agriculture, tourism and manufacturing. 3.55 p.m.

On another note, Sir. We talk about wastage and squandermania. I have in my possession a fax which was sent to a company here advising him about the quantities and types of fish which he was supposed to ship from St. Maarten. At the bottom of this fax the sender is asking the buyer what kind of weights he should put on and what price he should put on the invoice. Now, Sir, these things are bad. These are the areas where you are losing your money. You have to tighten up. You have to police these things. You have to put all friendships aside and do the things that you know you should do to push this country forward.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Well, I would hear now that I should give it to the Police. I know if I give it to the Attorney General, to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Housing who has such a big mouth, nothing will be done.

Now, I was hearing that this money would be spent in all these road works programme. Money was spent in parks, and house spots. I wonder if the Minister of Housing knows that the people in Parish Land are still waiting for the development of 60 house spots he had promised me since three years ago. Every time he gets a chance he shouts over here that the house spots are coming.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. I never promised the Honourable Member 60 house spots. The Honourable Member came in here on about three occasions speaking about 115 house spots up that way. I told him that the area he was speaking about is in the NEF-40 zone where housing is restricted because it is in the flight path of the aircraft. I then told him only this year what we are trying to is in Parish Land. We have a few available spots up there. I am going to try to put in some

roads up there for him - not for you - for whoever is representing there after you because you would not be there after the next Elections.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Twenty years from now. We will represent it 20 years from now.

. *Aside.*

Mr. E. BOURNE: We are long livers. We live to 86 and 90. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am still waiting to see the long promised Wilcox Hill rectification. I am still waiting to see the Sayes Court/Goodland corner being straightened out. They went up there about two or three weeks ago and they promised all this. You promised it yourself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One minute.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I promised it before, now you have promised it since me. I would expect to see that these things are being done.

I am much obliged to you, Sir.

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

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply in relatively brief terms to the debate that has taken place so far from the second reading of this Bill. I must say, Sir, that I am very disappointed in the comments that have been made on the Bill by Members on the Opposition benches. I expected that there would have been some debate. I expected that perhaps I would have heard some arguments about the impact of this measure on the economy as a whole, whether it was approached from a Keynesian perspective or whether the monetarists would have talked about money supply, velocity and all those kinds of terms and the impact that would have on the supply or demand side and such issues. Instead, what we have had is a rehash of a lot of old political arguments dressed up at this particular time to suit the perspectives of the combined Opposition parties in terms of what they believe may be an election date or what. It was a political response to a measure that seeks to address a basic fundamental problem in our economy.

I believe in this reply I would like to put this matter into perspective. No-one has denied that there is a problem and has been a problem in terms of the management of the Ways and Means advances to the Government. I have given the information to point out that on several occasions in the past the limits set by this Parliament for that Ways and Means has been exceeded. The information has been given on the times that it was exceeded. As Minister of Finance and as Government we had a choice.

The limit was exceeded under the Barbados Labour Party Government. On several occasions they ignored the excess. The limit has been exceeded by the Democratic Labour Party Government. We had a choice to follow their particular action in not seeking to validate the matter. It happened, ignore it and remain outside of the bounds of the law or we seek to correct the wrongs by coming to the House and saying, "This is what has happened. We did not wish it to happen and we are making the correction." 4.05 p.m.

As a Government, we chose the latter course. We felt that this was the proper thing to do, to come to this Honourable Chamber and say, "Yes, the limits set by Parliament have been exceeded. They were also exceeded by the Barbados Labour Party Government. They did nothing about it. We are now seeking to put the sins of omission on their part in correct order. And we are also seeking to set a limit that would take us along the road, without having to come back every week for any kind of validation."

There have been two aspects to this, the validation of past acts and the setting of a limit that would prevent us or whoever is the Government of Barbados from coming to Parliament every two years or whenever the breaches may occur and to take further validating legislation. That is a simple matter, Sir.

I would not think that it would have taken the Leader of the Opposition five or more hours to spew forth his venom, at this time of Christmas, on a simple matter that is seeking to correct a wrong and also to set us on a path that would keep us within the framework that would be all right.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Those are mild when compared with all the talk about "back street abortion" and all kinds of aggressive language that he uses, and "rape" and all kinds of things like that.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I know you do not mind that. Sir, what has happened is that one would think that we were trying to hide some kind of wrongdoing or something like that from the tenor of the speeches that have taken place. Instead of that, as we seek to correct what has occurred in the past, and the Leader of the Opposition - I really do not mind the Member for St. Peter, he made a speech that was here and there - himself knows the difficulties that he had, in seeking to manage the Ways and Means and keeping it into accommodation, particularly the last seven days of his brief tenure as Minister of Finance. No one talks more about finance than that Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. He has served for the shortest time. He has the most limited experience of any

Minister of Finance in Barbados. He has all of them over there mesmerized, as far as when he gets up to talk. From the way he talks, you would believe that he has been adept in this particular discipline. He had considerable difficulties. He was at the very limit of the Ways and Means for five of those last seven working days.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I have already indicated to this Honourable House, during my speech, which means that the Right Honourable Prime Minister is misleading the House, that I maintained two deposits in the Central Bank, one was \$179 million and in the last month that I was there, that overdraft could be liquidated to zero on any day. That is a matter for the Central Bank, not for me.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not know which deposits those are. If I am misleading the House, Sir, I would not wait for you to ask me to withdraw. If I have misled the House, in any way, I am happy to withdraw, if the Member would point out specifically what are these special deposits that he was talking about. What I do know is that he said that while he was at the limit - and he admits that he was at the limit - that he said he had a large deposit account and that in most instances, he did not have to borrow from the Bank, he said. He was a net lender to the Central Bank.

I do not have to take up any book, yellow, mauve, red or green. The important thing is that I have access to the information and I do not need to take up publications within any covers to leaf through covers and things like that. You can challenge the information that I put out. What I do know is that for the month of June 1986, the special deposit - I am not even sure that it is special deposits that he was talking about - " but the category designated as special deposit was \$40 million and the advances were \$58.4 million.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You owe the Central Bank. I do not understand. He said he was a net lender. Now he is saying he was owing. Sir, that is June. You see, it is quite easy to get up and talk but when the actual facts come, they may show something else. That is June. July, the special deposit was \$17.3 million, the advances \$69.4 million. Do your arithmetic again. Let me hear the number. You owe. That is June and July. August 1986 now. We are taking it month by month. Special deposits \$7.1 million, advances \$66.6 million.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: He wants me to go ahead. September \$7.1 million, the advances \$69.6 million.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am not going to go ahead because I am not spending five hours. That is 1986. October \$42.5 million, advances \$66.5 million, the advances in excess of the special deposits. 4.15p.m.

November - you said you were not borrowing. That is the point. You were a net lender. That is what you got up and told this House and in November 1986, \$42.2 million special deposits and advances \$69.2 million. Sir, I believe that I have given some information which indicates a relationship between the special deposits and advances to put the argument of the Honourable Member into some kind of perspective.

Sir, there were other kinds of comments that were made. I believe both the Member for St. Michael West and the Member for Christ Church West Central have dealt with this question of alleged breaches of the legislation. The breach that I am aware of is the breach that I am seeking to correct. That is the breach that I am correcting. I am not aware of any breach by the Central Bank of the Laws of Barbados and, if those breaches are pointed out to me, I will seek to get corrective action taken. At this stage I know of no breach by the Central Bank of the laws under which they should operate. They have done what they are supposed to do but the Opposition singly or combined is not in any position to dictate policy to the Government and they are not in a position to dictate policy to the Central Bank. As far as the compromising of the Central Bank is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition would know better than anybody else about that particular subject and he would know the length of time that it would take in order to correct what he has called the compromised position of the Central Bank. Those are the terms that I will phrase this particular matter and I wish to say no more about that. No one will get me to say more than I wish to say and I will say exactly what I wish to say in these matters.

I have heard a lot about the net foreign exchange position being in the red and throughout the years there was a particular way of looking at the foreign exchange and it is indicated how those should be described. But suddenly now the CMCF balances, they should not be concerned. That is what they are saying. They should not be taken into account. They should not be considered when from the very beginning they were part of the foreign reserves of the country. They have always been treated that way and now suddenly they want to take them out. They do not want to consider them at all. I want to make it abundantly clear, Sir, if there is a problem with the CMCF it was not created by myself or the Democratic Labour Party. We did not create the CMCF. It was the Barbados Labour Party Government that created it. The problems occurred during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party Government and activities under the CMCF were suspended under the Barbados Labour Party Government. Now both Opposition parties are seeking to hang the allegation that we have no foreign

reserves and they are in the red, around the neck of myself as Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and around the necks of the Democratic Labour Party.

We regret that there has not been a flow of the funds in any large measure under the CMCF. But that is part of our inheritance. We will have to deal with it. It is part of our inheritance. We did not create it and this is precisely the problem that I am drawing attention to and that the country must realize that when deliverance occurred in 1986 it did not mean that the problems disappeared. It meant that we had to deal with the problems and, when the Minister of Finance in the new Democratic Labour Party administration came, he compounded the problem by clumsily seeking to implement the Budgetary Proposals of the Democratic Labour Party. He created a major problem in that particular way. That is the particular position, Sir, and we have to deal with it. I wish to make the point that every year they are asking where the money has gone. Every year we have to start from zero. It is zero budgeting. We have to start from zero in order to get the amount of money to pay the public officers, goods and services that we wish to use in any one year, and for our capital works programme. We have to start from zero to build it up and we have to find it. We have to pay for the loans. Do not think that they walk away. They want to know where the money has gone. We have to find the money to pay for the loan that we have borrowed abroad. Successive Governments have been able to maintain our credit worthiness and we have been able to increase that credit worthiness because we have kept our commitments to those from whom we borrowed in the foreign markets. On every turn this Opposition finds some ways and means to try to tear down the good name of Barbados both internally and outside of the country. If I am about to go to raise a foreign loan...

Aside.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have not said anything like that. That is part of the great distortion that occurs.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interject here. Will the Honourable Member sit a minute? Will the Honourable Member give me an opportunity? I want to reiterate that when one Member is speaking I expect the other Members to be quiet. If you want to make an interruption, the Rules provide for a legitimate way of making an interruption. I will not permit this sort of shouting across above tones that equals to speech. I can only remind you my ruling is that asides should be in very low tones. Continue.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sat relatively quiet and listened to the comments that were made. I admit, Sir, it was a bit trying at times but I sat very quietly and listened to the comments that were made and to the criticisms and adverse comments. But when we reply,

Sir, they tend to get very flustered because they apparently do not realize that for every action there can be a reaction. For every criticism there may be a rebuttal, and on this side we are never afraid, and my Government is never afraid, if we have made a mistake to get up and say we have made a mistake, because I believe that is the basis on which trust and confidence are established. That is why there is such a good rapport between this Democratic Labour Party Government and the people of Barbados, in particular the electorate of Barbados, and that will be demonstrated in due course when those whom you have misled, and yourself, will be on the outside looking in. 4.25 p.m.

Sir, they talked about all kinds of things, overtaxing and squandermania. I am not proposing to take up the time of the House in replying to these one by one, it will be done in due course and in the appropriate forum. We are not going to allow any of the criticisms to pass, and let me make it clear that this Democratic Labour Party Government has no problems with anything you call a revolt. You speak about some kind of revolt among members of the Democratic Labour Party in the Senate. We have no problem, it is well with our souls, with our souls it is well, so let not your heart be troubled on those particular matters.

Sir, I have already indicated that the Bank has not been in breach of any laws that I am aware of. I merely wish to say that there are only certain circumstances in which I am supposed, according to the law, to make any publication of different views and to see that those go into the Gazette, or come into Parliament, or whatever the procedures may be. Those conditions have not applied. The Bank does what it is supposed to do and I do what I have to do in terms of fiscal policy or monetary policy, or any of the other regulatory functions that I am supposed to carry out.

They keep repeating an allegation about a Trinidad loan and I have explained that already. The fact is that we have sought on every turn to honour our obligations, and apparently this is a matter for concern. You know, Sir, the problem is that whatever action this Government takes the Opposition finds some way of trying to oppose those actions. When we sought to bring revenue and expenditure into a closer relationship by introducing a surcharge, they said that we were overtaxing. When we went to indirect taxation, they charged also that we were overtaxing. We did not begin any indirect taxation as the major and substantial earner of Government revenues, that was a policy crafted by the Member for St. Peter. He was the arch deviser of that policy of the lurch to indirect taxation, Sir.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Member seems to be taking some objection, Sir, so I will withdraw that

comment, but it was the Barbados Labour Party Government and he was a guru in there and they went indirect, but when we went that particular way they criticised. In 1989 we were able to bring the overall deficit down to just over 2% of the GDP, and that was a problem. When I came to raise the local loan limit, they said we should come for a foreign loan, and if it was a foreign loan they would support the foreign loan. The truth, Sir, is that they did not believe that we would have been able to raise that loan on the London market. I went to London and I was successful in raising that loan, but not before they found reason - I am talking about the combined Opposition - to indicate that they could not give it their positive support. They found some kinds of grounds to indicate why they could not support it. Every particular action that we have taken, Sir, in order to put this economy on a path of growth and development and on a path of prudent economic management, they have found ways and means to criticise, and in some of the harshest language that one could think of.

We have been speaking about the earning of foreign exchange, and it is not the Government that is engaged in the earning of foreign exchange, it is Government that creates the conditions through which foreign exchange may be earned. That is a major contribution. You are talking about the private sector, so if we are not earning the foreign exchange in the quantities that we should be earning it, we need to get a better response in this particular area from the leaders of the private sector who have been speaking critically. The Government only owns a few hotels.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is what you believe. Do not be misled by that. You are seeking to draw tears from the eyes of the Government. That is what your task is, but you will not succeed in that. The only thing you have been able to do is to displace and dispossess the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party from the position of Leader of the Opposition. That is what you have been able to do.

When we try, Sir, to get an area of foreign exchange earnings going to diversify our agriculture by putting a cotton segment into that particular sector, using a premier product to put it on the world market, who seeks to frustrate the actions of the Government and the enterprise that has been formed to do it? I see the Opposition parties heavy in this exercise, citing the Government and its agencies at every turn to frustrate the efforts of the Government to earn the foreign exchange that they say we should earn. 4.35 p.m.

I think sooner or later it had to be told. What we are seeking to do is to ensure that Government, and I am talking about previous Governments, this present Government, and looking long into the future of any future

Government of Barbados, that it will be able to borrow on the short term in accordance with the legislation from the bank or banks, principally the Central Bank - short term borrowing by means of Treasury Bills and by way of the Ways and Means advances within the framework of the law. That is all we have been seeking to do, Sir, to correct.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I haven't said the law applies to treasury bills and that is not the import of the point I made. It applies to the Ways and Means advances. So what we are seeking to do is to bring all of the operation within the framework of the rule of law and that is our policy. It is what we are committed to do and if that is what the Opposition is concerned about and what they are attacking the Government for... Up to this particular time, they have not said what they would do in the circumstances. Would you ignore it? Well, we are going to bring it back within the limit and revalidate the past excesses that you committed and that have surfaced under this Government. I don't think you can have anything fairer than that I sat and listened and I tried to get down the figures as to where this money was coming from that the Leader of the Opposition was saying that within the next three months would bring down this Ways and Means limit without increasing the limits; and I did the counting. I don't know. He lost me somewhere at \$33 million. All of them, every cent more illiquid than the very CMCF funds that he was talking about. Nothing that was bankable anywhere but he was trotting out and churning out figures as to how it would come down and not one cent was in liquid funds that would be usable in liquidating the excess of the Ways and Means. Pure talk. Empty. No substance at all¹ and that is what the Leader of the Opposition is all about. He is best when he is talking.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I would just like to say we are...

Asides.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think I will end Sir, on this question of the CMCF because we are hearing how illiquid it is and they keep criticising it. Within the past week Sir, this debt which is considered as a bad debt and which we should exclude - we have received a payment of BDS\$2 million on that account I don't know when will be the next movement in it but I...

Asides.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, this is one small step but a step nevertheless and I think that is something at least that we can...

Asides.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I think Sir, all the talk has passed and there have been some harsh things said and some strictures have been made, Sir. I think we understand the background against which these have been made, but I like to put the best construction on these things and I would like to take them as some kind of warning that we should be ever vigilant in this country, that we maintain our monetary and fiscal and economic management of the country, that we continue to keep that at the very highest possible level. That we can go to the foreign capital markets and raise loans is an indication that we are well thought of in those markets. I would wish that we would not have to do that. I would wish that we would not have to make accommodation or to seek accommodating for our day-to-day activities; but that is how Governments operate. The outflows of expenditure do not coincide with the inflows from our revenue and we have to borrow by means of treasury bills from time to time and we also have to borrow under the Ways and Means advances. So that is the position, Sir. I would like to give this House and the country the assurance that we will continue with the prudent management of our finances. We will seek to maintain the Ways and Means advances at the lowest possible level that are consonant with our continued economic and social development and with those words, Sir, I would like once again to commend this measure to this Honourable Chamber.

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

AYES: RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. R. L. MORRIS, Mr. C. A. NEBLETT, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON-14

NOES: Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. R. P. BYER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, Mr. E. BOURNE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS and Mr. O. S. ARTHUR - 6 4.45 p.m.

On motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there are certain issues relating to Clause 2 which I would like to address at this point in time. I am not at all satisfied with the explanations offered during the second reading by the Honourable Attorney General as to the particular status of this amendment.

I have been at pains to point out that nowhere in this, the main Act, because now 'what was in a subsidiary Resolution arising out of the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, that is now brought into the substance of the main Act I think it is wrong to use an Act that is primarily dealing with administrative matters in this particular way, particularly where you are dealing with what would inevitably become a hard core of debt, and just as in the case of all other debts which can be incurred under this Act and under other sections of the Act there are separate bits of legislation then I think there should be separate bits of legislation dealing with this particular matter.

I also wish to point out, Sir, that it was quite incorrect for the Honourable Attorney General to have "been suggesting that in 1971 there was legislation being brought in to regularise any illegality. What was being regularised was the capacity for Government to borrow locally against foreign held assets. If he had taken the trouble to read the entire speech, because it is right at the beginning of the speech, it sets out what was being regularised. It has nothing to do with any illegality.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes. But regularising and correcting illegality are two different things. The juxtaposition and the way in which we tried to put it was to suggest that someone who certainly had great respect for the law would have done such a thing I think was quite ungracious for you to have tried to suggest that Regularising the irregular is not the same thing as legalising the illegal.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am very glad to hear that. That is what we are supposed to be doing today, Sir. We are supposed to be legalising the illegal.

Now, Sir, to this question of 17¹/₂%. I am saying that the 17¹/₂% should be substantially reduced because this has to be seen in relation to other existing legislation. The point has not been taken by the Attorney General. The point is this that if you fix this level far above what the Central Bank by legal edit should be lending, then you are going to find that there is a major gap between what this gives the Minister the power to demand of the Central Bank...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said against the legal edit. I did not say limit. You want me to spell it out?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The legal edit is this that the Central Bank should not and cannot enter into any arrangement with the Government which will either endanger monetary stability or indeed exceed the legal limits. What I am saying is this that in the past at 10% those things were roughly in line. This is taking it completely out of line.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You do not understand the point. How should I rephrase this, Sir? The Honourable Attorney General cannot understand. When the original legislation was passed in 1971 and the limit was fixed at 10%, that was in relation to the securities that were available to secure borrowings at that level. When the Central Bank came into being, there is a given level of lending which under section 47 is the correct level. I am saying that 17*72% is way above that level. The two bits of legislation must be seen side by side. The legislation has a purpose. You will never understand it

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not being misled, my friend. Under sections 47 and 48 there is a clear obligation placed on the Central bank to do certain things. Under section 47 he cannot exceed the limit imposed by this amendment but now he can go up to 17% which is dangerous. Prior to that he could not have entered into any arrangement or any composition with the Government which went past 10%. Therefore they were breaking the law as well.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Prime Minister said as far as he was aware the Central Bank was not breaking the law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me remind Honourable Members that we are in Committee and each Honourable Member will have the opportunity to raise their points.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Under sections 47 and 48 it is quite clear that the limit as defined under the Financial Administration and Audit Act should bear some relation to those sections otherwise it does not make sense. Right from the original debate it was made clear that the borrowings should relate to the security against which you are borrowing. 4.55 p.m.

That is your problem. You can put it at 20%. All I can say is this, that as far as we are concerned, in the interest of

the prudent financial management of this country, we will be seeking to reduce that back to the 10% which would be in line with sections 47 and 48. That is your interpretation of the law. That is your business.

What I am saying is....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading this Committee. The Central Bank Act came into being in 1972. Therefore there cannot be any relationship in section 47 which is quite clear. Section 47 has to do with the relationship between the Minister of Finance and the Bank. It has nothing to do with the limit to be set, according to any piece of legislation. It is clear that it is the Minister of Finance. Do not go by the brief you have. Go by the law.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Cannot be an unlawful level. Sir, the Honourable Member....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order, please?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member got in here and claimed that he brought in the Central Bank Act. He said that inside here. The whole point why you see that in the original legislation, it said "bank or banks" is that because at the time of passing legislation, it was being contemplated that the Central Bank would be established. There was no guarantee that Government would have liquidated all its residual debt to the commercial banks. That is why it said bank or banks at the time. That is why that level was fixed because there was a determination already made, as to the.....

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Section 47 of the Central Bank Act reads as follows:

"The Bank shall be consulted by -

- (a) the Minister on the total amount of credit to be extended by the Bank to the Government during the Government's financial year;
- (b) the Government, its institutions and agencies, and statutory boards at any time when either domestic or foreign credit operations are contemplated and in the event that,"

and it goes on. What section 47 says is that the bank shall be consulted by.

Section 48 says:

"Whenever the total amount of credit being extended by the Bank to the Government, its institutions, agencies and statutory boards by advances under section 45, the acquisition of evidences of indebtedness under sections 32 (b) and 46, and the acceptance of securities as collateral under section 32 (c) (i) (D) threaten either -

- (a) to exceed the amount agreed under section 47 (a);"

which would be the amount agreed between the Minister of Finance and the Central Bank. That is what it is about Do not come here and get somebody to write down some foolishness and try to confuse me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is made.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: When you are interpreting the law, you have to interpret the law, not what somebody writes down for you.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we have seen all this clowning before. I have read those sections already, during my presentation and I am saying that neither the Minister nor the Central Bank can enter into any agreement, arrangement, composition for any amount in excess of what 10% meant under the old Act. Any arrangement of that kind is unlawful by both of them. I said so before. I have said it several times.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member wait one minute.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have said it on several occasions. You were not in the House when I said it.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Members.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: As far as I am concerned, both of them have broken the law.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Central Bank has broken no law. He keeps repeating that. It is thorough and complete garbage.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You could say it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is your legal opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not continue yet The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central just take

your seat a minute. I am not very happy with the voices I hear shouting across the Chamber. I think the Chamber is equipped with the kind of equipment that Honourable Members do not have to shout the way they are shouting. I do not think that we should continue in that vein. The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude his presentation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member has his views. I have my views, Sir. I believe that it is wrong and inappropriate to fix this at 17½% bearing in mind the present structure of the Central Bank of Barbados. As far as I am concerned, it is nothing but a legal licence for the Minister of Finance to continue to indulge in the reprehensible practice of printing money which, apparently, he finds is the only way to run the country. That is one of the things, as far as I am concerned, and that is that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has made a number of points. He repeats this point about the breaches of the law by the Central Bank.

The first point he has made is in relation to his view of the law that provision of this kind should not be included in the substantive law itself. The provision which we are talking about was originally the subject of this resolution which was passed in Parliament back in 1971. That was a resolution which it was possible to pass in 1971 because the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act permitted that kind of resolution to be passed. The Financial Administration and Audit Act was the enabling statute enabling the resolution of that kind to be passed.

If you can pass a resolution following on the Act, what is wrong with putting the provision of the law, in the substantive Act itself?

The whole point, Mr. Chairman, is that we are selling out here to validate Acts which have been irregular.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Do not be funny. You are validating Acts which have been irregular. Unless the enabling statute permits you to pass legislation which validates the Acts *ex post facto*, you cannot do it by resolution. You cannot make the change by resolution.

It was not possible, in law, Mr. Chairman, to pass a resolution, under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, as it existed, validating any irregularity which took place from 1981 right down through the years. Perhaps that might have been convenient to the other side because they did not want any mention to be made of any irregularity

which took place between 1981 and 1986. It would be convenient to them not to have reference made to any of that.

It is not possible, in law under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, as it stands to accomplish the validation which we are seeking to do now. There are one or two ways you can do it, either by putting the provision in the statute itself or by amending the Financial Administration and Audit Act to include a provision in that Act empowering resolutions to be made to validate and to have retrospective effect which really does not make a big lot of sense.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Hold a second. It is not creating any further instrument of borrowing any more so than the existing resolution of 1971. It is a resolution of this Parliament. An Act of Parliament is a resolution of this Parliament.

The other thing you have to take note of is that my reading of that resolution tends to suggest that when it was originally passed, the intention may have been.... It talks about, "Parliament may, from time to time, pass resolutions". One wonders whether the original intention was not that, in the terms of the statute itself, that perhaps every year or whenever the Minister needed to borrow, that a resolution should come to Parliament. When you read the statute itself of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Chapter 5: "Parliament may from time to time by Resolution authorize the Minister of Finance to borrow by means of temporary advances from a bank or banks money to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate the sums specified in that behalf in the Resolution to meet the current requirements of the Crown." 5.05 p.m.

What that means is that the Resolution of 1971 is not binding and the figure of 10% is nothing that binds every succeeding Parliament. The next year the Resolution could have been changed. It seems that the original provision of the statute contemplated that this was something that could happen from year to year as the Government saw fit in order to regulate the requirements of the Crown for finances.

Now the other point made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West in relation to Section 45 of the Central Bank Act which states:

"(a) a bank may make temporary advances subject to repayment within three months following the end of the financial year in which they were granted a fixed rate of interest as it may determine to the Government,

(b) with the approval of the Minister to Government institutions, agencies, and statutory boards."

What that does is to permit the making of temporary advances subject to repayment within three months of the end of the financial year. Now what is inconsistent between that provision and the provision of the law which we are now passing? I do not understand where the inconsistency is because I understood the gravamen of your argument to be that there is an inconsistency between that and the Resolution. Section 45 remains the law. Even after this law today is passed, Section 45 still remains the law. But all I am saying is that there is no inconsistency between Section 45 of the Central Bank Act and the Financial Administration and Audit Act prior to today before it is passed. In the second stages there is no inconsistency also between the provisions of Section 45 and the provisions of the Amendment to the Financial Administration and Audit Act which we are passing today. I understood one of the principle points about your argument is that this amending Bill which we are passing today is improper and that it is legally improper.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: It does not harmonize. The essential point that I am making is that there is no legal contradiction between the two statutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Peter.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Clause 2 which is the subject of the House's consideration at this time is important in so far as it sets a new limit on Government's overdraft for banks in Barbados at 17.5%. I really want, Sir, particularly to speak to that part of the clause. Mr. Chairman, the 17.5% is not being picked at random. It is not being picked at random, Sir, in a very precise sense. The Government has arrived at a figure of 17.5% because the 17.5% specifically would allow Government to be able to validate the excess by which the overdraft has been exceeded. In point of fact, Sir, the overdraft of Government with the Central Bank almost reached \$170 million and might have reached \$170 million at some stage. Now Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is my point of difficulty because it is quite clear to Government and must be quite clear to Government based upon what the Minister himself has said that the \$170 million overdraft or the 17.5% is an exceptional situation which no Government in Barbados would have wanted to see happen and what we are in a sense doing is legislation to perpetuate a situation which we regard as exceptional and not the norm. We are building a whole piece of legislation, Sir, to deal not with something which reasonable men in the ordinary conduct of things would regard as reasonable but to legislate, Sir, something that reasonable men in the ordinary course of

things, Sir, will regard as exceptional and perhaps even wrong. My difficulty with the legislation, Sir, is that principle.

The Minister has in point of fact even implied that we should not be talking about the 17.5% because he said that he would want, Sir, to bring that 17.5% down to 10% as soon as possible. We are, therefore, dealing with bad legislation in the sense that we are really writing into a law a clause to handle a situation that is exceptional and something that we would regard as unreasonable in the normal course of things.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I therefore have that kind of fundamental difficulty with this clause. In a way, what this House should be called upon to do as soon as we can get back the overdraft within 10%, is to come back and amend this and to prevent any Minister of Finance and Planning in the future to run up this kind of borrowing from the Central Bank. Mr. Chairman, I really want to stand on this point because the limits that are built into our legislation whether it is regarding the loans, overdraft, or so on, are built in for a precise purpose. They are built in, Sir, to make sure that discipline is exercised by those who are responsible for the administration of the financial affairs of this country, Sir.

The House knows, for example, that when we approve expenditure here, Sir, we are setting a limit beyond which no Public Accounting Officer should go without the approval of Parliament. The only way that Parliament, Sir, can maintain its real control over the public purse is by our insisting that people must respect the limits and that they should build their financial plans around the existence of those limits. For the last three Budgets I have been making the point in the course of each Estimates debate that a Government of Barbados has a responsibility to specify what is going to be Government's borrowing requirements. I feel that is what should be done every year. Government should say what are its borrowing requirements and it should satisfy Parliament, Sir, as regards how it intends to farm out its various borrowing requirements among the alternative ways in which those borrowing requirements could be met. At the start of the year, Sir, we should know that in the course of this year within the context of the prudent financial management that the Minister of Finance talks about that the Government has a finance capital of \$150 million which he intends to close by using let us say \$15 million in Central Bank financing and we approved that. That is what we must have. He must also raise \$100 million by foreign loans and the rest will be raised by the expansion of the Treasury Bills and debentures which Government has access to. If we recognize, Sir, when once we define those borrowing requirements up front that Government may have some extraordinary need for financing then perhaps we may want to come and respect the law by perhaps bringing a resolution asking that the limits be changed at that time. 5.15p.m.

I am appalled by the style of financial management in which we are here involved. When the Barbados Labour Party exceeded the limit, Sir, at least a sense of discipline was exercised from this point of view, that having recognised they had exceeded the limit, they acted quickly to come back within the law. In much the same way that the ordinary citizen who is called by his bank manager and told that he is over his overdraft, if he is a disciplined citizen he will take the necessary steps to come back within his overdraft limit, and he will plan his budget thereafter to keep within that limit. That is why the limit exists. He cannot possibly ask the bank, every time he goes over his overdraft limit, to expand the limit and to validate any excess that he might have committed during the process, and therefore I have a fundamental difficulty, Mr. Chairman, with this clause.

The Government really should never seek to do that which the rest of the society will not recognise as ordinary, Sir, that any bank manager who had done what the Central Bank has done would have been fired, and there is no ordinary citizen in Barbados who would have been in the position to do what the Government has done in the last few months, that for an extended period just write cheques over the limit of an overdraft willy nilly. I am therefore fundamentally at variance with the Government in setting this limit at a level that merely accommodates an exceptional situation. I fear that we are creating a very monstrous precedent. I fear that we are now creating a situation in this country where not only overdraft limits can be breached, but that people could go and spend public funds in large quantities without reference to this Parliament, and then we have to come back here, as if we are jokers, to validate illegal actions taken by people. This is all that is involved in this.

I would really be glad to hear the Minister speak more explicitly on what I thought was an implied assurance by the Government that at the earliest opportunity it will bring back the overdraft down to 10%, and I also want to say, at the earliest opportunity let us come back to this House and keep this limit around 10%. I say so, Sir, very advisedly. My experience as a professional economist is that the largest proportion of the problems in the developing world is caused by Governments utilising the credit that they can exact from the Central Bank to finance their operations. The developed world is replete with economies that have been broken precisely as a result of the abuse of the Government's ability to borrow money from its banker.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, no matter how we define the limit, it gives Government each year an automatic increase, because the limit is linked to Government's estimated revenues, and as Government's estimated revenues rise then the dollar amount of the credit that the Government gets, even with the 10% limit, is going to increase as well. Government must accept it as a discipline, and I am genuinely fearful of what can happen as our estimated

revenue rises and we leave this limit at 17½%. We are creating, in my view, a situation in which the use of Central Bank credit to Government can in the future become one of the principal ways by which the operations of Government in this country are financed, and I truly cannot find it within me to support that very, very bad principle.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anyone who heard the first part of the statement by the Honourable Member could quarrel with the position which he takes as a matter of principle, if that is his position. What he showed was an understanding of the legislation which we are enacting. This clause necessarily must have 17.5%, otherwise it could not validate something that went to 17.5%, and therefore any passion which one expresses while discussing the necessity for this legislation in the context of some Resolution that was passed in 1971 is motivated by precisely that very neat legal point

As for the second half of his presentation, that is a matter of his perception and his understanding, but if I recall correctly, the present Minister of Finance gave the House the assurance that it was his intention and his commitment to operate within the framework of a 10%. My own view is that the 10% is neither here nor there. This is a psychological difference, but it may very well be that I have existed in the United States and therefore I have a different point of view, but I do not quarrel with his point of view merely because I have a different one. I do not believe that because a country is bigger or because a country has a certain kind of resource base that it necessarily has more sovereignty than another country, and I recognise that a number of developing countries over time have fallen by the wayside, but Barbados has a history - long before we had a Central Bank, long before we had the kind of structure we have now - of prudence in its approach to fiscal matters. Therefore, I am not overwhelmed by the figure that is listed in the law, but I agree with the Honourable Member and I am sure that any Honourable Member on this side can agree that next week or next month or some time one could come into this House of Assembly and pass a Resolution saying that the figure should be 12%.

The point must be that the Resolution in 1971 obviously envisaged that where there was going to be borrowing in excess of 10%, that before the borrowing occurred you would come with another Resolution. The Honourable Member said that in 1981, or whenever, when the Barbados Labour Party first - and they would have been the first to have breached - and I am using "breach" now in its cleanest sense - this regulation, that they immediately brought it back. Soon after that it went back up again, then they had to bring it back. Then it went up again, then they had to bring it back, and in a sense, Mr. Chairman, it is no different from those of us who have personal overdrafts. We have an overdraft, the bank manager, if he is a good bank manager, fixes our limit based on his perception of

our capacity to deal with it. To use the technical language, he marks us at a particular point. Throughout our existence with an overdraft, each one of us is aware that from time to time we go beyond the limit of our overdraft and it is usual to have a telephone conversation with the bank manager if you have a relationship with the bank. 5.25 p.m.

When a bank manager is not prepared to undertake your going above your own overdraft limit, one of two things would have happened: either he is constrained by his own directives from the Central Bank or somewhere else or he does not believe that you are fiscally responsible enough to carry out the wishes. Therefore, it is a straight case of what kind of Government you have, who is the Minister of Finance, what kind of regime you operate and how you are proceeding, because if you fix the limit at 10% as the Resolution had done and we have had five Ministers of Finance so far and of those five three have died. The first one we can put him aside because the way the finances used to operate the question didn't arise. So, you had one Minister of Finance who exceeded it, you had a second one who exceeded it, you had a third one who didn't have enough time to exceed. Just before he exceeded ?' according to the information, he ran. There was another one: who didn't exceed it and you have one who exceeded it. So, you have to come and decide that this limit that was set is one that could be exceeded without necessarily the Minister who exceeds it being some kind of cretin. The system might require it and all we are doing here is putting some elasticity into the limit.

I accept the Honourable Member's point. Once you remove the technical point of 17.5%, the Honourable Members might feel a little queasy with 17.5%. There is no one who is seised of the methodology of our financing and fiscal operation who will not have some little question about 17.5%. But the 17.5% in this particular piece of legislation is necessary and therefore, to try to condemn it in the terms of condemnation which we are hearing is either to be arguing in bad faith or not to understand the point. If one concludes that those who are arguing understand the point, then it follows logically that the argument is bad and therefore I accept the Honourable Members' admonition. The fact is that we will go with the 17.5% and don't forget, in the final analysis the bar of public opinion is the final arbiter. So, we will go with the Resolution as it is.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in my first intervention, Sir, I ran out of time on this matter but I also believe that Government must lead by example and as we discussed this increase in Government's overdraft to itself up from 10% to 17½%, I think that it is very important that the House should put it in the context of the overall credit policy that the Government is asking the country to follow, because we are, Mr. Chairman, Sir, as a Parliament being asked by a government to allow it to increase its overdraft from 10% to 17½% of its revenue «'. a time when the

Government has in place on the rest of the society a policy which caused people to have to reduce their overdraft; because the policy that Government introduced was a policy that asked people, let's say, in October, to carry back their overdraft to a previous month and it is sending, Mr. Chairman, a very terrible signal to the rest of the Barbados economy that they must cut and contrive that the private sector people must accept a smaller overdraft in the interest of the country.

The Government is telling the rest of the private sector that Barbados' balance of payments position right now does not warrant their having the same level of credit as they had September last year. That is what the Government is telling the rest of the society. The Government told the country, Sir, that we had to adopt last year an approach to credit for the economy as a whole recognising the nature of the balance of payments problem. Government had to restrict the amount of credit that the private sector could get, even to the extent of rolling back credit; and a lot of minimarts operators - small shops, found themselves unable to stop because the overdraft was cut by their banks, Sir. What the Government is doing now, Sir, is asking the House to agree to a policy that runs entirely at variance with the national credit control policy that the Government believes is critical to the management of the foreign position of the country. I am asking the Government, therefore, how can you possibly rationalise the situation in which the rest of the economy must accept limits on its credit availability while the Government itself is having almost a doubling of its credit facility? At the same time, Sir, doesn't the Government recognise that the same argument advanced in support of its control of credit to the private sector should be applied to itself? Because if credit controls are necessary, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that private sector activity does not destroy the balance of payments, then I am submitting respectfully to the House that a similar argument must be advanced in relation to the public sector. Indeed, one must have a fundamental difficulty. It's sending the wrong economic signals, Sir, and I am not going to be very long in this intervention, Sir, but my fundamental difficulty with it is therefore that you are bringing into the law an exceptional situation which I hope that the Minister will say is a one-off situation, that at the earliest opportunity he will come back to the House and let us carry back this to 10% and also Sir, that he is asking the House to agree implicitly to a policy for Government access to credit which is entirely at variance with the policy that Government has for the rest of the economy and that if I, therefore, were to apply the DLP's own policy to this clause Sir, I could not agree with it. And that Sir, is my position in relation to clause 2.

Clause 2 is at variance with the DLP credit policy for the economy as a whole. It cannot be rationalised with reference to the criteria that the Government has established for managing the balance of payments, Sir, and I would be merely indulging the DLP in not just breaking the law, but

in frustrating its own policy and reversing its own policy. I am not going to call it a back-street abortion, Sir, but I would be assisting the DLP in frustrating its own policy if I were now to agree to this clause that allows the Government to have more credit at a time when the Government is telling the rest of the society that it can't I am obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful to the Honourable Member for St. Peter for picking up the point that I was unable to develop sufficiently in the time I had on the second reading when I spoke of Government's setting proper examples of financial discipline to the rest of the country. Since October last year, all individuals and businesses in this country have had to operate under limits set by the Central Bank for borrowing - limits that went back to the borrowing that was allowed as of August 1989. A number of people have suffered. I have suffered personally in getting financing to repair my house. I had to wait from November last year till September 14 this year to get the money to do some necessary repairs. Now, any time my overdraft goes above the limit I get a letter in a Barclays Bank envelope telling me that I have gone over by so much and so bring it back. I have to pay it back. I have to try and get that account back in credit.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They don't have money to lend out. You know that since the banks have taken over. I know how hard it is over there.

But while the private people have the constraint put on their ability to borrow, the Government which has set up that system full of constraint, is at the same time going along as they used to say "free sheet", doing whatever they like, going to 110,115,120,130,140,150,170 now, and there is nobody to bring them back within the limit. Now that is where I have some questions to the Prime Minister in relation to the links between Sections 47 & 48 of the Central Bank Act and Section 25 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act. 5.35 p.m.

I think that is a fair exposition of the law. Section 25 of Cap. 5 says that Parliament may from time to time by resolution - that is the method - authorise the Minister to borrow, by means of temporary advances from a bank or banks, money to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate the sum specified in that behalf in the resolution to meet the current requirements of the Crown.

What we are faced with is not a resolution to borrow but an Act which must legitimise the fact that a borrowing that was made earlier pursuant to a resolution has been in excess of the terms of that resolution. The only way it can

be cured is by a substantive Act of Parliament like an Act of Indemnity. I accept that as the position.

The Resolution in 1971 which has existed for the last 20 years, constrained all Ministers of Finance to operate within a limit of 10% of current estimated revenue. The times that was burst we had not gone too far over the top but we are now in a chronic situation. This is not bursting the overdraft by \$5 million as happened under the Barbados Labour Party. This is now bursting the overdraft by \$70 million and \$60 million. The only way you can cure that is to legislate.

Now, Sir, under the Central Bank Act there are certain requirements which I think this House deserves to have answered. Under Section 47 the Bank shall be consulted by the Minister on the total amount of credit to be extended by the Bank to the Government during the Government's financial year. I wish the Minister of Finance to tell this Committee when he consulted the Government of the Central Bank -1 do not want the specific day. He would not remember that. I want him to tell us now we have a duty to hear it. He must tell us what was the total amount of credit to be extended by the Central Bank to Government during this financial year otherwise we are spinning top in mud in here all day. That is clear in section 47. He has to do it in respect of the Governor. We have to supervise it as part of the supervisory function of Parliament and we are entitled to know. You cannot hide. That is the first thing.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Ask a substantive question? The Minister should have that at his fingertips. Under section 48 it is provided that whenever the total amount of credit being extended by the Bank to the Government or its institutions threaten either to exceed the amount agreed under section 47 therefore this contemplates that there must have been not only prior consultation between the Minister and the Government but an agreement as to the total amount.

I go on, Sir, to the consultative part of the section because when it is threatened either to exceed the amount agreed or to endanger monetary stability the Bank shall submit a report to the Minister drawing attention to the situation. I have asked permission to talk about the Governor of the Central Bank and got it from the Speaker in relation to this debate. We are dealing with very serious matters as I said earlier when I started on the second reading.

I wish to know whether the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance in charge under Cap. 323C received from the Governor of the Central Bank a report drawing his attention to the fact that as he was proceeding he threatened to exceed the amount agreed. I want to know if such a report came. Ideally, I think I have a right to know because this is the law. We have agreed in here that the law has been

broken. We came with this legislation to validate it. I must know all the details of the breaches.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with section 25 of Cap. 5.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I dealt with section 25 already. I am on to the Central Bank. Illuminate the dark corners of your mind, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You suspect there are dark corners?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, because you were not following me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been following you very clearly. All I am saying is that this whole matter deals with Cap. 5. Clause 2 is dealing with section 25 of that particular Bill. Now, for you to be drifting on to the Central Bank Act which you quoted...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What am I hearing now for Christmas. Let me read it to you, Sir, 25(1):-

"For the purpose of meeting the current requirements of the Consolidated Fund the Minister may borrow by means of temporary advances from any (A-N-Y-) bank or banks.."

Any bank or banks include the Central Bank. Government borrows from the Central Bank and the Central Bank limit is \$100 million and Government has borrowed \$170 million without parliamentary approval. I want the questions answered. I am finished with that.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I sat and listened to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West trying to draw a comparison between the ordinary overdraft extended to a customer of a bank with the overdraft extended by the Central Bank of Barbados to Government. I believe that comparison is inadequate. To say the least, it was not a fair comparison. In any case, if he was using it to try and explain what is being sought to be done here, it fell far short of effecting that comparison. In the first place, just briefly, the bank fixes the overdraft of the customer. The Law of Barbados fixes the overdraft between the Central Bank and the Government of Barbados.

In relation to a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition which has been so far canvassed extensively in this Committee related to section 47. It is a point that the Leader of the Opposition was making from since Tuesday and he continued with it today. As far as I can say it is a very simple point. 5.45 p.m.

It is that whatever consultations occur between the Bank and the Minister of Finance, in relation to the amount

of credit to be extended, until today, the legal limit of that credit has got to be 10% - as I understand it - of current revenue, estimated current revenue. Any agreement that the Minister of Finance and the Bank work out must be between, let us say even zero per cent and 10%. He cannot go above that. It ought to be that. Anything that goes above that would be illegal. It would then be in contravention of the resolution that we have spoken about so much in here, today. That is the point that the Member for St Michael West seems to be misunderstanding. It was a very simple point which I thought would be completely within his competent grasp. But it escaped him, Sir. I just thought I would raise that point with him, to put that out of the way.

He also talked about the amendment here is putting some elasticity into the arrangements and so on. I can understand that the Government was faced with a number of demands on its revenues. You had the salaries for the civil servants, you had the regrading exercise that had to be undergone. Then you had money being wasted in CARSICOT. A lot of money was spent up Two Mile Hill. You had coaches and so on. It was a lot of money, Sir. Some of the money that Government collected was spent on good projects. I have no problem with that. But a lot of it was wasted and squandered. Government was faced with demands on its revenues. It did not have any money to expend. Therefore they went above the limit.

When the Minister of Health speaks about putting elasticity into the thing by raising it from 10% to 17½%, what we are seeing here is I believe two types of elasticity. You have what is called the percentage elasticity, that is the rise from 10% to 17½% and then the quantum elasticity which tells you that Government revenues expand and therefore what is 10% today in terms of quantum would be more tomorrow. For example in 1981 Government revenue was \$550 million or thereabouts, 10% of that. But today, 10% of \$1 billion. That is what we are talking about. So to talk about elasticity...

What we are doing here today, Sir, is that we are allowing for two types of increases, if I may be so inelegant in my explanation of the matter. One is from the percentage and one is the quantum. There is some danger in that.

What is happening here today has to be justified in terms of what is politically expedient. Government does not want to come back to levy taxes so close to election. Bad politics. It is likely to lose votes. Likely to lose seats. Government is doing what is the next alternative, to print some money. That is what is happening now.

The Minister of Finance said that he would try to operate within the 10% limit. If he said he is going to operate within the 10% limit, I would like to see how soon he would get it back to 10% and I would want to know having got back to 10%, if we are going to see more amending legislation to return to the 10% levels, to return to what I would consider to be fiscal prudence, in the

management of the economic affairs of this country and bring some integrity back into the system, Sir.

The fact that we had to borrow that loan the other day at such exorbitant rates of interest, as well as, on those terms tells me a lot, as to our standing in the international community and in international money markets.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. George South, I think has really put in perspective the point I was trying to make all along, that if the law sets a limit of borrowings....

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am dealing with the specific point of 17.5%. If you would leave the Chairman alone, he does very well when you are not interfering with him, at all times. I am very pleased, Sir, when he does not interfere with you. He misdirects you.

If I may continue. I am very happy, Sir....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Continue on clause 2.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is a genuine opinion that I feel. Sir...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 30, section 6, and ask Your Honour, since the Honourable Member is going to behave in that manner. Shall I read it, Sir? Rule 30, section 6 says:

"DEBATES IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

"In a debate on a Bill in Committee of the whole House, no Member may speak more than once on a clause or schedule, and a speech shall not exceed 15 minutes, provided that with leave of the Committee a Member may again be heard on a clause or schedule for a period or periods not exceeding 15 minutes."

The Honourable Member spoke on this clause already, Sir, so he has to seek the leave of the House. He had a long time. I am not prepared to give him leave to speak again on this clause.

Since the Honourable Member is saying that I interfere with you, I am interfering with you now specifically. I am not prepared to give him leave, on a clause. It is only two clauses. We are on clause 2. You spoke on clause 2 already.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: No. Not according to this.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Thirty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two Honourable Members are on their feet

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You would not stop interfering with me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the Honourable Member proceed. But let me make it abundantly clear that repetitions will not be accommodated. Proceed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I will make sure that I do not repeat myself, by the simple process of responding to those things mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who spoke after me and therefore, by definition, I could not possibly be repeating myself.

The first point is that he spoke of the question of 10% being good for 1971, time passes and 10% would have to be moved upwards, as time passes on. That is just a whole lot of rhetoric. Because once you fix that thing at 10%, the whole point is that that 10%, even if it remained there forever, it always takes into account inflation and all these kinds of things because it is fixed to a factor which will rise, in relation to inflation. So that you will find that \$10 million in 1971 is now represented by \$100 million with the same 10% rule.

But a second very important point arises, that is in terms of the volume of money which can be created in this situation, because of the higher revenue levels.

I would submit to you, Sir, that \$100 million, at any time in the history of Barbados, can do a lot more damage to Barbados' foreign reserves than \$10 million at any point in time. And now the possibility of \$170 million, I think is spelling disaster. I am responding only to what the Honourable Member referred to.

I think that it is ridiculous to try to suggest that the relationship between an individual and his banker, in terms of an overdraft limit, is the same thing between a Government and a Central Bank which is controlled by law. I think a more adequate comparison is if a limit - as limits are imposed by the Central Bank in terms of the amounts that they can lend in various sectors of the economy - if that limit is broken, they have broken the law and they can be prosecuted. 5.55p.m.

The Central Bank is the agency in Barbados to inspect that and to enforce the law. Similarly, Sir, if under the Banking Act the Minister of Finance imposes any limits on credit in any area under the Banking Act which the Minister

has discretion to do and if that is exceeded, they are breaking the law and both are breaking the law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Honourable Member will recall having made those statements already.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Not in Committee, Sir. Not in Committee, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your memory may not be very good in that regard.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am responding exactly to the point made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you can only respond in terms of what the Standing Orders allow you to do.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Have you heard me make this point, Sir? Mr. Chairman, I have moved into a different area and have not spoken yet I have not spoken at all in relation to the allocation of credit and the impact on credit that this will have on Barbados. I am saying that if you raise this to 17% that what you are doing now is creating the possibility of \$170 million in credit for the Government. The point made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter is extremely valid in that you cannot deprive other areas of credit and the Government over indulge itself in credit. I make the further point that credit by this means does far greater damage to Barbados than credit from any other source.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Right. You are printing \$170 million and the point I am making is that the kind of money that you are creating here now by this clause will do far more damage because it will be credit to the Government.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have already done it. You have already deprived them. What I am saying is that you have deprived other people. You have exhausted whatever was left in the society and what you are doing now is creating \$70 million more in credit for yourself which will do the damage to the society.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please address the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: One or two other final points, Sir, I would like to make and it is this. I believe that the Government has been sufficiently warned not only by us, but they have been warned...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has filibustered all day since Tuesday. I draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 48(1): "A Committee to which a Bill is committed shall not discuss the principles of the Bill but only its details." What he just said is not detailed anywhere, Sir, and as Your Honour is aware "discussed details" mean that this should not be here because so and so. That is what details mean. Do not let him stand talking again what we heard in the Second Reading speech, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am referring to the figure 17 which is right here, the number 17 that is in the clause. What I am saying is...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To what number?

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, if I may continue. The Government has been warned by both Oppositions and they have been warned by all their professional advisers.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. All of this is repetition. For almost seven hours the Leader of the Opposition has encroached upon the patience of this House. I said that you have encroached upon the patience of the House and at this time, Sir, I am saying that it is repetitive and a breach of the Rules of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already warned the Honourable Member in relation to repetition and it is really a little bit trying to travel on comments or statements that have been made by other Honourable Members and even to repeat some that you yourself have made. The Honourable Member will have two minutes to conclude the presentation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is amazing, Sir, that whenever I rise to speak in this Honourable House certain things are triggered. I have two minutes and I will use those two Minutes. What I am saying is that if I were allowed to I would have finished already and that you have been warned by all and the electorate will have the final say and deal with you all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is repetition.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are well on the way to destroying this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member does not have to shout I have warned against that already.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My ruling is that the Honourable Member has been shouting during the Chair's intervention and I cannot tolerate that.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative with the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Mr. D. H. J. THOMPSON, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH and His Honour J. J. PAYNE. - 14

NOES: Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. E. BOURNE, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, Mr. R. P. BYER and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS.-5

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question...

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, this is a matter of legal principle and so on. Earlier on the Attorney General said that validating legislation has been brought to this House before and he cited an instance where the then Prime Minister Errol Walton Barrow, now deceased, had alluded to that. Sir, it would appear to me that the difference between this validating legislation and any others that have been passed previously have had to do with validating breaches of the law that may have been accidental as against breaches of the law which were to my mind deliberate. I can see a difference in a situation like that I believe that every effort should be made to avoid this kind of thing. That is my position, Sir. 6.05 p.m.

Sir, can you protect me from the Lilliputian?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see any of them around.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: If you would shut your little mouth and listen, you would get the point I am making. Do you understand?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot ask for my protection and ask me to shut my mouth.

Mr. R. P. BYER: You did not hear that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You were on your feet.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I believe that validating legislation should be brought in situations where the legislation is

merely accidental. This is a case, Sir, to my mind, where you are bringing legislation to correct a situation which you were warned about and I do not believe that that ought to be the case in these circumstances. This is not the history of validating legislation in this country and it ought to be different. The point is that they knew and they were warned about it, and they continued to be in breach of the law. This should not be allowed to happen.

The question that clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, His Honour J. J. PAYNE, Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH and Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON - 14

NOES: Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. R. P. BYER, Mr. P. J. M. MILLER, Mr. E. BOURNE and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS - 5.

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

ORDER NO. 14 - THE LIVESTOCK (CONTROL OF STRAYS) BILL, 1990

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is complementary to the Animals (Civil Liability) Act, Cap. 194A, which was...

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I understand the Minister is going to make a Second Reading speech. If this is the Bill that would provide for the seizure and impounding of stray livestock, it was placed on my table this morning by Mr. Best.

A'side.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You gave notice, but the actual Bill was put here this morning by Mr. Best.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is this the one which was laid on Tuesday? All right, but I saw this here today.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to provide additional ammunition to deal with one of the two thorny problems in agriculture, namely, straying livestock and praedial larceny. The present legislation on

the Statute Book is Cap. 194A, the Animal (Civil Liability) Act, which was thought not adequate to deal with the problems that have been increasing more recently.

The short title to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, as you will see, is the Livestock (Control of Strays) Act, 1990. What this Bill seeks to do is to give the Ministry the authority to establish pounds throughout Barbados.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: As many pounds as are necessary. The Ministry at the moment is thinking to start with a minimum of three pounds, one in the north, one in the south and the central one at the Central Livestock Station.

Clause 5(2) states that any livestock that is found tethered, wandering or straying can be seized. Clause 5(4) also gives the authorised authority the permission or authority where any livestock which is tethered near a highway and is causing an obstruction can also be impounded, together with any found straying, wandering or untethered on any lands that are cultivated, pastured or enclosed.

Clause 6(1) gives the livestock owner the same authority as any authorised person to hold the livestock if they are found within their premises and to either take them to a pound or to call an authorised person to take them to the pound.

Clause 7 also illustrates that the owner or occupier may have to secure the livestock seized in the condition and can hold them for not exceeding two days after the seizure before sending the livestock to the pound. Any person who has held the livestock cannot hold them for more than two days before they are sent to the pound. Before the livestock is sent to the pound, the owner can go to the person who is holding it, and as long as he pays for the damage, he can have the livestock redeemed at that time without the livestock being sent to the pound. 6.15 p.m.

When the livestock is sent to the pound the pound-keeper has the right to enquire about the ownership of the livestock and to notify him of the fact that the animal is being impounded. The person also has the right at this time to redeem the animal for the cost of keeping it as well as the cost of bringing it to the pound.

Section 7(2) calls for the information that is necessary to be taken by the pound-keeper. Eight deals with the notice of the pound-keeper to all owners of impounded animals that they can come and repossess them. Section 9 deals with the cost of keeping the livestock at the pound. This is a charge against the owner. Section 10 deals with the cost of taking them to the pound. This is also a cost against the

owner. Section 11 deals with where at the expiration of the day after any livestock is impounded, the pound-keeper is unable to ascertain the identity of the owner or person having charge of the livestock, the pound-keeper shall cause a notice to the impounding of the livestock to be posted in accordance with the regulations.

Section 12 makes it an offence for any person trying to fraudulently impound any animals by driving, leading or enticing any animals into a public place, square, quay, wharf or highway with intention to impound them.

Section 13 also makes it an offence for any person going to a pound to rescue, release or attempt to rescue or release, break or damage the pound, or does anything to abet or the doing of any act whereby any livestock impounded may escape. It also makes it an offence for any person to obstruct an authorised person or pound-keeper in the execution of his duty. The offence is a fine of \$2 000 or one year's imprisonment.

Section 14 also sets out that the pound-keeper must exercise due care and not be cruel to animals when they are in his care. Section 15 is disposal after they have been detained. Section 16 gives the pound-keeper the ability to sale etc. Section 17 sets out what has to be done when livestock is not sold. Section 19 sets out the items under which the Minister must make regulations for.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, what it allows is the authorised person to impound any untethered animal found on highways, cultivated lands or in parks. It also allows owners to have the same authority as the pound-keepers to exercise the rights under which they can be kept.

I therefore beg that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that I would not give any difficulty on this Bill. On the Praedial Larceny Bill I will talk as long as I am allowed. On this Bill I have just one little difficulty with section 13 on page 5. I do not like the use of the word "rescues". "Any person who rescues any livestock while it is in or being taken to the pound is guilty of an offence and can be fined \$2 000 or be locked up for a year or both." Now, Sir, envisage the situation where the pound-keeper is not around. An animal, as happens from time to time, gets the rope around its neck and is about to suffocate or strangle. I am passing. I see the animal in distress and go to release it. I am rescuing that animal and I am liable for that good Samaritan deed to be locked up or to be fined. I understand the intent of everything here but I think "rescues" is, perhaps, worthy of deletion.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Take out "rescues" and just release it. What we are saying is, if anybody goes in and willfully releases an animal.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sure. Anything other than "rescues". I do not think you should punish a man for an act of rescue. It is as simple as that.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is one question I have on this Bill. It is section 4 on page 2. I would like to know what about the person who sets loose animals on or near...

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: You have nothing on that but I would like to see something done to the person because people deliberately let loose animals near the highway. What are you going to do about those people? If you catch the animal you take it to the pound. I am saying that the person who does this should be fined. It is quite easy for me to go on or near a highway and let loose four or six cows.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: - Yes, but how about me who willfully does this. People do it all the time and it causes a lot of damage to cars on the highway.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: It is livestock. You are not punishing the owners of these animals. This is the problem. People willfully do these things, just set them loose, as I said, on the highway.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words. I support this legislation fully but I want to suggest to the Honourable Attorney General that I myself would have been more satisfied if it were possible to have composite legislation dealing with this including the present Animals (Civil Liability) Act because there are some remedies that owners of land on which livestock have trespassed which, in a sense, are inconsistent and do not square completely with the provisions of this legislation.

A person would have an option, for example, to impound the animals themselves on their own premises for a period of about 14 days under the Animals Act as it exists whereas under this legislation they will be obligated to have it delivered to a pound. This legislation preserves the remedies under the old Act. I do not think it makes sense for people to have an option to pursue a large number of remedies kind of in the ah-. When they are taking some steps to remove animals or impound them they should declare what legislation they are doing it under. They

should be required to follow the steps that are required under one piece of legislation rather than have three or four separate causes of action which arise under different pieces of legislation. I would prefer if there were a composite review of the whole legislation but because of the importance of this I am going to give my full support to it. 6.25 p.m.

I hope that in the near future, the two pieces of legislation will be looked at together and the remedy available to people will be clearly circumscribed and that some of the archaic provisions of the Animals Act, for example, for a Justice of Peace to assess damage and that kind of thing could be removed and could be assimilated into this legislation.

I am going to give my support to this legislation.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to such matters relating to animals, livestock and so on, I think that as a St. George man who has spent a lot of time in an environment where these kinds of problems surface that I should try to put some kind of input into the impact of this piece of legislation.

Sir, we have to look at several things. I have no difficulty, in principle, with supporting certain aspects of the principles which underline this Bill. This presumably is for the better protection of animals, to try to encourage persons to keep their animals in a safe place and try to exercise greater care where they can become a hazard to people using the highways and so on and provision is being made, in a legal framework, for them to be taken to the appropriate pounds, under legal conditions, and be so dealt with.

One thing which bothers me is this. If you look at Barbados and look at the development of the livestock industry in this country, there is a very curious phenomenon which is that the people who are most competent, generally speaking, and most experience and most successful in the rearing of livestock are people who, in fact have no lands. The tradition in Barbados has been and still is that a large number of people who have been successful over the years in raising livestock find themselves in a position where they have to pursue this particular aspect of their lives very much in a marginal situation. The marginality arises where they graze on the lands of other people, sometimes with permission, sometimes without permission.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: And often without permission. On many occasions, for many years, we know that people have reared their livestock by grazing their livestock at the side of the road.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sometimes under control. Sometimes their children go to help hold on to the rope of a cow, the cow gets away and all kinds of problems like this can arise.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know what is wrong with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. I am not questioning the general principles behind the Bill. All I am saying is that you have to make sure that you do not have over zealous officers who may operate in a way that you could very well undermine a significant sector of agricultural activity in Barbados.

On many occasions, on the Floor of this House, I have pointed out that one of the problems that we have in Barbados is that many of our institutions do not recognize the existence of these people. For example, I know several persons who have raised cows successfully, produced some of the best beef, produced some of the best milch cattle, over the years, and those people could never get a loan from a bank.

What I am wondering, Sir, is to what extent does this legislation take into account the existence of such people and how would it impact on those people. I think, Sir, that it would cause a whole lot of problems if I had two cows or something like this and I could not get home on time and I asked someone to go and graze the cow for me, in the evening and the cow gets away and the next thing I know, the cow is impounded or something like this.

We have to bear in mind whether or not we are just dealing with strays or whether we are dealing with animals that might be part of an organized structured system of production in the agricultural sector. My concern, looking at this, is that this might well be the kind of legislation that might be copied from other jurisdictions and do not necessarily reflect the quality of life in Barbados.

The Honourable Member for St. Andrew would know only too well what I am talking about, in two ways. He himself is involved in sheep rearing and cattle rearing and he would know the kind of background of a small farmer, particularly in those two areas. Goats, sheep and cattle are the three big areas where this kind of thing would obtain. Less so with pigs.

I also understand that in the Scotland District, there are many things relating to unlawful grazing. I have heard many complaints of the inability or the lack of legislation to control animals that just stray across the terrain, in that area, and often destroy the crops of other people.

I have no problems whatsoever with the legislation which is dealing purely with genuine acts of lawlessness and those people who deliberately misuse and abuse the

lands of other people, even to the extent of destroying or not caring about the impact this has on other crops. I know, Sir, for example that I have some land in Barbados somewhere and I know that there are many people who raise sheep, cows, goats on the land.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is right None of them asked me permission. I have not complained, except on one occasion, where I planted a lot of potato slips, hard labour, a lot of resources involved and the next thing you know, they are all gone. I think that that is quite unreasonable.

I really feel that this would have to be administered with some degree of sensitivity. I would urge the Minister to look very carefully and see the impact that this might have on..... Look, it is the genuine small farmer whom I think needs to be encouraged because, at the moment, we do nothing for him. I have said this again and again that one of the biggest errors... We do nothing for him because our criteria for credit and lending in that area does not regard, as a bankable asset, the traditions and skills that he has had in rearing. He has no lands. In other words, Sir, it is easier for the Honourable Member for St. Lucy who has never reared a cow, a goat or a sheep to go into a bank and get a loan to rear cattle, sheep or goats than another man who has had 30 years success in rearing these animals and would like to expand but because he has not got land or property he cannot have access to reasonable financing. 6.35 p.m.

It is the criteria we use for collateral. We know they operate under that disability already. I would not like to think, Sir, that under the general umbrella of protection of this Act that there could be in any way disadvantaged.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It does concern me, Sir, when you are trying to get across a significant point and make no mistake about it. I will say that it is about fifty per cent of livestock agriculture that I am talking about. All I am saying is that whereas you may have a difficulty in amending the Act or when you get around to administering the Act that it is important that those persons should be given appropriate instructions. Do you want me to give way?

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that I might be able to help the Member for St. Michael South Central. If you look at Section 6(1) we make note that the owner of the enclosed land...

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the Honourable Member risen/

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of elucidation. Section 6(1): "The owner of enclosed, cultivated land, or pasture land...". So lands that are now uncultivated and people are grazing on it is not cut up in the Act here. This will give the leeway to what you are talking about

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am quite satisfied once the thing is being taken into consideration because I would not wish to see that class of person, Sir...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am going to wind up right now, Sir. I have a vested interest in this because I consider, Sir, my ideal retirement is to be looking after a few sheep and a few goats, one or two pigs, and a couple of cows in the country. I am damned if one of my cows should stray that somebody is going to take it up and impound it Sir, that is my interest. Thank you very much.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, just a short intervention. The Honourable Member for St. Andrew knows more about livestock straying or otherwise than I do, I am sure. He keeps telling me about the United Beef Producers and how he assisted the Honourable Minister of Finance in destroying that project. But I am not getting into that now.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Do you see what I tell you now? The same thing that I just said. I just had some concerns. One may wonder what am I doing rising on this because being a city person who was born and raised in St. Michael that I may not know much about livestock. That is not true. I will have you know, Sir, that when I was nine years old I was given a present of a goat which used to kick down a bucket of milk every time that I milked it. I never got a single ounce of milk from it. Do you believe that?

Sir, one asked what problems do we have in the City with strays. We have a serious problem. Any of you who work in the City, a lot of the lawyers especially around the Court area, would notice there is a large flock of sheep who create a serious problem. I do not think that the sheep even recognize that they belong to Nassar anymore. The sheep are on their own now. They do not even recognize him as the owner anymore. They stop at traffic lights. They cross when they feel like. You have to wait and that sort of thing. But it is a serious thing.

We have also a number of cows along the banks of the Constitution River which many of you have passed in the mornings and have seen a man actually milking them on the banks of the river under the most insanitary conditions. Of course, we know there is a large number of cows now on Murphy Pasture owned by a rasta guy. Sir, as the

Honourable Leader of the Opposition was saying and I was mentioning to the Member for Christ Church West, especially in St. Michael you will have a large number of landless livestock farmers. The Honourable Member for SL Michael North East although he represents a St. Michael constituency, he has a rural area in his constituency. But in the more urban part of St. Michael there are a large number of persons who still keep livestock and who have no land. There is no land even if they wanted land.

Now I have heard Honourable Members sotto voce try to say - what should they be doing with livestock if they do not have any land? Well, that is a tradition. It has been so for a long time. I am sure, Sir, in your growing up in Westbury Road your family must have had a sheep or two in the yard or a pig or two. But they did not have any pasture land to graze them on unless they let them go down to the Westbury School pasture and graze.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: It is not the same thing as somebody selling vegetables. No, Sir, I do not agree. It is not the same thing as somebody selling vegetables and they do not have ground. It is the same thing as somebody growing vegetables without ground if you want to argue that kind of foolish argument. That is a stupid argument - selling vegetables without ground. If you want to compare that with what I am saying, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave out the vegetables.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I agree with that, Sir. The point I am making, Sir, is that one has to be very careful. You know sometimes when we start to bring legislation here we do not always take into consideration conditions in Barbados. As one Honourable Member said before, you may borrow wholesale from somewhere else this type of legislation and not take into consideration the fact of the social conditions that exist in Barbados. What is problematical...

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Man, "Sweetcakes" keep quiet now. I refer to the Honourable Member for St. John. That is a pet name that Sir James had for him, "Sweetcakes", but we are not dealing with that now. I do not know why he used to call him so either. But let us get on, Sir. What I am saying is that with this kind of legislation the problem comes at the point of policing it. As one Honourable Member said, Sir, one has to be very careful as to how the officers who are going to go out there and impound the so called stray livestock will deal with the matter. How do we know when it is really stray livestock? The Honourable Prime Minister has about four or five black belly sheep that are always wondering around Porters? Nobody can say that

they are strays. They are his. They are not strays, Sir, because they do not have a tag around their neck or in their ear.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I would just like to say that I have no stray animals. I would just like to say that I have no stray animals, sheep or anything else, that stray around Porters.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Sir, as I told him, when you eat the sheep down you should replenish them. If the sheep are not six anymore and he has no more left, well all I can suggest that you buy a few more lambs and start again. That is my only suggestion. But do not let them stray again because this legislation may give you some problems. You will recall, Sir, that when legislation was brought here to deal with domestic animals...! am talking about dogs and cats, the Honourable Member was asking, if you found cats grazing somewhere what would you do with them? He asked that sotto voce - what about a cat grazing somewhere? The Honourable Member for SL Michael West - yes.

Laughs.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member mentioned St. Michael West and I really have gotten up to dissociate myself from any grazing cats. I know nothing of any cats that graze in the City.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: If you were half asleep or whatever, because you know that you cannot sleep in here, he did mention about the stray cats that were grazing.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I understand. We move on from there, Sir. Seriously, you will recall, Sir, that there was legislation brought here before dealing with other domestic animals like cats and dogs where there was an Animal Control Centre set up. The then Health Minister, the former Member for the City, brought in legislation where people were picking up your dogs if they did not have on a dog tag. Do you remember that, Sir?

Laughs.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: You know that it is nice that the Prime Minister could be in such a jovial mood at a time like this. I am really glad to see that. 6.45 p.m.

What we are saying is that when the policing time comes along and you start to pick up people's animals, I have another difficulty. How are you going to identify that you have picked up the Honourable Member for St. Andrew's brown cow and not that of the Member for Christ Church East?

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The law does not deal with that specifically, Sir, and if it does I would prefer to hear the Honourable Attorney General on this than the Member for St. Lucy, because he knows nothing about law anyhow.

I was driving along the East Coast Road the other day with a friend of mine from St. Andrew. My friend told me I had better slow down because there were a lot of cows down there flying across the road. I said, "do they have flying cows in St. Andrew?" He said, "there are several cows that are flying across the road," so I slowed down, but the point is, once he had said that I started to realise that there were really a lot of cows along the edge of the road and most of them were either brown or black and white. I would like the Honourable Attorney General to tell us how you are going to determine whose black and white cow it is if two people go to identify the same cow.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West ran into a lot of trouble already with Vic Johnson with this cow thing. I am finished with that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I have not got into any trouble with anybody, Sir. All I know is that the cow found itself at the bottom of a piece of rope. That is all I know about the cow.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Sir, you are dealing with the smallest of all livestock farmers, that landless farmer, that fellow who does not have any land. There is an open spot somewhere - and God knows there are several of them with bush on them now and the bush is very tall - I would like it if somebody would bring a whole herd of cows to the Orleans now to keep down some of that bush that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West would not let the Ministry of Health come and cut down, so that the people would stop suffering from the mosquitoes - but the whole question of dealing with very small farmers has to be carefully looked at. All I am saying is, when you are bringing the legislation, look far enough down the road that you understand the type of people you are going to have policing it. Understand that and understand that you must put enough in here that they cannot get out of control and start picking up people's cows, otherwise you will find one or two of those persons behaving very much like my friend from Christ Church East and you might have to deal with them.

And so, Sir, after all the fun and games are over, it is my serious concern that you do not end up hurting these small landless farmers.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few observations here. It is a pity that we have been trivialising what I regard as a serious bit of legislation which has been brought here to assist people who are involved in agriculture.

I do not think that this legislation should have any serious effect on the small farmer. I think I must draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases you find a landless farmer is drawn towards the grassy areas. I believe most of us would understand how the agricultural fields are laid out. The cows are attracted to the grass on the hedge row and the owner of a cow or sheep would deliberately put his stake very near to this area, which results in destroying whatever produce there is on the land. This legislation has been brought here to see if we can correct this.

There is another type of fanner who deliberately removes his rope or chain so that the animals can have a free range. Again, this legislation has been brought to correct this situation.

Aside.

Mr. C. A. NEBLETT: There are situations where there are open lands, but where those lands are not being used you will not have that problem. For instance, in the Scotland District feed lots have been provided by the ADC and in spite of the existence of these feed lots you find the owners of cows tying them even to the cherry trees where they graze indiscriminately. Again, I see this legislation as an attempt to deal with that problem.

One Honourable Member just said that there are people who live out of the Scotland District who keep cows in the Scotland District, and again these provide problems, so I would not say that there is an attempt to interfere with the role of the landless farmer in this particular instance. All we are trying to do is to bring some semblance of order to it.

The Honourable Member for the City mentioned the fact that cows stray on the East Coast Road. This is quite true, because early in the morning one can find cows actually sleeping on that road, and again if we put the pound into operation I know that some action would have to be taken to remove these animals that create risks for those drivers who use the area.

I would say definitely that within the broad ambit of this legislation you could find the mechanism for at least bringing some control to the question of livestock, so I want to support it fully.

Thank you very much.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I had better begin my contribution by making a generalisation

and a fear which I have about Barbados at present, and it is this, that there is obviously an uneasiness and an anxiety in the community in many fields of law and order which are reaching legislators now for various reasons. I want to sound a warning. Whilst that is a genuine concern, we must be careful to balance various interests, and I am sure that this House in the next couple of hours, and probably the next couple of weeks, will have a large volume of legislation before it, some of which is going to fail to respect people's rights in a fundamental way and have the sort of balance that is very necessary.

In times of crisis there is a great danger on the part of legislators and others to go the other side and to go to the other extreme. Legislation that is hurried in such circumstances often eventually turns out in the long run not to be a cure at all but creates its own problems. Part of the problem of this particular Bill is that it does not take into account the existing common law provisions, and indeed one of the weaknesses in Barbados at the moment is that very often people say that they do not have remedies where remedies truly exist but they are unaware of those remedies.

There has always been a remedy at common law to impound animals and you can enforce that impounding by an action of suing for your rights. Those of us who have watched the development of the common law will know of the right of agistment, and indeed the term "agist" is a well recognised term which enables people to take in, and to charge for, animals that have trespassed or come onto their lands. Those common law rights have not been abolished in Barbados, and perhaps the only purpose of this legislation then seems to be to enforce in the minds of persons that they now have something on the Statute Book which they may be a little bit more conscious of. 6.55 p.m.

It is like the Trespass Act which was passed when I was Attorney General. It was passed to allay fears, not that there were not existing provisions to deal with the situation, but people seemed unaware of those existing provisions.

The other generalisation which I wish to make is this. Passing of the laws is no cure for enforcing either existing or indeed the new legislation. Once again, I want to say that we can pass the Livestock (Control of Strays) Act, 1990, but unless one has in place people who are going to see that it is enforced, we will be no nearer the cure that is being looked at.

Now, I have some difficulty with sections of this legislation. The section in particular that I have difficulty with is the section 5, subsections 3 and 4. Those sections are not providing a defence for persons whose animals through....

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: A-G-I-S-T-M-E-N-T. An agist is A-G-I-S-T. Sections 2, 3 and 4 allow livestock that is found tethered wondering, straying or lying on a highway or any place to be seized by an authorised person or constable and taken to the pound and that the owner eventually ends up either losing the animal or paying for the fact that the animal has been taken into custody and kept for a period of time.

I have seen in my 30 years at the Bar and indeed my 57 years as a person, circumstances where animals stray through no neglect or fault on the part of their owners. The Low Courts are replete with examples, let us take horses getting out of their enclosures and going on to the highway through no fault of their owners. The Common Law allowed a defence in those circumstances and you were not even liable for the negligence. Here such an animal, if impounded, we have provided no defence for a genuine case such as this.

You can have a situation where somebody maliciously lets go an animal that is properly tethered and the animal is on the highway. There is again no defence. You can go as the owner and say, "look, why are you impounding this animal. This is a genuine case" and probably prove it. But, again, the section provides no defence for those circumstances. I would seriously urge on the Government, it is very anxious to put a lot of legislation through, that legislation such as this should take into account these types of real events which we do see and do experience in this Island.

Now, Sir, I want as well to join my voice to that of the Leader of the Opposition. Those of us who are born in the country and have been reared in the country do know that Barbados has always had a class of landless farmers. Genuinely that landless farmer has been the small man. My first calf was given to me by my godfather, a Mr. Layne, who lived in Cane Vale not far from the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central's house. I, in those days, could not possibly have owned an inch of land at all. Obviously, those of us who were educated at primary schools were encouraged to keep and care for livestock. We were encouraged to learn to work the land, to work in the gardens at our schools so we came up with a sort of interest. Now that I do live again in the country I recognise that a large section of Barbadians who own not one inch of land are good farmers despite this. It is true that they are either grazing at the side of the road or they are grazing on somebody else's land. That is a fact.

I can cite the area of St. John where I live where several persons, with my consent, graze on my own land. They also graze without consent on lands of Haynes Hill and other places. They are able to educate and help their children in those circumstances. I am not condoning a trespass. What I am saying is there is a genuine need in Barbados for the provision of land for those persons, the

small farmer, who is interested in a livestock industry or in farming generally and who, today, lacks the wherewithal to do it

I also represent a constituency that contains quite a significant number of farming people, the constituency of Christ Church West. It may surprise some Members to know that but we have one of the biggest owners of the black belly sheep up in Forde's Road. He is a first class farmer. He does not own a stick of land. He keeps them under control. He is also one of the people who might go to work, come home and find that somebody has interfered with his animals and his animals are straying.

It is for that reason that I began by saying that section 5 of this Act certainly needs a section giving protection to that genuine person who has done all within his power to control and keep his animals in, whether it is from the highway or elsewhere and finds himself confronted with a situation where beyond his control his animal is now found on the highway. That type of person whom I speak of in my own constituency has a genuine case, in my view, for protection because he is genuinely interested in farming. Now I know the Government may, like myself, have concern about the stray sheep that one sees around Bridgetown...

Aside.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, they are strays. At some stage you may have concerns for the cows that you used to see in the Constitution River who do not seem to have been brought under control. I can understand that. I believe at the same time we ought to provide protection for the genuine case of the small farmer who wants to make a living in this country and whom we may well be preventing from so doing by some parts of this legislation that in some respects, in my view, does not take into account his rights in the careful manner that I would have expected of legislation of this sort.

This legislation, I am not sure whether we have taken it out of one of the Caribbean countries or from the United Kingdom or elsewhere. I know in the United Kingdom you will find that most farms are enclosed. The category of the landless farmer which is a Caribbean phenomena and, indeed, almost unique to Barbados, with limited land mass, is not a problem in Wales. It is not a problem in Northumberland. 7.05 p.m.

The problem you have there, Sir, is to deal with the farmer who does not enclose his area properly enough and thus allow his sheep or his cattle to stray in the manner which this Act seems to answer. But they do not have the category of the landless, as we have the category of the landless farmer. I rather suspect that the Government has not carefully taken into account the needs of the landless

farmer, the small man in Barbados who ought to be encouraged, whether he is keeping rabbits - a subject on which I heard the Honourable Minister of Agriculture speak, quite correctly - or whether he is keeping a few black belly sheep, an industry that has a tremendous potential for us or whether he is keeping, as is happening now increasingly in Barbados, a few cows. One of my employees who works with me, a young man from Coach Hill has a couple of cows. He has no land. He is most careful. He is so solicitous about it that he gets his vet like anybody else. But I have known not only him but other persons's cows to be straying around the place because you get wanton people interfering with them. Are we giving that person any protection? I do not know the anxiety of the Government to pass this bit of legislation, before the end of the year, but I would counsel that, perhaps, the Attorney-General should have a careful look at section 5 and the other absolute sections and provide the normal defence that I would wish to see provided in legislation such as this.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker this legislation provides for absolute liability. One of the problems with legislation of this kind is that where you start to make extensions, you are going to make the legislation ineffective.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West makes the point that you need to legislate for situations where cattle may be straying, as a result of the wanton act of someone, other than the owner, or by the negligent act of someone other than the owner and that provision should be made for that kind of situation.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, about exceptions of that kind is that, once you start to go down that road, you are going to make the legislation totally ineffective. Because in every case, a person whose livestock is found straying and is seized will make the point, "Look, I took every reasonable precaution and somebody must have let the animal go." You cannot legislate for every single situation, Mr. Speaker. I think one wants to ensure that you do not pass legislation which is totally ineffective.

The other consideration which one has to look at is that the urban area of Barbados is spreading.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The rural area is contracting, yes. A lot of development is taking place throughout the length and breadth of the country. Some of the things which have motivated the legislation are the problems which arise, over a vast area of the urbanised developing areas of the country, where one needs, I think, to have some kind of strict liability in relation to straying animals. One of the considerations, Mr. Speaker, is that a person is not being deprived of the animal. If I have an animal which strays and damages your property, I can be held or somebody has to be

held to be accountable. Why should you suffer, as a result of my straying animal, even if my straying animal has strayed because of the wanton act of somebody else? The fact is that your property has been damaged as a result of the straying or wandering animal. I am saying that there are certain situations where the law of strict liability does not necessarily work any undue hardship on persons.

All we are saying is that, in this case where that kind of problem occurs, the animal may be impounded and the person can go and recover the animal upon paying all reasonable expenses of its seizure and confinement. Those conditions are not onerous. We are not putting any penalties on the person and on the animal for straying. All you are saying is that this animal has been straying on property and you pay the reasonable expenses of the seizure.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: I am saying, Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that you cannot legislate for every kind of contingency, I think the legislation, by and large, is not unreasonable.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East has suggested that in clause 5 provision

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Yes. Clause 5, subsection 4. I would prefer at this time, to leave it as it is. I do not like amending legislation on the Floor of the House. Setting loose, releasing livestock does have a little problem. You see, the point about tethering livestock on or near a highway to cause an obstruction, is a clear offence. You are saying that if anybody does that deliberately and causes an obstruction or injury to a user of the highway, you want to penalize that person specially.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: In a case where the person releases....

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The thing about setting loose wilfully, if the person sets loose wilfully - to avoid any offensive conduct then - the type that the Honourable Member spoke of, the response is to impound that livestock and make him pay the expenses of seizure and confinement. No person who owns livestock is going to continue to do that nonsense all the time, if every time that it is done, they are going to be seized. What I am saying is that there is in the law at the moment, some kind of penalty for the person who releases the livestock at the side of the road and causes the obstruction. To that extent, I say that we should go with the lesser penalty for the person. The one who ties them on

or near the highway creates more of a problem because more danger is inclined to result to the public from that kind of deliberate obstruction.

The other point made by

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: It is straying because the stake was not put down properly. It is a serious thing. People sometimes just stick the stake there in the ground.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: It cannot pull it up. Precisely. In clause 13, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas made the point that he did not like the word "rescue" where it reads:

"Any person who rescues or releases, or attempts to rescue or release livestock".

The Honourable Member for St. Thomas did not like the word "rescue" because he said that perhaps the situation could arise where a particular animal may be in danger and someone did some act to relieve the danger to the livestock. But when I looked at the legal text, I see that "rescue" in law means precisely that - "removes from custody". So that I would suggest that "rescue" remains and I think persons applying the law would not apply the thing unreasonably. If a particular livestock fell in a well and somebody went and performed an act of rescue in that sense of the word, nobody would be so unreasonable as to apply the law unreasonably. But "rescue" in this context I am fairly sure, Mr. Speaker, will always be construed to mean anyone who attempts to remove from custody or set free or release. 7.15p.m.

Those are the main points that I wish to make, Sir.

SUSPENSION

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let me do a little rescue job here. Mr. Speaker, it is now 7:20 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it is 7:20 p.m. I beg to move that this House be suspended until 8 o'clock.

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

The question that this sitting be suspended until 8:00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 7.17p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I move, Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Sir.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was not aware that the Bill had been passed in the Second Reading. The House was suspended, Mr. Speaker, before the Second Reading was passed.

Aside.

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

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. .

Clauses 1 through 21 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, seconded by Hon. E. E. GREAVES, the Bill was read a third time and the title read and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LAND REGISTRATION (SUSPENSION) ORDER, 1990

Order No. 13 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Land Registration (Suspension) Order, 1990.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, because of certain problems with the total registration in the Land Registry, certain acts under Sections 14 and 15 of the relevant Act states that the Registrar of Titles has to provide certificates of titles and certificates of charge in respect of applications made under those respective sections. Because of certain problems we were having with the computer in the Lands and Surveys Section and also because of the shortage of staff which existed in that section there were no demarcations of the sporadic and voluntary titles affected

by the Chief Surveyor and because of that no registry map could be prepared to enable the Registrar of Titles to issue these certificates of titles and certificates of charge.

We have no alternative than to suspend these two sections in this Act until we have the necessary hardware in the computer and the necessary demarcations have been done. So this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament to suspend these two sections of the Land Registry Act at Sections 14 and 15(a).

The Registrar is of the view that this is the way that you should go, but I would hasten to add that the titles will still be adjudicated and so forth. But it is just because of that little map that you need to put on to the conveyances and titles which the computer cannot do at the moment that we have to suspend this total thing here.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I beg that the Resolution to suspend Sections 14 and 15(a) of the relevant Act do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Sir, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak. 8.10 p.m.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I think this is the second piece of legislation that is being brought before the House to suspend or amend or allow a certain section of the Act to operate at a later stage. As the Minister said, there are certain problems in the Land Registry which need to be attended to, but I am a little unsure about the reason that the Minister gave for the suspension of these two sections, 14 and ISA. By way of explanation the Minister has said something about the computer breaking down at the Land Registry.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: If I may just give some information here, the Registrar of Titles said the reason for the suspension under section ISA of the Land Registration Act, Cap. 229, is that thus far no demarcations of the sporadic and voluntary titles have been effected by the Chief Surveyor, and hence no registry map has been prepared so as to enable the Registrar of Titles to issue certificates of title and certificates of charge as these sections of the Act require. That is the reason given to me by the Registrar of Titles.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Section 14 deals with the registration of first dealing after commencement of the Act and section 15 deals with the voluntary registration after commencement of the Act. Section 14 is meant to deal with those titles within what are called registration districts, and section 15 deals with titles that are outside of the registration districts. Sections 14 and 15A are being suspended for a period of two years, and it is said that this

would enhance the systematic registration of titles generally. It is for this reason that the operation of these two sections is suspended for a period of two years.

What I would want to know - and I am still not certain about it, in spite of the explanation given by the Minister - is whether one would still have to file the necessary documentation allowing for registrations under these two sections. The Minister did say that adjudication of the titles would still continue, and this is why I am a little uncertain. Maybe when he is replying he would be able to explain that to me.

Now, Sir, it was anticipated very early, as I remember, when the Minister of Agriculture was very forceful in his arguments as to why the Act ought to have been proclaimed, and we have spent some time debating it. Previous to that time we said that problems would have resulted because of the manner in which things were happening at the Land Registry Department. Problems have still continued there. These are only some of the problems. These are the major problems, but there are a lot of other problems that have got to be attended to at the Land Registry Department.

Land registration, Sir, is a good thing. I have no quarrel with land registration. It is anticipated that with the system of registration we have that we will be able over time to have a quick conveyancing procedure, as against the lengthy time that we have at the moment. Conveyancing in Barbados is still a very tedious and time consuming practice, and it would appear to me that a suspension of these two sections for a further two years would add to the tedium and, at times, frustrating experience that conveyancing is in Barbados.

We had dealt earlier on with shortages of staff in the Lands and Surveys Department when we were seeking permission to employ people, I believe, from abroad - Trinidad or wherever. I do not know what is the current status of that. It would appear though that we still have the shortages of staff. It was unfortunate that at the time we did not anticipate the impact that the shortages of staff would have had on the systematic registration of titles, the very matter that is raised here in this Suspension Order.

The suspension will last for a period of two years. I would want to know from the Minister on what this estimate was arrived at I know the provision that you should ask questions formally, but I would think in a matter like this the Minister might be able to give us some answer as to what this two year period was based upon.

There were also computer problems as well. That was not gone into in any great depth by the Minister as to what were the specifics of the computer problems in the Lands and Surveys Department, or alternatively in the Department of the Registrar of Titles.

One of the quarrels I have with the Land Registry - and it is something that has been canvassed in here before - is its distance out of the City and a lot of problems are being experienced in this regard, problems of staff and things like that. It is situated at the Garrison and your staff has difficulties in travelling there. As a practising attorney, who does a lot of conveyancing, I experience this from time to time and I wonder if it is anticipated that the Department of the Registrar of Titles would at some future date be moved a little closer to the City, and if any arrangements are being made in that regard, whether the question is being looked at at all. This is something I would like the Minister, if he can, to address when he is winding up.

Earlier on, Sir, I made a point about whether we would still have titles being adjudicated. If the two sections are suspended, is this possible? Unless I do not understand the meaning of suspension. I know you said that titles would still be adjudicated.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I agree that practitioners have asked for it, but the Minister said that titles would still be adjudicated upon. Section 14 allows for adjudication of titles and I was wondering how that could happen if you suspend it. What is the authority for doing that? Section 14(3) says: "Where an application is made under subsection (1), the Registrar shall cause the title of the applicant to be examined by the Commissioner as if the land were situate in a registration district...." I was wondering whether in the light of the suspension of these two sections whether you could have adjudications being done. I would have thought that could not now occur because the section is suspended. Not only is that Sir, but could you lawfully and legally have the certificates of title being issued? 8.20 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: So what is the point of having the adjudications then? I am looking at the intent of the law. I know for practical purposes it might be necessary to do that. This is what I am talking about. The intent of the law is that you suspend the operation of the two sections for two years. One of the sections, section 14 (3) allows for adjudication of titles. If the section is suspended, how can we have that? Upon what authority would somebody be adjudicating a title? That is the point that I am making.

I do not know if you could explain to me the entire intent of the Land Registration (Suspension) Order. I understand that you are having problems with shortage of staff and also software computer problems. Is that a sufficient reason for suspending the operations of two sections when it is possible that the suspension can impact in other ways? If the Minister can, I would like him to address those matters when he is winding up.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may throw a little light on the situation here. I think the difficulty arises in that the compilation of the register was intended to be in two phases, a systematic compilation as well as a sporadic compilation. The systematic compilation, as I understand, is going ahead fairly nicely in that they have started in those areas that were more recently surveyed and where the titles were good as well as the surveying. The Land Surveyors Department staff then went into those areas and controlled the surveying.

The whole idea of registration of title falls in two sections, that is the legal identification of the parcel of land which gives you all the legal rights, encumbrances etc. to the land, and then there is the physical demarcation in mapping that parcel of land. The part that is posing a problem is in the sporadic compilation where it was suggested that where you have about 2 000 parcels of land changing hand each day that it would not have been the best thing to allow those 2 000 parcels of land if they were outside any systematic registration district not to come on to the map that they should have been brought on.

This was presupposed that two things would have happened - (1) that there would have been enough surveying control through Barbados that when an individual parcel of land outside of the systematic area was being sold that the individual private surveyor would have been able to control and tie it on to the national grid. If he had been able to tie it on to the national grid, it would have been able to be plotted either by the computer or by the draughtsman on to a registration map which would be compiled systematically like how a jigsaw puzzle is done. In the process of time, as you build up that also would come into its own.

My understanding is that there has not been enough intensified breakdown of the national grid. Therefore, there are certain ones that the surveyors have to tie and run some very long traverses to. As a result the Registry is finding some problem in that physical demarcation. What is being asked now is that in those areas that the requirement be suspended for the physical demarcation in those areas but you can allow the adjudication to go on.

If you allow the adjudication to go on, when you come back to it, when that part is properly plotted by the land surveyors, you would have already done the legal adjudication on it. Therefore you could bring about the physical mapping. I think we should not, although we allow it, stop the adjudication in these areas because it would mean that you would then fall back on the system of registration of deed. You would lose it completely.

It is a pity that the two are not going hand in hand, that is, the legal identification and the physical demarcation. I think at some time that the Minister should look at it. I am certain that if he uses all the available manpower in

Barbados that the physical demarcation can catch up. It is necessary at this time to suspend that part of the Act to allow the natural registration.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as I anticipated...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Franklin and Franklin are my official surveyors. They have not fired me yet. Not him.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the contribution by the Honourable Member for St. Philip North would have proved to be much more enlightening to the House than the contribution from the Honourable Member for St. Philip South which only served to confuse the entire House. I am extremely disappointed that after all these years we are still having these administrative problems in respect of the operation of the Land Registry.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Several years. I have checked the Act and it was passed in 1979. It was commenced in 1988. This is 1990. It is 13 years that it has been on the Statute Book. The point is that I am one of those people who enthusiastically supported the idea for a variety of reasons.

I must say that I am disappointed to see that every now and again one has to come back to the House because of some serious administrative hiccup. Make no mistake. To suspend two significant sections of the Act for two years cannot, in my view, be any significant enhancement of the process because if those two sections constituted an integral part of the entire legal process, then, quite clearly, suspension of two significant sections must, inevitably delay the process. It would seem to be, therefore, that the whole idea that suspending two sections would speed up land registration in Barbados does not make too much sense to me. Sir, I had hoped that by now the whole question of speed of conveyancing and the cost of conveyancing in Barbados would have been substantially reduced as a result of these efforts. I am coming to the conclusion that there are certain people who do not really want this to become effective probably in their life time. Because it would seem to me, Sir, that generation after generation of conveyancers seem to be happy to be continuing with the archaic methods of searching for titles, recording titles, transferring titles, spending

8.30 p.m.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not attacking any lawyers. I am talking about conveyancers. Not all conveyancers are lawyers and not all lawyers are conveyancers. I do my own conveyancing when I am selling, when I am the vendor, not

when I am the purchaser. The onus should be on the purchaser to find a lawyer and pay the fees.

But the point I am making is, Sir, I can always do my own conveyancing because it is a matter of photostating the previous document and substituting names. That is all I do. It is usually a good and valid title that I am handing over.

Mr. Speaker, it does bother me. Let me give you an example, Sir. In many parts of Barbados today, take places like Sunset Crest, Haling Park, in all these places, you have had a large mass of land that has been subdivided say, within the last 20, 25 years. You have had a multiplicity of subdivisions on those sites. You have had lawyers who have been paid, for example, for the overall conveyance of the overall plot. You have had hundreds of lawyers who have been paid for the individual conveyances on three sides, the vendor, the purchaser and the one acting for the bank. Then you may have resales in the same area. The title has been searched, researched, researched, researched, over and over again and all that has happened is that people paid over and over and over again for the same thing, just paying different people.

I am saying that that is wrong and something needs to be done with it. I can see no difficulty whatsoever in getting those kinds of titles in particular in some kind of registration where there can be easy access to cut out all these searches and all this kind of nonsense so that you can get an adequate certificate and say, "This is a valid title" and continue.

You may have heard, Sir, of our proposal for no downpayment houses. Do you know, Sir, that if in Canada a property is being conveyed that you may pay CAN\$200 for what you have to pay BDS\$10 000 for here in Barbados?

Aside,

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I know that. I am not knocking the lawyers because I believe that, over time, the volume of work and the remuneration would be the same. But I am talking "about the efficiency in the society and I am talking about reducing costs particularly to young couples who want to own a piece of land, probably in a development and get on with the job and this kind of thing. It is absolutely amazing the kind of unnecessary costs that are involved and this thing has a tremendous negative economic impact, the losses incurred by persons often between a deposit and then a year later getting a title and all that kind of foolishness. All that has to stop if we are going to become a modern society, in which property transactions constitute a major sector of economic activity in the society.

I think that after 11 years of having this on the statute book, I am not at all satisfied that adequate progress is being made. I think that some attention needs to be paid because I take the wider perspective in these matters. The

wider perspective is that there is tremendous wastage and loss to Barbados because of the lack of some kind of easy access of the various parties, quick and easy access to a definitive document, a title if you want to call it, in their hands which would indicate a satisfactory legally binding transfer of property. That needs to be done.

I believe that the Government must take the matter more seriously. If you need professional people in, get the people in. If you need adequate computers, get them in. If you need adequate computer staff, get them in. The point is this, that the savings to the society would be enormous.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What computers? It might reduce the Ways and Means. Sir, this might be a very rapid way of reducing the Ways and Means because it means that Government's revenue might be enhanced considerably, if you get a more rapid turnover, in terms of Property Transfer Tax. I certainly am one of those people who get very depressed when I get into a situation with three groups of lawyers trying to get a simple thing done and cannot get it done, just like transferring a simple piece of property and because of a lot of confusion, everybody searching the same title and this kind of thing. But I really feel that something needs to be done and we will never ever be able to achieve the kind of objectives of a property owning democracy in this society, unless we set up the infrastructure in order to give the kind of catalyst to this kind of thing. Whatever you attempt to do in housing, land transfers, you can be quite sure would be delayed by two, three years when you take the total mass of transactions, because of this infrastructure that we will have to go through. It is for the Minister to recognize that this is a legitimate complaint. You need to pay some attention to what is going on here and try and accelerate the process.

This Parliament has taken the decision. As legislators we have taken the decision. Each time the Minister has required a facilitation and he has come here, he has got that facilitation. Between parliamentary action and action at the executive level, I am not satisfied that we are getting the kind of performance at that level. There are always more and more excuses as we come back here.

Mr. Speaker, I have no detailed knowledge of the process. I have no specific knowledge of the process. We are fortunate, there are persons in this House, for example, the Honourable Member for St. Philip North has been at this for a long time and I am sure all the other practising lawyers in this House would have a lot of experience.

I am convinced, as a layman, that we took the right decisions to press ahead but somehow or other, somewhere, the whole thing is being frustrated. I do not believe that it revolves around the question of legal fees as some people try to say, because I think whatever system you operate

under, the lawyers will always make a reasonable living. I do not think that that is the problem. I think the problem is a management problem. The problem is an administrative problem and I think that something needs to be done about it, Sir.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to say - not in defence of lawyers - that I believe that there is a strong case for speeding up the early registration of all titles in Barbados. It is a fact that the cost of transferring land still remains reasonably high. I would not like to believe that the cost is because of the lawyers. I think that it is the system which we are operating. Although we have now changed the period for searching titles to 20 years, it is a fact that we have moved away from the 60 and the 40 years that previously applied, it is a fact that lawyers are still having to go through the cumbersome process of searching a lot of titles.

The purpose of the Land Registration Act, along with the other ancillary legislation, the Land Adjudication of Rights and Interests Act, was to bring all of the titles in Barbados on to an automatic register so that, in future, when you are conveying your title, you would virtually be guaranteed by state. You would be able to get a title and access to a surveyor's plan. 8.40p.m.

Now it certainly means that it must be a close coordination of action between the surveyors, Government Land Registry, and the lawyers who have been practising. It seems to me that part of the problem that is occurring here is a problem really of the surveyors and it seems to me that the Minister is going to have to find some way in a constitutional and proper manner of insisting that the abundance of expertise which we have in the surveying field in Barbados is used by the Registry. Really, I think a lot of the problem centres around the Chief Surveyor's Department at the moment. In fact, you will recall, Sir, that in the last few months there was some protest from the local surveyors who felt that they had not been consulted enough and that whatever difficulty they had was really not that they were opted out of the system, but they had not been invited to participate fully in making the system work.

We do have a significant portion of very competent surveyors in Barbados who know their job and who have had several years of experience, and who can hold their own here and in the wider Caribbean and elsewhere. I will seriously urge the Minister to examine very carefully whether there is not a case of using the various surveyors and surveying firms that we have in Barbados to assist the Government Lands and Surveys Department. I hate to think that we are going now to suspend registration under Sections 14 and 15 outside of registration districts. I thought that both things were going to continue

contemporaneously and that the registration districts which must come automatically on would come on to the grid at the same time as those that are not within that registration district. But the result of suspension would mean to me that those outside of the published registration districts will not now come on. Now that is going to be longer than a two year period because once you delay it for two years it is going to ricochet and we really are going to be in some problems.

I would ask the Minister although he is making the Order to look at the administrative and other problems which are preventing this Order from going. I believe that he will find that the local surveyors are willing to assist and that they are not unreasonable in their charges either. I work with them. Many of us work with them, Sir, and I really would seriously like to suggest that he explores that possibility and rather than a suspension for two years that we find that they are speeding up the process of bringing all the land in Barbados on to automatic registration.

For instance, in the tenancies under the Freehold Tenancies Purchase Act, we simplified the surveying process to give a statutory title. At first some lawyers were resistant to this, but I do not know if any difficulty has been done or there has been any fraud at all that I could detect in conveying lots in tenancies. Automatically one has seen where people are now converting their homes using whatever savings they can and improving their living conditions. If we can simplify land transfer, there is no doubt in my mind that one would get an immediate improvement almost by voluntary self help on the part of persons in improving their conditions. I think that the legal profession has played their part in assisting with the smooth transition of this piece of legislation and I think that I can speak on behalf of the legal profession. We are really prepared to continue to play our part but there is a need for closer coordination between the Land Registry, the Land Surveyor's Department in particular, the surveyors, and the legal profession.

I would suggest to the Minister that early in the new year that he may wish himself to coordinate a meeting between the various professional bodies with the Government bodies and take their advice. It is not a matter that is devious. It is a matter in our own interest and you will find that the professions are willing to assist and wherever possible to minimize the cost. The lawyers can make their money from volume. We are as frustrated as anybody when we have to wait for so long to get through the whole mass of administrative detail and humbug in order to do a normal simple conveyance. We are very conscious of the fact that today in some jurisdictions, United Kingdom for instance, land transfer and conveyancing are now being done by registered conveyancers and they are moving away from the profession. So the legal profession has a vested interest in seeing that the system is simplified that it is passed and that it is done at a reasonable cost. You will find no difficulty from our part and I hope

that the Minister will not yield too easily to the pressures that obviously are coming from the administrative side of his department, not the public administration side but from the professional side. Probably the Land Surveyor's Office or what not will not yield too quickly to suspending this legislation but instead would find a way of speeding up the legislation.

He is quite right to say that Britain has been trying to bring all of its titles on to the register since 1932. But Britain really had a really complicated system of land ownership. A lot of our titles are now secure titles because we have used very extensively in the last 40 years the foreclosure suit. I think in terms of the number of good titles that have been made we have not had a good deal of fraud. There has been some fraud in the use of the foreclosure suit. Wherever that has been detected, of course, the Courts have dealt with it very strongly and very promptly. But I think that by and large the foreclosure suit has been one way of giving a good title in Barbados. I believe that we can simplify this process and have almost if not all the land in Barbados on the register and on the grid within the next five years. I would not like to see it go pass the next five years. So that anybody could walk into the Registry and within a few hours get a conveyance completed. We will need, of course, to ensure title and there is room for development in the insurance field as well, as people I believe, as they have in the States, who will carry on this profession. It will provide opportunities for employment for other people. I recall, Sir, although I have not given you notice of the name of Mr. J. P. Brown who formerly practised here. He is now one of the biggest practitioners in this field somewhere in Boston. He has had opportunity to do that there and I can see opportunities coming up under the legislation for other ancillary services which will simplify the whole area of land ownership.

Obviously, I am interested in simplifying the system not only as a lawyer but from the point of view that I think that land is one of the indicia of wealth and I believe that we are going to find in the next few years that Barbadians are going to want to own a lot more of their own resources. It has already been started under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, a revolutionary piece of legislation if ever there was one. The Honourable Member for St. John laughs but he will see the benefit within his own constituency. I am sure that he would have loved to have been part of that legislation, Sir, in retrospect. But it has been one of the effective ways of transferring wealth from those who have to those who have not. We need the necessary legal apparatus to go along with these revolutionary steps that will be taken for the balance of the century.

Whilst I have some sympathy with the Minister because of the difficulties he is having, I believe that two years is too long and, although he has made this Order, he should not be hesitant to revoke the Order. I strongly recommend that he meets with the surveyors, he

coordinates, and that he himself sits on the conference. He has next to him sitting the Honourable Member for St Philip North, and although we might put some blows on him as Minister of Agriculture, Sir, I do not think that anybody would put any blows on him in his professional capacity as a surveyor because he certainly knows his job in that way. I think that this part of the legislation he knows extremely well. 8.50 p.m.

Even prior to the legislation being passed, he was in at the groundwork of planning this legislation. I remember when I came into the Ministry I had consultations with him. He offered his services and helped people voluntarily on it, along with another very knowledgeable person from the legal aspect, Mr. Bernard St. John, who knows a lot about this area of land law. I trust the Minister will take the words which he has heard from this side of the House seriously and do something about it in the New Year.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to be very brief. Most of the strictures and concerns raised by Honourable Members have been concerns of mine. There are some teething problems, because although, as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, this Act went as far back as in the 70s, this actual position here did not commence until 1988. I have had several meetings with the officers concerned - the Registrar of Titles and the Chief Surveyor - and I will admit there are problems. I am hopeful that early in the New Year most of the problems that are now holding up this matter will be solved.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the matter has been having the attention of the Ministry.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am very, very clear on the problems. I know what the problems are and they are being looked at early in the New Year. I will have a further meeting with the officers concerned early in the New Year, when I hope to have this matter thrashed out, for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party. My information was that the land surveyors in Barbados were not willing to take part in this exercise, but my information from the land surveyors is that they are willing and able to take part, but I do not know if there has been a breakdown in communication or what I intend to look into that very early in the New Year as well, and I hope that some time in January I will be able to come back to this Honourable House and report.

This Resolution asks for the suspension of sections 14 and ISA for two years. If early in the New Year the problems that we are having now are solved, I will come back to this Honourable House and ask that this matter be revoked, but I want to tackle it very early in the new year and I promise to do that.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CRAB HILL, ST. LUCY FOR
RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Government promised that there would be the establishment of a cultural and sports facility at Valery, Collymore Rock and at Crab Hill, St. Lucy and in pursuance of the promise we made back in 1986 it is proposed to develop a community centre and playing field on the 1.6 hectares of land which Parliament is being asked to acquire now at Crab Hill for recreational facilities.

The Town Planner and the Ministry of Tourism and Sports consider that the area is quite suitable for the stated purpose and they have given their approval and their full support for the acquisition of this land.

With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Honourable Member in his introductory remarks indicated that in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party there were promises in respect of Crab Hill and Valery. However, Sir, I note that the Resolution here before me applies only to Crab Hill.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Sports could say that something was done at Valery, because I went there with him, he honoured his pledge and something has been done at Valery. I also went with the Minister of Housing and he has dishonoured his pledge.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would just like to remind the Honourable Member, if I allow him to make reference, fair enough, but we are...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: He only made reference but he did not elaborate on that

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Valery is mine, Sir, Valery is not his.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, wait until Valery comes, but we are dealing with Crab Hill, so I hope the Honourable Member will bear that in mind.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. I do not think that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is serious, because I did make the visit with the Minister of Tourism and Sports. The land is the property of the Ministry of Housing and Lands and the Ministry of Tourism and Sports fixed the sports space, the recreational centre.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is, exactly what I am saying, Sir. The sports facilities were put there but he forgot the land he was to give to the boys at Valery to put up the pavilion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing the debate to go any further on that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On Crab Hill, Sir, he remembers Crab Hill now, because of the massive political meeting that the NDP had in Crab Hill which was followed a few weeks later, I gather, by a meeting just as large by the Barbados Labour Party.

Laughter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only problem I have is that the laughter in this Chamber sometimes puts me off. I wonder if Members would remember that the Mighty Charmer gave a description of varying laughs. I would not like the Chamber to choose the last class laugh. I think we can choose another laugh. 9.00 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Sir, I am very pleased to see that as a result of the intervention of the Opposition parties in Crab Hill recently that the Government has been stirred into some kind of activity. We note the significant silence of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy who has not even been stirred to speak on other matters affecting his constituency. This is a very important development for Crab Hill. I happen to know that many of the young people up there are very interested not only in this development but

they want to see further development at Duppies Bay because they regard it as one of the prime surfing areas in Barbados and where they want to make sure that this complex....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House to be speaking of the young people of Crab Hill when he sent an old time dead horse as his candidate. He must be misleading the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The important thing is, young in spirit establishing good relationships with the young people. I am very satisfied that our visit to Crab Hill was worth it because it has certainly borne fruit. I hope over the weekend to pay a visit to the Crab Hill area and let the people in Archer's Bay know what is coming up and what we have done, how the appearance of the NDP on the scene has managed to bestir the Minister and the representative in order to get things done.

Tonight, Sir, I will make sure that our candidate for the area is informed of the passage of this matter. I will be instructing him, if at all possible, from 8 o'clock tomorrow morning to be in the area and whilst he is distributing our new Newsletter to let the people know of this outstanding success that he has achieved so far.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that one should really be particularly moved by the intervention by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition. It is clear that he intends to talk on everything which comes before this Chamber tonight. I am not surprised that he did intervene in this matter.

This is a matter which was included in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party. As has rightly been said, it is mentioned under the same section which relates to Valery. I would want to compliment the Minister for bringing this Resolution here and to indicate that it is certainly most welcome. It is something which we had promised. We are hoping that we will be able to get the development going on this area as soon as possible.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the youngsters in the area know all about it. We have sat down and planned the development of it. They do not need to be informed by the Leader of the Opposition or by any candidate who he might want to take there. I do not have any particular bother about that. I would want to commend the Government on this. We are looking forward to development.

Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the predicament that the Government has found itself in. It is the Friday before Christmas, the Government wishes to get through its legislative programme to have an election no later than the third week in February. They need all the cooperation of the Opposition.

It is indeed a terrible situation that we have had the reporters and the stenographers of Parliament here since 9 o'clock this morning and the Government is not showing the caring side that it boasts of in bringing this charade since 4 o'clock to an end. If we have to come back on Monday we are coming back and we are going to talk all day long.

Imagine a simple Resolution to acquire a piece of land for a playing field which was promised in 1986 and the last Friday night before Christmas, 1990 this incompetent lot of persons parading, masquerading as a Government bring it to this House of Assembly to delay us from the responsibilities which we have to our constituents and our individual parties at 9:10 p.m.

I did not think there is anything wrong in the Leader of the Opposition exercising the freedom of speech which you claim on our behalf at the opening of this session because if the Government proved itself once again so incompetent as not to organise its business as to allow proper hearing of a No-Confidence Motion, it must take whatever alternative tactics or strategy being devised by the Opposition party.

In 1986 the Democratic Labour Party on page 21 of its Manifesto promised a cultural and sports facility at three places, Valery, Collymore Rock and at Crab Hill, St. Lucy.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: There are two? I do not know if Valery is the same place as Collymore Rock. Let us say Valery is the same place as Collymore Rock. Two in five years. It has taken all this time for the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, a Member of the Cabinet who should have an inside track to his fellow members in the Cabinet to bring this Resolution to Parliament. I must say that I find myself totally in consonance with the observations of the Leader of the Opposition that it has only been since the intervention of the two Opposition parties in Crab Hill that this Resolution has appeared. 9.10p.m.

Fortunately, I can say, and I want to speak very straightforwardly about this, I did not see or attend the NDP meeting in Crab Hill, but the Honourable Member for St. Peter and myself did go on the Wednesday or the Thursday night to Crab Hill to speak in support of the Labour Party's. We drove behind each other because I am not familiar with the parish of St. Lucy. I confess that openly. It is a gap in my geography. The Honourable Member for St. Peter led me to Crab Hill through the showers, the thunder and the lightning. Fortunately when we got to Crab Hill, it had all subsided and we had a nice - I am not going to paint a picture that was not true - spot meeting. I am not going to say that it was a massive meeting. It was not. We had a nice meeting of probably 120 people. I call it a spot meeting. It was unannounced and so on. But the rapport with the people from St. Lucy warmed my heart, as the Leader of the northern team for the Barbados Labour Party. We did speak - and the Honourable Member for St. Lucy will have it on his tape - of the neglect of the implementation of this promise for the sports facility at Crab Hill. This is more than a month ago, Sir. He has it on his tape. He would have heard us speak about it.

I will tell you how we spoke about it, Sir. We spoke about it in terms of a Manifesto promise. We spoke about it in terms of the Manifesto of the Member for St. Lucy who promised 54 different things to be done in five years. With these now, he will have achieved 6. If this and Archer's Bay go through, he would have achieved 6 of the 54.

But I must make it very clear that I am convinced and I shall be returning to Crab Hill shortly to let the people know that the campaign we waged for a sports facility at Crab Hill has borne fruit because we goaded the Government and the Member for St. Lucy into action to pass the resolution. By the time the action comes, the facility will not have been established. Whoever is going to be responsible for sporting activities in the Barbados Labour Party government will have the pleasure of delivering this to the people of St. Lucy.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No. Tell the truth, if Attorney-General and Sport could be amalgamated, I would love that, more than anything else.

Sir, there have been several attempts made to develop individual development plans for parishes.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no, no. For parishes. The St. John Development Plan was a fraud and was stillborn. I am talking until my half hour is out. We had the St. John Development Plan in which is included some recreational facility. It is a strange thing, a rural parish....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member is irrelevant to the resolution, Sir. He is not germane. I do not mind him speaking for his half hour. Speak for your half hour. Speak about Crab Hill and the Resolution before us. I will be in you, each time.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the fact that you have not ruled on the vacuous intervention impels me to the conclusion that you, more sober than those on that side, well appreciate that I have to have an opportunity to develop my trend of thought I was linking the St. Lucy Development Plan that has not come on stream at all with the St. John Development Plan that was fashioned by two white men for some poor black people in St. John.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is a mulatto. Two white men and the mulatto and foisted for electoral purposes, on the people of St. John. I did not say....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member is breaching the Rules of the Chamber. He is out of order. He is irrelevant to the resolution, the matter before us.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was comparing St. Lucy with St. John. I am sure you would allow that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Comparisons are odious. In this case, it may very well be. What I would suggest to the Honourable Member is that I have given him, as I always do, some time to develop his point. But if you just make the reference and pass on there is no problem there.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not going to dwell upon it at all, Sir. I accept your strictures. I was comparing the way that the St. John Development Plan had either come into being or not come into being, vis-a-vis the St. Lucy Development Plan which is coming at the end of the government's last days.

The 54 prong programme that the Member for St. Lucy had for development in St. Lucy has been as disastrous, in concept, as his actual experience, as the Minister of Trade where he has disgraced. I am sorry, Sir. I will withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the Honourable Member....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will withdraw that word, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not so sure the Honourable Member read the resolution you know. I would ask the Clerk to read it for you again because I am starting to believe that you might not have heard what the Resolution was.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, I am moving slowly to the point like a crab. We are in Crab Hill.

Mr. SPEAKER:... for recreational purposes.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you all will adjourn the House, I will stop. If you all insist on going on, I can keep going on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member has now explained to me the problem. If the Honourable Member wants to speak, he will directly to the resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am speaking directly to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my view, if you are not, it is very easy to ask the Honourable Member to take his seat. Speak to the Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That would be as Merchant of Venice said, "The most unkindest cut" if you ask me to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not be unkind to you. I am very kind to you by asking you which I know you can do, to speak to the Resolution.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am going to speak to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very closely to it.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But I am going to speak to the resolution, according to my own intuitions and my own nuances. This is 12 hours we have been here. Those poor people up there.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We cannot do all of these today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member has concluded his speech then I will ask him to take his seat

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if you would just....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am trying very hard.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you pull the wig a little closer to your ears, Sir, so that I can have a *sotto voce* with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy....

Mr. SPEAKER: Not standing. Mr.

D. A. C. SIMMONS: Pardon?

Mr. SPEAKER: If you are standing, you are addressing myself. There cannot be any *sotto voce*. I would just ask the Honourable Member....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very patient with the Honourable Member.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, with respect, Sir. I am being very, very serious. I am trying to get some signals from the Government benches. We have been in here a long day, over 12 hours.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to hear the Member.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If we agree something, fine.

Asides.

9.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now for the last five minutes I listened to the Honourable Member and nothing has been said to me. I believe the Honourable Member requested me to ask him to take his seat. I believe you are doing that.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not going to take my seat at all unless you order me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not do it that way, but I will do it within the framework of what we have to operate by. Within the last five minutes the Honourable Member has not said anything germane to the Resolution and it is clear to me what you are inviting me to say to you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have been listening to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: So the Resolution says to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Crab Hill for recreational purposes - nothing to do with St. John.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will omit St. John. When the Minister introduced this Resolution, I asked the Clerk of Parliament for this manifesto which is not privy to the House to check that it had been a manifesto pledge of the Democratic Party in 1986 and I found that it indeed was.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now you are repeating what you have said.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I never said it before, Sir. It was a manifesto pledge in 1986 but it was no different from the pledge of the Barbados Labour Party's candidate for St. Lucy, Mr. Roy Brathwaite, to provide sporting facilities in St. Lucy just as he had provided in his time a range of sporting facilities from Connell Town to Checker Hall. That gives an indication of the seriousness with which the Members of the Government treat the provisions of recreational facilities.

Now the provision for recreational facilities is an important aspect of contemporary life in Barbados. We have had a Task Force, Sir, and I have to say this. We have had a Task Force set up by this Government and one of its recommendations was that there be an extended provision or, if you like, an extensive provision of recreational

facilities throughout Barbados to provide a facility or a series of facilities to which young people could resort for the better utilization of their leisure time. One would have assumed that this range of facility would have spanned from the point in St. Philip...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is irrelevant to this Resolution and if I have to remind you again I will certainly ask you to take your seat. The Resolution is very clear and straight forward.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful, Sir, that the people of Crab Hill to whom I spoke no more than four weeks ago and promised that we would fight as the Labour Party on their behalf for this recreational facility to develop the minds and physical well-being of the youth of Crab Hill to participate in cricket, football, road tennis, lawn tennis, basketball, and all kinds of recreational facilities to give it our fullest expression.

Now the Democratic Labour Party promised a cultural and sports facility as Item No. 14 on Page 21 of the manifesto of the Capital Development Programme to which the Minister alluded in his opening. The Minister has been very careful to continue fooling the people in Crab Hill by not telling this House what is planned for the facility at Crab Hill. A sports and cultural facility is more than just a pavilion. They are going to acquire the land and by the end of February I will be out on the campaign. They are going to be telling the people - but we acquired the land. We are going to do this and do that. Thank heavens the people would have known that for almost five years they promised a sports and cultural facility and all they did in the time was to acquire the land.

I wish to say that the policy of the Barbados Labour Party for such a facility is an integrated project which would lend itself not only to sporting activity but provide...

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ...in Crab Hill and elsewhere which will be made more abundantly clear when our manifesto is on the road shortly. We see these facilities which are put up throughout the length and breadth of the Island as not purely physical structures but physical structures designed and built with a purpose in view. A recreational facility such as that which we are debating tonight must be of such dimension as will provide adequate accommodation for the development of cultural talents within the particular district. This is especially important, Sir, in rural areas.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, all I am saying is that a recreational facility at Crab Hill for which purpose the land is being acquired must not be a pure pavilion. It must be a facility which will allow the fullest expression of the sporting talents of the people of the district as well as the cultural talents. I am being very serious, Sir. I have said in here before in relation to the St. Thomas Secondary School that particularly in rural parishes they are not facilities to which the people from the district can resort to develop their cultural talent. We have St. Lucy Secondary School...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I can press on to 2 o'clock tomorrow morning if it comes to that. When I leave here, I am going to a Registry party. No big thing with me you know. I can spend the whole night. But I feel that if we have a recreational facility it should not be limited to just being a pavilion with changing rooms. It must be designed in such a way that it will provide a facility for people from the immediate district to develop their cultural talents. I feel that we have sold ourselves short and I am being very serious in that the Ministry of Community Development has not liaised and integrated sufficiently with the Ministry, if you like, Culture or Sport to ensure that let us say on a Monday night a particular group will have use of the facility for training for presentation of a play for the people in the district. Tuesday night you could have the facility open for visiting lecturers to come from outside to talk to the people in the district about whatever the current problem. Wednesday night, you can have it available to groups for dominoes, cards, whatever; Thursday night, something; Friday night; Saturday, cricket; Sunday, perhaps cricket and in the evening the facility can be used. Having had the experience at National Sports Council as Chairman, I think it is important that when Government erects recreational facilities there must be proper marketing of the facilities. We tend to respond - I am not being critical of Government at all in this - to the calls of people from districts for playing fields or pavilions. Each Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government included, does it, except for the Honourable Member for Christ Church East, who has not got anything. They promised him, they told him they were bringing things, they never came and he called them liars and they never denied that they were liars. 9.30 p.m.

Be that as it may, I think we have to ensure that when people of a district ask for a facility that the responsible Government agency does its homework to ensure that really (a) it is needed, and (b) it is going to be properly utilised. The Honourable Minister of Sports can tell you of our experience with Lowlands, where tennis courts were put down. They were not properly utilised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your time has expired and I suppose you and the Minister of Sports can discuss that

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am much obliged, Sir.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I agree with most of what the Honourable Member who just took his seat said, except that it will be an NDP Minister of Sports who will have to deal with it next year. I guess as Leader of the Opposition then, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West will have his say on the matter.

When I got into Crab Hill a few Sunday nights ago....

Asides.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot even hear myself now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not even so sure if you know what the Resolution is, because of the way you have started. I am not so sure if the Resolution that we are talking about is what you are required to talk about.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is an unfair attack on me, because I have only made one sentence so far, I have not said anything yet, so how do you know what I am going to say? I just said "as I arrived in Crab Hill a few Sunday nights ago," and you said I was not talking on the Resolution. Is that not where the Resolution is dealing with? Crab Hill?

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly it did not impress me that that is what the Resolution is about. Arriving in Crab Hill has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: I have to get there before I deal with the land, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are acquiring land in Crab Hill, not arriving.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: But don't I have to satisfy you, Sir, that I know about the land we are acquiring? I am trying, Sir, to satisfy you.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is about time that Members in this Chamber who have boasted about the high educational content expect a Presiding Officer to know when a person is irrelevant. Surely Members can do better.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: But I have not said anything yet, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is dealing with the acquisition of land to provide for a sports and cultural facility, as the Minister tells us. It says that the parcel of land described in the Schedule is for the provision of

recreational facilities. It goes on to say that the land is at Crab Hill and I will assume that the acquisition of land has to do with the provision of these recreational facilities.

What I was saying to you, Sir, is that I am supporting the Resolution, because having gone into Crab Hill a few Sunday nights ago and hearing from a number of people in that area, particularly persons who....

His Honour J. J. PAYNE: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member started off by saying that he went to Crab Hill and he is now repeating himself. That is entirely against the rules. He cannot do it

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: ... and having heard from a number of persons in Crab Hill, particularly young people, that they needed to have some attention paid to them in terms of these kinds of facilities, it obviously made me feel very glad to see that we are going to be dealing with the acquisition of land for this purpose.

The feeling among the youth in Crab Hill, the feeling among people in general in St. Lucy, who I am sure will be using this facility in Crab Hill, is that the present parliamentary representative has not looked after their interest in this regard. Although the Honourable Member for St. Lucy really had nothing to tell us about it, I am sure that you will agree that if you were the representative in St. Lucy and after four years something appears to be happening in terms of provision of these facilities, you would have been able to come in here and make a proper intervention in terms of what you would be putting in as far as recreational facilities are concerned.

All it says here, Sir, is "recreational facilities". The Minister got up and said something about a sports and cultural centre. What that means, I, like the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, do not really fully understand. It means that it is a sports and cultural centre, but providing what kind of facilities? A sports and cultural centre could very well be the galvanise shed that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy already has in Crab Hill. They play dominoes and have a few dances there. They do not have any sweet cakes down there, so do not worry about it

One would also have expected to have heard something from the Honourable Minister of Sports as to what plans his Ministry has for that facility at Crab Hill, for which we are dealing with a Resolution to acquire the land. We would like to know how that fits in with the national programme, if there is such a thing. Whether or not he speaks to you, Sir, I do not know, but in terms of his Ministry and in terms of the National Sports Council. One would have expected to hear from the Honourable Minister with responsibility for community development to get a better field for what is planned for the centre which is hoped to be constructed. I would hope that we are not just here talking about acquisition of land and that this talk

about a centre being put up is not just that kind of talk that comes at this time just prior to an election where people then have the feeling that something is going to happen and you may be able to encourage the people to vote for you in that way. 9.40p.m.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central *sotto voce* asked me if I cannot put in a word for Silver Hill. You know that we are dealing with Crab Hill and I cannot talk about Silver Hill. I cannot accommodate him. You have already made it very clear to me that....

Hon. M. A. KING: I do not know what the Honourable Member is trying to drag me into this debate for. If he has nothing to say he should really sit down.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: If I may press on. I leave him to his friends. He knows who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I really rose to make this short intervention because I am honestly as concerned as the people of Crab Hill and the people of St. Lucy are that for all this time, after the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has fooled around with them, made promises to them, all of a sudden you have a lot of English teachers in here, people like Harold Blackman that cannot even pronounce the "bad" without calling it b-e-d. Suddenly he is going to tell me what to say now.

Aside.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: The Honourable Member for St. John went to Combermere School too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member is addressing myself. You keep addressing the Chair.

Mr. P. J. M. MILLER: Remember, you might not be aware, but the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has boasted to me on many occasions that Crab Hill is his stronghold. He is now in a situation where it was his stronghold. I know he has no stronghold anywhere in St. Lucy now. One would have hoped that if, in fact, Crab Hill was his stronghold and that he owed his position in this Honourable Chamber mainly to the people of Crab Hill, that at least those are the ones he would have looked out for most of all but what do we have? We have a situation where he gets up in here, says nothing about it, does not tell us what it is, how it is going to benefit the people of Crab Hill or anywhere in St. Lucy. He does not even tell us when he hopes it will get started. Nothing of the sort.

We are no wiser than when we came in here in terms of what is going to happen in Crab Hill after this land is acquired. I am just, on behalf of the people of Crab Hill and St. Lucy, asking the Minister if he gets another opportunity or if he can tell us via the media or something what he is really putting up in Crab Hill. Are we getting a bigger version of the little galvanise shed he has down there? Is that all it is? If it is not, then tell us what it is.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, this Resolution deals with acquiring land at Crab Hill, St. Lucy for recreational facilities. This House has been going from 9:00 this morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that to do with the Resolution? That has nothing to do with the Resolution.

Mr. R. P. BYER: At this time of the day people's patience is wearing a little thin.

Aside.

Mr. R. P. BYER: I am not laughing because I have reached a stage now where I see how the game is played in Parliament. I am getting to know the rules. We all will play by the rules as we go on. The rules change as we go on. The Leader of Government Business in the House has control over what happens.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to suggest to the Honourable Member I have the same rules that I was given when I came to this Chair. If the Honourable Member knows of any rule that has changed he should draw it to my attention so that I would be able to make sure that I am not ruling by rules that are not given to me.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, at no time was I reflecting on the Chair. I am talking about the rules on the Floor of the House, as it were. It has nothing to do with the Standing Orders or what is contained therein. It has to do with the lack of communication between the Opposition and the Government party. That is what I am talking about. That is where I believe the problem started.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the people in St. Lucy, especially the people in Crab Hill, are getting some recreational facilities. I am all for recreational facilities being made available to the people in the various parishes. It was a Manifesto pledge of the Democratic Labour Party. They have moved to fulfil it. What I would have liked to find out from the Minister of Housing - these questions were raised before - what the project would consist of? I know it is never given but, certainly, if you decide to acquire land for a specific purpose I would have thought that you would have some idea of what the purpose that is

being fulfilled? In this case you have recreational facilities, what would be the extent of those facilities?

You just do not go and acquire 12.843 acres of land to put a cricket pitch in the middle of it and a pavilion at the end of it. You must have some conception of what you are going to put on it? I do not know what it has in, if it has in three or four gullies or whatever. I want to know what it is going to be for. That is a legitimate question. You are going to tell me that I am talking foolishness? The Minister of Housing always has...

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Resolution that we are doing, Mr. Speaker, says that we are acquiring 1.623 hectares of land at St. Lucy. Now, I do not know if that is 12 acres. If you can convert that and get it to 12 acres, well then we are acquiring 12 acres.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I heard you ask a question in relation to an Honourable Member just to know whether he was talking on the Resolution. The Minister of Housing just got up and introduced the Resolution. I have a paper in front of me. I have so many papers in front of me. The Schedule says:

"all that certain piece or parcel of land the property of Crab Hill Estates Limited situate at Archers Bay in the parish of Saint Lucy in this Island containing by admeasurement 12.843 acres or thereabouts..."

Whose fault is that? Is it mine? This is the one that I have here. I do not care what you say. 9.50 p.m.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. I specifically got up and introduced a resolution saying, "For the acquisition of 1.62" - I did not even put on the 23. I said, "1.6 hectares of land". That is what we are debating. If you go and pick up a resolution that says 12 acres, well you are reading the wrong resolution. That is all.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, whatever the area of the land, whether it is 12 acres, 1.6 hectares or what, the point is that if you are going to acquire that amount of land, you should have some conception of what you are going to put on it. You just do not go out there and take up land without knowing what you are going to put on it.

I want to find out, as I was saying a legitimate question, what you are going to put on it? Are you just going to put a cricket pitch and one pavilion or what? What kind of facilities are you going to put there? That is what I want to find out. Are you going to provide hiking facilities or what? That is all I want to know, Sir. There is nothing difficult about that. There is nothing magical about it. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am a bit confused because I have been served two papers, one telling me....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has just clarified the position.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I have noticed that we are dealing with roughly 4 acres of land; at Crab Hill to provide....

Asidr

Mr. E. BOURNE: i have two. Both of them playing facilities for the people in St. Lucy.

I am saying that with all this land in St. Lucy, why would you only look for a meagre 4 acres for a playing field? Will this playing field accommodate cricket? Four acres will not be enough to provide a full size cricket field and a pavilion.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am telling you.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Acres, yes. It cannot provide a full 75 yards boundary. You are looking for a cat's pan. You are providing a cat's pan for the people in St. Lucy. In Sargant's Village, Sir, if I may divert a bit...

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Do not tell me, "No". You are not the Speaker. You are not controlling this. Three acres....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always allowed you to make references but not to expand.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am making a reference, Sir. I am referring to Sergeant's Village which is 3 acres and it is very little bigger than a sardine pan. Four acres are inadequate to make a proper cricket field.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I represent a constituency wherein lies one of the greatest cricket grounds in the world called Empire. It is one fifth the size of what we are about to acquire. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. It produced Worrell, Weekes, Walcott and a large coterie of world class cricketers, .0621 hectares.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not speaking about a little twos and fours boundary. I am speaking about a full sized cricket field. Empire is not a full sized cricket field. The boundaries are threes and fours and something

like it Twos and threes or something like that. I am speaking about the full sized 75 yard boundary. That should be the size.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Why do we not need it in St. Lucy?

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: It cannot give you that with a pavilion. You cannot get it.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I know cricket well too. I had the best BCL team in Barbados for years, Sherbourne. You see, the Honourable Minister knows about Sherbourne.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stay with the resolution.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Sir, I should like to know why is it that the Democratic Labour Party likes to wait ages before they would attempt to deliver the goods? This was promised almost five years ago like most things in the country districts of Barbados. At the last minute, when lots of pressure is put on the Ministers, you see them trying to make an effort to bamboozle the populace. Because, Sir, this is just what it is, bamboozling. All that is going to happen here, like in most other places, is that this land will be acquired and nothing more will be done to it. It is a policy of this Government. Many of us were promised all kinds of things.

I remember having a meeting in Crab Hill a few weeks ago. A man came to me with a long list he said, "Skipper, I do not know you, but I heard about you. I want you to talk about these things for me. I want you to talk about these things in Parliament."

Mr. SPEAKER: I want you to talk about the acquisition of land at Crab Hill. I am not concerned with any list of anything. I am concerned with the acquisition of land at Crab Hill for recreational facilities. I want you to confine yourself to that resolution.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I am dealing with the Resolution. I am dealing with Crab Hill.

The gentleman was telling me about the promise made in Crab Hill about these recreational facilities, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: And the acquisition of land. Mr.

E. BOURNE: And the acquisition of land. Mr.

SPEAKER: Continue.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I should like to know from the Minister, what type of facilities we will have at Crab Hill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has already clarified that.

Mr. E. BOURNE: He talked about the acquisition, Sir, but he did not tell me what facilities would be at Crab Hill.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is aware. All this is to do is to acquire land for recreational purposes. It is not the business of the Minister acquiring the land to give any details about the pavilion, about any specifications. I submit that calls for such details, Sir, are attempts to mislead the House.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, because it has never happened before, does it stand to reason that it should not happen now? I should like to know if only a toilet facility will go on the property because I will be asked, in a short time tonight, to vote on this measure. I would like to know what I am voting for. I do not believe in voting blindly. I am not going to vote for any acquisition for recreational facilities and I do not know what the recreational facilities are and when I vote against it you will be unhappy. You will be telling the people that you brought a good measure to the House and we voted against it. So I would like to be able to tell the people in Crab Hill when I visit them another time that I have supported a resolution to acquire land for recreational facilities and the recreational facilities are such and such and such, and had it not been for us putting a lot of pressure on your representative this land would not have been acquired neither would the recreational facilities be at least talked about because I cannot guarantee that they will be provided. 10.00 p.m.

I would hope, Sir, that when the Minister sums up he will let me know what is really going to happen in Crab Hill, St. Lucy. I thank you, Sir.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give support to this Resolution and to make a few comments because some of the Members of the Opposition have used their facility with words to bring plausibility to an argument that is devoid of reason and sometimes bordered on the asinine. I wish to say, Sir, that there is no question of any pressure. Whether there were meetings by the NDP or by the BLP in Crab Hill, that is their business. It has nothing to do with me. I have been the Minister responsible for Sports since June 1, 1986 and it has been my intention, Sir, to make sure that sporting facilities in Barbados will easily be the best anywhere in the Caribbean and they have been. So that when we have gone to Crab Hill in an effort to acquire land so that facilities can go in there, Sir, it is the same as the facilities that are at Waverly. Those were put in at Valery. They were put in, Sir, when the then Member on this side came to me and we visited the place, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling will stand firm for everyone. If you make reference do not expand.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I will not expand, Sir. Suffice it to say...

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I am not like some of those people out there who speak in paragraphs and not in sentences. Therefore, you cannot understand them. I speak in sentences and you can understand me quite clearly.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I know. You have said that there are Members on this side that are ignorant. You have said we are wicked. Sir, I would just like to point out that the Government is very anxious to make sure that the sporting facilities for the people of Barbados are the best in the Caribbean. We have got some 70 playing fields, 30 pavilions, and 40 hard courts and every Member, Sir, in here of all 27 constituencies can say without fear of contradiction that something as far as recreational facilities has been done in every constituency. This is not a Government, Sir, that has not been able to do things. We have done this and we have gone too in Crab Hill, St. Lucy. I do not have as Minister of Sports to get up and say that we are going to build this and we are going to build that.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I do not. You cannot tell me what I have to say. I do not have to tell you anything. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I have to tell you with most respect that...

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: ...arrogance. I can afford to be arrogant with you. I am saying, Sir, as far as I am concerned that we are looking forward to going down into Crab Hill, Sir, and giving the people of St. Lucy as we have done in Checker Hall, great facilities. Sir, it is normal practice to acquire land first of all. This is what a responsible Government does. You acquire the land, then you set about putting in the necessary facilities. At Checker Hall for instance, Sir, it was a big playing field. When there was a road cut on the eastern part, they went down and told the people that we were running a road right through the playing field. What we did, Sir, was to proceed to put in a pavilion and a hard court. You had to do it, Sir, as your expenditure allows. This Government has been accused, Sir, day in and day out, every day, all day and all night like Mary-Ann. They have been accusing, Sir, of runaway expenditure yet they want lights, roads, and recreational facilities.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want the Honourable Member to abide by my ruling. Let us stay with the project in Crab Hill. Let us stay there. Continue.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I, therefore, wish to state, Sir, that I am congratulating the Government on acquiring this land. It is nearly a year, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and I went to Crab Hill, looked at the land, and we decided that it was suitable for recreational facilities, Sir. I am putting it to you, Mr. Speaker, that four acres of land is sufficient I say so, Sir. Four acres of land is sufficient to have recreational facilities, Sir. I am saying, Sir, that four acres of land is a lot of land to play cricket on, Sir. It will provide for a full size cricket field and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows absolutely nothing about a cricket field or football because when I went to Valery with him he was totally ignorant, Sir, of what was required.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He might say that I cannot play cricket but he cannot say that I do not know anything about it. I am one of the best informed persons in this country about cricket I could tell you, for example, that you tried to bowl a bouncer at Dexter at Lord's in 1963 and he hooked you over mid-on. I could tell you that

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, for the record, it would be rather impervious of any batsman in my time to hook me, Sir, far less mid-on. That is nonsense.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no need for that kind of intervention.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I was only making the point that when you are developing a playing field you put things in motion. You acquire the land and then you develop the field as your finances will allow. There are many playing fields in Barbados, Sir. That is what we have to do. I am not standing here tonight, Sir, and telling any Member of the Opposition that we are putting in a cow shed, pavilion, or what. We are acquiring four acres of land for recreational facilities and I promise the whole world that as long as the money is available we would look to make sure that the people of Crab Hill have improved facilities and that is important.

With those few words, Sir, I will retire. But if you force me to return, I shall.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, just two points. The Opposition keeps harping on the fact that there are things in the Manifesto and it appears to the Opposition that if you do not do the things in the Manifesto in the first year or the second year then you have disappointed people. The things that are put in a manifesto are things that a

Government would like to do in a period of five years if it is possible to do it, not in a month. So every time they get up they say that you promised this in 1986 and you only did it in 1988. You promised it in 1986 and you only did it in 1990. A manifesto is a five year document of what a Government intends to do if it is able to do it in five years. That is one point.

The next point, Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how the Opposition can range from the sublime to the ridiculous. Earlier this year you heard how the Ministry of Housing takes long to do anything. Now today I heard from the Opposition that in three weeks' time we acquired land in St. Lucy. This acquisition was going on since February. I have explained to this House already why it takes long to acquire land. The Minister has been asking for it for a long time, but the negotiation for this acquisition started in February, not three weeks ago when you had a meeting. Do not be silly. 10.10p.m.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ARCHER'S BAY, ST. LUCY FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is seeking parliamentary approval to acquire approximately 12 acres of land at Archer's Bay in accordance with Government's proposal to establish a national park along the north and east coasts of the country.

The acquisition of this land is for the provision of recreational facilities. We were trying it by private treaty, but we have run into some problems. We have to acquire it under the Land Acquisition Act, and this Resolution seeks the approval of Parliament to acquire this portion of land at Archer's Bay.

With those words, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a short intervention on this acquisition to give a history surrounding it. In May 1976 I introduced a Resolution into this Parliament, which was passed, in the following terms:

"WHEREAS Archer's Bay, St. Lucy is recognised and appreciated by Barbadians for natural beauty and attraction which it offers;

AND WHEREAS the area of land which is presently used by the public at Archer's Bay is privately owned;

AND WHEREAS it is in the interest of the nation that the amenities of this area should be permanently available to the community;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government to consider such steps as may be appropriate to convert and develop Archer's Bay, St. Lucy into a national park."

Elections were held in September, 1976 and the Resolution was re-introduced into Parliament in May, 1977. The then Government, in an effort to play down the effect of the Resolution, went about this matter in a rather roundabout way. I recall that just prior to the debate on the Resolution the then Minister responsible for lands made a statement in the House, the gist of which was that the Government had taken a decision to declare from Archer's Bay, St. Lucy to Ragged Point, St. Philip as a national park.

Up to this day I do not think that anybody could explain clearly what was the intention, and certainly what was supposed to happen in that particular area. A check with the Town and Country Planning Department would indicate that they are totally unclear about this particular policy statement. Indeed, I understand that it had the effect of restricting development in that particular area. Be that as it may, I think the wheel has come full circle. The Barbados Labour Party indicated from 1977 that this was their intention. Of course, ten years went by and absolutely nothing happened in that particular area, and so it has fallen to the Democratic Labour Party to pursue this particular matter.

It should be pointed out, however, as the Minister has pointed out in his introduction, that there were a lot of problems which developed relating to the acquisition of this land, problems which I would not want to go into, suffice it to say that the position has been reached where we can now clearly get a position and be in a better position to proceed with this acquisition. As a result we are having this Resolution here today.

I think it is generally accepted by persons who know Archer's Bay that it is an ideal location for the development of a national park and since within recent years the Government has been putting a lot of emphasis on the development of these kinds of facilities, I suppose it is good that we are moving in this direction, because it would enable us to develop Archer's Bay into the concept for recreation and, generally speaking, the kind of facility that would enable people to visit, to relax and of course to have

the kind of environment there that would be a credit to this country, and certainly also be a credit to St. Lucy.

I have the greatest pleasure, Sir, in supporting this Resolution and to say that I want to commend the Minister for taking the step to give effect to an idea which was developed, and certainly to a Resolution which had passed this Parliament in 1976 and again in 1977.

I thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not going to take issue tonight with anything that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has said, I just think that it has been grossly unfair on our part to keep the Reporters up there until 21 minutes past 10 o'clock, and I think we should pass this Resolution and adjourn this House of Assembly. We have been here since 9 o'clock this morning, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am interested in learning from the Leader of the House what the position is. Is this the final item of the evening?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, Sir, if the Honourable Member will not give the commitment, I will proceed. 10.20 p.m.

Sir, I am advised by my colleagues in this House that the interpretation of what the Honourable Leader of the House said can honourably be interpreted that this should be the last item. I have seen the area. I have made one or two investigations and I am quite satisfied at the moment. I say no more.

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

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Cabinet to lay the following document-

1. Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the causes and collapse of Trade Confirmers (B'dos) Ltd.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I also give notice of the following:-

1. Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at Cluffs, St. Lucy, for housing development.
2. The Companies (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1990.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I wish to draw to the House's attention that the Reporters are not in their place.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT the Companies (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill was read a first time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I would also state, ^ Mr. Speaker, that there is a Resolution which has been circulated, an omnibus money resolution, which will take the place of another resolution which is listed as No. 10 on the Order Paper. I am just stating that for Honourable Members' benefit.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: At this point, Sir, I am going to move the adjournment of this House. In doing so let me state that we have been sitting for a very long time. Even though the Reporters are apparently not in their places to hear this, I still would like to thank them for the extended time that they have been at their desks and at the work during this day. I regret the circumstances that have brought this about. We all know the circumstances. I hope that when we meet again on Monday that we would be able to conclude the business of the Government.

At this point I am moving that the House do now adjourn until Monday, December 24, 1990 at 9:30 a.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Sitting...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I really must speak on this adjournment. I believe that the Leader of the House has organised this House's business in the most scandalous manner that I have seen in my 19 years in this House. I believe that in moving an adjournment for Christmas Eve the Government is obviously in great confusion. I have never seen a Government wait until the last minute to bring before the House regardless of the state of its employees legislation of this nature in the hope of finishing it regardless of what happens. It shows no consideration for the House.

I am also amazed and appalled that Government should allow a no-confidence motion of such a nature to remain for so long without dealing with it adequately. It really is not the way that the Government should organise the public's business at this time in the history of the country.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Speaking, Sir, on the adjournment as well, let me say that I am somewhat

ashamed and embarrassed as well that the Government has just paid scant regard to established parliamentary traditions in respect of debating a no-confidence motion. Sir, we will be here on whatever date they adjourn the House to do the people's business. However, I think it is most unfortunate to have a crowded Order Paper come before Parliament at this stage. It not only shows the confusion but the incompetence and the disorder reigning in Government circles. 10.30 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it has been the tradition that the business of the House is organized by the Leader of the House. The statement by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West that the Government's business was organized in a scandalous fashion, Sir, is an assault on the traditions of this House. It is improper to say that it was organized in a scandalous way when the Order Paper has not been interfered with, the business having been brought in the usual way. To ignore the fact that the business was delayed by one Member speaking for more than five hours is not only disgraceful, Sir, it is the height of irresponsibility if not dishonesty for anyone to ignore the fact that during the sitting that we spent more than nine hours on one item. Then we saw filibustering, the likes of which we have never seen coming from the other side.

Certain remarks made by Hon. B. M. TAITT and Hon. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. DA. C. SIMMONS were ordered, by Mr. SPEAKER, to be expunged from the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I want to say this. I would never have thought that Honourable Members who have been brought up in the tradition of a dignified Chamber should behave....

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, if you do not want to be dignified, I could ask you to leave.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask Honourable Members.....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will Honourable Members keep quiet.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, I have asked Honourable Members to be quiet.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am also asking the Member....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER The question is that this sitting be now ...

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to move, Sir, the sitting be suspended until Monday, December 24, 1990 at 9.30 a.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 10.35 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think Honourable Members should pay special attention to Rules 38 and 39. We know that the sound system is not working at the moment but I wish to remind Honourable Members that the question of Rules should be observed. I should like to remind Honourable Members particularly of Rule 38 and Rule 39. I suppose Members can read those Rules and they will be observed. This is my only comment this morning in view of the fact that the sound system is not in operation.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to suspend the sitting for 5 minutes.

The question that the Sitting be suspended for 5 minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 9.35 a.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1990-91 NO. 11
- \$3 490 920

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the passing of this Resolution for the sum of \$3 490 920. In respect of Subhead 1, a total of some \$42 201 is required for this particular Head - Prime Minister's office. The sum is required to meet the expenditure and commitments towards the end of the current financial year.

Under Subhead 1 the supplementary required is \$6 577. This is because the sum of \$26 760 which was provided in the current Estimates will prove to be insufficient to meet the obligations during the remainder of the current financial year. At the end of November 1990 some \$23 854 had been spent A balance of \$2 906 remains. That is inadequate for the remainder of the current financial year. Therefore, the supplement of \$6 577 is being requested.

Sir, there have been some payments here. The insufficiency of the funds has resulted from the payment of substitutes and acting allowances in respect of the Data Processing Department. No provision had been made by that Department for the substitute and acting allowances.

Under subhead 3 - Central Emergency Relief Organisation the supplementary required is \$5 983. The balance in the vote approved by Parliament is just \$113 at the end of November 1990. The sum of \$5 983 is being requested by way of supplementary provision.

Under subhead 5 - Printing Department, a supplement of \$998 is required. This is because the amount voted has turned out to be insufficient again because allowances for the months of February and March of the last financial year amounting to \$541 had to be paid out of the current year's provision. Therefore, that amount has to be replaced and a small sum in addition is required. The total supplement being requested for the Printing Department is \$998.

Under Maintenance of Property, Sir, \$14 724 is being requested by way of supplementary provision. The amount voted is inadequate. It is unlikely to last until the end of the current financial year. This is due in part to the fact that there was a need to replace circuit boards for the Polar guillotine. These proved to be costly amounting to some \$14 051. Additionally, there were other mechanical failures which were not anticipated. Supplementary provision in the sum of \$14 724 is being requested then, Sir. 9.50 a.m.

Then, Sir, a supplement of \$11 518 is being requested under Operating Expenses, which relates to the use of

outside professional services, in relation to conferences, official visits and other local events. The amount in the vote is inadequate so a supplement of \$11 S18 is being requested.

In total, the amount being requested for Head 13, Sir, is \$42 201 for the purposes which I have indicated.

I beg to move, Sir, lhat Head 13 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, my first comment, on this matter, relates to the significant percentage increases in some of these heads. For example, under subhead 3, Central Emergency Relief Organization, we see under travel, an increase from \$4 600. That is being increased by \$2 401, almost a 50% increase. I think we have repeatedly pointed out, on the Floor of this House, that when Estimates are being supplemented by these large percentages, it casts serious doubts on the accuracy of the original Estimates which were brought before the House. This has been a continuing pattern in the supplementaries which we have seen, before this House, in recent times.

The area under subhead 3, Central Emergency Relief Organization, CERO perhaps the Honourable Prime Minister can let the House know, if he so wishes, what steps have been taken to improve the status of this organization in this financial year, bearing in mind the man-made and the natural disasters which we have had, in the Caribbean recently and whether or not, CERO has been co-operating to establish some kind of regional arrangement which will assist in dealing with disaster preparedness.

I think it is becoming increasingly evident that the Caribbean, as a whole, has to be better prepared to deal with disaster, not only at the unit level but also at the regional level. I thought that the Prime Minister might have taken this opportunity to let us know .what additional steps have been taken. For example, we have had, in Barbados as you know, flooding occasionally, we have had threats of hurricanes. We have had threats of a major fire in Bridgetown and so on. Particularly, Sir, in the area of medical preparedness, what mechanisms are in place? I know that there has been a recent medical conference in Barbados dealing with emergency medicine. I do not know to what extent CERO was involved. I am always concerned as to whether or not, we have the capacity in Barbados to respond to the medical requirements of a major disaster.

Certainly, our resources have not been severely tested because apart from the downing of the CUBANA Airways some time go, I do not think we have had to deal in Barbados with any significant loss of lives on any single occasion other than that, since Hurricane Janet in 1955. But it is important. This is now becoming a highly specialized

area of medicine. I know that we have had quite a range of experts here only a few weeks ago at a conference at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. But to what extent have we benefitted from that?

I should like to know if there is any emphasis, within CERO now, on upgrading the preparedness of the country to handle major medical emergencies, as our community has become more and more internationalized, as we have more and more flights -into Barbados particularly with the large jets and so on. I wonder what is being done to ensure the capacity of this country to deal with a major disaster of that nature.

I believe. Sir, that a lot of emphasis in the past has been on preparedness to deal with hurricanes. Since that was the major threat which we were exposed to in the past, although fortunately we have not been the victims of any major damage in recent times. Is our preparedness beyond that? I think this is something that we need to look at very carefully.

Perhaps when the Prime Minister responds, he can give us some idea of the range of focus of CERO and what particular areas they are really getting themselves prepared to deal with. Perhaps the Honourable Minister of Aviation can tell us, give us a rundown of what preparedness there is at Grantley Adams Airport

In the area of printing, I have noticed one or two documents circulated which seem to me to be the putting together of a number of speeches made by -I am not sure written by - the Right Honourable Prime Minister and whether or not that was a cost to the Printing Department and if so, whether or not that was a justifiable expense to have arranged for that through Government I think that information should be made available.

In the area of data processing, we spend a lot of money in this area. I am quite unhappy with the performance of the Data Processing Department. It seems that very little is being done to upgrade that Department I think again and again, we have pointed out that in a critical area such as the tourism sector of Barbados, that it is almost impossible to get hard data until several months have passed on simple things, simple things like tourist arrivals and tourist departures. Is it a matter of staff? Are the computer facilities available being adequately utilised? Is the computer time available being adequately utilised? 10.00 a.m.

We have also had a very unfortunate situation recently of bogus employment figures being put out to the country and I wonder whether or not there is any arrangement for checking those kinds of figures.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interrupt the Honourable Member.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Don't interrupt me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member will withdraw that statement

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which statement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While I am speaking you cannot be speaking and in that manner to the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not want to be interrupted unnecessarily....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member will take his seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will take my seat whilst you speak, but I am not sitting down permanently.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have a little difficulty in recognising why we should go on to the Data Processing Department, since as far as I am aware this particular Head does not relate to any matter from the Data Processing Department.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely amazed, because the Prime Minister in introducing Subhead **1 made it clear that the \$6,577 was related to the Data Processing Department**. Are you saying that the Prime Minister has misled and misinformed the House? If you are saying it has nothing to do with it, then I am very sorry. May I take my seat whilst I get an explanation from the Prime Minister, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am dealing with the Addendum to the Resolution as I see it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, it says "Other Personal Emoluments \$26,760," and "Other Expenditure \$6,577." In my notes, whilst the Prime Minister was speaking he said that that related to the Data Processing Department. But if it is your ruling, Sir, that I cannot speak on that, I will take my seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I believe that all Honourable Members, when they are called to order by the Chair should peacefully and in an orderly manner take their seats. There is no need for us in this House to be truculent or rude to the Chair, or indeed to one another. The Chair is making a point and I believe the Member should sit down and hear what the point is.

In this particular instance we are dealing with this supplementary and I did say that it related to substitutes and acting allowances in respect of the Data Processing

Department. All that is required to be done is a civil response to the point being made by the Chairman and let us pass on. Let us not waste time again in spinning these matters out. They are simple matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is made.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, they may be simple matters, but I intend to defend the rights of this Opposition at all times. I am pleased to hear that the Prime Minister has indicated that he said when he was speaking that that amount of \$6,577 related to substitutes and acting allowances in the Data Processing Department. Now, Sir, I think that is the crux of the matter.

I do not think that the Data Processing Department is an area where you should find a vote being inflated by substitutes and acting allowances. It is a highly professional Department and I think that what you need to make sure is that the Department is adequately staffed. This may be the root of the problem, the root of the problem may not be available technology, or lack of technology, or lack of adequate computer equipment, the problem may reside in the fact that you do not have a sufficiency of trained staff. I do not know if that is the problem. Perhaps you may respond to that I am just asking questions, because I think that all of us have from time to time, over the past years that **I have been inside here, raised concerns about the Data Processing Department**

I happened to know, when I was in Government, that there were repeated concerns about a variety of things, not only the equipment available, the quality of computers, the question of staffing and various other areas, so I sincerely hope that we get a response as to whether active steps are being taken to upgrade the Department. In this modern age, with the changing technology available to the world, I think the Government has to put itself in a position where it can function as any modern Government should be functioning in the closing years of this century. It means, Sir, that not only the Data Processing Department but those departments that feed information into the Data Processing Department need to be substantially upgraded as well if the Department is going to be able to perform its function.

No matter how much money and how many resources you put behind the Data Processing Department, if they have a problem, say, with the Department of Inland Revenue or a problem with the Board of Tourism or the Ministry of Tourism in terms of getting data available to them, I would like to see the day when this country has reached the point where there is an automatic link up by computer between the Data Processing Department and all Departments of Government so that there is a constant input of information and you have a body of experts who are analysing this thing on a continuing basis, so that you can get that highly developed alert system to know whatever is going on within the system at any given time, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: **One minute.**

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: May I be permitted for one minute, Sir, to give an example? If you go to any of the major banks in the world today, they would have a special room, a highly computerised room, and thousands of bits of information come from within their system and from within the international banking system. They have the equipment there to process and deal with that information almost immediately. I want to see a Data Processing Department in Barbados functioning on that basis, not on the kind of basis that existed 20 or 30 years ago, with a little piece of equipment here, a little piece of equipment there and so on. I am willing to support any measure that would try to change that Department and bring it in line with what is going on at this stage of this century.

I will be back to talk about it a little more, Sir. Thank you very much.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Member for Christ Church West proceeds, let me just make the point that my intervention while the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was speaking related purely to the Addendum and the Head as printed. I have been guided by, and I have been reminded that the Honourable Prime Minister did relate to the Data Processing Department and that regard I would like to give the Honourable Member the assurance that there was no intention to stymie his debate. 10.10a.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are welcome. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in absence of our spokesman on economic and financial matters I just want to repeat a statement that he has made in this House on numerous occasions, to the effect that it is difficult for the Labour Party Opposition to vote for supplementaries in instances where there are large, and where at times, the particular Head shows a supplementary that is almost as big and sometimes bigger than the original Head. That is the principle we have urged. The reasons for that, he has adumbrated on several occasions and I am not going to repeat for the purpose of this debate.

However, Sir, I wish to advert to a few of the departments coming under the Head of the Prime Minister and under this particular supplementary and I wish to talk first about the Printing Department. I notice there has been a change in the presentation of the Official Gazette recently. In some respect the change has brightened the Gazette but I think it is still true to say that the Official Gazette is not looked at in any sense as a publication which should be

paying its way and meeting its own printing costs. There are some jurisdictions where this has been achieved and I wonder what steps Government proposes to take to see that the Gazette appears not only in an attractive form and a timely manner but that it is also cost effective. The Gazette itself is not well marketed in Barbados or elsewhere. Normally, people have to write and apply for a Gazette. I do not believe that any effort is made to market publications coming out of the Printing Department in any serious manner.

Let me take for instance, Sir, the position of the Laws of Barbados as well as the Law Reports of Barbados. A statement heard among the profession who are the main customers of the Reports and of the Laws is that the cost is too high and that has been a deterrent to persons buying the Laws of Barbados as well as buying the Law Reports and I, myself, was amazed at the cost of the last set of Law Reports. It seemed to me that either we are not using modern printing methods in order to decrease the cost or we are not really very conscious ourselves of being able to produce these publications for a market which is out there.

I think it is generally true as well that no effort is made to market the products. Certainly, even among the legal profession from time to time we do not know that a particular publication is out and I would seriously suggest that this is a department that could be made to pay for itself in a serious manner if we take the commercial approach to the Printing Department.

There is also a failure, Sir, at times, to provide within the Gazette itself, if I may revert to the Gazette, much needed information. I believe that the time has come in Barbados when every tender that has been made to a Government department or a statutory board once the tender is awarded that there should be published in the Gazette the names of every person who has made a tender, the amount of the tender and the reasons where an award has been made to a higher tender, the reasons why this has been done so that the citizen can feel fully satisfied that he is getting a reasonable chance.

I said that no attempt is made to market and I want to cite one instance, for instance, Sir, and it links both the Data Department and the Printing Department together. The Data Department produces for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission the diskette which is used to provide the electoral lists. Under the legislation in the United Kingdom, such lists are sold to the public at large as well as those lists are sold for a price to the Members who may be interested in contesting elections. Here in Barbados, there seems to be a resistance to making that diskette available for persons to use which would simplify the obtaining of the relevant information for electoral purposes. I am seriously recommending that the United Kingdom legislation which makes it obligatory for the Commission to publish the information in the form in which it is held which, is in

diskette form, should be adopted and that we must not use the procedures as a way of frustrating the obtaining of necessary information and the sharing of necessary information. Technology has made a lot of difference to how we collect, store, retrieve and disseminate information and too many departments and too many people are still in the archaic age and believe that information is something that should be held to one's breast rather than published at large. I believe that we have to be much more open in our procedures. In fact, I recall myself starting an Act to publish information and to review and revise the Official Secrets Act and I believe that the time is coming when that sort of information should be openly made available.

I want as well as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, to refer to disaster preparedness in the Caribbean. Some ten years ago, various overseas agencies made money available for the establishment of a provisional headquarters in Antigua to coordinate regional disaster preparedness. That agency is on its way out and is to be succeeded according to my information by a Disaster Preparedness agency which will be run from CARICOM. Obviously, however, the Caribbean has not been in the forefront of preparedness in an area in which the Caribbean has had very disastrous experiences. We are an area that is prone, not so much to flooding, although we have had some of that, but to hurricanes, and I believe increasingly as well we may find ourselves confronted by other forms of environmental pollution whether it be toxic waste or from oil spills. But we have had very bitter experiences in the way of hurricanes.

Research has been done at various tertiary institutions in the Caribbean in this area - Martinique, and Guadeloupe. There has been quite a bit of research done at our own University of the West Indies and the University of Puerto Rico but there has been no coordination of this type of research in order to help us as a whole to plan. In fact, the Caribbean today should be taking the lead in the world in showing how one can prepare for and avoid this type of severe disruption which has cost us both in human and economic terms a tremendous amount I would hope, Sir, that the new DPA, as it is being called, and which I believe is going to be headquartered in Antigua, that the new DPA will be conscious of the research already done within this field within different Caribbean tertiary and other institutions and bring together the research, spend money on it and help us at the same time to be prepared against disaster. I said it is an area that we should be leading. Unfortunately, we are not leading. We tend to wait until the disaster occurs to be coordinating at the last moment. Sometimes there is no overall plan in place for coordinating, not only on a national level but on a regional level and in fact we are very deficient in being able to plan ahead in order to prevent some of the disasters which have occurred in our region.

I am hoping therefore that Caribbean governments - another area in which in my view we should move towards integrating our human and other resources - will be well prepared in the future in this field.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a couple of questions. I want to ask the Prime Minister about the rights of Honourable Members to the Official Gazette and the Laws of Barbados in relation to the Printing Department. It has been my experience in the past 14 years in Parliament that the Laws of Barbados and the Official Gazette are supplied free of charge to the Honourable Members. I have had the greatest difficulty in receiving the Official Gazette and mine has been coming very irregularly and is not at all in sequence or up to date. To that extent I have been operating at a disadvantage.

If early in the new year a word can be given to the Printing Department to make sure that all MPs get their gazettes on a regular basis, I will be grateful. That is assuming that we are entitled to them free of cost. There was a time when I used to pay \$35 - I think it was something like \$35 a year - and I used to get it regularly then but some months I will get it for two weeks and then I don't see it for six weeks. In relation to the Laws, I support the Honourable Member for Christ Church West in calling for a better marketing structure for the Laws. We are accustomed to these blue books and the annual volumes that are circulated in here from time to time and the Printing Department has developed, presumably with the permission of the Attorney General, what I think is a very good scheme where they bring all of the Laws relating to a particular session. 10.20 a.m.

You can get the Labour legislation of Barbados in two volumes which include everything you can think of from holiday with pay to National Insurance. All of the subsidiary legislation is collected. They also have a bound volume of the Companies Act which is handy. It is less cumbersome than in the blue books. The Regulations are also bound. There could be more of that. They could be sold to the general public. I think in that way a substantial proportion of the cost could be regained. What I have difficulty with is the quality of the print.

Certainly in the Labour legislation there are pages on end where you cannot read the print. It is illegible. On some pages nothing exists. Sometimes it is jumbled up. I have had to return a set that I bought. I bought a set for a case which I was doing. It cost me \$130. Some lawyer in Barbados stole that set from me. I had to go and buy another set. It cost me another \$130. I am saying that because I want them to know. They have stolen more books from me than any other lawyer in Barbados. Friends of mine in the profession know who steal my books. I buy 300 to 400 pounds Sterling of books every year to keep up-to-date. I lose books by people slipping into my library and

stealing them. There are lawyers who know where my books are and tell me I know a person has five of your books but they would not tell me who is the person so that I could just go into the Chambers and take back my books. Be that as it may.

Since I had to pay twice for the same set of Labour legislation if the Attorney General could help us....

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No lawyers in here have stolen my books. There are one or two that I have very strong and reasonable suspicions about. We are all Honourable Members in here. I wonder if in relation to these special volumes I was entitled to pay for the volumes. In other words, I want to know what is the policy. If we get the blue books free, if we get the annual volumes free, if we get the subsidiary legislation free ought we to pay for the special consolidated thing. I do not think so.

The point is when I raise it the second time when I went back to get Vols. 1 and 2 of the Labour legislation and I said I had paid \$130 six weeks ago and normally we get our laws free, the Printing Department told me they were not aware of that Perhaps there could be some set policy sent down to the Printing Department if we are entitled to the laws free as we have been for so many years.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We meaning parliamentarians. I am not talking about these. If you were not here I was speaking about special volumes that come out now as, for example, Labour legislation. There are special volumes. I am saying that we should get them free.

Sir, I have some questions also for the Prime Minister - I am glad the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned this - about the two volumes of speeches which have been published. Somebody gave me two volumes of speeches published by the Prime Minister about Democracy and something else. I forget what it was called. They are printed by the Government Printing Department I would be grateful if the Prime Minister would tell us since they are his own speeches at what cost were the two volumes published and printed. Secondly, if it is a policy to publish and print a collection of speeches delivered by the Prime Minister over a year. Then are we to expect that the extra parliamentary speeches made by every Minister are going to be collected, collated, printed and published. In other words, is there going to be a shift in policy, to the extent that all of these things are going to come out in little booklets every year? 10.30 a.m.

Sir, the Government Information Service is a department of Government about which I cannot speak in two minutes. I would require the whole 15 minutes on that

But I want to ask the Right Honourable Prime Minister whether the Government Information Service pays the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for time used on CBC TV and Radio for the broadcast of various matters? If so, at what rate?

Recently, within the last six months, there has been a stepping up of Government publicity on TV and radio. I am not so naive as not to understand that all of this is political campaigning and electoral works.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Alright, Sir, I will have to come back.

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

Mr. R. P. BYER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make mention of one or two matters in relation to printing and the Official Gazette. Very recently, I noticed something which occurred in the printing of the Laws of Barbados. There has been a recent update in the Laws and it occurred to me that, in relation to the Family Law Act, there were certain sections of this Act which were missing from the Laws of Barbados. When the Family Law Act was first passed, there were certain rules having to do, for example, with the transitional provisions. When the law was first published in the loose form it contained more sections than does the one in these Laws of Barbados, the bound volumes.

I know very recently, in a matter in the courts, a lawyer wanted to refer to the Family Law Act When he sought to do so by referring to the original publication, the small Act the judge enquired why not use the other Act and told him that those sections were not included. There was a little problem as to what should be contained in the Family Law Act

My enquiries have revealed that maybe certain of those sections coming after section 98 would no longer be operative because they are spent. I do not know if that is so or not I have not made any enquiries beyond that. Unless there was something allowing for certain provisions to be spent, I would have thought that those sections ought to have appeared in the new version - put it that way, Sir - of the Family Law Act I do not know if this is so in relation to other Acts.

The original Act dealt with the transitory provisions sections 99 to 103. When this Act was passed in 1981, it was meant to also affect those divorce petitions, as they were then called, that were before the courts previous to them. There are some of them still knocking around there. I would like the Attorney-General to tell me, if he can, why these provisions might be spent, when there might not be any provisions for that to occur.

In relation to the two books of speeches that I hear about, apart from wondering whether I will get a complimentary copy, or whether Members of Parliament will get one, there are other questions that might be raised, in this connection. I would have thought that any publication of a Member's speeches would be a private thing, separately arranged with a publisher, not necessarily the Government Printing Office. I do not know if the Government Printing Office does work on contract or what. The same considerations that are raised by the Member for St. Thomas I would want to raise. I do not know if the Management Commission arranged them or not. But I would have thought that any matter like that dealing with debates would have had something to do with Parliament. I do not know of any other occasion when the speeches of a Member of Parliament were published by the Government Printing Office on the instructions of the Management Commission.

It would seem to me to be highly irregular for something like this to happen. Would the speeches of the Member for Christ Church West, for example, be published? Would we expect a publication of the speeches of the Member for St. Michael West at some stage because of the instructions of the Management Committee? Can the Management Commission authorize the publication of speeches made outside of Parliament? I would like some answers to all of these things.

I know at some stage, the Prime Minister had said in one of his earliest interviews on CBC TV that he would have published a book of speeches. You do not remember these things. You do not remember what you say sometimes.

One other thing I would want to raise is the Official Gazette. Very often, as members, we would want to collect all of the Official Gazettes insofar as they refer to business done in Parliament, those issues that deal with Government Notices and other Notices and so on that you would probably want to discard, except where you might want to extract something from them that, if you are a lawyer would affect* your practice. Like an application, for example, for titling land. If it is published in the Official Gazette, then you would want to extract that Notice.

But in relation to those Official Gazettes that contain the speeches in Parliament and the day's happenings in Parliament, sometimes you miss copies, not that they are not delivered to you but you are not as diligent as you would want to be in your collection of those copies. Very often when you seek to obtain such copies, it is very difficult to do that. Sometimes it is almost impossible. Then the next thing you can do is to seek the debates of Parliament to have whatever you want copied from them but the way the copies are bound, it is difficult to do that, to get the copies done.

I would want to suggest that efforts be made to collect, in an orderly and systematic fashion, substitute copies so that when you go to the Government Printing Office, that you can obtain them. I would want to suggest that some effort be made at the Government Printing Office to file and keep substitute copies of the Official Gazette amongst their records. 10.40a.m.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on CERO, Central Relief Organisation. I have been hearing for a long time that this organisation should deal with disaster preparedness and I would like to know what kind of disasters you are talking about. I would like to know whether it is hurricanes, air pollution disaster, aircraft disaster, or oil spills that they are capable of dealing with, or marine disasters for that matter.

Sir, I would like first to deal with hurricanes because most of the talk centers around hurricanes. When you hear CERO talk about preparedness, I find that this is what they speak about. Now we in this country experience a hurricane on an average of every fifty years. The records show that, Sir. The last one was some 34 years ago. After the last hurricane, we were told that there would be hurricane shelters set up all around the country and every year you will notice that these same buildings would have the name "hurricane shelter" stuck onto them. I know for a fact that since the last hurricane 34 years ago nothing was done to most of them as regards maintenance and repairs and nothing substantial was done to those that some kind of maintenance was tried on. For instance, Sir, I am speaking about places like the St. Christopher Girls School. I can remember during that hurricane the winds lifted the roof off for about 18 inches and then put it back into position. Nothing has been done to that school ever since then and I wonder whether places like this would be a safe place to go.

I think that the first thing we should do is to see that these places are worthy of being called "hurricane shelters" because what we are doing in fact is encouraging a person to leave his home which in all probability might withstand the hurricane, to run into a place like this to lose his life as has happened in 1955. I have seen, Sir, shacks standing up to the hurricane and massive buildings falling down. One building that comes to mind is in Hastings. The top floor was blown into the Hastings Road and that was supposed to be a very strong building. The walls were built from coral stone something like 18 inches thick. So when we talk about hurricane shelters, I think it is time that we really look at these places and come up with some kind of good secure building. I know that you will have to look at many buildings around the country if you are talking about secure hurricane shelters.

Another thing that bothers me about the preparedness for hurricanes is this. When I was a lad and up to the last hurricane, we used to use flag signals and I have noticed

that these flag signals have been discontinued. I was told that you will now be notified by siren. Now take my position. I live a little over two miles from the Oistins Police Station and something like about five miles from Boarded Hall. It is about a little over two miles from Seawell. Now how will I ever be able to hear a siren from Seawell, Oistins, or Boarded Hall? I think that all CERO is doing is trying to bamboozle. Why not go back to the flag system which was posted on the Southpoint Light House and visible places where when there is a hurricane there will be one type of flag and when you really have to get serious and look to run for cover there is another type of flag and when it is all clear there is another type of flag put out. I think this was done in the past and it worked quite well with the people. I think this is something that we should continue. For instance, you get a country like Belize. They use the flag system and it works very effectively. These are things that we should be looking at.

I remember during the last hurricane church bells were rung and this alerted you that a hurricane was coming. Now I do not know if you are going to ring church bells anymore because there are some churches which claim that their steeples are not that strong to bear the vibration from the bells. I think that we should embark upon a better system whereby people will be notified of this impending danger. You know the hurricane warnings are always on the radio but you are not always in a position to hear the radio. If I was driving along in my car, I would not hear a hurricane warning because I never listen to a car radio. It is always turned off. Sir, these are things that I would like to see done with CERO.

When I look at aeroplane disaster, I wonder how effective CERO will be in such a mishap. Oil spills - there is no provision with this Department to cope with oil spills neither is there any provision to cope with air pollution. Suppose we had 10 feet spills. What will happen? Year after year we get air pollution problems from the Sahara dust in Africa. Who knows what will become of this dust - next year or a few years down the road? How will CERO be able to cope with it? Are we prepared to handle these mishaps? So I would hope that when the Prime Minister sums up that he will shed some light on the position with CERO in this country, Sir. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated when I last spoke on this matter that I would have one or two other things to say under Head 13 Prime Minister's Office, Subhead 6 - Government Information Service, Object No. 12 Operating Expenses. First of all, Sir, I think I should draw to the House's attention that that is now a misnomer, it is no longer a Government Information Service, it is really a Government misinformation service, because in recent times that has degenerated into a major

arm of propaganda of the Government putting out blatantly false information and emanating from almost every Ministry of Government 10.50a.m.

I want to deal with one or two examples. The latest example, Sir, was a GIS release which sought to confuse and mislead this entire country as to what actually took place in relation to the use of the Defence Force to remove cotton in contempt of court. There were two or three sentences that were so juxtaposed that they were clearly misleading, and at no point did that release state clearly that there were two orders by the court, one order and a second order staying the first order, and that the action of the Defence Force took place after the second order, and it also omitted to inform the public of Barbados that instructions were given in writing on two occasions to the Commanding Officer at Paragon, who actually was the officer who was required to go and move the cotton.

It also failed to inform the public of Barbados how it is that a Ministry that under laws of Barbados has no authority whatsoever to give any instruction to the Defence Force, actually did such a thing. I refer to the Ministry of Agriculture, when in point of fact under the law it would have to be the Minister of Defence or the Attorney General, or some arrangement between the two of them, who can give such an instruction. •

I think, Sir, it is wrong that a Government Information Service should be used in that way, as a propaganda arm of Government to misinform the public of Barbados. This is not Russia, this is not what obtained under the Communist regimes, the Communist regimes are moving away rapidly from that kind of propaganda operation by the State, because they recognise that it is not in the long term public interest, or in the long term of democratic development in those countries, and we are allowing ourselves to slip into a mode which is highly reprehensible and I think that something has to be done about it.

Any Minister wishing to make a political statement is free to go and make his political statement. They do not have to use the Government Information Service for that purpose. Whenever the Government Information Service issues a release, I think the public of Barbados should feel that this is an authoritative, truthful statement which the public can rely on. After all, Sir, as this Resolution here indicates, it is the Government, it is the taxpayers who pay for the Government Information Service, not the Ministers of Government. The taxpayers pay the Ministers of Government and they pay the Government Information Service.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, they pay me too, although I am one of the few people without the benefit of my cheque

for this month before Christmas, but I managed to borrow some money, so I will be all right. I understand what is going on. It is not a problem, because I cannot buy any Christmas gifts today because I have to be in here.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I usually leave it until the last minute to go, on the 24th, and I cannot go and buy any Christmas gifts today.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the Honourable Member address the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue, Sir, the point I am making is that the Government Information Service used to be at one time, I think when Gladstone Holder was in charge of it, an organisation that you could rely on for truthful information. Now a major problem has arisen because of political interference into its activities.

Here again is another example where an original vote of \$35,000 is being supplemented by a vote of \$11,000. The point is that again we have this very high percentage increase in relation to a particular vote, which makes one question the kind of judgment that was exercised in relation to the very first vote. I cannot reflect on a vote of the House in respect of the Estimates, and I would not wish to do so, but it seems to be a continuing pattern.

Now, Sir, we are also told that this additional amount of money is being called for because of conferences and official visits. We have had no details of those conferences or those official visits. Normally when you have an official visit, the Press is so anxious to get news, they take all the photographs free, they put out all the information free, so you do not have to pay them if the official visits are anything worthwhile. When you have conferences they go and take all the photographs. Yesterday, for example, Sir, I had a very large Christmas party of about 2,000 people or so - an amazing thing, Sir - at the NDP Headquarters and I gather there were a few people around the corner, and that also my friends from the other Opposition party did not have too large a representation either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You expected the Government Information Service to cover it?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir. The point I am making is that even for such a function I did not have to pay for anything, the Press actually turned up and took photographs, although they have not published them yet. Are you going to tell me that you have an international conference and the Government has to pay for this kind of thing?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The real problem is that the Press is not accustomed to such a large

crowd at the NDP gatherings, so they would not have had a lens to take a crowd of 2,000. They are accustomed to two and three hundred.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much. We started at 200 but we have moved up geometrically. 11.00a.m.

Now, Sir, the point I am making is that I don't see any justification for this kind of expenditure if it is for conferences and official visits. I do not want to spend too much time on my feet at the moment because I gather the Honourable Member for St. Thomas also wants to address this question of the Government Information Service. I have only cited so far one example of misinformation but I will deal with other examples during the course of this debate if I deem it necessary to do that. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I rise Sir, mainly on a particular point as the Honourable Member who has just taken his seat referred to the Defence Force taking control of some cotton. As to what he says is contempt, he clearly does not understand. He allows himself to be misinformed by people who want certain information put out.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let's have some order, please.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The fact is, Sir, that when the cotton was taken possession of by the Ministry of Agriculture who had the control of it and sent to the Defence Force, it was done so on an order, Sir, of the Court. The Court subsequently made another order which had not been served on the Ministry and until....

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It had not at that point been served and until it was served on the Ministry, Sir, the original order stands.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misinforming the House. The order was served on the Ministry on the Thursday afternoon and the Defence Force did not move the cotton until the weekend. The second order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the order had not as yet been served. The order made on appeal by the Acting Chief Justice had not yet been served, Sir. That's the point. It had been made but not served.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, I rise on this matter that the Leader of Government Business, the Member for St. Michael North, just adverted to.

Now, on November 20, 1990, a Judge of the High Court made an order directing that the cotton in question be delivered to the Ministry of Agriculture. I just want to deal with the facts as I understand them. On November 22, 1990, the Acting Chief Justice stayed all action on the order that was made by the first Judge. On the same day of November 22, a copy of the order made by the Acting Chief Justice was received by the Ministry of Agriculture at about 3.35 p.m. of that day. It was the same day and it was communicated to officials of the Ministry who were at the time at Spencers Plantation taking charge of the cotton pursuant to the original order that was now suspended, but yet, instructions were given to the Defence Force later to take charge of that cotton and accompanying that order of the Acting Chief Justice was an affidavit as well. Those facts that I just mentioned were confirmed in the affidavit which the Deputy Permanent Secretary of the Ministry had sworn and which is on file in the Registry. To my mind Sir, it follows that one of the Ministers of Agriculture as well as the Prime Minister since he is in charge of Defence and Security are still to explain to Barbados and citizens of this country why the Defence Force was brought in two days after the service of the Order on the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, the premise used by the Leader of the Opposition was the news release. I don't want us to get into either Agriculture or legal discussion on it.

Mr. R. P. BYER: No, Sir. I quite understand your ruling but at the same time the Minister of Agriculture was one of the major actors in the matter and the Deputy Prime Minister did mention the Ministry of Agriculture....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was in response to a point that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Well, Sir, it always springs from «!""! came out of the Government Information Service, which information, to our mind, is misleading and does not in any way reveal the facts. That release from the Government Information Service did not in any way reveal the true facts as they occurred and the order in which those facts occurred, Sir. That is all I would want to say. 11.10a.m.

Just to wind up, I would want to say that, in my opinion, the Defence Force acted highly improper in this matter but, obviously, on instructions from someone. I say improper because they knew about the second Order. There *cm two bits of instructions one controverting the other c ;if How, in the first place the Ministry of Agriculture was givr-n possession of the cotton I would never understand in - ••". They had to follow orders and that is what I am saying.

I am saying that the Government blatantly disregarded the order. That is all I want to say on that, Sir.

RL Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to some of the points that have been raised. The one which comes readily to mind relates to the issue of collection of speeches made by myself as Prime Minister. I would not really think that the publication of speeches made in an official capacity by the Prime Minister would be a matter for discussion or debate. We live in a democracy and we should be spreading as much information as possible.

Three collections of speeches have been issued for the years 1987-1988, 1988-1989 and 1989-1990. There are here. I will make them documents of the House in the further spread of information. They deal with, for example, during the period 1987-1988 the address which I delivered to the Plenary Session of the CARICOM Heads of Government Meeting in Castries, St. Lucia Tuesday June 30, 1987. I am just picking out some at random, Sir.

Another speech in the collection is a Welcome Address at the Opening of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Conference at Dover Convention Centre, Christ Church, Barbados, on Wednesday, September 23, 1987. A speech at the 17th Industrial Awards Ceremony on October 7, 1987, Hilton Hotel, Barbados. That is just three of the items in the collection of speeches. For the 1988-1989 there was an address to the Annual General Meeting of the Barbados Chamber of Commerce and Industry on Wednesday June 1, 1988. Statement at the Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament on Tuesday, June 7, 1988. An Address at the Ninth CARICOM Heads of Government Meeting, St. John's, Antigua, Thursday July 4, 1988.

In the 1990 collection entitled the Process of Democracy, an Address to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference, Malaysia, October 23, 1989. Statement on the Occasion of the Eminent Release of Mr. Nelson Mandela, February 10, 1990. Address to the Opening Ceremony of the Commonwealth Caribbean Heads of Government Meeting, March 1990. I really do not understand what they are talking about.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: If you would look at between pages 120 and 125 you ought to find the introduction of the Honourable Minister of Transport at the George Street Auditorium, his build up with all the qualification of the Minister of Transport talking on consensus Government. That is in there.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You do not want to hear about consensus Government? That is what it is. Those are the collections. I have not checked pages 120 to 125. I do not know if that is in there. If that is in there, so what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order.

Rt. Hon. L.E. SANDIFORD: There are publications put out....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Prime Minister is on his feet. I am hearing other voices.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD....by the Government Printery. If there is some question that they want to ask which they have not been asking, there are no funds that come to me from these publications because there seems to be some hidden suggestion, or some innuendo, or some unexpressed view that somehow or another there is some monetary benefit coming to me. I cannot understand what else it could be.

Mr. R. P. BYER: Sir, on a point of order. All the questions that I raised and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas in relation to these publications have been clear. Nobody asked anything about that. The Prime Minister said he wanted to address the matters raised in connection with the publications. For example, Sir, if I may just restate. I asked whether other Ministers' speeches would be published and things like that. I never asked anything about money. It has nothing to do with me whether he is getting money or not. I do not care about that.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I want to make it absolutely clear. It is an official Government publication. I take full responsibility for this. It is the policy for a collection of speeches by the Prime Minister to be issued every year so that those statements that are made which are considered to be important statements which can be collected in one place so that people can refer to what has been said by the Prime Minister authoritatively can be obtained. If they have not been circulated to Members I will try to see that they are.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I made a policy in respect of the Prime Minister.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would not believe that there would be so much time wasting at this time by the Opposition on these particular matters.

Mr. R. P. BYER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not come in here to waste people's time or anybody's time. I do not come in here to waste the Prime Minister's time. I come in here to do the people's business, similarly

the Leader of the Opposition and the Barbados Labour Party. We do not waste time so do not talk foolishness and ignorance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I would like Honourable Members to understand is that you are interrupting the debate while you are in your seat and that is the cause of some of the problems we have in debate. If an Honourable Member wants to make a point, he has the right to get up and make that point when allowed by the Chair. The Honourable Prime Minister will continue.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I will be very economical in my reply because it is clear that there is an attempt by the Opposition parties to try to prevent the Government from getting through its business. They are talking inordinately on matters that really should not form a debate or discussion on a supplementary issue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister is alleging that we are misusing the Rules of this House. There has been no intervention made by anyone on this side that has been a misuse of the Rules otherwise I would expect the Chair to so rule. I believe it is an unfair and unfounded criticism for the Prime Minister to be making those accusations.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Can we have some order. I do not want to hear voices shouting across the Table at each other during debate. I am not going to tolerate it.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Now, Sir, we have had payments for substitutes and for acting allowances. It is a normal pattern of the running of Government. If someone goes on leave and someone comes in to work for that person, the person may be a substitute. If someone acts in a position superior to their substantive position they may be paid acting allowances depending on the period of time.

I come here for a small supplementary for the payment of substitutes and acting allowances and I hear a long debate about equipment in the Data Processing Department. It has nothing to do with equipment in the Data Processing Department. It is to pay substitutes and acting allowances. That is the information that I have. Matters relating to the Data Processing Department are matters to be debated not on the basis of a supplementary Resolution for acting allowances and for substitutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am just stating my own position. I sat very quietly and listened to all of the discussion. I am entitled to make my own position clear on these matters and the position of the Government. As far as the Data Processing Department is concerned, the funds were to pay for acting allowances and substitutes. If somebody goes on leave and someone comes in to fill that particular place for

a period of time or if somebody is acting in a higher position under the rules in the Civil Service they are entitled to payment for that additional responsibility under certain conditions. This is what this is all about.

As far as CERO is concerned, it is the coordinating agency of Government. It is not an agency that is staffed with specialists in all of the areas that one could conceivably have to mobilise during an emergency. It relates to other Government Departments. It relates also to some non-governmental organisations such as the Red Cross, the St. John Ambulance Brigade and other non-governmental agencies.

As far as the medical aspects of it are concerned, it is clear that the hospitals would have a major role to play through the Ministry of Health in this particular area. It is not CERO that would have prime responsibility. It would be the hospital and maybe the Defence Force itself may, in terms of any mass disaster, have a role to play in that as well. From time to time there are simulation exercises that take place in which there is some kind of practice run or something like that. The sirens go. They respond by going to the airport and the seaport. So there is a whole range of Government and non-governmental agencies, including the Ministry of Transport and Works, the Ministry of Housing, maybe the Ministry of Agriculture. Almost every Government Ministry may have a role to play. The Ministry of Education also through the schools. 11.20a.m.

Right now, the Head of the particular agency is on study leave on a National Development Scholarship at an institution, I believe in Texas studying for a degree in that particular area of emergency response.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am checking my speeches, Sir. I do not see anything about hurricane shelters around Barbados. This is where I should find them.

I am trying to recall some of the other issues that have been raised about the Laws. I promise that if Members are not getting the Official Gazette....

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:...in the correct manner, I will check on that to see what may be the cause for that. We have been looking at the Official Gazette. We have been trying to do something about it. We have taken a step to improve the presentation and appearance of the Gazette to create a more interesting publication and we may be taking other steps as well. I think these are the main points that have been raised, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE-, FOOD AND FISHERIES

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the amount needed under Head 25 is the sum of \$309 920 which is broken down as follows:

Subhead 1 - General Administration	\$64 500
Subhead 2 - Government Analyst	\$40 000
Subhead 4 - Crop Research and Extension	^\$ 16 000
Subhead 5 - Sugar Cane Variety Testing	\$24 700
Subhead 7 - Land and Water Use Research	\$ 5 315
Subhead 10 - Seed Store	\$53 880
Subhead 13-Veterinary Services	\$91425
Subhead 18-Fisheries Department	\$24 100

The funds required can be grouped as follows:

Personal Emoluments	\$92 820
Supplies and Materials	\$84 350
Maintenance of Property	\$73 700
Operating Expenses	\$42 200
Plant, Equipment and Furniture	\$16 850

The funds provided are inadequate for the following reasons:

1. During the current financial year, the reclassification and regrading of posts in the public service was completed and, as a result, the Ministry has had to meet arrears and increased salaries and acting allowances from the funds.
2. The balance of funds remaining in the vote from the supplies of materials, maintenance of property, and operating expenses are almost completely exhausted.

During the year the Ministry had to purchase additional chemicals to fight the Amblyomma, the bont tick which attacks cattle and other livestock. It came to Barbados unexpectedly this year. The cost of chemicals for the eradication of the Amblyomma tick is very expensive. No provision had been made as the tick was observed after the financial year would have commenced.

Orders for the replacement of vehicles in shipment came late through the Department. As a result, the old and non-efficient vehicles had to be used which resulted in numerous breakdowns. The maintenance charge in the provision is inadequate.

The funds required in Operational Expenses are to purchase vegetable seeds and insecticide for the seed store for sale to the general public. These funds are recoverable.

Non-recurrent items ordered during the last financial year did not arrive in time to permit payment and, as a result the funds provided lapsed and payment had to be made out of this year's provision.

One should note however that the Ministry anticipates that savings under the various subheads of this Head would exceed the supplementary funds requested. We have identified savings and subsequently the overall provision for this year will not be exceeded.

Mr. Chairman, with these explanations on these subheads, I beg to move that this Head be now passed.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Christ Church East.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has been speaking about the replacement of vehicles and the heavy cost of maintenance of vehicles.

I should like to know, Sir, if these vehicles are mainly road vehicles or if these vehicles are heavy equipment vehicles like tractors and ploughs and such like. Because, Sir, for some time now, the small farmers in my constituency and I believe around Barbados have not been having the service which they were promised, as regards tractor service for ploughing and sowing the seeds.

I should like to inform the Minister that his problem in the heavy maintenance cost stems from not having preventive maintenance, in the first place. There is no point, Sir, in spending money to buy expensive equipment and then the person or persons who are responsible do not adhere to the maintenance programme, as outlined by the manufacturer. I think that this is one of his problems. If he wants to see his department save in high maintenance cost and save in the purchase of new equipment, ever so often, he would have to make it a point that whoever the workers are who are responsible for this equipment that they stick to the programmes, as set down by the manufacturer.

I have had occasion to visit two of these plantations where this equipment is kept and I can speak with authority on the lack of proper routine maintenance.

As regards other maintenance, maintenance of property, I wonder how much money is being spent on the Fisheries Office in Bay Street. I think that that place is a disgrace. Sir, I have to complain about the conditions at the Oistins Complex. Only last week, I had the occasion to be there with a former Minister of Agriculture from the

Government side and he was pointing out to me the shoddy state of the complex at Oistins. He even showed me another of the bumpers laying on the beach. That is the second one that is being buried on the beach up at Oistins. I have noticed, Sir, a tender in the paper calling for repairs to the jetty and in this tender you are calling for galvanized bolts and that type of material. I have pointed out here on some previous occasion that it is a waste of money putting galvanize at Oistins. You will have about three years service. Why not spend a little more and have bolts out of stainless steel? They are pretty cheap today. I have a quotation for stainless steel bolts for my boat and the price is very little higher than the price of galvanize. I think, Sir, you should somehow or another recall that tender and ask the contractor to supply stainless steel. There is no point of putting up a structure and every three or four years you have to be replacing it. 11.30a.m.

I want to draw to the Minister's attention that at the complex in Oistins there is not only the ice problem, but there is the problem of fuel. Boats at Oistins have to travel to Bridgetown and back in order to pick up their fuel supply and this cost them per day on average between another \$8.00 and \$10.00 just to pick up the fuel and come back. I want to know what is the position with the fuel supply at Oistins. I was told that the person who had the contract for supplying the fuel is no longer operating and I would like to know how long we at Oistins will have to wait until a new contract is issued to somebody who will really supply the fuel for the boats. Because after all the livelihood of the people at Oistins is fishing and the only way you can fish is when you have fuel to take the boats out to sea. They are not wind powered.

Aside.

Mr. E. BOURNE: No, we are not fishing for men. Now Land and Water Use Research. I would like to know, Sir, if anything has been done to identify the types of soils around the country suitable for particular crops? There is no point coming in here and asking us to vote for money to research land use and in the end farmers do not know which soil is suitable for what. There is no point trying to plant cabbages in my area when the area is suitable for cotton or for that matter dunks trees. I would like to know from the Minister if this is being done.

Water Use Research - Time and again I have had complaints from the farmers in my area about water. (1) Some complain about the scarcity of water and (2) some complain about the high cost of water. I think, Sir, that it is high time we try wind power because every time there is an increase in fuel charges the cost of water goes up to the farmer and it makes his product uncompetitive. There is no way with the high overhead cost that our farmers will ever be able to penetrate the overseas market that we all have been talking about for such a long time. It is time, Sir, that

we really go back to wind power. There are suitable windmills being built and marketed in Holland. Windmills were used in this country before and they were very effective and I do not see why we could not use windmills. It costs nothing. It is just the initial cost of the mill and maintenance is more or less at a minimal and ever so often we are hearing that we are digging these wells for irrigation purposes and then you see a tender which goes out for an expensive electric pump. There is nothing wrong with a windmill.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is obviously not aware that there is a windmill energy project which has been going on in St. Lucy. It is a project which is funded with international funds and they are now assessing the results. This project was started by the Honourable Members and the energy levels generated have not been satisfactory in the context as what is in a pump.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A windmill can only be a windmill. It may be a different design but it is still a windmill. I am not disputing him. I am just helping the Honourable Member with some information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is made.

Mr. E. BOURNE: When I was a boy and I must say this again, there were 22 windmills in Below Rock and if you will allow me, Sir, I can call the names of all the people who own these windmills. The idea that our wind speed will not power the mills is a joke. This is what I understood that you wanted to say.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is a project which is going on and it is now being assessed. Okay. There was another project dealing with wave energy on the east coast and that is also being assessed. But this is a windmill project which is being carried on in St. Lucy to convert energy from the windmill.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I think the Honourable Member does not understand what I am trying to say. He apparently is speaking of electrical energy. I am not speaking about electrical energy from windmills. I am speaking about the windmill energy to drive a pump at the bottom of a well. You do not need anybody to come from Europe to tell you about that. It was practised in Barbados ages ago and it was very successful. Every plantation in Barbados had a wind pump. What are you telling me about this thing in St. Lucy?

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Okay, please address the Chair.

Mr. E. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, that is why we will always be in trouble for money. When we get money, we behave like the average drunk. We do not know what to do with it. We go in a shop and we call Tom, Dick, and Harry to spend it. Why did we change from windmills? Because most of the small farmers went out of business. This is why they changed from windmills. Most of those fellows went out of business.

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

Mr. E. BOURNE: Every plantation, Sir, in this country had a wind pump. If you had the occasion to look at any old map of Barbados, I told you that there were 22 small farmers in Below Rock and they all had wind pumps on their properties. Some of the old frames are still standing. Listen, let me explain this conversion of energy. Listen, Mr. Chairman....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to you and if you concentrate on addressing the Chair then you would not hear the asides.

Mr. E. BOURNE: I want to put something in these fellows' heads. They are talking about converting energy. An internal combustion engine which is in your car converts the energy of that fuel into power to drive your car - any kind of stroke. It can be two strokes or four strokes. It does not matter. The power is converted from the energy and it is delivered to the wheels of your car via the transmission. Similarly, Sir, with a wind pump the power will be converted into air on the blades from the wind and it drives the pump up and down to pump the water. Have you ever seen a windmill work yet? I think these gentlemen are talking about electrical energy. I am not speaking about electrical energy, Sir. 11.40a.m.

So we do not need people to come from Timbuktu to steal our money talking about a windmill project, we should know enough about wind pumps. That would be a waste of money which could be spent in other directions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few points here. Subhead 5 talks about sugar cane variety testing, Subhead 7 talks about land and water use research. I think the Honourable Member for Christ Church East has so far given a very pellucidly erudite description of what can be done in the area of agriculture, and I think if the Minister had been listening more carefully to what he has been saying over the years, the Minister of Agriculture would have been a resounding success in this country rather than be faced with the problems he is faced with now. However, Sir, I do not wish to disturb his Christmas unduly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And at the same time you will refer to the Head under discussion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir. Clearly there is a tremendous demand for sugar cane variety testing in Barbados not only to deal with new methods of cultivation but also in order to lift the sugar yield per unit weight of cane back to the kind of levels which Barbados enjoyed in the past I know that on 10 acres of land in the past one could easily get 40 to 50 thousand tons of cane and achieve a conversion ratio somewhere in the region of 10 to one. You got a greater production of cane and a higher ratio of sugar per ton of cane. We have had two problems in Barbados, Sir, not only have we not been getting enough cane but also the sugar yield has been compromised. That is due to a multiplicity of factors.

Clearly one very important area is sugar cane testing so that you can build up a bank of varieties which can be used not only to accommodate the new methods of cultivation. I refer, Sir, of course to the whole question of the abolition of cane holes and mechanical harvesting and all these factors which have to be taken into account, so I have no problem with the money being spent on sugar cane variety testing, although my strictures would be the same for the inadequacy of the original estimate, bearing in mind the substantial increase, almost 50% again, here.

On the question of land and water use, Sir, I think the major decision that has to be taken on land use in Barbados is to put a total ban on the subdivision of agricultural land. I have been hearing rumours about one or two people getting permission, one in St. John recently, that are extremely bothersome.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will not be provoked. I promised the Minister of Agriculture that I would not go out of my way today to disturb his Christmas, I think he has had enough pressure during the year and I will go for another Minister if I need to. The Minister of Housing needs to be dealt with in more detail in this Honourable House, but next year is his year.

If I may say so, Sir, the point I am making is that there is a need for a total ban, no excuses whatsoever, and that is the major policy decision that has to be taken in relation to land use in Barbados. All the other things are subsidiary.

I am disturbed that I am still hearing about certain permissions being granted for the subdivision of agricultural land. It is bothering me.

The Honourable Member is quite right, Sir, about the use of wind energy for pumping water. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West misled himself and then sought to mislead the House. The unfortunate windmill

project up north is an experimental project which is concerned with the use of blades of unusual length, and that has been one of the problems in the project, for conversion to electricity to feed into the national grid. That is the purpose of that project. What the Honourable Member for Christ Church East was talking about are small windmills that can get water out of the ground cheaper than if it had to be pumped out by electricity, or in the alternate, if the water had to be purchased from the Barbados Water Authority.

On the question of seed stores, Sir, I am to report to this House that ever since the Honourable Member for Christ Church East brought to the attention of this House that okras could be an extremely profitable export crop for Barbados, when he was laughed at and when he was told that it would be far too expensive to reap the crop, another Third World country has gone into the production of okras and last year exported U.S.\$20 million in okras.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. You will recall, Sir, that the debate was televised and the people of Barbados as well as Honourable Members of this House laughed when the Honourable Member sought to make okras a document of the House. That is all we laughed at, we did not laugh at him.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I think it is most unfortunate that the okras were not made a document of the House, because then we would be more aware not only from words, but visibly, we could feel the okras and beginning to understand their importance. Okras are a crop in very heavy demand at this moment among ethnic groups right through the metropolitan countries and beyond ethnic groups there is a tremendous possibility. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture... you see he has started to plant some? I am advised that the Minister of Agriculture has demonstrated a little more common sense than his colleague from St. Michael West and has started planting the okras and I hope that he is not finding it too expensive to reap, because that was his argument at the time that it could be uneconomical because it would be too expensive to reap. 11.50a.m.

Abides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I have some order, please?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, there is something wrong with the seed supply in this Island. There is some problem. Let me tell you something. On today, December 24th, forty years ago and you went to any field you would see guinea corn, pigeon peas, yams, potatoes, eddoes. You would see sorrel. You would also see first crop canes, Sir, in the same field. All of them preparing and growing and on top of that, Sir, in the same field you would see some potato slips as well. I can actually visualize fields, Sir, in Barbados,

throughout this country, that looked like that. And you can tell me something is not wrong? How many people have seen guinea corn in Barbados this year? Even guinea birds. I haven't seen any this year. There may be a few.

The point I am making, is that our agricultural potential is being substantially under-utilised and in this area of supply of seeds and the maintenance of seed stores I would like to see something done in this area.

Sir, today is the 24th of December and I am trying to be totally constructive today. There are many areas of criticism that I am avoiding making at the moment. I don't guarantee Sir, that I will continue in this vein if I continue to be provoked by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

So, Sir, if I may continue on this particular Head, Sir, I would like to see a little more happening in the area of seed stores.

In the Fisheries Department, I have had some more complaints as well and my complaints relate, Sir, to a very serious problem. There is something wrong with the management at the Bridgetown Complex here. I was faced with a situation where a fisherman came to me for some kind of assistance. Apparently there are ice boxes that are rented for \$35 a day or a week. That doesn't make too much sense to me.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Okay, a day or a week. They rent these ice boxes. The gentleman just had rented his ice box but he had more fish. He filled the ice box with the fish and he had additional fish. There were a whole lot of empty ice boxes and all he asked was to be rented a second ice box. You know that they refused it? I believe he called the Minister of Agriculture too, because that fellow tried the Ministry, he tried the officers of the Ministry and could not get a second ice box.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The information is not quite right the gentleman did speak to me. He is a Mr. Russell. The facts are that the ice boxes are rented per day or week. He rented an ice box for a week and he should have turned in the ice box on the Monday and requested it to be re-rented. In the meantime, on the Wednesday, he rented a second ice box so by the Monday afternoon, he had two, but he did not turn in the original ice box because the contract for the first ice box was out. He did not even approach the management nor told the management that he was going to continue to use that ice box. The problem down there is that these people want to do whatever they want. They want to run the complex themselves.

I investigated the matter, Sir. He woke me from my bed at nearly midnight and I investigated the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Alright. The point is made.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: So the facts are that he should have spoken to the Manager. I spoke to the Manager the next day and the Manager explained to me that if he had only spoken and requested the continuation of the rental he would have had it

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You know, Sir, this is a really dedicated fisherman and the fact that he called him at midnight was because it was a genuine emergency. An emergency in that he might well have had to dump his fish unless he got an ice box. That Sir, was a genuine emergency.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will give the Member two minutes to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much Sir. Only two minutes Sir?

The second thing, Sir. I understand that there is a genuine conflict of interest between persons who actually own boats and people in charge of these facilities within the fishing sector and therefore they tend to accord a priority to those persons acting in their own behalf to the disadvantage of other persons. I believe that this is something that needs to be looked at. I am not saying that because a man is employed there that he shouldn't own a boat. Don't get me wrong. All I want to communicate to the Minister is that whatever practices there are, that the practices should be uniform and fair, but there is a definite feeling of frustration and I do not think it necessarily relates to obstreperous behaviour on the part of fishermen. There is something wrong at the management level down there and you need to appoint an officer or somebody to deal with these personnel problems. It is a major problem and the fishermen are feeling quite frustrated.

I may be back later, Sir, but I did indicate Sir, so that the Minister of Agriculture can begin to relax and rest a bit that I would not be disturbing his Christmas this Christmas. Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, if it is Government's intention for us just to do these supplementaries so that Government departments could continue to function and wind up this Session, I would not wish to speak on a matter like Agriculture which is so important and for which we can speak for hours. In other words, I am prepared to facilitate Government if it is their intention just to get these supplementaries through and then we break.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The asides are loud.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: As an indication of my good will I am not going to say anything on this Head, Sir, other than the okras that were made a document of the House were frozen and it isn't strictly accurate to say that the Honourable Member for Christ Church East was the one who gave the fillip to okra production or export. For some considerable time now, Barbados has been exporting the finger okra overseas. I participated in that program myself and indeed one would like to see it continue and develop but as I said, Sir, these are things that we can discuss another time and I wouldn't wish to prolong the business of the House unnecessarily if we are going to have an understanding.

Asides.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: The Member for St. Michael South Central raised the question of conflict of interest at the Fishing Complex. I, too, heard about this and I investigated this matter very thoroughly and I think that from my investigation that it is unfounded. What has been happening is that over the last fishing season there was an insufficiency of ice and as a result people have been waiting and they got frustrated. We have had a supplementary which is allowing us to put down a second plant and I believe that with the installation of the second plant we should alleviate this problem and therefore the areas of doubt and suspicion will be removed.

The matter of the subdivision of agricultural land has been noted. Matters dealing with the sugar cane variety testing which is very important to us. The Member for St. Michael South Central should be aware that it takes about 25 years before you can test a variety of cane and that the varieties coming out now are those that have been started 25 years ago. My particular concern has been that the plantations have not been using newer varieties that have been tested and found to be very good and have been passed for commercial production. They still have about 80% of the sugar cane still in the old variety that they have had over 25 years. That variety is about 35 years old now and is beginning to show reduction in yields and ratoon stunting disease. It is beginning to become susceptible to smut plus the fact that we have compaction due to the mechanical harvesting and they have not been supplying canes like they did before. So, if you took any acre now there are far fewer cane holes than there were before in the old cane holes system and there are a variety of things responsible. 12.00 noon

We have our suspicion about the whole idea of the fertilizer application. The sugar industry is acutely aware of the fact. As I said last year that if on the same acreage of sugar cane we grew this year we were getting the yields that we got 15 years ago, we would be in the 100 000 tonnes. It

is not a matter so much that you are taking land out of sugar cane but the yields are dropping so dramatically that it appears as if the amount of land used for sugar cane is reducing rapidly. It is not true.

Five or six years ago you had about 4.4 tonnes of sugar to an acre. Last year we were down to about 2.9 tonnes. The year before 2.82 tonnes. It would be about .18 per acre. If you had 25 000 acres of land you are short of about 43 000 tonnes. We are working very hard on getting back up the yield.

My disappointment has been that the industry has been very slow in putting new varieties that have been tested by the station into commercial production. It is only now they are beginning to bring on some of the newer and better varieties. They are more resistant to the smut. The yields are higher. They are better suited for mechanical harvesting. The juice quality is a lot better than the old ones. We are beginning to see the results of some of the newer varieties that are coming on.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East raised a few points. First of all the tractor scheme is being operated by ADC and not Central Government. I do agree with him that the maintenance programme could be a lot better than it has been, not only the maintenance programme but the operators. You find that some of the fellows drive those tractors on the road like motor cars.

Aside.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: We are getting a new fisheries complex. Above the Fishing Complex we should get a new office down there. At Oistins we have passed the money in the vote over to the Ministry of Transport & Works. They are responsible and are our advisers on the equipment to use, the quality of the stuff etc. I will speak to them about the boat.

Mr. Chairman, I beg that Head 25 stand part.

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

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 28 stand part. You will note, Sir, that the sum of \$575 000 for operating expenses is considerably larger than the sum which was originally voted of \$296 387. The reason for that is quite simple. At the beginning of the year it is usually quite difficult to anticipate the judgements of the Court which Government may be called upon to pay during the course of any financial year. It so happens that during the course of this financial year the judgements of

the Court which the Government has been called on to pay have been quite substantial. These are responsible for the large sum of \$575 000.

There are judgements like the suit of Boulevard Investments against the Commissioner of Inland Revenue - \$77 214. These are costs with the lawyers making money; Carl Maloney against the Attorney General - \$18 589; Belfield Bolden against the Attorney General - \$23 893; Michael Burgess leave for certiorari - \$2 777; Shirley Howard against Valton Bend - \$7 788; Penny Hill against the Chief Marshal - \$22 000; Computer Information Services against the Attorney General - \$14 000; your friend Pearlle Berman, Pailley and others \$102 500. That is finished now. That is a balance.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Legal costs - police officers and coroners inquest - \$69 300; compensation to Mrs. Carmen Fredericks - \$160 000. A lot of these are clear results of negligence for which Government has had to pay one way or the other. That accounts largely for the great excess.

Let me just indicate to the House that these are not all. There are more. There are some in relation to negligence at the Hospital and in other areas. There are a lot of liabilities for which the Government is being asked to pay. A lot of them has been settled.

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

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

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

HEAD 31-PRISONS

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that Head 31 stand part. If any questions are raised, I am prepared to answer.

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

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

HEAD 32 - FIRE SERVICES

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 32 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman this subhead quickly. Under Structures - \$235 000, Purchase of Vehicles - \$113 000; Plant, Equipment and Furniture - \$418 000.

I beg to move that this Head stand part. I will answer any questions on it.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.10p.m.

HEAD 75 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL SERVICES

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 75 stand part.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one money resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the resolution was read a first time, a second time and agreed to.

PRAEDIAL LARCENY PREVENTION ACT, 1990

Order No. 12 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to make better provision for the prevention of praedial larceny.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is an area that has caused us considerable concern in the agricultural sector. As I referred earlier, it is one of the chief problems that we have had in this matter.

This is an area that has exercised the Ministry for some considerable time. We have a series of committees sitting on it, looking at legislation, looking at all the ways and means of trying to scotch this very vexed problem of people who have not been cultivating but have been reaping.

As a result, this Bill that is before Parliament today attempts to deal with the matter. A quick look at it shows that the Bill provides the following:

.. 8⁺

Under section 2 of the Bill, the definition of agricultural produce, livestock, parish constables, et cetera.

Under section 3 we introduce a certificate of purchase. The receipt in issue of a certificate of purchase or receipt by anyone who purchases or otherwise obtains as well as anyone who sells or disposes of agricultural produce or livestock to the value of \$50 or more or weight of 50 pounds or more as specified in the form.

The reason behind this is that before it was almost impossible for the law to trace agricultural produce. Because how could you detect one yam from the other. It is not like a TV where you have the serial number or that kind of thing.

What we are trying to do is that we put the quantity that where the average person, if you have a sizeable amount of produce, we are asking you to get a receipt when you purchase this produce so that any time you are stopped by a police or a constable, you can easily show your receipt of purchase. We fix it at the amount which means that the normal householder would not be affected. If you are buying produce for your home, this would hardly affect you. We try to fix the amount dealing with people with commercial sales. This should not be an irritant to the housewife going in town to buy her carrots and beans et cetera. She would not have to get that type of thing. It is only if you are buying to sell again that we ask you to have that certificate available.

Under section 4, we try to deal with the matter of vehicles or other ways of conveying the goods. We say that a person who is in charge of a vehicle or other means of conveyance that is used for the purpose of conveying agricultural produce or livestock is to ensure individual identity of ownership of the items being conveyed and make it an offence for failure to comply with this provision.

What we are saying is that in this particular area if you are conveying agricultural produce for farmers that you are likely to be in a position to have from those individual growers the necessary certificate to identify that you are a lawful person conveying them. We know that from the quantities of foodstuff that are being stolen nowadays, you would have to be conveying them by some truck or vehicle or something else because these are large quantities that are being stolen. We are trying to give the law the ammunition that if he stops a person with large quantities of food stock and he is not in possession of this type of certificate that he can be questioned and charged by the law, if need be.

There is also under section 5 the power to stop and examine, in that a police officer or parish constable under reasonable grounds of suspicion may stop a vehicle or other means of conveyance for examination and require production of a certificate of purchase or receipt or other

proof of ownership. Failure by the person concerned to produce the required proof in respect of the produce or livestock constitutes an offence punishable on summary conviction by a fine or imprisonment.

Section 6 is one where we give the police or the constable the right to arrest without a warrant. It says arrest and charge anyone found in possession of produce or livestock who fails to provide the specified proof relating to possession of the item. Naturally this is necessary because these items can be disposed of so readily and so easily that if you have to go back and get a warrant before you can come and arrest a person, by the time you come back with the warrant, all the things would have been disposed of. We want to give the officer the authority that if he finds, on reasonable grounds, and he believes that the articles are stolen that he can make an arrest and charge without having to get a warrant.

Section 7 deals with the power to seize, seizure of items in possession of a person arrested in a vehicle or other means of conveyance as well as the vehicle or other means of conveyance.

Section 8 deals with the escape of suspect where a magistrate can issue a warrant for the arrest of a person and for the seizure of vehicle where a person refuses to stop when requested to do so or in the case of a suspected person who escapes arrest or who discards produce or livestock from his possession.

Under section 9 Trial, prompt trial before a magistrate of a person arrested and for imposition of a fine or imprisonment on summary conviction where satisfactory account is not given as to lawful possession of any produce or livestock involved.

Under section 10 this is a clause for restitution or produce of livestock obtained contrary to the Act to the person who it appears to the magistrate is entitled to it, where in the dismissal of the complaint, the accused denies possession or is convicted or where the magistrate acts in accordance with section 3 of the Probation of Offenders Act.

Section 11 sets out the offences, penalties for failure to produce a certificate of purchase or receipt or falsification of information or production of an invalid or altered certificate or receipt and make it a defence to a charge to prove that the items in respect of which the charges arose were produced by the person charged. It also says, "This Act binds the Crown."

As I said, Mr. Speaker this Bill was long in coming because we examined all the Bills available to us. 12.20 p.m.

We tried public relations programmes. We had discussions. The Police mounted special survey teams, et cetera. But despite all the effort that we made outside of legislation on this side -the problem got worse and the farmers were complaining daily about the matter of praedial larceny. We hope that this Bill will provide additional authority to the police and constables to try and allow us to arrest this practice which is now very damaging and debilitating to the agricultural sector.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I beg to second that, Sir. ^

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it is understood that at this point that further consideration of this matter be postponed as a result of discussions between myself and the Leader of the House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in that case, Sir, we knew it was a very important matter and it would take some time. I did not expect that it would be concluded today and other Members on either side feel that perhaps we need more time to look at it. There is no objection from this side. I, therefore, move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed, Sir.

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

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that this matter would have ended as soon as it did. I had some words with the Leader of the Opposition and we understood each other that we would not have reached Private Members Business today. That is the matter to which I am particularly referring, specifically of the Motion set down by the Leader of the Opposition. But if he is willing to make a start on it, Sir, at this time we can. If not, Sir, we are prepared....

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I want to say this. There is no double cross. I did not expect it to be completed at this time. There is no double cross. Let me state my position, Sir, clearly. I had agreed with the Member for St. Michael South Central that we would have started this matter last Friday. None of us expected, Sir, that the Bill dealing with the amendment to the Financial Administration and Audit Act would take us down to 5:30 p.m. in the evening. It did, Sir. The Member for St. Michael South Central spoke extensively on that particular matter and what is more, Sir, after it went on that long I told him that we could not reach his particular matter that day last Friday after all. His response to me was that I got in what I wanted to say on that matter anyhow. He had got into Hansard the matters

that he wanted to say on the Private Members Business anyhow. That is what he told me on Friday.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: So I want to make it clear because I am seeing all kinds of statements in the Press about our running away from Private Members Business. That is not the position. The position was that we had intended to do that matter on Friday but the extensive time taken up by the Opposition, particularly in dealing with the other matter - I am not complaining, I am merely setting the record straight - concerning the Financial Administration and Audit Act prevented us from getting to his particular matter on Friday as intended. This morning I spoke to him again and I told him that we cannot be expected to do his matter today which he understood. Let me say that we had agreed on this that we did not expect to do this matter today. Neither did I expect, Sir, that we would be ready at this particular time because I expected to be adjourning a bit later for the day. I just want to know, Sir. We can do it when we meet again after the adjournment. I just want to know.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is correct in saying that we understood that what we will do today will be the Resolution and the introduction to the Praedial Larceny Bill. This was clearly understood. The reason why the debate has collapsed earlier than usual is because we decided that we would facilitate the Government by not continuing further debate.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Just one minute. Until we can get some order then we will deal with the matter. The Honourable Member may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I entered into an honourable agreement behind the Chair with the Leader of the House with an honourable gentleman whom I have always found to be honourable, that we would do the Resolution and we would introduce the Praedial Larceny Bill and that the House would stop at that point. So I am sticking to that agreement. I adhere to that agreement. Do not get into this.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I just wish to be clear in my own mind that I am not going to see over the next few days that we refused to allow the Leader of the Opposition to debate the No-confidence Motion. Listen to me. I was assailed on more than one occasion for participating in preventing him from doing the No-confidence Motion. Therefore, my understanding of what has gone on is that the Honourable Member and the Leader of the House have agreed that the only business that we would do today is the business that we have done. On the question of facilitation, I think that we understand that the debate which was going on would have finished at 12.50 p.m. anyhow because it could only

last three hours, that particular debate. We understand each other but we need clarity so that there is no confusion because I saw nothing but confusion over the last few days. I want to be clear in my own head, Sir. That is all.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That means that he will not confuse the issue further. Alright, Sir, I accept that.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at this point I am going to move the adjournment of the House. We have been here for three hours this morning. This is Christmas Eve. We regret very much that we had to return here this morning because of circumstances beyond our control on this side but we are here. We sat for a long time on Friday. I made that statement already at the time of the suspension on Friday and this brings us now for the final meeting, Sir, for 1990.

I would like, Sir, in traditional manner to thank all Honourable Members for the cooperation that we have got, Sir, principally but not on every occasion. That is known. Okay. But I want to thank them, Sir, for their cooperation. It has not been 100 per cent but it has been substantial in my opinion, Sir, and I would like to thank all Honourable Members for that. I would like to wish the staff of Parliament and I am referring to the Clerks and the Reporters who have had to sit for long hours, which they did, Sir, particularly last week. There were two sittings of the House of Assembly. I understand there was also a sitting of the Other Place. 12.30p.m.

I would like to thank the staff of Parliament again for the dedication to their duty. I would like to include the police and the security as well. The police have to take up duties here when we are suspended and provide the Chamber with surveillance until the House meets again. That is what has been happening now almost for a week, because we met last Tuesday, then we suspended until Friday and suspended again until today, which meant that the police had to take up their duties from last Tuesday until today. They have always been very co-operative as far as I am aware, Sir, certainly with me and I believe with the whole House, and I would like also to join them in the felicitations I am now extending to everybody who has had anything to do with this Chamber. The Press would also have to be included, Sir.

To everyone I wish a very merry Christmas. I wish that when we return here some time in the New Year that we will come back in a new spirit, ready to continue to do the business of the country, not of the Government.

I now extend my best wishes to you, Mr. Speaker. You have had a particularly hard time in the Chair on some occasions and on behalf of Members generally I should like to extend to you season's greetings and also to Members on the other side. I extend these greetings to all Members.

At this point I would like to adjourn this House until Tuesday, 15th January, 1991 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the adjournment and to join the Leader of the House in the expression of felicitations to yourself, to the Deputy Speaker, to the Chairman of Committees and to the staff of Parliament. I have had the privilege of leading the House from time to time when the Leader unavoidably has been away and I should like to take this opportunity to thank all Honourable Members for the unfailing courtesies which they have extended to me on those occasions when I have had to lead the House.

I am fully seised of the fact that we are in a political battle zone and that from time to time we exchange harsh political sentiments, but I do not believe that that in any way interferes with the honour which Honourable Members feel that is being part of this historic place. So it is in that context and in that tradition that I am able easily to join with the Leader of the House in extending felicitations to Honourable Members. I hope that next year they will come back renewed and refreshed. If the Prime Minister chooses not to bring them back, I hope that they will find themselves renewed and refreshed as well, but in any event, Sir, I wish you a merry Christmas and wish you all a happy New Year.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the House and the Honourable Deputy Leader of the House. Particularly so, I would not like to allow this occasion to pass since we may not meet again under the same circumstances. We may meet again or we may not meet again, as has been clearly hinted by my good friend.

If I may continue, Sir, I would like certainly to join in thanking the staff of the House, certainly all the Reporters of the House, and the Press deserves a special word of welcome for their excellent reporting of the House during this year. I think the Government should be specially thanked for providing an unprecedentedly good wicket for the Opposition to bat on during 1990. I would like to thank the security very much and certainly not least of all yourself and the Chairman of Committees, who I think have certainly done much to maintain the dignity of this Honourable House, sometimes under very trying circumstances, but we do appreciate and thank you for the efforts you have made to maintain the continuity in the dignity of this Honourable Chamber.

On behalf of the Opposition, I wish you all a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year, whether we meet in here again or not.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the Adjournment for the ostensible date of January 15, since this is the last sitting of this Session, I cannot let Hansard close off this Session without comments on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party. It has been obvious for some time now that after this sitting it would be very unlikely that we would return to Parliament. The Prime Minister now has enough to tell the country in his broadcast coming up within the next week that they have indeed brought the Praedial Larceny Bill before Christmas as promised, and they have some other Bills, including one on domestic violence, so he would read out a long list of them when we watch him on television, Sir. 12.40 p.m.

We in the Barbados Labour Party are pleased to have cooperated with Government in facilitating its attempt to crowd into the very last few days of this Parliament what should have been done four and a half years ago, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We didn't promise those things. You all promised them.

I know, Sir, that I will be returned here, if my life is spared. I can't say so for some on the other side. In fact, the Prime Minister earlier this year had said that he knew that he would lose some seats and I will at this stage tender my commiserations to those who will not be returning.

Asides.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The few who come back, our positions in this House will be changed, Sir, and the Prime Minister can hand the writ to Her Excellency on the 30th or 31st and let us have the election in the week of Mr. Errol Barrow's birthday. I am ready for it. The country is ready for it too, Sir.

To all the staff and workers of Parliament, Sir, the Labour Party wishes to offer thanks for the excellent work they have given during this Session and this year. To the Police and security personnel and all members a happy Christmas. Under the Barbados Labour Party we can promise more prosperity in 1991.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, since this is the last Christmas in this entire session, I want to thank all Members for the continuous support they gave during the past year. I didn't expect the Chamber to behave like a Sunday School at all times. I would expect that we would have had one or two little difficulties but nonetheless, they have not in any way impaired the smooth working of Parliament and for that I want to thank you all for your cooperation.

I want to join you in extending to the staff and all the other persons who were involved in making this Parliament a very successful one for this particular period best wishes and I hope that the future will be much brighter.

I therefore take this opportunity to thank you for your good wishes and I am sure that on behalf of the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees that they would also want me to say to you they wish you a very happy and prosperous and bright 1991 and I can only hope that those good wishes which we all foster in our mind for our country will at least begin and end with this Parliament.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday January 15, 1991 at 12.00 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 12.50 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of

November 11, 1990 6294

PAPERS**Hon. P. M. GREAVES** 6350, 6440The Land Registration (Suspension) Order,
1990.Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the
Causes and Collapse of Trade Confirmers
(B'dos) Ltd.**GOVERNMENT NOTICES****Hon. M. A. KING** 6294A Bill to make provision for the prevention of
praedial larceny.**Hon. P. M. GREAVES** 6350, 6440Resolution to approve the Land Registration
(Suspension) Order, 1990A Bill to provide for the seizure and
impounding of straying livestock and for related
matters.Resolution to approve the compulsory
acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land at
Cluffs, St. Lucy, for housing development.The Companies (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill,
1990.**FIRST READINGS OF BILLS****Hon. M. A. KING** 6295

Praedial Larceny Prevention Bill, 1990.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 6295, 6350, 6441

Sexual Offences Bill, 1990.

Domestic Violence (Protection Orders) Bill,
1990.Corporate Affairs and Intellectual Property
(Amendment) Bill, 1990.

Boycott Pension Bill, 1990.

Financial Administration and Audit
(Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1990.

Telecommunications Bill, 1990.

Livestock (Control of Strays) Bill, 1990.

Companies (Amendment) (No. 3) Bill, 1990.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 6295**GOVERNMENT BUSINESS****BOYCE PENSION BILL, 1990** 6295Hon. P. M. Greaves, 6295, 6309, Dr. R. C.
Haynes, 6296; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6296,
6301; Mr. C. A. Neblett, 6297; Hon. B. M.
Taitt, 6297, 6310, 6315; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman,
6300; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6302, 6315; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 6304; Hon. M. A. King, 6309, 6313;
Mr. O.S.Arthur, 6311.**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE OF
SUGAR INDUSTRY BONDS** 6316Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6316; Mr. Speaker, 6317;
Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6317, 6320; Mr. O. S.
Arthur, 6318.**MATTER RE ORDER OF BUSINESS** 6321Hon. P. M. Greaves, 6321, 6322; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 6322.**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (PROTECTION
ORDERS) BILL, 1990** 6322

Hon. M. A. King, 6322.

**THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND
AUDIT (AMENDMENT AND VALIDATION)
BILL, 1990** 6324Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6324, 6399; Dr. R. C.
Haynes, 6326, 6351, 6403, 6411; Hon. P. M.
Greaves, 6350, 6359; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 6363,
6406, 6408; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6368, 6408,
6411; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 6373; Hon. H. A.
Blackman, 6377; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6381,
6409; Mr. R. L. Morris, 6385; Mr. R. P. Byer,
6390, 6410, 6413; Hon. M. A. King, 6394,
6405; Mr. E. Bourne, 6395; Hon. W. O.
Franklin, 6397.

THE LIVESTOCK (CONTROL OF STRAYS)
BILL, 1990 6414

Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6414; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6414, 6415; Mr. E. Bourne, 6415; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 6415; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6416; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 6417; Mr. C. A. Neblett, 6419; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6419; Hon. M.A.King, 6421.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LAND
REGISTRATION (SUSPENSION) ORDER/
1990..... 6423

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6423; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6423; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6425; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6425; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6427; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6428.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT CRAB HILL, ST. LUCY FOR RECREA
TIONAL PURPOSES 6429

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6429, 6439; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6429, Hon. E. E. Greaves, 6430; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6430; Mr. P. J. M. Miller, 6434; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6436; Mr. E. Bourne, 6437; Hon. W. W. Hall, 6438.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUL
SORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
ARCHER'S BAY, ST. LUCY FOR RECREA
TIONAL PURPOSES 6439

Hon. H. A. Blackman, 6439; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 6439; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6440; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6440.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES No. 11 -
\$3,490,920.....6442

HEAD 13 -PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE 6442

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 6442, 6451; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6443, 6449; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6445; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6446; Mr. R. P. Byer, 6447, 6451; Mr. E. Bourne, 6448; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 6450.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE,
FOOD AND FISHERIES.....6453

Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6453, 6457, 6458; Mr. E. Bourne, 6454; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6455; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6455; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6457.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS..... 6458

Hon. M. A. King, 6458.

HEAD 31 - PRISONS 6459

Hon. M. A. King, 6459.

HEAD 32-FIRE SERVICES 6459

Hon. M. A. King, 6459.

HEAD 74 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD
AND FISHERIES 6459

Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6459.

HEAD 75 - MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS.....6459

Hon. M. A. King, 6459. PRAEDIAL LARCENY

PREVENTION ACT, 1990..6459

Hon. W. O. Franklin, 6459; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 6461; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6461; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6461.

SUSPENSIONS..... 6309,6342, 6351,6381, 6422,6442

ADJOURNMENT.....6441,6462.

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 6441, 6462; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 6441; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 6441, 6462; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 6462; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 6463; Mr. Speaker, 6463.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South) BOURNE, Mr. E. (Christ Church East) ' BYER, Mr. R. P. (St. George North) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) MILLER, Mr. P. J. M. (City of Bridgetown) MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central) NEBLETT, Mr. C. A. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) TROTMAN, Mr. C. LeR. (St. Michael Central) WEEKES, His Honour L. A. (St. Michael North West)