
THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 27, 1991.

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P.,
(Speaker)

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, (Deputy Speaker)

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.),
J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic
Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)

Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader
of the Opposition)

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A.(Hons.), M.P.A.,
LL.B.(Hons.), (Minister of Health)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime
Minister, Minister of Public Works, Communications and
Transportation and Leader of the House)

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

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P.,
(Minister of Labour, Consumer Affairs and the
Environment)

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Justice
and Public Safety)

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc.(Econ.), (Minister
of State, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs)

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

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

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

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

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of
Housing and Lands)

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

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

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

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.)
(Minister of Community Development and Culture)

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.

Miss B. A. MILLER

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)

Mr. J. O. TUDOR

Mr. D. W. BOWEN

Mr. G. W. PAYNE

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND

Prayers were led by Reverend Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Minutes of Tuesday, August 13,
1991.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minutes
for August 13, 1991 have been circulated and can be taken
as read. I beg to move these minutes be confirmed.

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

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Immigration (Amendment) Bill be now read a first time.

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

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question No. 2 is ready, and reply to Parliamentary Question No. 14 is also ready, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before the Motion is put to the House, I would ask of the Honourable Acting Leader of the House, the undertaking that Private Members' Business would be allowed to proceed today in the normal time allotted to it, and that the setting aside of those Standing Orders will not affect the position.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you would have seen there have been various matters on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business, some as long as the 6th February 1991. In the name of the Opposition there are two Resolutions standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Resolution No. 5 calls on the Government to submit to the House, proposals concerning the economy and the currency of Barbados. That is a brief summary of it. We had asked that this matter be treated as a matter of urgent public business. I think it is now recognised, having regard to all that the Rt. Honourable Member for St. Michael South has said, that this is a matter that is of urgent public business and in the circumstances the Opposition would wish to proceed today with the debate on Item No. 4 under Private Members' Business in the normal hours allotted for Private Members time.

In the last few weeks, in fact, that we have been coming into this House most of our discussions have related principally to compulsory acquisition motions or abandonment of compulsory acquisition motions. It is very important that these substantive matters which are so critical to the country's business, particularly, Mr. Speaker, Sir, when allegations of economic terrorism are all over the

air, be dealt with as promptly as possible. I am expecting, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that you will support the Opposition's rights on these matters and we can proceed to deal with the matter today in the normal time allotted to the Opposition. I am therefore asking that the setting aside of the respective Standing Orders will be without prejudice to the right to deal with matters affecting the Opposition.

It seems to me that there is only one new matter, possibly two matters, on the Order Paper under Government Business which will no doubt be dealt with and in those circumstances, subject to that undertaking, Sir, you will wish to proceed along those lines.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I must first of all register complete surprise and disappointment at the intervention by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I have been in this House for a very long time, Sir, and the suspension of Standing Orders have always been with the understanding that the rights of the Opposition would be protected wherever that is necessary. I do not understand why today of all days, suddenly without warning, without the customary discussion in these matters, the Leader of the Opposition is now getting up and looking ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. I am asking ...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: They have obviously come to terrorise the House today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking for order, please. A matter is before the House. I am listening to both Members on both sides of the House. Will the Honourable Leader continue.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, it is clear, Sir, that more by design than by accident, we are moving into a new approach to parliamentary methodology. Not a single solitary word was said to me in my capacity as Acting Leader of the House but suddenly as we come to suspend the Standing Orders the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, is now getting up and determining how the Government's business is to be run.

Now the Honourable Member ...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot make allegations that I am determining how the Government's business is run. But, what he will not determine is how the Opposition's business is run within the Standing Orders of this House.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is fully aware that there is no opposition here that deals with the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House is to do with Government's business and to ensure that the rights of the Opposition are protected.
12.25 p.m.

No one will come in here and terrorize me and seek to suggest that we are depriving them. I am disappointed, Sir. I am mortally disappointed, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I have to speak on this at length. I am further disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition who was the Attorney General during the time in this House of Assembly when the Opposition almost did not exist, now that Honourable Member has the temerity and goaded by his recently returned colleague who should know from what he has observed where he was that his tactics are merely blowing in the wind. If they wish to have matters dealt with, there is a civilized way in which it will be done. I give the Honourable Member the assurance that nothing unusual will happen. I give him the assurance that the same consideration that we have always given will be given today and the Government's Business will be done and then the Leader of the House will determine where we go from there subject to the wishes of Your Honour and the rest of the House, Sir. You cannot organise the business over here.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: You cannot determine where we go from there in Government's Business. There are Standing Orders and that is what will determine that. If the Government wants to walk out...

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have risen on a point of order. No, I got up on a point of order. If he wants to walk out at the time of Private Members' Business, he can walk out. But the point is that the Honourable Member is moving to set aside certain Standing Orders and I am reminding the House that the Standing Orders also have a time for Private Members' Business and we would wish to proceed with Private Members' Business at that time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: All I am saying to him, Sir, is that we have a well laid out methodology for that. It is customary for the Members of the Opposition if they wish to proceed with a Bill for him or some Member of the Opposition to come behind the Chair. It is customary. That is all that I am saying. He is free to do what he wishes to do, but he will do it within the confines of how the Government's Business is going to be determined. I am not going to allow anybody to come in here and railroad in here. He can vote not to suspend the Standing Orders, Sir. That is his privilege.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, having regard to the garbled and distorted propositions that have been put forward by the Honourable Member who just spoke, I think it is necessary for us...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If you want to have a row, let us have it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two Honourable Members are on their feet. The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is the thing. He thinks that he is in the Courts bullying people. No, it will not be that in here. In here, we are all equal. Not in here today! We are going to see.

Mr. SPEAKER: One moment please. Will the Honourable Member take his seat. I am not going to allow this Chamber to be turned into a political platform as is accustomed to other people. I am going to maintain dignity and order in this Chamber today. I am prepared to listen to both sides which is the duty that I have neither to raise on one side or the other. The question has been raised about protection of rights. There are two points that have risen in this particular issue. I am not prepared to create any precedence nor to change any conventions. What I am prepared to do is to stick with the straightforward ruling by the Standing Orders. If the Standing Orders that are suspended infringe on the rights of any Member, the Chair has a right to listen to that person's complaint and then try to deal with it within the normal circumstances of things.

Now it means in the first place before I can deal with it, that if Members object to the Standing Orders, then they have a right to vote against the motion and then I will make the necessary ruling that is necessary. On the other hand, if Members want to change conventions, I will not be the person to create that precedent. I think that the Chamber has been run along those lines which I just mentioned and it is left to Members to make the Chamber a place for proper debating.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: Standing Order 20, Sir, sets out very clearly the following:

"(1) Public Business of each day's sitting should consist of notices of motions, being motions of which notice has been previously given, and orders of the day, being matters which have been set down for a particular day in pursuance of an order of the House.

(2) Subject to these Standing Orders, Government Business shall have precedence over all other business and the Government may arrange their business whether it consists of notices of motions or of orders of the day in such order as they think fit.

(3) Private Members' Business shall commence immediately after the conclusion of Question Time but shall not continue after 4:45 p.m."

Now the Honourable Member has moved the suspension of this Standing Order. The effect of that will be that Private Members' Business will be suspended. All the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is seeking is the assurance of the House that today notwithstanding the motion of the Honourable Member that Private Members' Business will be dealt with in accordance with the Standing Orders. How could it be possible in the face of a clear and distinct order, for the Honourable Member to talk nonsense about some convention. The rights of Members are inscribed in the Standing Orders. No convention can overrule the clear word under the Standing Orders.

Therefore, when I say, Sir, that the Honourable Member has presented a garbled version of the Standing Orders, that is the reason, Sir. The position is clear that...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot say that I sought and presented a garbled version in the explanation that he has given when I did not at all allude to the Standing Orders. I spoke to the convention of the Leader of the Opposition coming to discuss the position before getting up. That is all I spoke to, Sir. That is the convention, Sir. It is no Standing Order and, therefore, I say that he is out of order to say that I attempted to distort the Standing Orders which is what he is imputing.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: The Honourable Member is not speaking the truth, Sir, when he is getting up in here and saying that he did not speak to the Standing Orders. The Honourable Member moved the suspension of the Standing Orders so he must be speaking to the Standing Orders. What the Honourable Member failed to disclose to the House is that particular Standing Order was one that...

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

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I submit that the Honourable Member is now distorting what I said. I spoke to the convention of the Leader of the Opposition going behind the Chair. That is what I spoke to, Sir.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: The Standing Orders are there. What we are calling on you as Mr. Speaker, Sir, is to uphold the rights of the Opposition.

Aside.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: Do you hear him? He is the one that cost the Government thousands of dollars.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not really relevant.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The basic position is, Sir, that we have rights. Just as people who appear before magistrates have rights, so too does the Opposition has rights. Just as people who appear before magistrates expect that the magistrates must obey the law and not their whim or caprice, so too does the Opposition in here expects the institutional upholders of the law, namely you, Mr. Speaker, will have regard to these Standing Orders. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, are going to do that. You have already reminded the Honourable Member that that is the position. When he moves now to suspend these Standing Orders, all we are asking in a very civilized and polite fashion is to have your Government Business. But we have on the Order Paper a number of matters.
12.35 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael Central has a matter on the Order Paper. It may be that he is terrorised by the fact that he does not want to deal with it now, but we are not worried about that, we are willing to abide by the rules. When the matter comes up the Honourable Member will be given the opportunity before the Honourable Member for St. Peter. We accept that. He is entitled to priority, he put his down first, but the fact that he might not want to proceed does not mean that the Honourable Member for St. Peter does not want to proceed.

That is all we are asking for, nothing unreasonable. We are asking for nothing more than what from time immemorial has been enshrined in the Standing Orders of this House.

Certain remarks made by Mr. H. B. St. JOHN were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to uphold the rights of the minority.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had no difficulty in explaining myself. I have already said what the Standing Orders are and I will repeat that if Honourable Members are objecting to the suspension of those Standing Orders they have a right to vote against it. That is their right. My position has always been – and I have been following what has been the custom, which I observe myself and which most Speakers have observed – not to get into the business of deciding what the Order Paper should be. We have never done that, we have always left those matters within the realm of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of Government Business to determine. Should I start to take a stand on how an Order Paper should be run, then I would become a very impartial person.

I am saying to Members that they can operate within the framework that has been established, which is, if you

object to the suspension of the Standing Orders you vote against it. If the Honourable Member agrees to discuss with the Leader of the Opposition the Order Paper for the day, I will not intervene. That is my ruling.

The question that those Standing Orders be suspended for remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, 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. J. O. TUDOR, His Honour T. C. ESTWICK and Mr. D. W. BOWEN - 14.

NOES: Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. L. R. TULL, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. G. W. PAYNE and Mr. R. C. EASTMOND - 10.

ORDER NO. 4 - RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON THE
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PUBLICATION
IN THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF NOTIFICATION OF THE ABANDONMENT OF THE
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGE
ROAD, SAINT MICHAEL

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I had not spoken on this Resolution and I would like to take the opportunity to use this Resolution to discuss the area surrounding where this land was to be acquired. I am sure that the Minister will....

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Absolutely.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member finished his speech?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that earlier when the Honourable Member introduced this Resolution he talked about the fact that they had discovered that the survey plans and information on the basis of which the section 5 notice was prepared contained certain inaccuracies and that two small parcels said to have been utilised in the project had not in fact been so utilised. You will recall the project, Sir. That was the time when the Barbados Labour Party went and put in roads and took away the people's lands. I am being reminded, Sir. You will recall that that was the time when the Minister of the day operated without any reference to any custom, constitution or any of those things.

Anyhow, there are two small parcels of land which constitute Schedules 14 and 15 of the notice under section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, which was published in the Official Gazette, No. 10, dated 4th February, 1988. It contained 40 square metres owned by the estate of Letitia Olliviere, who is now deceased, and 10.4 square metres owned by Cynthia Dottin. I think the Honourable Member for St. George South might know these people intimately, having grown up with them.

Section 9(1) of the Land Acquisition Act makes provision for the abandonment of the acquisition of any land which has been compulsorily acquired.
12.45 p.m.

Now as I understand from the Minister, the Ministry has no interest in retaining these small parcels of land, and sought the Cabinet's approval for their abandonment. It is now seeking the House's approval to abandon them. Sir, you will recall that that whole area that runs from the back of Glendairy all the way down to Hall's Road forms part of the drainage system which we have been trying to put in place to allow for a better drainage of that area that is aback of the Prisons. That whole area has become, what can be described, as urban area and there has been - as I think the Honourable Member for St. George South said earlier - quite a lot of flooding in years gone by.

Since that time, Sir, we have sought to canalise all the land in the surrounding area. Such canalisation occurred in the Prescod Bottom area which is just another stream to the north of this stream and we have now canalised the Prescod Bottom area. All of Bank Hall, going behind the lands that are now owned by the Barbados Workers' Union, will now be drained into a canal. All of those who may have gone in that area would have noticed that what used to be swamp land, mosquito-ridden and an unhealthy area, has become very dry and may in fact, in due course, be available for a playing development or housing spots. Indeed, there are three or four or five spots that have now grown up in that area which before would not have been allowed by either the Health Authority or the Town and Country Planning people but can now be allowed because of the decision to drain the area. That drainage which now comes from the Garden Land and Prescod Bottom and flows right under Roebuck Street meets with the drainage coming along this area from Station Hill and down Hindsbury Road, cutting across to Arthur's Hill and coming out into Roebuck Street. There is a confluence which then goes via Hall's Road around the Constitution Road area and goes all the way out. If you look, Sir, not only have we drained the area, we have also decided to put some vegetation in the area to give it the kind of peaceful and beautiful look which we believe the city and the surrounding area should have.

We have also taken the opportunity at the same time to remove all of the garbage. Sir, there were 37 loads of

garbage immediately behind the National Housing Corporation's property and the Moravian Church. Thirty-seven loads of garbage had to be removed from what is in essence the Green Fields.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am told 37. That's a friendly input, Sir. I have a model view to look at. We have been waiting for the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to return so that we may show him what magnificent works we have planned for him in the same vein. I cannot discuss that in this resolution because that is a mountain where this is a mere molehill.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, we have cleaned up the entire area going from the corner of Roebuck Street and Country Road, aback of Country Road stretching right through to Whitepark. We have also, on the other end, cleaned up the entire area at the back of Hindsbury Road and Carringtons Village. Now, what used to be a mere gully is an area that can in fact accommodate persons such as young children and others who are on nature walks or studies to get some idea of how the land lies. There is no doubt that in times gone by this used to be a river which became a stream in due course. We have now turned it into a canal.

There is just one other area which is part of this plan where we will put in a canal as well. We will complete the Prescod Bottom as it comes out of St. Michael Central and it will permit a full drainage of the area. Now, Sir, the problem that arises and is still arising, has to do with heavy rainfall. When there is heavy rainfall, it sometimes comes very suddenly, and the area might still be prone to flooding. We have not had an opportunity to test the new canal at the back of the Bank Hall area with a sufficient heavy downpour of water. What we will have to do is to continue the programme of the sinking of wells. Apart from the canals and the drainage which will occur, we need to have wells located at strategic points which will have to throw off the water. Again, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems is that because this area is low-lying and part of an alluvial plain that used to spread throughout the entire area, starting at the bottom of Pine Hill and going in an arc under My Lord's Hill and those areas, the drainage came into what is now a low-lying area. I think we have successfully moved all of the housing. I notice two or three houses have now come back in the vicinity of Halls Road and I hope it will not be long before those are moved from there to ensure that there is no longer any danger for people who live in these low-lying areas, should there be heavy flooding. Your Honour will recall that in the forties and the fifties it was perfectly normal to see houses floating away as soon as the rains started to fall and came in any heavy downpour.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has determined that this land should be abandoned and you will recall that on the occasion when we discussed it, it was decided that a site visit be made. I believe the Minister has made such a visit and will be able when he is winding up to tell the House exactly what has happened. However, I wish to give the assurance to the other side that the abandoning of this particular acquisition – they are really two little strips of land that will help to make the persons who now live on the adjoining spots better accommodated. I believe that this is a matter which we can accommodate.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very pleased to hear that the Minister of Health has committed himself and his Ministry to concerns regarding the continuation of the canalisation programme in the area that is being addressed by this particular bit of legislation. The reason for my interest in this is that it is a fact that the programme was started and if one looks at the area around the Globe Cinema one can see ample evidence that work has been done and has been continued as far as the bridge. Regrettably, when once the programme got into the area of St. Michael Central, it seems as though for one reason or another there was not a possibility for continuing and as a direct consequence the people from the Dean's Village area are suffering tremendous inconvenience. There is a problem particularly of drainage or lack of any drainage at all. There is a problem as well of mosquitoes and other problems associated with them that the Minister has spoken about in relation to the other stream.

12.55 p.m.

We are pleased to see the other stream has been addressed and we would wish to let the Minister know it has caused us to be able to work in some degree of improved comfort, because there are not so many mosquitoes there. Our concern is that because the original area that we are examining today was not completed and because there have been problems from time to time, coming from the area inside the Prisons themselves, we have the difficulty of the drainage being worsened.

The Ministry of Health in response to pleas which we have made in the last year or year and a half have in fact responded and have done some work, but we wish to advise that the people of Dean's Village are still not satisfied that we have got the kind of relief that we are looking for. We are not able to determine exactly what would be the nature of the assistance which is required. We, ourselves, would be very happy if the complete canalisation programme was continued until we are able to reach the area right outside the walls of the prison, but even as we say that we realise that we have a particular difficulty.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the area of St. Michael Central is a rather poor area in terms of physical facilities. We do not have any areas, except one, where we have

what might be considered to be playing facilities and there is a very small area that has been opened in the area where the canalisation programme has stopped, where the young people look for some release for their energy and some times they play football or cricket.

We would like to think that the Ministry of Health, now that they are looking at the whole area to improve the drainage, that they may be able to find some way of addressing the drainage problem there without necessarily preventing the facilities for playing from being utilised.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when one examines the area in the immediate surroundings of Bridge Road and Dean's Village and Station Hill, one is forced to recognise that any programme that attempts to address the drainage cannot be properly finalised unless we attempt to go much beyond that particular area. It would seem to me that it would be in the interest of the Prison as well if that entire area behind the prisons, going right up into Station Hill itself, into Goddings Road, if that were looked at. There is no question at all about it, Sir, that for people who are living in that area we have the problem that because there is not the kind of graduation of the land that would allow for smooth run off of water, and when one adds to that the domestic waste waters which sometimes there might be – though attempts may be made to sink wells – that there is the problem of possible stagnant waters remaining in those areas and preventing the residents, not only in Dean's Village, but in Station Hill as well from being able to live under the conditions that we would wish any Government to be able to provide for the residents of a country.

We are particularly concerned, Sir, because although we are ourselves in that area, assisting the people, and although they are making their particular efforts to improve the drainage in and around their homes, although attempts are made to sink wells, one finds that in several of the areas that wells cannot properly be sunk. So we are appealing to the Government that it would recognise that at the same time that it is looking to improve the Bridge Road area that it will continue the exercise and it would try to bring some relief to our constituents in the area going right up until we get to the Waterford section, thereby making for a smoother more healthy community.

I thank you, Sir, for your patience and I am very happy to support the Resolution.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I would like to join the debate in support of some of the concerns that have been expressed by some members of my constituency and I would appreciate that they are in actual fact contiguous to the piece of land that we are presently discussing.

We, in that particular area, are part of the link that comes behind Station Hill. If you take the St. Michael East

area, the water that filters to that particular area comes from the Norman Niles Roundabout area where they have the gully which is immediately south of the highway and that runs entirely through the Belle and through the Licorish Village areas and into the Bridge Road section that we are presently discussing.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is one where there is a significant amount of stagnant water that is built up and left lying, particularly in the Licorish Village area. Again there is a large built up of the *aedes egypti* mosquitoes which have been found in the particular area and it did present some concerns to the residents. I have notified the Ministry of Health and the officers there have certainly been playing their part in trying to identify and eradicate these mosquitoes. The point remains that the drainage system in that particular area must be looked at. We are again asking the Government to pay some attention to it. We of course have the link that comes from St. Barnabas down Government Hill, and all of this water, when it is the rainy season filters into this area and presents hazards for the people in St. Barnabas, through Government Hill, into the Ivy proper, where over the years we have had tremendous flooding in Rogers Road. I am sure that you are aware of the perennial problem that we have, where this flooding continues in that area in the Ivy.

In fact, in the Housing area itself we have a situation where the wells are clogged. All of the wells in the Housing area are clogged and we are hoping to have that system looked at because we may have to extend the canal project into the stream that would filter the water properly into the area that we are now discussing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that at some time we pay some attention to it and possibly look at part of the beautification project where we would even put vegetables or fruit trees into this area that is idle but will be part of a water system and we can probably use it for the residents who are in the immediate areas. We are hoping to start that kind of project in the Housing Area in the Ivy where we will plant some fruit trees and so forth to take off some of the water that is being built up in the area.

Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate that in St. Michael East about sixty or seventy percent of our constituency is restricted by the water zone 1 problem. You will appreciate that we are restricted in St. Michael East. I am saying that if we in actual fact have to be restricted by our land use – what is available to us – and if our residents in the area are subjected to having to keep the area clean, I think it is important that attention is paid to the preservation of the environment on behalf of the country. It really is not fair on the one hand to restrict them in terms of building or to restrict them in terms of development in that particular area and then we have a situation where they are left in

conditions that are not acceptable in this modern day. I really do have some concerns as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I recall as a young chap, that particular area in Bridge Road being severely under water and I really would not like to see a system that is developed that will cause that kind flooding to exist again in this Barbados. We have a very serious problem in the Ilaro Court area and I have spoken about it once or twice and I realise that it has not been heeded to. There are several residents there that are suffering every day as a result of the drainage of water coming down the Eighth Avenue in St. Barnabas where the road has been eaten away. There is a lot of soil erosion of the land all through the back of the Ministry of Transport and Works, down Ilaro Court ...

Mr. SPEAKER: We have drifted very far, Sir.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: No Mr. Speaker, you will notice that that area as I said slants its way down Government Hill and it leads back to Bridge Road. The water is a constant flow. The major problem that we are having with the water is that it is creating some damage early up in St. Barnabas...and I have had persistent complaints from the residents in 8th Avenue and even below south of Ilaro Court where the water remains stagnant out there. Again, it creates the problem of mosquitoes and so forth.
1.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am just joining this debate to say that we must pay some attention and I am appealing to the Government to pay some attention because it is of some concern to me. It is not easy everyday or every week when you are in your constituency and hearing repeated comments on the conditions they are under and subjected to all of the time. I know there are restrictions in terms of money and so forth. But I think that in terms of providing canals or proper guttering to filter the water properly that this will be in the interest of my constituents and I really thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak about it. Thank you.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, just a short comment in winding up this debate and to remind the Honourable House that when we last met that further consideration of this matter was entered into so that we could at least satisfy ourselves based on the comments which were made by the Honourable Member for St. George South about the location of this land and the possible effects which it may have on abandonment. I think that his argument at that time was that it would be better for the Government to maintain the acquisition on this land because of its location and we would be better able to control any possible flooding which would take place from time to time as would happen in that particular area.

It was pointed out then as far as I can recall the canalization programme of the Government and this was further ventilated here today. But arising out of that request, my Permanent Secretary, the Chief Town Planner, two representatives from the Ministry of Transport and Works and myself made a visit to the area on Friday morning. It is a very small area. As a matter of fact, it is situated about 100 metres from the end of the bridge, going to the east of the bridge at Bridge Road. It is not really possible that this would have any particular effect on controlling the flow of water there. As a matter of fact, between the end of the bridge and the location of these two strips of land, there are about three or four houses.

We are satisfied that the points which were made by the Honourable Member for St. George South were groundless as far as this particular Resolution is concerned. Consequently, the Government would want to pursue with the Resolution to abandon this area of land and I now, Sir, beg to move that the Resolution seeking the abandonment of these two areas of land as described in the Resolution containing 40 square metres owned by the estate of Letitia Olliviere deceased and 10.4 square metres owned by Cynthia Dottin do now pass.

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

IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1991

Order No. 8 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Cap. 190.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, in these very contentious times, I do not think that this particular measure that is before us would stir up any kind of controversy, Sir. I believe it is one that should win the support of both sides of the House, Sir, and it is in that particular spirit that I am happy to move the Second Reading of this Immigration (Amendment) Bill, 1991.

I think, Sir, that all of us who are true Barbadians and all of us who are true Caribbean people have the hope and the aspiration that at sometime Caribbean peoples would really get their act together and usher in a new society in the Caribbean that would reflect our past history, our present struggles, and our future hope for unity. It is against this background, Sir, that Commonwealth CARICOM Heads of Government have been meeting for many years now irrespective of changes in Government in order to try to bring this search for unity to some kind of finality or to bring it to a higher stage of fruition. The search, Sir, has been conducted on a number of fronts, some of them being searches of substance and others being searches of style. Some of them are symbolic and some of them are structural in content.

I believe that the measure that is before us for the establishment of an Order of the Caribbean Community which would be conferred on deserving persons would fall more into the line of action of style. I am just trying to remember the other word that I had used before in respect of it. Even though we put it within the category of style or symbolism – the word was symbolic that I had used – I think that it is significant or important in terms of what we are seeking to do in this Caribbean Community.

The measure that is before us, if I may explain it in detail, seeks to establish a system of regional honour for CARICOM nationals who have made outstanding contributions to the development of the region. This is the basic aim and objective to identify those Caribbean nationals who by their work and contribution have made a significant input to Caribbean consciousness and the development of the Caribbean region. It seeks, Sir, to confer the title of "Honourable" on the members so identified and it seeks to entitle such persons to the privileges of residing, engaging in employment, and acquiring and disposing of property in any of the member states of CARICOM.

1.15 p.m.

The persons so identified as being deserving of this regional honour would also be issued with a travel document, the equivalent of a diplomatic passport, a kind of a *laissez passer*, to facilitate travel within the Community by the Member, by his spouse and his children under the age of 18. Member States would be expected to assign an appropriate rank in the Order of Precedence of their respective states.

The Agreement for establishing the Order provides for a mechanism of representatives drawn from the CARICOM area to identify such members. The committee is set up and that committee would investigate and consider nominations and make appropriate recommendations to the Conference of Heads of Government, so in terms of identifying the persons the proposals call for the establishment of a committee made up of a representative of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States and a representative from each of the other territories of CARICOM who would identify deserving persons and make recommendations to the Conference of Heads of Government. The Conference of Heads of Government itself can also identify deserving persons for the award.

Barbados has already designated the Cabinet Secretary as the official to sit on that committee, but to the best of my knowledge no meeting of the committee has been held to date. I know, Sir, that some attempts were being made to get a meeting convened on Friday last, but I am not sure whether that meeting took place, so let me try to be as accurate as possible. Subject to that, as far as I am aware, the committee has not yet met on that matter.

Barbados is in agreement with these proposals and indeed the Agreement in respect of the establishment of this particular Order on behalf of Barbados was signed on May 14, 1991. That was during the meeting of the Standing Committee of Ministers responsible for Foreign Affairs, which was held in Barbados. The Member for Christ Church West Central in his capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs signed that particular document. The Agreement instituting the Order of the CARICOM Community entered into force on May 28, 1991.

There are certain steps which we have to take in Barbados in order to give full effect to the privileges that would be conferred on the members designated to the Order. For persons to work in Barbados and to have other privileges, it would be necessary to amend the Immigration Act. This is so, because the right to reside and engage in gainful occupation in Barbados, and to acquire and dispose of property in the same manner as citizens of Barbados would have to be made clear in the Immigration Act, or would certainly call for an amendment to that Act. That is why this particular Bill is before the Chamber today.

I believe that an occasion such as this should be one not only of looking back but also looking forward. If there is one thing that has struck us very forcibly, I believe on both sides of the House, is that the pace of Caribbean integration has not been as fast as we would have wished. There are all kinds of problems and difficulties as we seek to broaden the area of integration, as we seek to free intra-regional trade, as we seek to have the movement of capital and the movement of goods and other services in the region. It is very difficult to get agreement among a large number of territories. We all know that, Sir. It is even difficult when you are dealing within one territory to get agreement, so that has been one of the stumbling blocks, but so long as we are operating in a democratic system we have to proceed as fast as the members who are part of the group are willing to proceed. We try to nudge, to push and to influence, but in the end unless there is a common aim, a common spirit, a common approach and a common desire to work together, we will not be able to proceed much faster.

I think, Sir, what has been happening in the Soviet Union is instructive in this particular regard, because we are talking about the substance and we are also talking about the symbolism of what we are doing here. This particular amendment to the Immigration Act is for the purpose of doing something that would give an impetus to the integration movement and would seek to inspire others to make their contribution towards the building of the Caribbean movement towards unity. It is clear that the days of old style federation, or the principle of federalism, is not really on the cards, Sir.

1.25 p.m.

So we have, Sir, to try to find a new mechanism that will mirror our aspirations and bring about the desired unity that we require in these circumstances. The basic question remains, how will we achieve unity amidst the requirement for diversity among the different territories of the region?

I, Sir, do have my own views on that and the kinds of further steps that we have to take, and in due course, I will spell these out because I believe there is a way forward and that we all have to work together to get on that particular path. Sir, what this piece of legislation that is before us will do, is to amend certain sections of the Immigration Act. It will indicate what is the agreement that we are talking about. It will identify the community that we are talking about, that is, the Caribbean Community and, Sir, it will do other things as well which will be expatiated on in subsequent speeches on this matter.

I think, Sir, as I said, this is a matter that will get the support of both sides of this Honourable Chamber. The Heads of Government at their last meeting identified three outstanding West Indians to be accorded the honour of being the first to get their names inscribed on the Order. These are, Sir: Mr. William Demas, Mr. Derek Walcott and Sir Shridath Ramphal. Those are the three persons who will be the first persons to be accorded this highly distinguished order. The Order will be designated the Order of the Caribbean Community and will carry the distinguishing letters of OCC after their names. It will be the Order of the Caribbean Community and the members of the Order will be entitled to be called Honourable and will be entitled to the privileges I have indicated before.

As I have said, Sir, this is both symbolic and inspirational and is a recognition that we have, by our efforts, by our conduct and by our participation, to work for this new Caribbean if it is to come about. It is not going to come about by mere rhetoric. It is not going to come about by mere wishful thinking. We all have in accordance with the opportunities available to us to work for the building and achievement of this new Caribbean region. I am certainly hoping that in the not-too-distant future we will have that Caribbean Community with the maximum level of integration possible instituted and not only the objectives as set out in the actions that were taken at Chaguaramas in the early seventies. Not only would we be able to achieve those, but in the light of the developing and changing circumstances since then, we would be able to fashion a community that would truly promote the Caribbean consciousness, the Caribbean market, as well as promote the welfare and well-being of the Caribbean people.

It is against this background that I am happy to move the second reading of this Bill to amend the Immigration Act and I so do.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I think it would be very difficult for me, having spent so much of my time in public life in Caribbean politics and the Caribbean Community development that I would be remiss if I allow this moment to pass without participating in the debate. The Prime Minister has said that this is a matter which should not and would not occasion controversy and I believe that that fairly represents the point of view of almost every West Indian that there ought to be in the fullness of time full economic integration of the Caribbean. Many other West Indians believe that similarly in the fullness of time there must be political integration. I do not know that it is useful to expend large amounts of energy at this stage talking about the one or the other when it might come about. Suffice it to say that we in the Caribbean embarked – perhaps 1968 is the watershed year.

1.35 p.m.

In 1968, the then colonies, territories and countries – because they were made up of all three – determined that they would have a Caribbean free trade area. The three Bs as they used to be called, that is Barrow, Burnham and Bird, determined that they would let their countries have a free trade area and soon they were joined by the other leaders in the Caribbean at the time. So, Mr. Speaker, two of those leaders have now left the shores and the other one, Sir, like old man river is going on and on. The fact is that their prescience at that time has worked to the benefit of the Caribbean in a way which no one could have envisaged in 1968, looking at where we have come by 1991.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps in the time at my disposal I should look at the three persons who have been chosen for this very distinguishing and distinguished award. In the first place I hope that notwithstanding any points of view as to who should have got it and who should not have got it, that the people of the Caribbean who have the capacity to influence other people in the Caribbean, that is to say, the media houses, I hope the media houses would join in helping to make the spirit of this award reach the levels that those who conceived of it must have anticipated.

Sir, I am extremely pleased that Willie Demas has been among the first recipients of this award, because there is no one person in the Caribbean, alive or dead, who has made a greater contribution to the concept of West Indian unity than Willie Demas. I make that without fear of contradiction, Sir, because I had the privilege from 1971 in particular until the present...

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am going to try and allow those who wish to advance their view about whom else was responsible for West Indian unity to put their view, but

I am saying, Sir, on the basis of my experience and my knowledge, there is no one alive or dead who has made a greater contribution to the concept of West Indian Unity than Willie Demas. A man who has worked tirelessly in the truer sense of the use of that term, Sir. As a matter of fact, it can properly be said that he has given his entire life to the pursuit of that particular goal. No one who has spoken to Willie Demas seriously for longer than five minutes would have had the opportunity to hear anything before he heard about the Caribbean and Caribbean unity.

Those of us who were privileged and it was a privilege, Sir, to have participated in the vintage years between 1971 and 1974 when the Caribbean Free Trade Association was moving rapidly toward Caribbean Community, no one who participated in those historic meetings which went on sometimes interminably, but which had, as I have said elsewhere from time to time, the benefit of the best brains available in the Caribbean – give or take a few Sir – in one place at one time at some time or other, moving towards the common goal of a Caribbean Community and West Indian unity.

Sir, to have observed the tireless efforts made by Willie Demas and his band of West Indian Civil Servants in Georgetown and in other capitals, whether we were in Georgetown, whether we were in Basseterre, whether we were in Dominica, St. Lucia, Kingston, Jamaica, wherever they convened a Caribbean Community Council Meeting or a Heads of Government meeting one could not help but being absolutely astounded at the amount of work which was being performed by what could only be described as a motley few within the Caribbean Community.

Sir, I had the privilege of working in the United Nations. I have now been involved at the highest level with the Pan American Health Organisation. I have watched other international agencies including WHO function and they have a large cadre of high level international civil servants available to assist in the decision making and the paper producing. The production of paper in these agencies has been well known and well recognised but it has in fact become an industry, but they have always had at their benefit, large numbers, large cadres of people and other resources to help produce the kind of decisions which come to the momentous decision in the international community.

In the Caribbean Community, for example, in the Secretariat in Georgetown, working sometimes in the strangest conditions we have seen just a few West Indians joined together in the first instance by the inspiration of William Demas and he was to be followed in due course by Kurleigh King and Alistair McIntyre, in their own way making their contributions, but theirs is not for me to discuss at the moment. The inspiration which William Demas was able to bring to this group of Civil Servants

inspired the politicians of the day, as well as those who followed. I would make bold to say that it is a very strong political person who would attend a Caricom meeting and come away from it unchanged in the direction of West Indian unity. It is true that when we return to our respective territories we tend to come more fully face to face with the reality of living in our respective territories. Sometimes I believe that because the standards that are set or the goals that have been set have been so high that our people tend to look at what has occurred as failure. I want to make bold to say, Sir, that the Caribbean Community cannot be said to have been a failure, given where we started and given where we have arrived and what we have accomplished in all of twenty years.

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of all of that could be found either the spirit or the voice or the gentle prodding of Willie Demas. Sir, the opportunity to praise him while he is still alive must be taken. He has been either as the Secretary General of the Community or subsequently as President of the Caribbean Development Bank where he took a salary cut. He was probably the first West Indian who started off in his new position by announcing to his employers that the salary was too high and that in the interest of the goal which had been set and the principle which he admired, and had advised that he would take a salary cut.

It was in fact a magnificent moment in Caribbean history because it was the first time anybody had ever heard anybody say, I am getting too much money. Willie Demas demonstrated when he came to work in Barbados as the President of the Caribbean Development Bank that it can be done. Willie Demas went on, either by constant prodding, by constant pruning, by preparation, by direction, to bring his tremendous influence to bear in the Caribbean Development Bank's attitude to lending.

I, Sir, am not going to allow the asides to touch me because I do not think that anyone could seriously suggest that discussing Willie Demas in the context of the OCC, the new order, could be spinning out time. I think that Honourable Members are not serious so I will press on.
1.45 p.m.

At least we tell the people that we are sending them home. We did not do like you and go behind people's back. You all sent home thousands of people and did not tell anybody that you were going to do it.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member bear with me for a moment? I have not heard anything from any side and you will be the person who will put it in the record. I am saying that I have not heard them. Continue.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it is regrettable that this particular debate would be marred. Mr. Speaker, Sir, his latest publication "Towards West Indian Survival," an essay by William G. Demas, which is the first occasional paper prepared for the West Indian Commission, I would recommend to be required reading for all those who have to make any decisions about the Caribbean Community and especially those who are in politics today. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question about Demas' contribution.

Sir, there are some people when we look at Ramphal who may not fully appreciate the significant contribution which Sonny Ramphal has made to the broadening of the image of West Indians outside of the Caribbean. Outside of this Caribbean, Sir, many of the persons who posture on the political scene are nothing more than little puny mortals when they go pass the confines of the Caribbean Basin. Some of them are reduced to stuttering tiny persons while they posture inside of their respective territories as gorillaphants. But Ramphal by virtue of his attitude on the international scene has given the Caribbean status and has allowed by his works for the Caribbean to be known in places where it had not been heard of. Ramphal, as Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat, played a significant role in helping to bring down apartheid to the extent that it has been brought down in South Africa. Sonny Ramphal, as Secretary General, made a significant contribution in the diminution of apartheid in South Africa. It is nothing short of a shame, Sir, that in a situation where that particular issue is raised that others can seek to reduce its importance. But Ramphal has gone where others dare not tread.

I recall, Sir, when we were negotiating the African/Caribbean/Pacific/EEC Treaty at the LOME Convention, Ramphal participating with P. J. Patterson, Demas, and myself and a couple of other people taking on the might of the European Economic Community. The sugar protocol, which is now the backbone of the relationship of sugar and the EEC, was to become one of the major aspects of this unique agreement. The ACP/EEC Treaty was the first and indeed has been the only one of its kind where over forty African and Pacific States were able to stay together in a treaty with the developed world. That was the best advice available at the time. Many men with hindsight can always answer all kinds of questions. But when called upon at the time and called upon in the moment, many of them have frittered away to nothingness. The fact is that those men and women in the 1970's were able to lay a firm ground work for what was to follow.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may just touch lightly on the other recipient, Derek Walcott. No one who has read "Dream On Monkey Mountain" could fail to observe and indeed feel the sheer power of the intellect of the man who produced this work which says so much about the ethos and pathos of what is West Indianism.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am grateful to the Honourable Member. Having spent some time in North America, one sometimes fall prey to these differences. Well, that is because you are a Greek scholar. I am not a Greek scholar.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: But I am a decent person. I might not be a scholar and I challenge anyone like you from the City to raise the question of scholarship.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Member just keep quiet? Will the Honourable Member, just wait a minute. Continue.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: My record as a scholar is there. I do not have to tell anyone where it is. I challenge anyone on that side to question it from him all the way down. You do not have to worry about me as a scholar. The record is there. I do not have a problem with that, Sir. Anytime we want to discuss scholarship we can meet on any ground — your ground or my ground. The record is there my friend. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with that.

I was saying, Sir, that Derek Walcott's writing is powerful evidence of the kind of contribution which...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot hear the Honourable Member. Continue.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I was wondering if Your Honour could hear as much as I can. Maybe when you are down this way you can hear a little more. Derek Walcott's contribution to the Caribbean is available for all of us who like to read. Unfortunately, there are too many people in this country who, although they wish to have an important voice in public affairs, find it difficult to continue reading after they leave school or the university setting.
1.55 p.m.

Those who have read Derek Walcott can testify to the power of his intellect and the power of his scholarship. One would hope, Sir, that Members of the Opposition, including the Honourable Member for the City, will become familiar with the works of Derek Walcott. I know that these kinds of suggestions would be alien to her, but I would hope that in due course she and some of her colleagues would become familiar with the works of Derek Walcott. She will have a much better appreciation of a number of the values which help to make the West Indies what it is and perhaps in time will be able to recognise what true scholarship is.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Your Honour, Sir. I hope that in due course we will have someone from this Honourable House who will have reached the level of contribution to the Caribbean as to warrant and merit this award. I hope that these awards, in the spirit they have been started, will become a symbol of what is excellent in the Caribbean. I hope that in making such awards, however, those who are responsible will not fall prey to the problems which bedevil Caribbean efforts such as these, which see people saying that if one sportsman from one country must get an award that another sportsman from another country must get one too. Those kinds of attitudes have stood in our way in the past and I hope that these awards will not be bedeviled, and I am very pleased to see the kind of structure which has been put in place. I am extremely happy to be in a House of Assembly, and to be part of a Government that has the honour to bring this kind of amendment to introduce this very worthwhile line into yet another area of excellent Caribbean strategy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other Honourable Member wish to speak?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 o'clock, Sir, and I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m.

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

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points I wish to make on this Bill, which I am pleased to support. The point has been made that in a number of Caribbean jurisdictions certain changes certainly have to be made to the laws of national jurisdictions in order to accommodate the Agreement which has been entered into by the Governments for this Order of CARICOM award.

What this Bill will do is to provide that a citizen of the Community who receives the Order of the award is thereby entitled to the status of permanent residence. That status will permit the holder of the award, by virtue of having that status, to enjoy certain rights and privileges almost akin to those of citizenship, except that he or she is not a citizen. One can recall that under legislation like the

Property Transfer Tax Act in relation to certain rights and property that persons who have the status of permanent resident would enjoy the same rights and privileges as if they were citizens of Barbados.

We do not have any aliens land holding legislation in Barbados, as exists in some other countries of the Community, and it would mean that if those countries of the Community which have aliens land holding legislation in place, which in essence prohibits the holding of property by aliens, and in some cases permits the holding of property under conditions, that those countries of CARICOM which have that kind of legislation in place, if they must comply with the terms of the Agreement, must ensure that the appropriate legislation is passed in their countries amending, changing or revoking their aliens land holding legislation.

I believe some steps have already been taken in some of the countries of CARICOM with a view to eliminating the problems which would make aliens land holding legislation inconsistent with the terms and conditions set out in the Agreement setting up the Order of the CARICOM Community. It will be necessary, therefore, throughout the Community where any hiccoughs exist between the Agreement and national legislation, for the countries to ensure that their legislation is to that extent amended to keep pace with the terms of the Agreement which all Governments had entered into.

Reference has been made during the course of the debate to three distinguished persons of the Community who have already been honoured.
3.05 p.m.

I believe one of the features of the award which has been agreed by Heads of Government is that awards would not have been made posthumously. It was recognised that there are a considerable number of distinguished West Indian persons who have already passed away, who, by every stretch of the imagination, would deserve to be honoured if those who have already passed away were being considered.

I believe one of the problems faced by the Heads of Government was the question of space as the extent to how far back they could go if the concept of posthumous awards were made. So that the way they dealt with it was to determine that in no circumstances then would posthumous awards be made.

It was a little ironic in the first awards that it was only recently a very distinguished West Indian, namely Sir Arthur Lewis, passed away. Had he not passed away at the time that he did, he would surely have been a serious contender for one of the awards.

This Bill must be seen in the context of putting in place another of the legislative frameworks for encouraging the CARICOM integration movement. I believe that, in that context, all of us support the progress of the region towards integration and that there certainly can be no serious opposition or no opposition at all to the terms of the Bill as proposed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I rise to address this Bill and to give it support in the conceptualisation of awarding outstanding citizens of the Caribbean Community. It is something that we could all support. I believe in fact that this should be at the top of a pyramid of systems that recognises individually persons of outstanding merit; that it should be a basic presupposition that in each individual territory we recognise that there are these outstanding citizens; that we need to recognise those outstanding citizens whether they have passed on and gone to the great beyond or are still alive and can garner national recognition.

It seems to me we are moving towards a situation of the region awarding this level of distinction to those who have made outstanding contributions to the development of the Caribbean as an entity. We need to recognise that in most cases the basis of this regional recognition has to come at the national level: the names put forward at this point in time for this honour to be conferred on them are persons who have worked to ensure that the Caribbean region has reached a level of acceptance in various areas of human activity. Clearly each one of them started from a local basis – a national consideration. Take the point, for instance of Derek Walcott. I will make so bold as to claim that although Derek Walcott as an outstanding writer projects the Caribbean, his locus has always been his birthplace which has always been the symbol from which he moved. Whatever his writings have been, he has always operated from the deep love and understanding that he had to interpret fair Helene, St. Lucia, his native home, and therefore most of his writings relate to that particular country. Even though he is writing about St. Lucia it can be seen as a microcosm of the Caribbean and therefore, in a sense, he addresses the wider community. There is no doubt in my mind that first and foremost, Derek Walcott's writing is rooted in the identity of his national roots. It is clearly so in most of his poetry as well as his plays and in a sense that he brings honour to the Caribbean as a whole and he has certainly influenced the entire Caribbean in terms of his perception of literature and the way he applies himself to the genre of literature that he has chosen.

I think he is different from other persons put forward here in another respect also. Both William Demas and Sonny Ramphal have been regional civil servants and they have distinguished themselves at their level in applying themselves to the regional entity and have made

outstanding contributions to the structural development of the Caribbean as the region.

My point is that we need to recognise that we have to have recognition at the regional level, but it seems to me that a case has to be made and I speak about my own country, Barbados, for further consideration of persons of national merit. The time will come when we will have to choose from among our own and will have to submit to the wider community Barbadian citizens of distinction who will be awarded one of these merits. I believe that we need to start seriously by looking at a system of selection of those persons being put forward when the time comes. I believe that we have to be broadbased in our selection. In an initial setting we come across with an outstanding artist and two civil servants basically, and I am hoping that a broad base will be created from which these choices will be made. I am aware that Mr. William Demas himself in a booklet called 'Towards West Indian Survival' has sketched certain criteria for this kind of selection and has indicated a list of persons whom he considered to be prominent West Indians. I note for instance in the section on trade union leaders a very notable West Indian was left out – Sir Frank Walcott. I don't see how anybody can come up with a list of prominent trade union leaders in the Caribbean without that name being included, but these are the kinds of lapses that will occur when perhaps individual consideration is given to something as profound as selecting a list. That is why I say there must be national consideration. Let us be as thorough as possible to make sure we do not perform unpardonable lapses by leaving out persons who by all criteria have to be included in certain areas of selection.

Of course we come looking at a list with our own personal considerations so what somebody else might not see each one of us will come looking to see if they are included. We are not so much impressed by the names that are in, as we are sometimes by the names that are left out. I would like to think that in Barbados we would be able to reach consensus when the time comes on the persons that we would want to provide on a batting list which we would then work through and when we have exhausted that list we would then come up with another that would be to the satisfaction of all. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker that I think it is important that we recognise the contributions that have been made by outstanding Caribbean citizens to the development of a concept of a Caribbean community. I believe that all civilisations and all of the major countries have accepted the need to elevate those persons who have made significant contributions to a call.

3.15 p.m.

This is recognised internationally as the thing to be done. There is no major capital in the world that one can go to without seeing in sculpted form for all times, the representation of those persons who have made significant contributions, so that they will always reflect the best of

the human product of that particular community. I think this is a significant opportunity to start in this direction in terms of the Caribbean Community.

I believe it is vitally important that this particular gesture, which is more to a gesture to some extent also, but this gesture of giving recognition to these individuals at this point in time, will move past gesture as this becomes an institutionalised system. It will certainly give the opportunity in the concept at a different level of the movement of personnel through the Caribbean. I think that we are really dealing with a question of immigration in a narrow concept here because you are giving these people permanent residence because of their individual greatness that they have achieved on behalf of the Caribbean Community.

At another level it is strong demand in the Caribbean for freedom of movement. Certainly at this level it is bringing home very clearly to everybody that when one makes a start, and when one makes a start, I think one has to start at a level that would be able to attract the support of everybody. It is going to be very difficult, I would think, not to give support to the question of a Caribbean citizen when people of this eminence are the persons brought forward but that is a beginning. We will move from there to the concept perhaps of skilled people moving in the region and then eventually, hopefully, to the question of wider migration, where people of all various skills and backgrounds etc. might be able to move in the Caribbean region. As I said, that is likely to be a much more thorny problem. It is one certainly that will be more controversial but I think that in going this route we are establishing the beginnings, but it must never be seen as an elitist position. It is true we are elitist in the sense that we are selecting the best people, but in broadening the category of the best people we will not restrict these people in very few categories but again some of our top sportsmen must come in and they must come in early to be embraced within this. Our trade union leaders – we will have to widen the categories and bring them in very, very, early. Cultural artists other than Derek Walcott. Walcott is a member of the arts form and therefore I think that that recognition has come very early.

Certainly, I think that politicians too have to be included here, because there seems to be some perception out there that is not a distinguished field of activity and I believe that some of our politicians will have to be considered. Not the ones that are still practising, not the ones that are still current, but some who have been able to step out of that. Perhaps, one might want to call them statesmen or whatever although not all who have been politicians will reach that honourable status. Certainly I think that politicians will have to be considered as a category in which we would include some of our people. Oh the journalists, that goes without saying. There will be outstanding journalists. When I find difficulty in

categorising journalists I usually bring them in within art. That is very wide. It is not that they all deal in fiction but they are all creative in one way or another, since this is an analysis it is part of their forte so we include them certainly in the realm of the arts.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I give support this Bill.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, like Honourable Members who have spoken on this Bill I will be short but I will not want this opportunity to pass without making a few comments on what I consider to be an important amendment to the Immigration Act. It has to be seen in the context of Barbados' continued commitment to the development and the promotion of the integration movement.

Now, Sir, a decision was made quite recently at the Heads of Government Conference for the establishment of the Order of the Caribbean Community and Barbados, as usual, is in the forefront of implementing this decision where we have here today this amendment to the Immigration Act which seeks to give legal force to the decision of the Heads of Government. I do not recall whether any other country in the CARICOM area has done a similar thing as yet. One of the problems which I think we are plagued with in the Caribbean, particularly when it comes to implementing decisions of the Heads of Government of CARICOM is really the slowness with which most other territories seem to want to implement decisions no matter how minor these decisions are.

I know that when I was on the CARICOM circuit I was constantly making the point that when once we have come to a decision on a number of things, particularly matters which are not controversial, that the CARICOM secretariat should abrogate unto itself the role of drafting the legislation, having it prepared and circulated to all of the member territories with a scheduled date of bringing it to their respective Parliaments and also a scheduled date of implementation. This would avoid a situation where as has happened in the past – and it would seem as if it continues to happen – where particular governments who are zealous about the integration movement can move ahead and others are left behind, because of their own choosing. I think, Sir, that probably has a very serious impact on the whole psyche of the Caribbean people about the seriousness or lack of seriousness which certain governments in the Caribbean seem to show about their commitment towards regional integration. There is no doubt about Barbados' commitment whether one is talking about this administration or the former administration.

I would like to think, Sir, we can, in the future, when it comes to matters of this nature impress upon the Secretariat that this is a role which they can play. I believe

that they have a very important role to play in this particular respect.

Today, certainly the decision of the Heads of the Government has identified three notable and outstanding West Indians. A lot has been said about them already. I believe that all Honourable Members and certainly the members of the public are aware of their prowess in the various fields in which they have distinguished themselves – Derek Walcott in the field of Literature, Willie Demas in the whole question of economic development with particular reference to small states and of course the integrated movement in the Caribbean, and of course Sir Shridath Ramphal for his role as a Commonwealth Civil Servant and certainly as a Caribbean integrationist.

Like the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, when one looks at the publication of William Demas on the topic "Towards West Indian Survival" one sees that in one of his appendices he has a brief list of achievers in selective fields. I would agree with the Honourable Member that we should not get ourselves locked into a situation, as we often do in the Caribbean, to accept a list put up by prominent people and think that is the end of the persons who would be due for consideration. As he has rightly said, there are some notable absentees from that particular listing. It is a fairly wide ranging list covering cricket, in the novel and short story writing, in writing plays and stage acting, in poetry, in painting, in sculpture and calypso, in pioneers of the steel pan and reggae and history, social sciences and the world of ideas, economist in the Public Service, diplomacy, the private sector, and as the Honourable Member has pointed out, politicians are noticeably absent.

3.25 p.m.

I do not think that those of us who are politicians are harping on being included. But no matter what the public thinks about politicians and we know that the media – television, radio, electronic, and print – have been carrying out what I would call a campaign which seeks to denigrate politicians and place them at the lowest level in the community. I wonder sometimes why those of us who are in politics get into it if this is the way in which we are going to be dragged on the ground and treated like trash by the media. It is actively being encouraged by people of the media. I am not at all identifying any particular individuals but certainly there are some members of the media who have a high respect for other people and certainly other people's callings and professions.

But the fact of the matter is that, regardless of what the Press may say or the kind of impression the Press do give to the wider public about the role of politicians, they are people who create ideas and implement ideas. They are people who have made a significant contribution towards the development of our West Indian society and certainly towards the whole question of the integration movement.

There is no doubt about that. I think that one cannot overlook the contribution which politicians have made and will continue to make in the future towards the development of life in the Caribbean and they also should be looked at. I think it will go a far way in my view to establish in the minds of our young people that it is a noble area to which people can aspire.

I know there are some limitations on the number of awards that will be made. But I would like to think that these will be dispersed over a wide area so as to give recognition to people who have made contributions towards the development of life. When I say life, I mean life in its widest sense in the Caribbean. I consider it, as I said, yet another step towards the further realisation of that goal which up to now appears to be somewhat of an illusive goal but one which all of us have some desire to see achieved – that is the whole question of Caribbean integration.

Once again, Barbados is leading the way in this and we hope that in the not too distant future other countries in the CARICOM region will move swiftly to implement this bit of legislation. I hope that overall that kind of attitude will prevail in terms of their implementing decisions which require legislative process. Now this is not like the other matters that have some economic implications and one cannot understand the delay in this particular area. But I hope that we will see a greater commitment and interest in getting decisions implemented so that we can move the integration movement closer to realisation than we are at the moment. I thank you, Sir.

His Honour. T. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support this Bill to amend the Immigration Act. I am certain of what I am speaking about, Sir. Even though I know that there is a particular eagerness in the air, I think Honourable Members must understand that it is extremely important no matter how small things may appear that if we in Barbados are to escape or get out of our economic woes a lot will depend on our fraternal ties and other ties in the Caribbean. This Bill before us is merely one step to cement those ties at a level which I am certain that some of the Honourable Members may not understand, but nevertheless we have to deal with that. It may appear small to some, Mr. Speaker, but as long as I have been in politics I am almost certain that Barbados has over the years been in the forefront of regional unity. It has been even to the detriment of some rightly or wrongly. Barbados has always taken steps to ensure that regional unity was extremely high on the agenda. The present Prime Minister, when he proposed the Assembly of Caribbean Parliamentarians, sought to ensure that the regional ties which we have had over the years were cemented even further. I am happy to be in this Parliament today that moves at least one step further in the broader sense towards regional Caribbean unity.

I am not surprised, Sir, at some of the remarks that I am hearing coming across the floor. As I said, it is all right to sit and make sport at everything. That is the lot of some politicians. But other politicians, Sir, must come to realise that every little thing which comes to the House of Assembly has some import and is of vital importance to wider measures. Even though there might be other things in the air, the fact that we can move now towards making sure that Caribbean people who have done yeoman service over the years are recognised not only in their domestic territories but across the Caribbean by being granted the Order of the Caribbean Community is a step in the right direction.

I do believe, Sir, like the Honourable Members for St. James North and St. Joseph, and my honourable friends on the back bench here who are the younger Members of Parliament...

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading this House. The Honourable Member said the younger Member of this House and called the Honourable Member for St. Joseph. Sir, he is misleading the House.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I really meant the Honourable Member for St. Andrew. They do look alike. Sir, I think we have a golden opportunity for the future because one other institution which has made sure that I, in my own capacity as a student of the University of the West Indies, have met hundreds of students throughout the region and we all have in one capacity or the other these fraternal ties which are important for the future.

Those of us who play cricket again establish certain ties for the future. Those of us who are involved in regional trading establish certain ties for the future. I can only say that along with an Act such as this which seeks at the highest level to honour people that the future holds well for the Caribbean and its people. One concern that I will have though, which I hope will be worked out very soon, is the fact that over the years there has been much talk about freedom of movement and much talk about Caribbean people being permitted to travel on drivers' licences and I.D. cards and matters of that kind. I hope that sooner or later that those things will become a reality and that as Caribbean people we realise that we do not owe a duty only to our particular domestic country, but we owe a duty to the region. I am quite certain that the three persons who have already been praised in this House of Assembly will at least acknowledge those praises in the light in which they are given and that these persons have given of their best years to the service of the Caribbean as a whole and to the benefit of the majority of people in the Caribbean.

I do not wish to be exceedingly long, Sir, but only to say that I will again try to exhort younger Members of this

House and the younger members in the Caribbean as a whole to realise that our lot is tied together. It has been tied together historically and it is tied together now. As the world is going, it will always be tied together. So it is almost thoughtless, Sir, for us to approach anything dealing with the community in which we have to live in a willy-nilly fashion. I do not think that can do us any good at all nor can it do any political party any good when its members choose, Sir, to deliberately and purposefully stay away from being involved in a discussion which deals with the future of the Caribbean and the future of the people that they represent.

3.35 p.m.

We cannot escape the fact that we are in the Caribbean, we cannot escape the fact that we are a people bonded by history, bonded by today's trade and by tomorrow's trade. We cannot escape that. Yes, we are in Barbados – to take that Aside, Mr. Speaker – but the fact remains that even though we are in Barbados, Barbados is a CARICOM country, Barbados is a signatory or could well be the first signatory to the Bill giving the right for persons to be awarded the Order of the Caribbean Community. Even though we are in Barbados, I take that as a given, we are still operating within a Caribbean Community, we are still operating within the wider context.

I think, Sir, it is a crying shame – and I mean it – it is shameful that any party of ten persons, even though I may forgive the two Members who joined me in here when we came in, it is shameful that eight senior politicians in this country can sit down and do everything else possible, other than misbehave and show disrespect to the Chair, to make sure that they do not participate in something as important as cementing ties in the Caribbean. I think it is a crying shame on them, and as a person who is now in Parliament I would hope that I never see this day come again in the history of this country. It is, if I may use the term, disgusting. It borders on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not so sure I understand what the Honourable Member is referring to.

Certain remarks made by His Honour T. C. ESTWICK were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record at this stage.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Can I not say, Mr. Speaker, that to me it is somewhat shameful that the Opposition can sit down and deliberately, purposefully....

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot say "deliberately and purposefully". You cannot say that.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: But that is what they are doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot say that.

Laughter.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Now, Sir, do you see what I mean?

Mr. SPEAKER: Just rephrase your language a bit; that is all.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: All right, Sir. I am profoundly disappointed, not only in that behaviour just now.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would prefer the Honourable Member to stick with the Bill. I will deal with the conduct of the House.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Yes, Sir. I have no doubt you will.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I may help you along, this kind of reaction may help you to be more forceful. I will ask them to let you speak in silence.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: No, Sir. I can handle that, I can deal with that, Sir. In spite of all that has been said....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! May I have some order, please?

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: My disappointment continues, but as I was saying, Sir, all of us – some Honourable Members who sit over there – certainly would have had ties in the Caribbean which I think they cherish. A lot of them, through the said University of the West Indies, through their travels in England, would have met persons of the Caribbean with whom they would always like to keep in touch, and this Bill which is before the House is merely seeking to make sure that those ties could be in a way more formal. Whenever the time comes, when some of these same persons are entitled to an award of this type, it would not be done in ignorance of those persons.

I have to get back to this. My disappointment is profound, because it is not really a simple matter, it is a matter in which we are dealing with individuals we know on a one-to-one basis, whether we met them at school, through our travels or through play, and I am disappointed and hurt that politics has reached a stage in Barbados where the Opposition of this country can turn a blind eye to some of their own friends.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is about time that Honourable Members take heed to what the junior Member has said. I think it is time that senior Members really observe it. Conclude your speech.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I am really hurt today, Sir, very disappointed. It is a measure I support fully. Anything which goes towards cementing ties in the Caribbean for the future in particular, anything which goes towards bringing Caribbean people together, I am all in support of. I am hoping, however, that the other measures necessary to bond the Caribbean even closer will, within a very short space of time, come to fruition. I hope that the time will come when I will still be around, when I can at least participate in ensuring that the history, the present and the future of the Caribbean, and what we all hope the Caribbean will one day become, a place for one people, a place in which there is free movement of both labour and capital, a place in which it is not for the big and for the small but for one and all of us becomes a reality.

I am in full support of the Bill which is before the House.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Barbados has been in the forefront ever since the integration movement in the Caribbean has been seriously approached. One believes that the fact that Barbados as a country spends the amount of money and interest in what I consider one of the most prestigious West Indian or CARICOM organisations, the University of the West Indies, that many of the people who may subsequently be considered for such awards may have been the people who have passed through that University and, because of so doing, were able to deliver to the people of CARICOM considerable benefits, again from the exposure they have had, albeit at the expense of the taxpayers of the Caribbean.

One hopes, Sir, that the same way we can sometimes share lashes to the CARICOM Heads of Government for not doing things which they sit and agree that they will do, and then there is some time lagging and feet dragging, that when an effort is made to improve the circumstances under which the people of the CARICOM movement should function, that we would wish to praise also in that regard. 3.45 p.m.

I would like in this very brief moment that I intervene, Sir, to laud the Heads of Government of the CARICOM region for the effort they are making to closer integrate the region. I think that we, as a territory and the entire region, will stand to benefit if we further recognise that whatever is done to improve the lot of the people of CARICOM ought to be appreciated.

I am sure, Sir, that some of the examples we will see from time to time in the Caribbean and more noticeably in Barbados does not lend any sort of credit to the fact that persons who have been the beneficiaries of the expenditures of taxpayers of the various territories pay so little respect for the people who have afforded them these opportunities.

I hope, Sir, that some of the behaviour that I have witnessed from time to time will be seen by the people of our country and our region for its true worth. I believe that some of us may have to hang our heads in shame when anything is said and done because we will not be able to stand and face the communities that we say we want to serve. I believe that we in the Parliaments of Barbados and of the CARICOM region ought to be serious people. I could feel no more ashamed than I do feel today when Honourable Members cannot even sit and listen to a contribution that is made in Parliament without the kind of interruption I am getting personally, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: One of the things about parliamentary language: it must be filled with moderation. To use the kind of terms that one wants to use does not speak well, in my view, for myself in the Chair. Secondly, it does not speak well for the type of debate that is expected. As I said this morning, Members are expected to rise above the political platform debate, and I am asking Members so to do.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while I appreciate your ruling, I have to say that if one participates in a debate in Parliament then I believe there are certain feelings one can have over what is happening while speaking. I know, Sir, that asides are not taken into account. They are not heard by the Chair, but I think Honourable Members know when they are offsetting other people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, I think the Honourable Member is slipping into the wrong direction. I think you should keep your mind set on the Bill. The Bill deals with the amendment to the Immigration Act.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I did say that my intervention was not intended to be lengthy, but I do not think that I should allow this opportunity to pass without adding my voice to that commendation of the CARICOM Heads of Government and their confreres for not only coming up with measures for the improvement of the people of CARICOM, but that they have taken the responsibilities in their respective territories from time to time to bring to legislative reality the position that they have taken.

In supporting this Resolution, I wish to applaud the CARICOM Heads of Government for looking at this very important aspect of their life.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be filibustering or anything like that. I just need not to let this occasion pass without making a few comments on regional integration. The fact that we are now honouring three great sons of the soil who are not Barbadians but nonetheless would be honoured by everyone in Barbados, is something that I have to spend just a few moments to talk about.

I think, Sir, that no one can deny the great contributions made by Messrs. Walcott, Ramphal and Demas. Therefore, I do not need to belabour...

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I make this contribution because I feel compelled to do so because it has a few things that I think should be brought to the fore.

Honours to non-Barbadians is something that has been written about in the Press and people have talked in large numbers about it on the call-in programmes. I feel that if there are West Indians who have given yeoman service to their fellow West Indians they should be honoured. This is not to say that because I was given the Hummingbird Gold Medal in Trinidad in 1970 that I should get up and quite naturally support non-Barbadians getting honours. I am a federalist. I believe in the enhancement of all West Indians and I think we should not leave it for the cricket team only to come together as an enlightened people and as one in a cohesive force. I think that we should recognise West Indians who have given yeoman service in various fields of endeavour and in so doing, I think that we would be better people for it.

I just wish to say that sport in general and cricket, in particular, has done more for the Caribbean people in our quest for regional integration than a lot of people – in my view, more than most politicians. It is true to say, Sir, that if some politicians go to London, not to mention Australia or further afield, although you can hardly get further afield than Australia, or anywhere in the Commonwealth...

Asides:

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes. Russia too. Red Square. I was there and its paradoxical, Sir, that when I was in Red Square I once found a Bajan there running a pub. It just shows you that Barbadians are everywhere, giving of their best. I wish to say, Sir, that there is a list in this booklet, *Towards West Indians' Survival*. On page 17, it says that they tried to draw up a list of achievers in the West Indies, which is not an easy task, and they went on to name 25 cricketers whom they think have done a lot for the upliftment of West Indian people. Now, Sir, I am not going

to argue about the 25. The mere fact that my name... This is not really in alphabetical order, neither is it in order of merit, because my name is about number 20.

I just wish to say, Sir, perchance anyone believes I am quarrelling about that, only yesterday I got some clippings from the Australian newspapers where they had an island wide competition – Australia is an island continent – as to what is the world's greatest team. Perhaps, Sir, it may bring joy to some Members of this Honourable Chamber, or perhaps it might bring some consternation that the name W. W. Hall served in that team, the World's greatest team. Sir, if I am in the world's greatest team I surely must be in the West Indians best 25 so I am not bothered about that, Sir, I am saying, Sir, that it is a good thing to see the achievers ...
3.55 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Charlie Griffith, Sir, should be here. I would object very much, Sir, if Charlie Griffith is not here. Sir, the list is as follows: George Headley, Frank Worrell, Jeffrey Stollmeyer, Gerry Gomez, Alfred Valentine, Sonny Ramadin, Everton Weekes, Clyde Walcott, Conrad Hunte, Rohan Kanhai, Cammie Smith, Andy Roberts, Larry Gomes, Gordon Greenidge, Lawrence Rowe, Garfield Sobers, Viv Richards, Malcolm Marshall, Derek Murray, Michael Holding, Wes Hall, Lance Gibbs, that is the batting order, Sir – Desmond Haynes, Jeff Dujohn, Mike Findlay and others, and Sir Learie Constantine was given a little mention at the bottom. I think, Sir, that Charlie Griffith obviously must be in the first eleven. There is no doubt about that. Let his friends tell him that I said something good about him, Sir. He is my partner and I really seriously feel, Sir, that these achievers should be recognised – not only in cricket, Sir.

Sir, I am not going to beg for an OCC, Sir, for the simple reason that I am Wesley Winfield Bartholomew St. David Hall, HMB, GCM, MP, there is no room for any OCC. I don't need an OCC, no need to put two lines and then you could put Esquire behind that too. I am saying, Sir – if I am allowed to go on – that there are many other areas that we have to recognise these people. Take for instance in the field of painting. We have a gentleman in Barbados who taught every Combermerian in the last 50 years, a man called Karl Broodhagen.

Only this year, I am serious, at Drexel University, Sir, they had an exhibition there where there were 33 West Indian painters, including Vasco Holder and his brother, Sir and people like Carlyle Chang. Sir, they were honoured in America, and do you know, Sir, it was very difficult to get Barbadians to understand that 26 out of the 33 artists were Barbadians and we could not muster enough money to even send Barbadian flowers up there. I am saying that we need

to look very carefully at the people who have done great service to this country.

In the field of reggae in music, Sir, it is noteworthy that the Jamaicans have made Bob Marley a legend in his life time and since then I am telling you, even people who were with him are now becoming legends. I am saying, Sir, that they have taken the reggae music and they have made it synonymous with Jamaica in terms of advertising on American television. They just advertise Jamaican music – reggae – and the Jamaican Government have seen it fit to tie in very cleverly the idea that the whole world should know about Jamaica through reggae.

I am only saying that, Sir, to point out exactly how people have used their cricketers, their painters, and their artiste, whether they are singers or not. They have used these people to further the particular cultures. Therefore I believe that we can look too at the unique UWI and we can see the stalwarts that have gone through that system and we can be very proud of the fact that we have had some of the great people of learning coming to make their contributions from that college of the West Indies.

I therefore deem it a privilege and indeed a real pleasure to recommend most highly that all West Indians should be aware of the great effort given to the particular task by these gentlemen and ladies, Sir, who have made their significant contributions to regional integration.

I say this, Sir, because you can always tell when the West Indies play a test match, Sir, in England, especially in London. How they react during the day is determined by how well the West Indian cricket team is playing at the game of cricket. It is seen in the factories throughout England and further afield, Sir. In the factories, you can tell whether the West Indies are winning or if they are losing. I say this, because if the West Indies are losing, West Indies don't even bother to go to work, they feel so strongly about it. I feel, Sir, that we, in the Caribbean should get some of that spirit that seems only to be with us when we are in far off lands.

Therefore, Sir, I would support any move which will honour West Indians. I am nothing to do with the choice, Sir, although on this occasion I do not think that anyone can quarrel with the choices that have been made but I do feel that there are many others who have given yeoman service, Sir, and I am quite sure will easily qualify for this high accolade in the field of calypso. I have mentioned reggae and I feel that if I mention reggae that I should also mention calypso because we have to be very careful how one perceives us, because there was once a Prime Minister, I think somewhere Malaya who said that West Indians were people who played cricket, drank rum and sang calypso and therefore we have to get away from that type

of thinking. We have to let the people know throughout the world, Sir, that West Indians, Sir, are very serious people and even though we are champions of the world in cricket, even though we have been known to partake in, sometimes a diet of liquid chicken, called rum, Sir, and even though we do sing beautiful calypso it must not take away from the fact that we are indeed a very serious people and I do believe that we can show our seriousness whenever we have the opportunity to pay tribute to our heroes.

While I am at that, Sir, let me say this to you, that there are some Barbadians, if they were living in any other part of the world, indeed if they had visited some parts of the world, people would turn out in great numbers and they would give them the credit which they are due.

It seems to me, Sir, and perhaps it is not our fault, perhaps it is something that is just natural in Barbados that we seem to take greatness as business as usual if you are great. One has to look at the immortal Sir Gary Sobers, Sir. I saw only a few months ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain being very, very anxious and nervous too, to meet the great Sir Gary Sobers. He invited him to No. 10 Downing Street. That is not something that happens every day to an average individual. There are very few of us in this room, Sir, that have been invited to No. 10 Downing Street.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Yes. Have you been there? Two years' experience as a Parliamentarian does not really qualify you to go to No. 10 Downing Street. I am saying, Sir, that I referred to Sir Gary Sobers because I believe that it is really amazing that when you go anywhere in the Commonwealth and when as Minister of Tourism and Sports in this country I try to use the services of this distinguished gentleman, especially when we are thinking of making promotions in the Commonwealth, Sir, people seem to think it is a joke. It is not a joke, Sir, one only has to be there to see the type of reverence which people pay to this great man. I feel there are other Barbadians, Sir, who, if not equally great they are great in their own right. 4.05 p.m.

Only in the last year, Sir, and there is no time in our history in sports in Barbados that Barbadians have done us so proud. It seems, Sir, to go unnoticed day by day as if greatness is something that is just there for Barbadians to pluck out of the air. I say no, Sir. It takes a lot of hard work and, when these people do well, I think that we should honour them. I said all of that to say this. I really believe that when it comes to honouring Caribbean people who have done well in their respective field, Sir, that we in Barbados should show the way. If this Bill seems to give that impression, I will back that.

I thought, Sir, that I should say these few words. I am not filibustering. I am not into any situation where there is any discussion. Whenever the economic discussion comes, Sir, whether it comes tonight, next week, on a political platform, in these hallowed walls or a rum shop, it does not matter, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: But not in this Bill.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, that is exactly what happens when you are batting on a good wicket and they bowl a half volley. It takes ten times to hit it through mid-wicket rather than through the extra cover. I am sorry, Sir.

I am only saying, Sir, that I am truly appreciative of the amendment of this Act and I have no difficulty in supporting it. I did not wish anyone to feel that I am supporting it because I wanted to be involved in this OCC. Indeed, Sir, I have not even given it the slightest thought. Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment of the Immigration Act, one realise that there comes a time in a society such as Barbados, although it is jointed in terms of the Caribbean since they are individual islands, that we have the opportunity to recognise and honour three citizens of the territory, specifically Sir Shridath Ramphal, Derek Walcott, and William Demas. History will show, Mr. Speaker, that traditionally Barbadians, especially if they leave these shores whenever they immigrate or visit any territory such as the U.K., U.S.A., or Canada, Bajans first of all tend to look for Bajans and, secondly, they tend to identify with West Indians. Therefore, in the whole effort of this integration which was established by the Heads of Government, we are really taking ourselves back to the very first effort which was made in the late forties and early fifties towards federation. That, Sir, was not successful and then we moved from there to the second phase which was the phase of CARIFTA. That one may say was part successful and there are those who may say in their view that it was successful, and others may say otherwise. Then we have the CARICOM movement.

We are now in the CARICOM movement. That, too, has had its ups and downs. That has been taken apart, put back together, and in recent times a special effort has again been made to bring this community spirit in terms of the whole Caribbean Community into reality. It has not been an easy task. It will not be an easy task. In fact, those of us who are around now may not be around when it can truly be said that the reality of the integration has indeed reached its pinnacle.

I do not think that the letters OCC associated with the honour itself can be considered to be expressive of an individual's contributions to society. However, one may be able to look at it and ascertain from that honour or the

rendering of that honour what may be the inspiration for those who may come after. It is indeed a fact, Mr. Speaker, that those of younger years who will follow us will then by simply seeing the letters "OCC" associated with one's name may very well ask the question: What is the significance of that OCC? This in itself, Mr. Speaker, can make a specific contribution to the history of this country. As a former teacher, one knows that one does not always have to go directly to the subject matter. But there are peripheral things that may draw you in through which you may be better able to impart the knowledge about the subject matter than if you went to what they call the raw data or the nitty-gritty of the particular subject matter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that in a way we are creating history and in a way we are giving knowledge to those who are yet to come. I think it is indeed an honour to Barbados that we have decided to step out and become part of this movement and in this Honourable House to honour these three gentlemen by the amendment to Immigration Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I can safely say that I am the senior Member in this Honourable House and I speak chronologically. I am sure of that, Sir. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, some of the things back to the late forties of the effort in the very first integration movement. What happened then, Mr. Speaker, in the late forties and early fifties, is no different from what is happening now. There are always the uncertainties. There are always the unbelieving "Thomases". There are always those who feel that black people can never get together and I believe that still exists here today. When I say here, I do not necessarily mean in this Honourable House but in the society of Barbados and indeed the whole CARICOM.

Sir, I have had very little contact with the three gentlemen. I have had the pleasure of meeting all three gentlemen, but I have had very little contact with the three gentlemen within the last twenty years.
4.15 p.m.

I have, however, discovered that, no matter what else may be said of them, in their own particular way they have all made an effort to signal to the Community that there was a need and a requirement for integration of the peoples of the Community. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I, in my short contribution to this debate, would like to place on record my association with the support for this amendment.

I thank you, Sir.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not believe that the opportunity should be allowed to pass without my expressing my views on this matter of these Caribbean honorees. I have no quarrel with the honouring of three persons, but I have said before now and I wish to repeat that the concept of moving towards honouring

Caribbean persons, the concept of moving towards a single unit as a people is laudable, but we have to guard against taking any kind of action which might suggest that we are trying to build elitist communities within the Caribbean.

I have made this point before in another place where I have had the honour to speak to the Caribbean Heads of Government, and I wish to repeat that whereas one cannot fault the quality of the three persons that will be immediately honoured by this particular amendment to the Immigration Act, when we speak about this particular amendment it seems to me that we have to speak in terms broader, in terms deeper than just three persons. It seems to me as well that we have to start thinking in terms of persons other than those who may have been given special gifts, or those who by special circumstances of privilege or success or good fortune have managed to reach the tops of their particular fields of endeavour, where those fields of endeavour have been those fields which we cannot all hope to reach.

It is very necessary that when the leadership within the Caribbean begins to think of the freedom of persons to move, and thinks of respecting those persons and allowing them to move, that we do not think only of persons who have managed to be senior members of regional institutions or senior sportsmen. Not everybody is going to be gifted to attain the heights in sports that Sir Garfield Sobers attained, and although we cannot ourselves argue that he ought not to be – indeed he should be – considered in a field such as this, and that there are other people that we could easily name, but we shall not name because we do not want to go into the realm of name calling, thereby running the risk of forgetting some important names, it is very necessary that in our efforts to build a Caribbean community we do not make the mistake of believing that we are setting out to dig a grave and that we are starting from the top and moving downwards.

If we are endeavouring to build a community, to build an institution, Sir, it is my considered view that we have at one and the same time to address persons within the region at all levels. That is not going to be very easy, I am satisfied, but we still have to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that the messages which we send to the man and the woman in the street are not messages that suggest that we are seeking to build institutions of privilege.

The concept of an integrated Caribbean will work only if what we commonly call the average person, that indefinable thing called the average person, becomes sufficiently satisfied that it will work and is persuaded that he or she should make efforts to make it work. If the average person is going to be encouraged to make the concept into a reality, then we must guard against building and setting up institutions that will seek to suggest that only at certain levels within the society will there be arrangements for honouring and for special privilege or

freedom of movement or any other thing that should go in this idea of an integrated Caribbean.

I believe that the framers of this particular bit of legislation for the region would have been considering that it is important to start somewhere, and I have no quarrel with that as a concept. I believe that in their starting somewhere they would have been looking for certain persons whose performance may be so established and so outstanding that all member territories within the region could accept these persons readily. With that I have no problem. I have only the concern that when the efforts that were referred to by the Honourable Member for St. George North were attempted in bringing the region together did not succeed, part of the reason that we can find on examination for that lack of success will be found to lie in the fact that in much of the preparations for the coming together of the people of the region was done from the very top; the political directorate, or the level of the technocrats, or the level of the bureaucrats, and very little of that coming together was done at the level of the average person, whoever he may be.

What I am very anxious to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that in this new thrust we have towards a single Caribbean entity we should guard against making the same errors that we have made in the past. I am suggesting that one way by which we can move away from that is by having the peoples of the region recognise that we have conceptualised the Caribbean as an area for people at all levels and of all classes.

An important factor which comes out of this, to my mind, Sir, is the thought that an integrated Caribbean can only come if the differences which there are between people are reduced to as few differences as possible. Many of those things which divide us are more figments of imagination and more matters of suspicion and doubt than they are true matters of substance. The old idea of the Trinidadian not trusting the Bajan, and both of them not trusting the Jamaican is still very much a part of the Caribbean culture. It is not going to be removed overnight, it is not going to be suddenly removed because the Heads of Government have signed a document at one of the Heads of Government conferences, it will only be removed when people by coming together, by understanding one another begin to realise that we share not only a common past, not only a singleness of the joys of winning at cricket and the pains of losing, but when we realise that economically, politically and socially we share a single destiny. In those circumstances, it is my very great wish that we, at the level of the total community, endeavour to see that this particular bit of legislation, or bits of legislation like it, establish something that would touch on all persons and not just on the selected few.

I thank you.
4.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the debate on this Bill that is before us and I would like to indicate at the outset that, in my view, this has been one of the most significant debates and one of the most important issues to be debated by this Chamber in a very long time.

From time to time, the point has been made that time is not found to discuss matters of regional integration, and yet the subject of regional integration is central to our own outlook and central to the development of Barbados and the rest of the Caribbean. This should be pretty obvious, Sir, if what happens in Estonia or Latvia or Lithuania, if what happens in Moscow or Leningrad or elsewhere, if what happens in Kuwait or in Iraq affects us here, what happens in Georgetown or Port-of-Spain or in St. John's should also and is also of very important consideration to us.

What we are talking about is not an abstract entity, Sir. The purchasing power of the people of Trinidad and Tobago is of direct consequence to us in this country, to our people who work in the factories or who work elsewhere. What happens in Barbados is of significance to the people of Grenada or the people of St. Vincent, as the case may be. This is precisely the point I was stressing when I introduced this measure. While it can be put into the category of the symbolic, it also has a deeper and truer significance and I would like to pay a tribute to all of the Members, Sir, who have spoken during this debate and who have spoken so very well from different perspectives. They have been able to make the point that what we are seeking to do is to create not only an economic community, but we are also seeking to develop that social and cultural symbiosis that will be the future of the new Caribbean.

I want to make it clear that what we are doing here is taking a step to amend the Immigration Act to give effect to a decision that has already been taken and to make possible the privileges that have been determined should be accorded to those honourable persons who are given the Order of the Caribbean Community. That Agreement has already been signed. What we are seeking to do is to ensure that whoever may be given that very high status of the Order of the Caribbean Community would be able to live and reside in Barbados, to own property here, and to carry out their economic and other activities in Barbados as if they were citizens or residents. This is on a reciprocal basis because all of the other territories who are signatory to that Agreement also undertake to do the same. It may be that if the other freedoms that may be necessary or desirable for a full community to come into being will take some time, at least at this level we are making a start for those persons who have made a most outstanding and significant contribution to the Caribbean.

I think, therefore, Sir, having underlined the point and having stressed the fact that persons have from time to time said that we do not find enough time to debate matters of regional significance that this is really an outstanding occasion in which we have so done.

I have already moved that the Bill be read a second time.

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

COMMITTEE

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 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.

Clauses 1 to 4 were called and passed.

On the motion of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
4.35 p.m.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 2.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Question No. 2 reads as follows:

"To ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

- (1) Will the Minister state how soon sufficient provision will be made for roadways, drainage and water supply for the areas in Gospel Road, Dayrells Road, Worthing View, and Pleasant Hall Tenantry, all in Christ Church, and Gunsite Road, Brittons Hill, St. Michael which are designated tenancies under the Tenancies Development (Designation of Gospel Road, Dayrells Road Tenantry, Christ Church) Order 1985, the Tenancies Development (Designation of Worthing View, Christ Church) Order 1986, the Tenancies Development (Designation of Pleasant Hall Tenantry, Christ Church) Order 1986 and the Tenancies Development (Designation of Gunsite and Taitts Road Tenantry, St. Michael) Order 1986, respectively?

- (2) Will the Minister state how soon sufficient provision will be made for roadways for the area in Fordes Road, Christ Church which is a designated tenantry under the Tenancies Development (Designation of Fordes Road Tenantry, Christ Church) Order 1985?"

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer to Question No. 2 is as follows:

"All the road projects mentioned are already included in our master list for tenantry road upgrading. Work will commence when funds become available."

Hon H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, having regard to the critical financial state in which the Prime Minister has brought the country, will the Minister please state how many years from now he anticipates funds will be available?"

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, having regard to the fact that if the Honourable Member was aware that the critical financial situation would not have afforded the roads as a priority, given the massive number of roads that have been completed so far, we anticipate that by the next eighteen months or so we will be able to proceed, not only with these roads, but with roads throughout the entire country.

Mr. Speaker ruled that certain remarks made by the Member for Christ Church West be struck from the records.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 14.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Question No. 14 reads as follows:

"To ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

1. Will the Minister please state whether Government proposes construction of a road to provide an appropriate access to Jones Land, Lower Burney's, St. Michael, so as to eliminate the inconvenience presently being suffered by residents of that area?
2. If such a road is in Government's programme, will the Minister indicate when work in it will commence?"

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Question No. 14:

On behalf of the Minister I am able to say as follows:

"The Ministry is aware of the condition of the road and will include it in future tenantry road programmes, subject to the availability of funds."

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Minister state whether the Venezuelan road programme has collapsed, and to what extent would it affect the tenantry programme that he just spoke about?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am unaware of any Venezuelan road programme, sir, I have not been to Venezuela recently.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable Member tell us whether the road programme, the tenantry road programme that has been financed by Inversiones of Venezuela to carry out road building programmes in the tenancies of Barbados is still continuing or has that programme collapsed?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is fully aware that I am not the substantive Minister. I am unable to answer that, Sir. I am not going to raise the question about his accusing me of lying because he has more information about ...

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. George South were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I am unable to answer him specifically about Inversiones or any matter relating to Venezuela. I am only the Leader of the House. I am not the Minister responsible.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any other supplementaries? End of Question Time.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that brings us to the end of Government Business.

Now, earlier today, Honourable Members on the other side raised questions and Your Honour was pressed to point out that the rights of the Opposition have always been considered and I spoke and indicated that we would behave in the manner to which we had become accustomed through many long years in this House.

We have come to the end of Government Business and to the extent that those Honourable Members who have Private Business wish to proceed, I recommend that Your Honour now proceed to Private Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Order No. 1 – To move the passing of a Resolution of thanks and appreciation to Her Excellency the Governor-General for the speech delivered by Her Excellency during the first sitting of the Parliament 1991-96.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 6, 1991, Her Excellency, the Governor-General, delivered what is called the Throne Speech. Following that Throne Speech, I sought to have the following Resolution brought before this Honourable House.

The Resolution reads:

"Be it resolved that this Honourable House convey to Her Excellency the Governor-General, our thanks and appreciation for Her gracious speech on the occasion of the opening of the First Session of the Parliament 1991-1996".

In that Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, Her Excellency addressed what she called the fundamental policy goals of her Government.

The performance of her Government will from time to time become the subject for public review and in fact the current national debate would be part of that performance review that would be relevant from time to time. Whether the performance, in review, manages to satisfy the intentions or do not manage to satisfy the intentions, one still has to come back to the basic question of the presentation itself.

I wish to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental policy goals set down by Her Excellency are goals with which one can hardly find any fault. She indicates that part of her Government's plan over the next five years and beyond, include the plan

- (1) to increase the economy's total output on goods and services,
- (2) to provide more job opportunities thereby reducing unemployment;
- (3) to keep inflation at moderate levels so that the purchasing power of wages and salaries is not eroded;
- (4) to maintain the value of our currency;
- (5) to enhance labour productivity;
- (6) to increase living standards;

- (7) to maintain a sound balance in our external sector through the expansion of exports, the relative reduction of imports, and through judicious borrowing on the capital markets;
- (8) to increase investment from both domestic and foreign sources;
- (9) to maintain the national debt at sustainable levels;
- (10) to provide better health, education, training, housing and infrastructure;
- (11) to increase food output; and
- (12) to enhance the security, protection, values and self-esteem of our people.

4.45 p.m.

The goals that are set by a Throne Speech intend to indicate what is the intention of the Government and, in this case, in the intention of Her Excellency in her speech are the objectives which her Government has set which she has been so kind enough to read. I believe that in the not too distant future considerable time and considerable debate will be entered into on the question of certain aspects of the economy of Barbados. That is the way it should be because there is no question whatsoever but that at the moment there are problems which are being experienced in the attainment of some of these objectives. When those problems are discussed, I would imagine that they will have to be discussed against a number of criteria which will be examined by those persons examined by Her Excellency to carry out the objectives which she has set in what is called her fundamental policy goals. She, however, in this presentation has indicated what so far as the Government is concerned and Her Excellency is concerned, the broad aspirations which she has for the people of our nation.

One cannot deny that the increase in the economy of our goods and services must be an objective which any Government in any country must aim for. It is the lifeblood of economic activity and, therefore, the lifeblood of any country's programme. One can say the very same thing for much of what has been set down in those fourteen broad objectives, Sir. It is therefore not my intention to seek to deal with these fourteen items.

Aside.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I easily can. I am more concerned, Sir, with looking for those areas affecting these fundamental goals that would permit for discussion at my disposal and would permit for identification at the level of my particular interest. There has been much debate within recent times, Mr. Speaker,

about the question of labour activity. Much of what that debate has tried to suggest is that the workers themselves have been guilty of failing to operate satisfactorily at their work places and that there has to be some kind of machinery to change that around. I am interested in making the point and of having the point observed that it is a fact that labour can be more productive. It is a fact that national productivity levels can be enhanced.

I am of the view, Sir, that in addressing this question that Government had to take a number of things into consideration. The question of labour productivity is not something that is going to be obtained at a time of uncertainty. It is not something that is going to be obtained if certain measures are not put in place for all of the people in the country. I am saying all of the people not referring alone to the workers, but I am referring as well to the employers. There must be a climate in the country of assurance and certainty. At the moment I am of the view that there is much that is happening that is undermining that assurance and certainty. So I am of the view that, while we are very interested in workers and workers representatives, as I am interested, in having workers make whatever contribution in this matter of labour productivity, whatever Government does or employers do generally that they must be consonant with the objectives of the Throne Speech. There must be every effort made to try to work towards creating increased job opportunities, whereby those who are already in jobs, their commitment is not a commitment towards the reduction of their own job possibilities.

Her Majesty has indicated that her Government has interest in increasing the living standards of the people of the country. The living standards of a people are going to be included, Mr. Speaker, not only by the money they obtain, but they are going to be obtained by a number of other reasons including the environment in which they live. In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is very necessary that the environment is provided to ensure that the living standards of all people first of all be maintained and improved.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me begin by saying I do not intend to be repeating myself asking for order. I think we are clear as to how we debate in here. The rule clearly states that when a Member is speaking other Members should remain silent. I cannot stretch it to the limit, but I am suggesting to Members not to interrupt another Member while he is speaking.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Thank you, Sir. I was making the point that living standards will not be addressed only by the money wage and that therefore when once the wage has been had efforts have to be made to secure the real wage of the worker. Therefore, I understand Her Excellency in her presentation would be concerned with

ensuring that whatever policies Governments will take from time to time, that her Government will endeavour to ensure that the real wage of the worker is maintained as high as it possibly can be and that therefore the living standards will keep being sustained.

That would mean that where Governments from time to time may have words to say about policies to deal with income, that Governments have got to be careful to address those policies on income against policies relating to prices, because one has got to be absolutely sure that whatever the circumstances are, whatever the measures may be – and there can be no denying that one is talking very much today and hearing very much today about austerity measures – that those measures do not so consume us, and those concerns do not so much get the better of us that we embark on a programme which sees only one half of an equation without addressing the second half of the equation.

It is clear to me, Sir, that in the fundamental policy goals that are set down, the intention of Her Excellency relates to an improvement in the quality of life, and the quality of life therefore as an objective she would have would be one that I would wish to embrace and to recommend. She speaks not only to those matters which are economic, the Address speaks as well to the provision of better health, better education, improved training, improved housing and infrastructure. The health considerations, Mr. Speaker, cannot be over emphasised, and generally a desire that is set in any objective by an administration to educate and to train must be a commendable objective.

There is a distinction being drawn here between education and training, as it should be, and I wish to relate to this training, especially as it touches on the whole matter of the same labour productivity which I was addressing a moment or two ago. The suggestion has come from time to time that labour productivity can be enhanced purely by setting in place a body of rules or purely by using a carrot on the one hand or a stick on the other. I think it has been generally recognised that if there is going to be an effort for Barbados at all levels to become more productive – and it has to be that Barbados at all levels become more productive and not just at some levels – that training has to be a very significant and important ingredient in any planning and any arrangement for that increased productivity which there is.

Within the broad framework of the fundamental policy goals that Her Excellency has set down, therefore, one expects that the Government will provide the opportunities and the facilities, not only for education, but for the kind of training on an ongoing and regular basis which will equip Barbados to be able to produce and to perform at levels that are satisfactory. It has been my view, Sir, that because we do not have low wages – and we do not

apologise for having wages that are not low, we have walked around for many years trying to pretend that we have low wages and making apology for them – I think that we have reasonable wages, although I want to see them higher, and those wages which we have and for which we ought not to apologise are from time to time set down by bureaucrats and politicians as the basis for us not being able to attract particular businesses which may have been interested in coming to our shores, but which have gone elsewhere where the competition in the labour may have been better.

I take the view, Sir, that consistent with the policy goals that are set down here, if we are going to address the matter of training, and we are going to make our people better work persons, then we will be able to address that apparent contradiction, because if the quality of our performance is addressed in such a way that it becomes even better as performance, I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that our output of goods and services will be at the quality level which will more than make up for the fact that we may have a higher wage level. Indeed, I am of the view that several businesses – the good ones, anyhow – do not mind paying a better wage if for the better wage or the better salary they are paying they are able to derive increased productivity and improved quality in the goods or the services that are being outturned. As a matter of fact, many Bajan employers – hopefully more will follow this example – are concerning themselves today with wishing to discuss the quality of the output of the labour they are paying for, and they have made it very clear that they do not mind entering into discussions which will have additional payments made, either by way of incentives or productivity bonuses, or what have you, always provided that they can see an association and a relationship between that output of money and the output of goods and services.

It is very necessary, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us to recognise and to address the matter of training as it relates to this. In this particular regard I wish to make the point that very necessary in this training exercise is the requirement for training to be improved and increased at the level of the Public Service, starting at the highest possible level. We cannot believe that we are going to motivate people who are at the lower echelons in our society, who are the lowest income earners; we cannot believe that we will get more out of them in terms of output on a daily or monthly basis if the people who are responsible for supervising them, for giving them direction, themselves seem not to have a policy direction, seem not to be motivated or themselves seem not to be adequately trained.

5.05 p.m.

It would be necessary for training to be recognisable and to be an ongoing feature of all levels, not only in the private sector, but in the public sector as well.

The Throne Speech also addresses, Mr. Speaker, the matter of labour relations and it indicates that Her Excellency's Government remains committed to the attainment and maintenance of further labour management relations; that it proposes among other things consistent with that, to examine the feasibility of establishing a tribunal to adjudicate on industrial disputes in the public sector and to prepare draft legislation on unfair dismissals after wide consultations on the matter.

Again, the speech addresses a very vital aspect of labour management relations in that it deals with the matter of consultation. We would want to suggest that when there is the discussion on the matter of industrial disputes in the labour sector to be dealt with, it is very important that full and meaningful consultations be entered into and that there is every opportunity for the social partners in this matter to be able to express very adequately their views. It is also important that those views are heard by the Government, recognised by the Government, and acted upon by the Government.

In the matter of unfair dismissal, we would want to be involved very early in discussions of this matter, and although we have heard that there is some draft legislation either very close to being handed out for public scrutiny or for initial discussion, we would wish to be very careful to make the point that we are hoping that the Government does not bring down a piece of legislation which will have the effect of creating a climate where workers will be even more disadvantaged than they are now, because there may be an arrangement where there is a machinery that is purely legalistic and where a series of appeals may be put into place by the legislation that would mean that a worker who has been unfairly dismissed has to go to a lawyer at a first level, possibly to a lawyer at a second level, thereby putting the possibility for justice outside of the realm of the poorer employee at the lower earning levels of the economic ladder.

If a person is working for only \$200 or \$250 a week, even though he has been employed for ten years, if he loses his job by what is considered to be an unfair dismissal, clearly the cost of litigation is going to be a very grave deterrent to having that matter pursued beyond the level of the conciliation processes at the Department of Labour. If we draw up a system which puts too much legal reference to attorneys into this matter, then we are going to have a situation where, Mr. Speaker, although the man or woman may be right, that person may not be able to pursue justice because it may be financially impossible for that person to do so. It is therefore important that in our efforts to recognise and to respect the goals which have been set by this Throne Speech that in our performance we try to adhere as closely as possible, in labour management matters, to the process of consultation and preliminary dialogue.

The matter of the quality of life is something that pervades this entire Throne Speech and for which one must have a particular feel. The goal to improve sporting facilities, the goal to improve agriculture, the concerns for those deterrents within the community which have the effect of making people turn against people or which have the effect of preventing people who would otherwise enjoy our country from coming to Barbados and enjoying the tourism plant we offer and the facilities we have. Those are some of those matters which are addressed in this particular speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has one minute more.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: With the interruptions too, Sir? Okay, Sir.

In those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely necessary that we recognise that some of those bits of legislation which are before us, and where we have taken the procedures of going to special committees, that it is desirable that, as soon as is possible for the planners, they be dealt with fully in all stages so that we do what ever is possible to make sure that in man's dealing with man or woman's dealing with woman, and in our dealings with our neighbours that we are able truly to say that the quality of life in Barbados is being improved. Those bits of legislation which impact are fundamental to improving the quality of life – the Domestic Violence Bill and those kinds of things. I wish to thank you, Sir, and to suggest that in her plans to have the quality of life....

Mr. SPEAKER: Time. The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: I do beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution be passed.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the Resolution and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is quite obvious that we are not going to be able to go on to item No. 4 on Private Members' Business, which is a resolution standing in my name. So, I must really thank the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central for having so graciously agreed to begin the discussion on his resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would take as my point of departure in this debate a statement made at the very start of the Throne Speech which was delivered to Parliament on February 6, 1991. It says in this Throne Speech, Sir, and the words which were put in the mouth of the Governor-General of Barbados is that:

"However, during 1990, as predicted in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of May 2, 1990,

economic activity contracted in response to local, regional and international factors."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in Economics, the contraction of economic activity has but one meaning. It refers to a situation where the value of economic output in one year, 1990 is less than the value of economic output in the preceding year 1989. The Government put words in the mouth of the Governor-General of this country to the effect that as predicted in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of May 2, 1990, economic output contracted.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of Wednesday, May 2, 1990 – a document for public record. It says on page 10:

"On present trends, the Barbados economy is expected to record moderate real growth of about 2% in 1990."

So, you have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where in the Throne Speech delivered to the people of Barbados by the Governor-General of this country, this year, February 6, 1991, it is written that as predicted in this Budget of 1990, economic activity contracted. Whereas if you check the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals it is clearly set out that there is absolutely no such prediction at all. The significance of this, Sir, is that this present Democratic Labour Party administration began with a lie. A clear lie, Sir.
5.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just for the sake of the record, what I am saying is that the Honourable Member quoted from a statement from the Governor-General and then a statement from the Prime Minister and ended up by saying that what the Democratic Labour Party said is a lie. Now it is difficult to reconcile the premise on which the statement was made and the conclusion. I have difficulty with it, so that any reflection on Members in this Chamber need to be safeguarded.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is unfortunate that the Governor-General of this country, Sir, was put in the unfortunate position to have to repeat a misstatement of fact. It is a misstatement of fact surrounding which there should have been no mystery because it is the Democratic Labour Party's administration which delivered to this Parliament, the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement of 1990, which said then, Sir, that they were predicting the economy to grow rather than to contract – the very words, Mr. Speaker, that they put in the mouth of the Governor-General of the country.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that perhaps we need in the light of this particular evidence to ask how many other misstatements the Democratic Labour Party has been

prepared to put to the people of this country, Sir. I will come back to that matter in greater detail because I have a limited time to cover many of the issues that are raised in this Throne Speech.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, committed Government to keeping inflation at moderate levels so that the purchasing power of wages and salaries is not eroded. The Democratic Labour Party committed itself in this Throne Speech to the pursuit of policies and measures to avoid the erosion of the purchasing power of wages and salaries in this country, Sir.

One of the chief ways by which the purchasing power of wages and salaries can be maintained – and not eroded, Sir – is to ensure that not only do people get increases but that people are actually paid cash when they work.

We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, very unfortunate situation in this country, that a Government which could on the 6th February 1991, commit itself to maintaining the purchasing power of wages and salaries in this country is now committing itself to the issue of bonds as a substitute for the payment of wages.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I recall, Sir, and all of us recall, Sir, that on the 26th July 1987, Mr. Errol Barrow held a press conference at which he said that he shall advise the citizens of Barbados that the law says that they shall be paid in the coinage of the realm and not otherwise, Mr. Speaker. He was saying that he, as Prime Minister of this country, was going to take his Attorney General to court if he did not get moneys payable to him by his Government, not in bonds, Sir, but in hard, hard, cash. Mr. Speaker, Sir, furthermore it was the same Errol Barrow who said ...

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have some order? I want to give the Honourable Member the same opportunity to speak in silence.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was the same Errol Barrow who said that he wanted also to introduce a piece of legislation in this country that if the Government of Barbados did not give you back your refund within six months that it had to pay interest. Mr. Speaker, we now have a situation in this country where a Government that committed itself in this Throne Speech, Sir, to protecting the purchasing power of wages and salaries is now thinking in terms, Sir, not only of issuing bonds, when the former Prime Minister said he would take it to court if they did so, but contrary to what the Democratic Labour Party proposed

in 1987, Sir, that you are asking people now to accept bonds that do not accrue interest, Sir, for five years.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that we have immediately a basis for not expressing any confidence in this Throne Speech because the basis on which the objectives that are sought by the statement of government policy in this Throne Speech, Sir, are absolutely flawed.

The Throne Speech also says, Sir, that Government will facilitate the holding of foreign currency accounts in this country, giving priority to exporters of goods and services. That was the commitment given on the 6th February, 1991, that the Government would liberalise the foreign exchange regime in this country. Not Sir, to put in security checks at the airport, not to put in a series of draconian measures to peep on all Barbadians when they are leaving the country, Sir. Nor, Mr. Speaker, to be seeking to involve itself in relationships with other countries to spy into the affairs of Barbadian people. It was saying we were going to liberalise and we were going to allow the Barbadian people to hold foreign currency accounts, Mr. Speaker. We are now hearing, Sir, this has gone through the window.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. I am asking for order. I want to get this perfectly clear. I am tired of saying this. Let the Honourable Member speak and you will get your turn. I want to hear him clearly.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: This Throne Speech is clear in sending a specific signal to Government in relation to how the Government proposes to manage the foreign exchange controls in Barbados. It did not propose a draconian set of measures that would virtually convert Barbados into the unfortunate kind of foreign exchange police state that we have seen set up in other Caribbean countries, Sir, to treat every Barbadian passing through the airport as a potential criminal. It did not set out with that intention, Mr. Speaker, it set out with the intention to allow Barbadians to hold foreign currency accounts, Sir.

Now we have a Government which, as recently as Sunday, threatened the people of Barbados that there will be greater security checks at the airport, and all other kinds of foolishness, Mr. Speaker, that are contrary to the spirit...
5.25 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I really regret interrupting the Honourable Member, Sir. But the Honourable Member is embarking on a fishing trip. The speech made by the Prime Minister to which he is obviously referring is recorded and was heard by everyone. The Prime Minister did not say that he was going to make all the citizens of Barbados criminals nor did he say...

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order taken.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I really have to come back to the basic point that I made at the very start of my speech. We all have to be very concerned when a Government can find itself in a position to know what it said in a Budget debate and thereafter it puts into a Throne Speech a statement which is absolutely contrary to what it said in that Budget debate, Sir. We have to begin to ask ourselves the question: How many other things is the Government issuing misstatements about? I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of this country is also issuing misstatements about who is responsible for Barbados' economic problems as well, Sir.

The Government of Barbados tells us, Sir, that the problem that we are facing in this country is a problem with the fiscal deficit. Then the Minister of Finance puts himself, in my view, in the position of Pontius Pilate. He washes his hands of the matter and then he looks in the mirror and say that I can find no fault with this man. He puts himself in that position, Sir, that he feels that the biggest problem in Barbados is the problem of the fiscal deficit. Then he seeks to blame everybody else in Barbados for that fiscal deficit. He blames the economic terrorists in the Barbados Labour Party. He blames Tom Adams, Sir. He blames Saddam Hussein. He blames the sugar workers. He blames Richie Haynes. He blames everybody else, Sir. But it surely must be a matter of fact that there is only one person and one person only who can be responsible for the size of the fiscal deficit in this country and that is the Minister of Finance. That has to be true, Mr. Speaker. The House should remind itself...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I propose to do if I cannot get the silence that I want is to suspend the sitting. When I come back, I will not be suspending the whole House. I will start to suspend a few Members if I cannot get Members to control themselves. So I will suspend and, when I come back, I will not suspend the whole House. I will be suspending Members.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he and he alone is responsible for the fiscal deficit. If the fiscal deficit is the big problem and he has told the country so, the country must understand that only the Minister of Finance can be responsible for that fiscal deficit, Sir, and more to the point. In 1989, the Minister of Finance reported a fiscal deficit which he said was the lowest in the history of Barbados. So that up to that point, Mr. Speaker, there could have been no problem in Barbados caused by a fiscal deficit because they had the lowest then in the history of this country. I am going to believe that without checking that he was right although perhaps I ought to check back. But up to 1989 he was reporting the lowest ever fiscal deficit in the history of this country. Must it therefore not follow that if there is a problem with the fiscal deficit after 1989 when it was the lowest in the history that it would

have to be caused not by the actions of a previous Government but by the Government in charge then and more precisely the Minister who was in charge then as well, Sir? Let us go back to 1989. What did the Minister do? For the first time in the history of this country, and we must deal with misstatements, Mr. Speaker, a Minister of Finance found himself in a position where his debt repayments were going to be \$60 million less than in the previous year. We are hearing now, Sir, in Barbados that our problems are caused by debt repayments. But in 1989 the Minister of Finance was not in a position in Barbados to show that his increased expenditure was caused by debt. He could not show that, Sir, because since 1990/91 debt repayment fell in Barbados. He was put then in a position the first time of any Minister of Finance in this country where he could not properly say that repayment of debt was going to add to his increased expenditure. But he is now telling the people of Barbados, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of this country are being caused by his having to repay debt. In 1990, Sir, the records are that debt repayments fell notwithstanding the decline in debt repayments in 1990/91 which the Minister redistributed the savings from the debt to all the statutory boards bringing Government's expenditure on current account in excess of Government's revenues brought to this House as part of this Budget which was already in deficit on the current account. Then there was added on top of that the \$33 million in regrading, \$25 million in salary increases, and I think about \$5 million in increased pensions and \$91 million in supplementaries, although I will concede that part of those supplementaries would have had to include some of the payments for the non-established staff. Can we therefore, Mr. Speaker, have any doubt as to where the responsibility for the deficit that the Prime Minister is saying lies? Can we have any doubt, Sir? Can we have any doubt about where the responsibility lies for the deficit of 1991? When the Minister brought to this House a deficit equivalent to \$372 million, 12 per cent of GDP or if you subtract 6 per cent debt repayments of GDP, he told this House that he had been advised by his technician to reduce it to 2.5 per cent of GDP but he would not do so because that would have been too draconian an adjustment to make. Sir, now he is asking this country to accept that that deficit should be reduced to one per cent of GDP. The responsibility of all of that must rest at the doorstep of the Minister of Finance.

Is it also not a misstatement on the part of the Democratic Labour Party to say that the decline in Barbados' reserves were caused in the last five months by the statements of economic terrorists in this country? If you would have picked up the facts, Sir, the economic reserves of Barbados as cited by the Central Bank were set at \$401 million in March 1989 and that there has been a continuous flight of those reserves not only within the five months, Sir, but beginning in March 1989. Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that the decline in Barbados' reserves was brought to Government's attention not in the last five months but in

1989 when they began to occur. I brought to the Minister's attention Section 26 (3) of the Central Bank Act prepared not by the Barbados Labour Party but by Errol Barrow himself.

5.35 p.m.

The laws of Barbados, Mr. Speaker, are drafted to prevent a balance of payments problem occurring in this country, not for the Government to act after the balance of payments problem has arisen. I will repeat for the benefit of the House section 26(3) of the Central Bank of Barbados Act, Cap. 323C, dealing with Reserve of External Assets.

"If the Reserve of External Assets has declined, or in the judgment of the Board appears to be in danger of declining, so as to jeopardise the adequacy of such Reserve, the Bank shall submit to the Minister a report on the reserve position and the causes which have led or may lead to such a decline, together with its recommendations concerning the measures it considers necessary to forestall or otherwise remedy the situation."

You do not act only when the reserves have declined, but if the Board of the Central Bank believes that they are in danger of declining. Our laws are drafted to prevent Barbados from being in the state in which it is today. This was drafted not by a BLP Minister of Finance, but by the late Errol Barrow, because he recognised that you do not let a country find itself in a position where you evaporate your reserves and then deal with it. If the Board of the Central Bank believes that our reserves may begin to decline, it has a responsibility in law to bring to the Minister's attention the situation which may arise and recommend action to prevent it.

We now have a Government, Mr. Speaker, that is telling the people of Barbados that it has waited until our reserves have been depleted and after the horse has bolted the stable, when the laws of this country require the Minister and the Board of the Central Bank to act to prevent that situation occurring. I want to ask again, Mr. Speaker, has the Governor of the Central Bank complied with the requirement of section 26(3) of the Central Bank Act of Barbados? If he has acted, Sir, in compliance with section 26(3) I want to know what set of circumstances would have allowed the Minister of Finance of this country to refuse the advice given to him by the Governor of the Central Bank to prevent our reserves from falling.

We speak also, Mr. Speaker, about mis-statements. The Minister of Finance would have this country believe today that Barbados' economic problems are being caused by the repayment of debt. He is a victim of his own contradictions, because at one and the same time he is telling you that he has a debt repayment problem and the debt is too large, and the next time he is telling the public that the foreign debt today is the same as the foreign debt

in 1986. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, if the problem is debt, and the foreign debt today is the same as it was in 1986, then the question which arises is: Why do you have to go to the IMF today rather than going in 1986 if the debt is the problem?

I want to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, of what that same Minister of Finance said in 1988 in his budget speech, on page 21. He said then:

"Conventional ratios used by international institutions to judge the burden of debt, when applied to Barbados, therefore indicate that its foreign debt burden is considerably lower than that of many other countries. We can therefore safely say that by international standards our debt service and debt to GDP ratios are not in the danger zone. Our international obligations are within manageable limits."

The Minister of Finance came to this House in 1988 and told the people of Barbados that by all conventional standards we are lower than most developing countries, that our debt service and our debt to GDP ratios are not in any danger zone and our international obligations are within manageable limits. He is now coming to the people of Barbados and trying to impute that this problem is a problem of debt and that the problem of debt that he said in 1988 was manageable is now the straw that is breaking the camel's back.

I want to say to the House, Sir, that perhaps there might have been straws that will break the camel's back, but it clearly must be the case that if the debt situation was manageable in 1988, it could only be developments subsequent to 1988 that have put him now in a position where he can feel that the problem is a problem of the repayment of debt.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the 1990-91 situation in this country where the Government of Barbados had to repay less debt than it did in 1989-90 gives the complete lie to the Prime Minister's assertion to the people of this country that it has been the escalation of foreign debt payments that has brought him to grief in 1990. In general, Mr. Speaker, we have to be concerned with the abundance of misrepresentation, mis-statement, that has characterised not only Government's outline of the state of affairs in this Throne Speech, but generally has characterised the whole range of Government's relationship with the people of this country.

I want, Sir, to the extent that it has been touched by the Member for St. Michael Central, who introduced this legislation, to say that I truly do not believe that what the Prime Minister calls consultations with interest groups and partners in this country are being conducted in a spirit of good faith, or with a view to providing persons with whom

he has been consulting with the kind of information on which they can fully make sensible decisions.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot make what is a wholesale assault on the Prime Minister's integrity. The Honourable Member is imputing that when the Prime Minister consults with the social partners, including the Barbados Labour Party, which he has done, that he has not done so in good faith. That is what he is imputing and I object to that, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has made an objection. If it is, as the Honourable Member is saying, that you are making that reference to the Prime Minister, I would kindly ask you to withdraw it and rephrase what you are saying.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it, but I should want to say something. If the Prime Minister of this country is serious about consulting with the Opposition – and I am stating my own personal position – and he intends those consultations to be genuine, then I do not expect to be called at 2.30 to a 3 o'clock meeting. In point of fact, I want to say to the House that when I received the call at 2.30 to the 3.30 meeting, I thought it so farcical.....

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is not in his chair and I have to point out that if the Leader of the Opposition is not available and we do not know who to talk to, it is entirely possible – we, meaning the Government, who have to consult – that the Honourable Member would get a call, but I know for a fact that the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, was told fully the last sitting day that there would be consultation and to stand by. The Leader of the Opposition was told that. Let him get up and deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not make a speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order as well, Sir. The position is, on the Tuesday the Prime Minister called me behind the Speaker's Chair and said he would be speaking to me during that day.
5.45 p.m.

I said to him, in that case, I would wish the Shadow Minister for Finance to be present. The day passed without briefing. There was no consultation. Later that day as he left the Chamber he said that, "We didn't get together today. I'll be in touch with you."

I arrived at Seawell Airport at about 2:15 p.m. on Friday to be told that I was wanted at the Prime Minister's Office at 3:45, with an hour's notice. I was leaving this country. I then passed on the information through the

official executive secretary to get in touch with Mr. St. John, Mr. Tull and Mr. Owen Arthur.

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member will get his time, Sir. I must put it quite clear. I understand that the same short notice that was being given to me was likewise given to the other Members.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to say that if the public is led to believe that consultation with the Prime Minister on the IMF programme means that the IMF has caused people to be able to make an input up front into what that programme may involve, Sir, that no such consultation has taken place with the Barbados Labour Party for sure. All the Prime Minister did was to state in a short meeting what he had already decided to do with the International Monetary Fund.

The point I want above all to say, Sir, is that a structural adjustment programme – and I want to say this as much for the benefit of the unions as for the benefit of the House – does not only involve Government in a relationship with the International Monetary Fund. Structural adjustment policies also involve government in a relationship with the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. The IMF part of the programme is called the Stabilisation Programme and the Stabilisation Programme alone. The intention of which, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the Honourable Member's time would have expired at 5:45. Five minutes have gone. I have decided to give you two more minutes to conclude. We are dealing with half an hour.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a structural adjustment programme contains what the economists call a series of demand management measures and a series of supply related matters. The IMF part of a structural adjustment programme, Sir, is but one part of it which is intended to involve the country in a process of containment, the reduction of consumption, but a full-fledged structural adjustment programme will involve a large number of additional measures with the Inter-American Development Bank. I am saying that if the Prime Minister of this country is genuinely interested in consulting with persons in this country, he will lead them to believe that they must see the totality of the structural adjustment encompassing not only the IMF measures but those that are to come with the World Bank and the IADB before he allows them to take any judgements and enter into any undertaking on behalf of the interest groups that they are representing. I am saying, Sir, there has not yet been full disclosure. We know, without getting all of the details, that the IMF part of the programme is going to involve a whole range of things including a tax package

that is going to be equivalent to \$150 million of taxes in the year. We wait on the details. I am waiting, Sir, and the country will have to await the additional measures that will affect the productive sectors which have been part and parcel of every structural adjustment programme that has involved, not just a relationship between a government and the IMF but a four-cornered arrangement between the Government the IMF, the World Bank, the IADB and the Caribbean Development Bank.

I am saying, Sir, that the Prime Minister himself has already told the country that all those other entities will be involved and we wait for the full disclosure. I want to say, Sir, on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition, we believe that to the extent that written into this Throne Speech is a misstatement put in the mouth of the Governor-General of this country to the effect that a budgetary presentation predicted contraction when that budgetary presentation predicted growth, that this Government should out of embarrassment apologise to the country and to the Governor-General for having put the Governor-General of this country in such a compromising and embarrassing position in the eyes of the citizens of this country.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. He cannot put it in the record that the Governor-General was put in... We know the Rules of the House. The Honourable Member must know how he has to phrase what he has to say. He cannot put that, Sir. He can say it out in the Square, but he cannot say it in here. The Rules do not allow him and the Press to write what he just said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member rephrase what you have said in much milder language.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it is much to be regretted that history will have to report that the very first utterance made on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party in the Session of Parliament 1991-1996 was a misstatement which could have been corrected, had the Government been of the mind to do so.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in support of the Resolution as moved by the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central. I need necessarily to reflect on some of the things which have been said only recently by the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

A few short weeks ago, the Honourable Member for St. Peter made one statement in this House of Assembly which was true. The Honourable Member speaks today in loud terms, sometimes he was unable to control himself about inconsistencies and contradictions. Some weeks ago, the Honourable Member said clearly that Barbados was at the end of a developmental strategy –

continuum, or whatever word he used – which is an operation boot-strap or beehive which in Barbados has reached its height. If the Honourable Member, Sir, takes that position to be correct, if he wants this country to believe that his position then was true, I find it strikingly strange, if not ludicrous, for the Honourable Member, not only today but before, on every occasion that he gets to make a noise about who is responsible for the state of the economy, to blame repeatedly the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. Both of them can't be true, because if "operation beehive" came to Barbados as the way out where we were to take off for our physical quality of life index to be ousted...

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member is deliberately misleading the House. There was no "operation beehive".

Mr. SPEAKER: Not deliberately. He can be misleading but not deliberately.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: He is misleading the House. No operation beehive ever came to Barbados, nor was "operation beehive", Sir, the development strategy to which I was referring.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member tends now to limit his own intellect. Clearly, we are talking about a developmental strategy which had a catch name. That is all it was. We are talking about a particular development strategy which was given a name and...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. I have allowed the other Members to be heard and I am very serious about what I say. I shall suspend the House if I cannot get the cooperation and that is the warning for the other suspensions. Shouting and jeering and laughing are all part of the interruptions that should not be in this House. I want to hear the Honourable Member.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Sir. If the Honourable Member's position is that our economic woes are caused by our reaching the end of a development strategy – I think those were the exact words he used – if that is accepted, I do not understand how the Honourable Member can today, and whenever else he feels to put it, blame a particular person or a particular party or a particular Government for the state that the economy of the country is in. The two of them can't hold hands together because as far as I understand it and from what my reading tells me the Democratic Labour Party from 1961 to 1976, the Barbados Labour Party from 1976 to 1986 and the Democratic Labour Party to date are basically

following the same strategy which the very Member has agreed has outlived its usefulness.
5.55 p.m.

We may well want in Barbados, to accept that as true, but with our limited resources and I will go so far as to say, with our limited skills, we may well be caught in a trap that we are to pick along – for want of a better word – or continue along this trend until better can be done and within that context. If the Honourable Member wants to admit that he was telling the truth on that occasion he can't be telling the truth on this occasion now, to be blaming a particular person at a particular point in time when the strategy continues.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I couched my discussion today, Sir, in the context of the statement and I said, Sir, that the Prime Minister has told the country, not what I said, that the problems are two-fold. The fiscal deficit and the balance of payments deficit, Sir. I have said that I referred to what he said as the problem and if those are the problems, Sir, the problem of the fiscal deficit could only, Sir, be caused by the Minister of Finance himself. I stand on that point, Sir. It is the Prime Minister who is telling the country that the problem is the problem of the fiscal deficit. If the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, wants to run from that, Sir ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is making a speech.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I don't know why the Honourable Member is making so much noise.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not have to worry about the Honourable Member.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I remember recently when the delegation from the Barbados Labour Party met the Prime Minister he was not even there. I don't know why, I don't want to know why, but I know two other Members went and they had a discussion on economics and the Honourable Member was not even thought of by his own Members. They could have gone home for him. I don't care at what time he got the invitation, Sir, they could have gone home for him if he was important to them.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order, take your seat.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member said that I was not thought of by the Barbados Labour Party and that is

misleading the House. I was asked by my Party to attend, Sir, but I had to go to a funeral and I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a less sad occasion for me to go to a funeral than for me to go to the meeting.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Yes, Sir, I am saying that statement is love of country at its highest. That is patriotism at its zenith, when the Honourable Member said he could have made a little input here or there, he bluntly refused to go. I do not believe it was as simple as that, Sir, I believe he was deliberately left out by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, I believe that, and by the Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: The Honourable Member said he was deliberately left out by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East said the Honourable Member for St. Peter was deliberately left out.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have some order, please.

Mr. H. B. St. JOHN: I thank Honourable Members for repeating exactly what and precisely what is offensive, Sir, and contrary to the Rules of this House, Sir. The Honourable Member's statement is that he believes that the Honourable Member was deliberately left out by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. He said that. I heard him say that. I heard the Honourable Member say that and I draw to your attention, Sir, that that statement is totally and patently untrue, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member state if what the point of order has revealed is true? If this is true then you will have to withdraw your statement.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I never at any time, to the best of my recall, referred to the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. He may well be right on this occasion, Sir, I don't know, but I never referred to him. He wants to get involved but I am not going to ... He knows his position with the Honourable Member for St. Peter. He knows what he is about, Sir, but I am not involved in it at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made a statement sometime ago and I rise to give the seriousness of that statement. I am inclined to suspend the House at this point, but I will not see that I recognise that another chance should be given. Members should keep quiet while that Member is speaking. I say no more.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I am indebted to you Sir. I don't know why, whenever I rise in here, they give me endless trouble, Sir. I don't know why.

Now, Sir, much emphasis ...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. A point of order was taken by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South on a statement made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East. Your Honour asked him before you had to intervene in the other proceedings of the House to verify whether he made that statement or to clarify for the benefit of this House what he said, and that has not been done, Sir.

Your Honour has not given a ruling, because if he is substituting another Member, I will really want to take an objection as well. We must not have offensive statements in the House that are deliberately untrue and placed into the records of the House at this time. I have suffered from too many untruths being told and perpetrated with the assistance of the Government Information Office right up to the IMF stage for me to put up with foolishness now after my years in this House. I am not putting up with it, I am sorry.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to respond to what the Honourable Member has said because these things need to be put correctly.

In reference to what the Honourable Member just said. I understood from the Honourable Member for Christ Church East that he did not make the statement that I asked him to clarify for me. On the other hand I am not sure that I recognise him to say that he substituted another Member, but if he has on this occasion as well and the records can show that, I am prepared to ask that Honourable Member to withdraw that as well.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you speak, let me hear the Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member in the course of offering a point of order made a statement about the Government Information Service which is patently not correct and therefore should not be in the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not dealing with that now. I am dealing with what the Honourable Member for Christ Church West has drawn to my attention and I need to have it clarified.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: If it makes the Honourable Member happy, I will withdraw whatever they deem offensive, Sir, it is no problem with me one way or the other.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it should be taken from the records. Now the Honourable Member for St. Michael West has risen on a point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition in the course of offering a point of order made a statement derogatory of the Government Information Service which is contrary to the Rules of this House and I insist that the Honourable Member should withdraw it and it be struck from the records. Your Honour, if he wishes to discuss the Government Information Service, he should bring a Resolution, Sir. It is not fair and I wish it withdrawn from the records, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not mentioned the name of any public officer in this House. The position is, I am entitled to launch an attack on the Honourable Member's Ministry and any Ministry in this House when they do foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I will not be the one to prevent any Member in this House from being critical of any of the institutions.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member was not being critical, Sir, the Honourable Member said that he was the victim. I think we should get the record. He said that the Government Information Service was deliberately telling lies on him, Sir.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: But that will not be my concern about the Government Information Service. The Rules are specifically laid to protect Members in this Chamber. Therefore, that does not fall under my concern. What are you rising on?

Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Arising out of what?

Miss B. A. MILLER: Your Honour has ruled on an earlier point of order. I am entitled to rise on a point of order. I wish to inquire. I see the cameras moving. I want to know if this session is being televised without our knowing that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I speak under the Rules of the House. This is a point of privilege. This is serious. I think that Honourable Members must be aware that from time to time the cameras do move. There is an ongoing system. Let me finish now.

Certain remarks which were made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West were asked to be expunge from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I want to clarify with the Honourable Member is that no one has asked permission of me to televise any of the proceedings and that not being the case it will be a very serious breach.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I was giving information to the House in my capacity as Leader.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am the person who would have to give permission. I have not given permission to anyone. Therefore, if they are working, that would require an investigation. But certainly the Leader of the House would probably be able to tell you that.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I was merely making the point that for reasons which I will make known to the Honourable Member after the sitting or subsequently that the cameras do move but it is not for a recording. It is for another purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to pause at this point. A point of order can only arise out of something that has been debated in the House.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: She was on a point of privilege. She said "order" but she meant "privilege".

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get some order and settle down. Can I hear the Member for Christ Church East?

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Thank you, Sir. Let me say that the fact is that members of the Barbados Labour Party had discussions with the Honourable Prime Minister – I am just starting from where I left off – and the Honourable Member for St. Peter, the chief spokesman for economics and whatever else, was not there. He was not hospitalised and he was not out of the Island. He was in this country. Those meetings were attended by the Honourable Members for Christ Church South and St. George South. That is a fact. So I do not know why the Honourable Member for St. Peter...

Mr. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East having misled himself is now misleading the House. I had no discussions with the Prime Minister over the matter to which he is referring. He did say St. George South. I had no discussions with the Prime Minister over that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: The fact remains whatever delegation that went from the Opposition the

Honourable Member for St. Peter and chief spokesman on economic affairs was not included. I am saying that I believe that it was deliberate. I can say that. I believe so, but he would try to come here and try and make enemies of everybody.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. He is entitled to prostitute his mind.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. He said that he believes that I was deliberately excluded. I am telling the House that as a matter of fact that before my colleagues met with the Prime Minister, Sir, I was consulted. I told my colleagues, Sir, that I was not going. I want that, Mr. Speaker, to be put in the record as a matter of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is in the record of the House. The second point that I want to add to that is if an Honourable Member gets up and refutes a statement that I will not entertain any further discussion on the matter. So there is no further discussion to be held on that particular issue.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Sir, the point that I will finish it off with is this.

Certain remarks which were made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I missed that one, Sir. All I am saying is that the Honourable Member's own premise now is without any foundation whatsoever. According to him, he deliberately refused to attend the meeting by choice. This is the Honourable Member's attitude to questions which are profound and important to the future of this country.

Certain remarks which were made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East were asked to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Sir, all I am saying is that just as the Honourable Member for St. Peter based an entire speech on an absence, we all are certain about the behaviour of the Opposition Members in here today. I can understand the concern of Members as to whether the cameras are on them. If there is a parallel between the two, I can see it because all of the premises are wrong. I know why they would want to interrupt me at every turn, but I can deal with that. I am not worried about that, Sir.

Now I heard the Honourable Member who spoke on behalf of the Opposition refer to a statement made by Errol Barrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is also not part of the records. I have removed that from the records as well. He made comments and you can speak on the comments but not on the document. I have removed the documents from the House but you can comment on his observations. He did make some observations.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: The Honourable Member said and it is in the record even though he read it. I saw him reading it. He said that we all remember. It is in the record. He said that we all recall Mr. Barrow making a certain statement and I am responding to that. It is in the record. All I am saying, Sir, to the best of my knowledge...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members keep quiet. May I just get the thing right? I have ruled that the article verbatim has been removed from the records of the House. I also said that he made comments and you could make your observations on those comments. If you are doing that, I have no problem with that.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: That is all that I am doing, Sir. That is all that I am doing!

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will suspend the House for five minutes.
6.15 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Thank you, Sir. If I may continue, the Honourable Member for St. Peter also in a very strange way, in my respectful opinion, sought to castigate the Right Honourable Prime Minister for making a statement on Sunday about the flight of capital and sought to equate that with a statement in the Throne Speech under the heading of Monetary Policies about the holding of foreign currency accounts by exporters of goods and services. I am surprised that a person of the Honourable Member's learning would equate those two phenomena.

The statement by the Governor-General in the Throne Speech merely says that part of Government's policy was "to further facilitate the holding of foreign currency accounts, giving priority to exporters of goods and services." I am yet to understand, even though I tried extremely hard in the short time I had, to come to grips with how the Honourable Member, representing the Opposition, can equate that statement with saying that if the Prime Minister proposes to clamp down on persons taking valises of foreign currency out of Barbados, that it

is contrary to the Throne Speech. I continue to be at a total loss as to how the two can be equated.

Any country, least of all a Third World developing country, that is hard pressed for foreign exchange, for hard, cold U.S. cash, will honestly seek to stop anybody, unless it is an authorised trader, from walking through an airport, a sea port or any kind of port with a valise of hard foreign currency. What is so difficult to understand about a Government or anybody else seeking to stem the flow, which is an illegal flow in the first place? What is the Honourable Member proposing? That people be allowed to walk through the airport with thousands of dollars in U.S. currency? Is that permitted? Or must that be passed through the Central Bank? What is he proposing? Is he proposing that we permit illegality? If he is saying that the Prime Minister virtually has no right to make those statements, and that it is contrary to what was said in the Throne Speech, I am at a total loss. That is why I am convinced that had he gone to the meeting he might have been better off and those statements would never have been made.

Now, Sir, what is clear is that the balance of payments problems in Barbados are not the creature of any Prime Minister that we have today, nor I would venture to say it is not the fault of the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. His time was extremely short. It is the result of years of difficulties which we have had in exports. This is the problem which I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter fully understands but is seeking to avoid when he speaks about the decline in reserves. I need not go into any long discourse as to the difficulties in the reserves *vis-a-vis* the difficulties in exports. I think many people have gone over that time and time again.

As to why, again, the Honourable Member for St. Peter should try to make us all believe, even though we will never believe, that it is the fault of the present Prime Minister, again I am at a loss, because an economist with any degree of training or understanding of an economy which he is studying – and I gather that the Honourable Member is a day-to-day economist – clearly would appreciate that if a country is not earning from its productive sectors, foreign exchange is not coming in, whatever little reserves it had, whether they be borrowed or whether they be earned...

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, again I rise on a point of order. I discussed the foreign exchange position, not with a view to saying it was the Prime Minister's fault, but with reference to the Central Bank Act, if you recall, Sir, to say that the Act requires certain things, and with a view to asking why those things were not put in place. If the Member is going to criticise me, at least he should criticise me...

Mr. SPEAKER: You need not go any further, I think the point has been made. Continue.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Is the Honourable Member denying that he is saying the problem with the reserves is the fault of the Prime Minister? I can accept that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again. The Member is misleading the House. I gave a speech in which I referred to the fiscal deficit. It is a fact that the only body who controls the fiscal deficit is the Prime Minister of Barbados. I said that was the Prime Minister's responsibility, that was his fault, Sir. A different range of arguments was advanced in relation to it...

Mr. SPEAKER: But there is no need to expand on that. Your point of order has been taken.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I was saying, before I was interrupted, that a practising economist should understand that in the absence of earnings from the productive sectors to get foreign exchange and you have some reserves, and those reserves are not built up either by earnings or by loans, they will disappear. That is a statement which is given and a simple fact.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ready. No comments. Continue.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: There are two simple approaches, as I understand it, to solving those problems when they arise, especially when they surface in the balance of payments. One is to finance the deficit, which we in Barbados are unable to do as a result of a decrease in those earnings; or by borrowings, which apparently it would appear that we have difficulty in that regard as well; or we can adjust the economy to either remove or reduce the deficit. I think, Sir, we are in the latter position, that of necessity the economy has to be adjusted to remove the deficit. If that is the case, it is again extremely unfortunate that some persons of learning would seek to have us believe that statements made in 1988, in 1989 – even though an economy is a dynamic thing – and statements made in 1990 should apply lock, stock and barrel to the letter in 1991 in the face of declining reserves and in the face of declining exports.

The point I want to get across is this, Sir, that if persons who seek to make Barbadians believe that they excel in certain studies, in certain disciplines, even though we all understand that economies are dynamic things which move from day to day, from hour to hour, how is it possible that a person can get up and read a statement made in 1988 and seek to apply it to 1991? I do not understand how the Honourable Member for St. Peter – I would not refer to anything said by the Honourable Member for the City at all, she does not understand any of this –

Mr. SPEAKER: But she has not spoken in this debate.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: In spite of when she speaks. I am not saying she has spoken today, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am trying to get to you is that you must leave the Asides alone. Do not listen to them.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Sir, I will say this. I will not refer to anything the Honourable Member for the City says, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, the Honourable Member for St. Peter, the Honourable Member for St. Whatever says. I am not picking out anybody in particular. If Honourable Members are going to be fair, if Honourable Members are going to be true to the training which they want us to believe they have and that they excel in, they cannot move away from the basic, that if an economy is dynamic it is not fair to anybody involved in the administration of that economy to go back to 1988 and read a statement which is static, which might be relevant for 1988, and seek to apply it in 1991 to make a cheap, short-lived, political point.

Asides.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: It is extremely unfortunate, Sir. Let me wind up by saying this. In spite of all the Asides and all that has been said today, the fact is we are all Barbadians. I live here, I am not going to go anywhere, and I find it difficult to understand at times – and I believe we all do, even though at times I question the motives of some people – and painful to accept that at a time like this in the development of our country, in the history of our country, some people consider it a laughing matter and find it necessary to point fingers and make fun at the hardships of people in this country. This is no time for that, and if I am angry at some Members of the Opposition it is a real anger. It matters not whether it is Sandiford's fault or whose fault, the fact remains that this country is in a situation from which we have to extricate ourselves. It matters not whose fault it is.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter has already admitted in this House of Assembly that we have reached the end of a developmental strategy. Whose strategy was that? Were they not part of the entire strategy for ten years of Government in this country? I am not on a political platform, so I would not want to behave as though I am on one, but truths must be told. I think there must come a time when politicians must be scrupulously honest about what they say in this country if we are to move on from where we are today. It is extremely unfortunate, Sir. I have been in this House for six months and up to today I stand in utter shock at the behaviour of Members of the Opposition. I am not casting any aspersions on you, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is obviously imputing that Members of the Opposition behave badly in this House and I would wish him to clearly state...

Asides.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to your point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The clear inference of the Honourable Member's speech is that the Opposition Members are behaving badly in this House. Therefore, I am asking that those words be either struck from the record or clarified so there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no difficulty with the statement at all, because I am not going to allow that level of discussion to prevail in here. The slightest inference about bad behaviour is a reflection on the Chair, and therefore any reference made in that vein I will not accept as a statement to be placed in the records of this House. Phrase your sentences any other way.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, I have to abide by your ruling, but I had not finished my statement. I can be shocked, Sir, I can be disappointed, I can be hurt and I can be pained when I see circumstances which call for persons to be more responsible, to be more magnanimous.
6.35 p.m.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: I will go on, because I do not believe, Sir, in spite of all that has been said, that it is fair to the political culture of this country, that it is fair to the political climate of this country, or that it is fair to the supporters of the Opposition themselves, for the Opposition to be carrying on in the manner that they are. I am not casting any aspersions on the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a point I want to make to you. If you build a case on Members and then make another statement and conclude in that vein, then I take it that you mean the Opposition in here. If you are making a generalised statement on the Opposition, then I can accept that. You can't start by referring to Members and then conclude in the way you have. It has the same effect.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Whatever your ruling is, Mr. Speaker, I will abide by it. However, it would be difficult, Mr. Speaker, Sir, all things considered, for the majority of people in this country to understand or

accept the particular approach of Honourable Members on the other side in times like these. It would be exceedingly difficult. I would not say, as I have heard some of the Honourable Members urging people to say, that they are unpatriotic. I am not going to go that far, because I don't believe some of them are.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is obviously in great difficulty to find something to say, but he cannot make a speech in which he says he doesn't believe that some of the Members of the Opposition are unpatriotic and clearly implies that there are others on a limited opposition bench that are unpatriotic. It is one of the worst things to accuse anybody of being unpatriotic. He must withdraw it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I agree with the Honourable Member that it is one of the worst things, but the logic is not valid. To say that a thing is not A is not to say that it is A.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order, as far as I am concerned. What I want to say – and the Honourable Member has now come to the end of his speech anyhow – is that I would hope that these exercises would give people an opportunity to develop, what I consider an opportunity that people like myself did not have – that is an university education. I hope that we would grace these Chambers with the kind of development of the mind that we develop there to bring to bear on this Chamber.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Am I to wind up now, Sir, or what?

Mr. SPEAKER: That's the end of your time. If you want to make your final statement you can. I will give you one minute to make your final statement.

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK: Sir, I have no difficulty in supporting the position as taken by the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central in seeking to have the resolution of thanks and appreciation to Her Excellency the Governor-General for the Throne Speech delivered at the First Sitting of Parliament, 1991-1996. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I realise that the ...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member will have to say what he is speaking on.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am speaking on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I think the Rules permit an Honourable Member to rise in his place and suggest that with the leave of the House the particular time be extended and therefore, Sir, I am asking your permission to invite the House to

agree that Private Members' time be extended for another hour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of extension of time is always left with the House itself.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I think it is time for adjournment, Sir, and that further consideration of Private Members' Business be postponed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that we have had a good debate and I am glad that as we come to the end of today's sitting that Members of the Opposition have seen that this Government is perfectly willing at all times and every time to accord them what is duly theirs. I am glad that we were able to give Members of the Back Bench and Members of the Opposition their due time and I hope that they have used it effectively. I am not able to speak on that part of the debate. Next time, again, when we come to suspend the Standing Orders, if Honourable Members feel that they wish to have them not suspended, they can signal to us and we will not suspend them if we consider that Government business would not be harmed. We are always willing, and I will continue while acting in this capacity to see that not a single Member of the Opposition suffers in one iota.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, September 3, 1991 at twelve o'clock noon.

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

Miss B. A. MILLER: Speaking on the adjournment, Sir, I am much concerned about the dignity of this Honourable Chamber. The Honourable Acting Leader of the House has just said that he would do anything to facilitate Members speaking, so I hope he will facilitate me now.

6.45 p.m.

We are on this side very deeply concerned about the status of this Honourable Chamber. Pronouncements are being made outside of this House on matters, Sir, of the greatest national importance and being made in particularly, politically, partisan circumstances – matters which pertain to proposals which can only pass this Chamber in order to become law in this House – unless we are now going to abandon the parliamentary process as we know it in Barbados, and possibly the rule of law as we know it in Barbados. There is deep concern abroad in our country,

that in these circumstances, these very important national issues are not brought for discussion in this Honourable House of Assembly which is the proper place for them to be debated.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, discussion is held in public forum, discussion is held in party political meetings about these very important matters. I am not concerned about the past. I am concerned about where we are at in Barbados today. What is our economic position in Barbados today is unprecedented. It has never been like this before.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the Honourable Member but we are really dealing with the adjournment and the matter should be relevant to the adjournment of the House. If the Honourable Member needs to raise a matter that concerns a Minister then the procedure should be to inform me that you want to discuss that matter, but we are dealing primarily with the adjournment until September 3.

Miss B. A. MILLER: The matter that I am raising concerns no Minister.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I draw to Your Honour's attention that matters were brought to Your Honour's attention by an Honourable Member on that side. That subsequent to Your Honour's ruling, the Honourable Member on that side brought a Resolution in this House. We have just finished the first part of the debate of that Resolution and it would be entirely out of order. Sir, we were in Private Members' Business and I am saying that the matters discussed arising out of the Resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central relate to the matters which Your Honour ruled on and a Resolution to this is found on this Order Paper and no anticipation of that Resolution can now form part of the adjournment debate.

I submit that would be a subversion and a perversion of the Rules of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling.

The question that this sitting be adjourned until Tuesday, the 3rd September, 1991 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday,
13th August, 1991 910

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 911

Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Cap. 190.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. B. M. TAITT 911

Notice that Replies to Parliamentary Questions
Nos. 2 and 14 were ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 911

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 911, 912; Hon. H. deB. Forde,
911, 912; Mr. Speaker, 912, 913; Mr. H. B. St.
John, 912.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION
TO APPROVE THE PUBLICATION IN THE
OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF NOTIFICATION OF
THE ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION
OF LAND AT BRIDGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL 914

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 914; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman,
915; Mr. J. O. Tudor, 916; Hon. E. E. Greaves,
917.

IMMIGRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1991 917

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 917, 932; Hon. B. M.
Taitt, 919; Hon. M. A. King, 922; Mr. R. L.
Morris, 923; Hon. E. E. Greaves, 924; His
Honour T. C. Estwick, 925; Mr. L. L.
Brathwaite, 927; Hon. W. W. Hall, 928; Hon. C.
V. Walker, 930; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman, 931.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION NO. 2 933

Hon. H. deB. Forde, 933; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 933.

QUESTION NO. 14 933

Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 933; Hon B. M. Taitt,
934; Mr. L. R. Tull, 934.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION THANKING HER EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL FOR THE THRONE
SPEECH 934

Mr. C. LeR. Trotman, 934; Mr. O. S. Arthur,
937; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 939, 941; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 941, 944; His Honour T. C. Estwick,
942; Mr. H. B. St. John, 944; Miss B. A. Miller,
945; Mr. L. R. Tull, 945.

SUSPENSION 922

ADJOURNMENT 949

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 949, 950; Miss B. A. Miller,
949.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)
ESTWICK, His Honour T. C. (Christ Church East)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)
HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
MILLER, Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central)
St. JOHN, Mr. H. B. (Christ Church South)
SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
TROTMAN, Mr. C. LeR. (St. Michael Central)
TUDOR, Mr. J. O. (St. Michael East)
WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North)