

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 70, 7993

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., LL.B., (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. 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 Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Justice and Public Safety)
Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Leader of the Opposition)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Hon. C. V. WALKER, J.P., (Minister of Education)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, G.C.M., B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Community Development and Culture)
Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., J.P., (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 State, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs)
Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.
Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW
Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. J. O. TUDOR
Hon. D. W. BOWEN (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., LL.B.

Prayers were led by Fr. Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 20th July, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber for the sitting held on 20th July, 1993, which Minutes have been circulated, be taken as read and approved.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the month of April 1993 as prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL
GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.

Ref.G.G:4 Vol.IX

4 August, 1993.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to refer to Her Excellency The Governor-General's Message of 1st June, 1993, and to inform you that Her Excellency's absence from office has been extended from August 1 to 15, 1993.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, I will continue to perform the functions of office of Governor-General during the above period.

As the Honourable The House of Assembly will not be meeting prior to 1st August, 1993, it will not be possible for the usual formal Message to be sent down to your Chamber. Will you, therefore, please bring Her Excellency's continued absence formally to the attention of The Honourable the House of Assembly when next it meets.

Inasmuch as the date has gone, this was not read before.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: In any event, this is a Message dated 4th August and the period is from the 1st to the 15th.

MESSAGE NO. 4/1993

HIS EXCELLENCY THE ACTING GOVERNOR-
GENERAL TO THE HONOURABLE THE
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Acting Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The House of Assembly that in His Excellency's judgement Owen Seymour Arthur, Esquire, a Member of the House of Assembly, presently commands the support of the majority of those members of the House of Assembly who do not support the Government. Accordingly, His Excellency has appointed the said OWEN SEYMOUR ARTHUR, Esquire as Leader of the Opposition with effect from 1st August, 1993 and has revoked the appointment of Mr. Henry de Boulay Forde, Q.C., M.P. as Leader of the Opposition also with effect from 1st August, 1993.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the International Business Companies (CMG's Capital Limited) (Rate of Tax) Order, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of I Minister of Housing, Lands, Community Development and Culture, I am commanded by the Cabinet to lay the Annual Report of the National Housing Corporation for the year 1990-91.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform you that the Joint Select Committee which is looking into the Films Bill has completed its work. However, the Report is not yet ready, so I seek permission of the House to lay it later in the Session.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, then the request is granted.

Also, during the last sitting of the House I promised to make a statement and therefore I have taken much time to prepare this lengthy comment as a result of the recent Public Accounts Committee Report which also coincided with a matter raised by the Honourable Member for Thomas. I should say to you that I will confine my comments primarily to procedures rather than the Report in its entirety.

STATEMENT ON INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE
OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS LAID IN THE HOUSE OF
ASSEMBLY ON 22ND JUNE, 1993

Mr. SPEAKER: Every Committee appointed by the House, whether it be a Committee of the Whole House or a sessional or other select committee, is constituted with specific terms of reference and instructions from which it cannot depart without further instructions from the House. Such a committee owes its existence to the House, must, as ordered by the House and may be recalled at any time by the House. Thus, according to May's Parliamentary Practice, 21st Edition, at p. 618, and I quote:

"A select committee, like a Committee of the Whole House, possesses no authority except that which it derives by delegation from the House in which it is appointed. When a select committee is appointed to consider or inquire into a matter within the scope of its deliberations or inquiries defined by the order by which the committee is appointed (termed the order of reference), and the

deliberation or inquiries of the committee must be confined within the limits so imposed...." If it is thought desirable that a Committee should extend its inquiries beyond the limits laid down in the order of reference, the House may give the Committee authority for that purpose by means of an instruction..." 12.30 p.m.

Instructions may be mandatory, directory or permissive, may enlarge or restrict the scope of inquiry or limit a Committee's powers and may be given at any time before the Committee has presented its final report.

The Committee of Public Accounts of this House derives its existence from Standing Order 59 which provides that

- * 1. There shall be a Committee of Public Accounts for the examination of accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the Committee may think fit, to consist of not more than seven Members, who shall be nominated at the commencement of every Session, and of whom four shall be a quorum.
- 2. The Leader of the Opposition shall be Chairman of the Committee of Public Accounts."

The Committee is therefore concerned only with appropriation accounts and other accounts laid before Parliament. Those specific areas are the Committee's only authority. The terms of reference of the Committee are identical to those of the Committee of Public Accounts of the U.K. of which May's Parliamentary Practice states on page 661:

"The Committee does not seek to concern itself with policy; its interest is in whether policy is carried out efficiently, effectively and economically. Its main functions are to see that public moneys are applied for the purposes prescribed by Parliament, that extravagance and waste are minimised and that sound financial practices are encouraged in estimating and contracting and in administration generally."

Policy is for Government, not for the Committees of the House. Its execution is for officers and agencies engaged for the purpose.

Select Committees are extensions of the House and, with some practical adjustments to suit committee work, such as sitting while speaking, must observe the Standing Orders which govern the conduct of the proceedings in the House.

At the same time, some provisions in the Standing Orders are specifically directed to Committees. Thus, Standing Order 60 provides for the procedure of select committees of the House, in particular that they shall have power to send for persons and to order any person to attend before a Committee and give evidence.

The House has not given to any Committee the power to summon Members to give evidence before it, whether under Standing Orders or by other specific instructions. The appropriate way for a Committee to seek, in its deliberations, the assistance of a Member who does not belong to the Committee is to invite him to attend a meeting of the Committee.

But the Committee has no sanction if the Member does not accept the invitation. Though a Member may have been invited to a meeting it is immaterial whether he attends the meeting or not, for the terms of reference of the Committee are not within his responsibilities.

If the reason for inviting a Member to a meeting is to seek his response to matters concerning himself raised in the Committee then a principle, now 305 years old and set out on p.637 of May's states and I quote:

"That if any information came before any committee that chargeth any Member of the House, the committee ought only to direct that the House be acquainted with the matter of such information, without proceeding further thereupon."

When a committee reported that a Member was mentioned to be concerned in matters directed by the House to be inquired into, then the House has ordered: "That the said committee has power to inquire into the matters to it referred, notwithstanding any Members of this House may be concerned therein; and that it does report the same to the House".

It is surely not in question that a committee of the House has no authority, unless such authority is expressly given by the House, to proceed with any matter where imputations are expressed or alleged against a Member whether or not such imputations would involve the application of Standing Order 28(10). It is difficult to see how a Committee could ignore Standing Orders which the House must observe.

On report of a matter concerning a Member to the Speaker, if the House so decides on reference by the Speaker, one course is for the House to direct the Member to attend the Committee, if the area covered by the matter is within the Committee's terms of reference and within the Member's responsibilities. Where original imputations

are made in the House the Speaker may direct the Member to be present in the House in his place to respond to any imputations.

Committees have no jurisdiction to make determinations against Members. That is for the House to do. So that, even in a reference to a Committee of Privileges where a matter concerning a Member is being heard, the standard principles apply. The Committee of Privileges, like any other Committee, may make recommendations.

Ministers and other Members in some Parliaments regularly accept invitations to give evidence to Committees but the principle described above stands.

By the same token, a select committee is not empowered to order a Minister or other Member to produce any paper, book, record or other document in his possession or under his control, although it is doubtful in any event if a Minister has legal control over departmental documents in our system.

It is not clear, therefore, on what basis the Interim Report of the Committee of Public Accounts can properly contain, in relation to a Member of the House of Assembly, a number of statements which concern his duties in his capacity as a Minister, of which notice would be required under Standing Order 28(10). If they were sought to be made in this House, and the Member issuing them would be responsible -for their accuracy, such statements are out of order.

The provisions of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities & Powers) Act, Cap. 9 section 8 have been claimed to apply to Members. I do not think it is necessary or worthwhile to go into detail in that contention. Where Cap. 9 refers to Members it says so specifically. That contention suggests that a House may issue a summons, if necessary using the authority of the High Court, to order a Member to attend the House to give evidence, with penalties if he does not so appear.

I have never thought that this House would need the assistance of the Courts to secure the attendance of its Members, for whatever reason, at sittings. Sanctions are already set out in Standing Orders. If a Member does not attend in his place when required to do so and is absent from sittings for 3 consecutive months, his seat in the House "shall be declared vacant" under Standing Order 72. The House also has the power to proceed against any Member by Resolution under Standing Order 40:10 and to expel a Member from membership under Standing Order 40:7 or under section 45(l)(g) of the Constitution. My view is that this House neither has nor needs power under Cap.

9 to require Members to attend its sittings for any purpose. The contention could be carried to its ultimate conclusion, which would mean that if under section 12 of the Act, a Member refused to answer questions before a House or one of its Committees, his refusal could be referred to the High Court. That is a matter for those who advance such a contention, but not for this House.

Nor can a Committee require an officer of a public department to produce any document which, according to the rules and practice of the House, it is not usual for the House itself to order to be laid before it or which a Minister could not in debate be required to make available to the House.

A public officer cannot be required therefore, except with the consent of the Governor-General, to produce any document or give any evidence relating to the unpublished official records of a civil department or to affairs of state; nor is other evidence of the same matters to be entertained from any other source: Parliament (Privileges, Immunities & Powers) Act, Cap. 9 section 13(2). Where unpublished official records are used in debate they should be made available to staff for correct references as well as to Members. There is no need for them to be exhibited as part of the record of the Committee. 12.40 p.m

Whatever the position may be with public officers and public agencies, Ministers and other Members are by the Constitution and by the Financial Administration and Audit Act not eligible for appointment and, therefore, for responsibility as accounting officers. I mention this point as it is fundamental to the Committee's existence and functioning as a part of the parliamentary process in which we are involved in this Chamber. It is central, too, to the policing of public expenditure.

A Report which is stated to be an interim report is ^perfectly acceptable to this House. An interim report by a Committee to this House should be complete in itself and should cover all relevant aspects of the subject matter to which it refers so that this House may be the better informed for a debate. A Committee should not leave aspects of the matter for a later date, unless that is the wish of the House. But perhaps no objection may be taken by the House.

It must also be noted that Committees of this House are not Courts of law and do not determine right or wrong or guilt or innocence, but they should scrupulously observe, preserve and practise principles of natural justice. At most, unless required by the House to go further, Committees are required to offer recommendations within their terms of reference.

The Interim Report of the Committee of Public Accounts was laid in this House during the sitting of 22nd June, 1993, by the Chairman of the Committee. Here I refer to May's at page 644 which states of minority reports, a matter which appears relevant:

"It is the opinion of the committee, as a committee, not that of the individual members, which is required by the House, and, failing unanimity, the conclusions agreed to by the majority are the conclusions of the committee. No signatures may, therefore, be attached to the report for the purpose of showing any difference of opinion in the committee or the absence thereof; nor may the report be accompanied by any counter-statement, memorandum of dissent, or protest from any dissenting or non-assenting member or members; nor ought the committee to include in its report any observations which the minority or any individual member desires to offer, but which are not subscribed to by the majority; nor may a draft report which has been submitted to the committee, but has not been entertained by it, be printed as an appendix to the report. If a member disagrees to certain paragraphs in the report, or to the entire report, he can record his disapproval by dividing the committee against those paragraphs to which he objects, or against the entire report, as the circumstances of the case require, and can put on record his observations and conclusions, as opposed to those of the majority, by proposing an alternative draft report or moving an amendment to the question for reading the draft report a second time".

Such an amendment may also be moved to the motion for adoption of a report, or a member may simply speak and/or vote against a motion for adoption.

No signatures, even that of the Member laying a report, are needed or relevant to a report, though for whatever reason they are appended to the present Report. It seems to me that a Member of a Committee is ultimately free, subject to Standing Orders, to express in this House in any consideration of a report in debate any view he may wish on its contents whether he was a member of the Committee or not.

Standing Order 62(2) provide as follows:

"A report or special report together with the Minutes of the proceedings of a Select Committee shall be presented to the House by the Chairman or other Member deputed by the Committee, and shall be ordered to lie upon the Table and be printed without question put, and a Member may, after due notice under these Standing Orders, move that the report be adopted."

Standing Order 22 will give you a clear example as to procedure.

I am advised that the Report was sent for printing on 22nd June, the day it was laid. It was printed on 13th July, I am informed and, on 14th July, a copy of the Report was despatched from Parliament to every Member of Parliament and, thereafter, to each of 4 public officers.

May I interject here to say, even up to this time, no Report was sent to any agency outside that of Parliament.

I am also advised that, by letter dated 23rd June, the Clerk of Parliament informed Honourable Members - and I myself received a copy - that

"This office is therefore not the source of any information on the contents of the Interim Report which may have been published up to now before it has been received by Members".

Yet, as has been drawn to my attention, the reputed contents of the proceedings and Interim Report of the Committee of Public Accounts were widely publicised in various media from the day it was laid and before its publication. This included, by particular report of one radio programme, alleged extracts from a copy stated during a broadcast to have been received by the station from the Clerk of Parliament.

My investigation has dispelled that.

I refer here, to illustrate my point, to section 26(a) of Cap. 9 which says

"Any person who -

being a member of a committee, publishes to any person not being a member of the House or Houses by which the committee was appointed any evidence taken by the committee before it has been reported to that House or both Houses, as the case may be;...

is guilty of contempt of the House of which he belongs."

That provision is not intended to protect secrecy, even though committees meet in private I may also say here that in the United Kingdom they have allowed the Public Accounts Committee to meet in public. We meet in private here. They have reached that stage by being able to develop the proper system so to do. I am not so sure that we have reached that stage yet that is, without admission of the general public. It is there to protect the integrity of the system so that a whole story is told at one time, rather than have unreliable comments casually buffeted around.

Whoever was or were responsible - and I have to reason or evidence to suggest that any Member or any other specific individual was responsible - for the continual public airing of the Committee's on-going work is in some way to be blamed for the nature, course and pattern of media publicity. We should reflect on the unwarranted damage which has transpired.

As far as I am aware, no such publication was done or permitted by order or authority of this House. It may be that such publication could be the subject of attention under section 35 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, which reads as follows:

"Any person who prints or causes to be printed a copy of any Act now or hereafter in force, or a copy of any report, paper, minutes or votes or proceedings of either House or a committee as purporting to have been printed at the Government Printer or by or under the authority of either House and the same is not so printed, shall tender in evidence any such copy as purporting to be so printed knowing that the same was not so printed, is guilty of an offence and liable upon conviction thereof by a magistrate's court to a fine of five hundred dollars or to imprisonment for twelve months or to both such fine and imprisonment."

Such publication, both before a report by the Committee and since then, is a very serious matter and a travesty of our own proceedings. It represents and demonstrates gross contempt for this House and its proper processes.

May's states on pages 648-9:

"Any publication of a draft report which has been submitted to a committee, before such report has been agreed to by the committee and presented to the House may be treated as a contempt; and when the report of a committee, which had been presented to the House, but was not yet available to Members in printed or photocopied form, was communicated to the press, the Speaker stated that the more regular practice was that the Members of the House should be the first to be put in possession of the results of the deliberations of a select committee."

The House of Commons Privileges Committee has recommended that in the event of premature disclosure of the contents of a report which a committee has under consideration, or which it has agreed but not yet published, certain procedures should apply.

They are:

"(1) The committee should carry out its own investigation to try to discover the source of a

leak, in particular by formally asking all members of the committee and the committee's staff if they can explain how the leak came about;

(2) the committee should decide whether or not the leak constitutes a substantial interference or the likelihood of such, with the work of the Committee, with the select committee system or the functions of the House;....."

and the Committee should also make a special report of its findings on (1) and (2) setting out the action it has taken and the conclusions it has reached so that, ultimately, the House would have the benefit of recommendations for its final resolution of the matter. There could hardly be a clearer statement of how Committee work should be regarded. 12.50 p.m.

It is possible that our select committee system could, for the immediate future, be affected by these events, for persons may be unwilling to appear before our Committees even under summons whereby they can be compelled to attend, whereas many people, who now appear do so voluntarily by request and without a summons. Persons may not wish to give evidence except under oath, even though that evidence attracts absolute privilege by section 14 of Cap. 9, lest the perception through media coverage of premature publication of committee proceedings or of reports which have not yet been adopted may lead to unsupported and erroneous statements which may not finally be corrected. To such extent, grave injustice may be done to Parliament's work. Greater injustice may be done to persons, including Members, by such publications.

To lay a report of a Committee is never an end of the matter. It "shall be ordered to lie upon the Table and be printed without question put....". That printing has been * done. There is, in the Standing Order, no provision for or requirement of general publication at this stage so that the matter is still with the House. No action is or can be taken on or arising from a select committee's report unless it is adopted by the House. That is the case with reports from all select committees. All are the same, without distinction or regard to form; so that if, as our Order Paper now stands, a report on the Films Bill or the Evidence Bill is presented to this House by the relevant Committee and there is no motion on the report, there can be no further progress on the Bill. The same would apply, for example, to a report of the Committee of Privileges or of the Library Committee or of the Standing Orders Committee. The position is as simple as that.

No Committee has any greater power or authority than any other. Subject to their terms of reference

and to instructions given by the House, all Committees have the same duties and authority.

But then, the House does not require that a report of a Committee shall be adopted or even that any motion shall be moved for its adoption. Standing Order 62(5) says that:

"a Member may, after due notice under these Standing Orders, move that the report be adopted."

So the Report will "lie upon the Table" until such time as action is taken on it. A Member may move for its adoption, but there is no obligation so to move.

The courses inherent in such a motion are clear. The House may adopt a report, with or without amendments. The House may also reject or recommit a report in either case, in whole or in part. The House may recommit the report giving the same or varied terms of reference to the Committee as it may at any time during the Committee's life. But where there is a simple, unqualified recommitment, the Committee must start afresh on the same business.

Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 21st Edition, p. 652:

"The report of a select committee, may be recommitted in whole or in part to the committee, or it may be recommitted and the order of reference amended.

A motion for the recommitment of any report may be made upon the consideration of the report or as a substantive motion.

The effect of recommitting a report is to undo all that has previously been done in the House with reference to the report, and to throw back the subject into the hands of the committee for revision, completion, or for whatever purpose the recommitment may be ordered..."

It then stands that a select committee only reports. The decisions are for the House. What a Committee states or recommends has no basis on which to stand without the determination of the House on it. The Committee is not the House. The House embraces the Committee. If procedures are flawed then results are open to review.

Just give me one moment. There is another section which I do not have here with me. I am asking the Clerk to ...

The Interim Report of the Public Accounts Committee, in relation to a Member of the House of Assembly, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of

St. Michael West, contains a number of statements concerning his duties in his capacity as Minister of Health of which notice would be required, if they were sought to be made in the House of Assembly under Standing Orders 28(10).

It is an established and common place principle that a Committee of the House has no authority, unless such authority is expressly given by the House, to proceed with any matter where imputations are expressed or alleged against a Member which would involve applications of Standing Order 28(10).

The proper course, on report of the matter is to the Speaker and if the House so decides on reference by the Speaker, is for the House to direct the Member to attend the Committee. Where the original imputations are made in the House the Speaker may direct the Member to be present in the House in his place to respond to any imputations.

Committees have no jurisdiction over Members nor any right to make determinations against Members. That is for this House to do. So that, even in a reference to a Committee of Privilege where a matter concerning a Member is being heard, the standard principles apply.

A Member may be invited to attend that Committee. Even if he agrees not to attend, no imputations may be heard against him without the expressed authority of the House. That is the end of my Statement. 1.00 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to approve the vesting in the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation of a parcel of land at Six Roads in the parish of St. Philip.

I give notice of two Bills, the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation Bill, 1993 and the Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1993.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, the following Bills were read a first time:

The Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation Bill 1993.

The Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1993.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think the record of Hansard should reflect the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Peter, according to the Message that you read earlier today, Sir, is now responsible for the very important post of Leader of the Opposition.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I want to give you, Mr. Speaker, the assurance that the Honourable Member has assured me and the rest of the Members on this side that he intends to hold that office only until so long as the Prime Minister decides that there is to be an election in this country. He has also given me the assurance that that post is not the limit of his aspirations, nor will it be the limit of his attainments.

I think that on these occasions it is only appropriate for us to record these changes when they occur.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to express my thanks and satisfaction for the co-operation which the Member who held the post previously had assisted me greatly in my duties. He was most co-operative and very well versed with the procedures of Parliament, which has helped me to have a less stressful time in the Chair. However, I have no doubt that his successor will continue that good tradition and I can assure him that I will always be willing to be of any assistance which will enhance his own completion of his task.

Thank you.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it has not surprised me that the Honourable Member for St. Peter is occupying the chair he is now occupying today. The way that events unfolded over the past several weeks, it was my opinion that that was probably where he would end up, and "end" is the operative word, Sir.

I wish him well in this new office. We have to work together. We spoke yesterday and I think that for the proper conduct of the affairs of Parliament it is important that there should be communication, and positive communication, between the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of this Parliament. I promised him then, as I promise him now publicly, Sir, that there will be this co-operation as far as I can go and I believe I will get his co-operation as well, because that is the only way, in my opinion, that Parliament can properly function. I am saying this very sincerely. I also sincerely wish that he occupies that position for a very long time and many years in the future. I wish him well in that as well, Sir.

I have already given him my congratulations privately in the position he occupies and I will publicly congratulate him as well on behalf of everyone on this side.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.10 p.m.

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE GUARANTEE BY GOVERNMENT OF A LOAN OF US\$772 333 FROM THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES

Rt. Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 5 and Order No. 6 are both inter-related in that they refer to the borrowing of resources to assist the University of the West Indies in playing its role of developing the human resources of the Caribbean, including Barbados.

What we have been doing, Sir, as leaders in the Caribbean, is to take a forward look at the development of Caribbean countries over the remaining years of this decade and into the coming century. In 1989 at a CARICOM Heads of Government meeting, it was agreed that priority should be given in the region to human resource development.

In that regard, the University of the West Indies has been identified as a major agency to assist in achieving the objective. The University prepared a 10-year plan to achieve certain objectives, a plan that was estimated to cost some \$300 million up to the year 2 000. A comprehensive, integrated development plan for the university was proposed and the financing was identified to come from 2 sources. One was the Caribbean Development Bank and the other was the Inter-American Development Bank.

I said, Sir, that the 2 Orders are inter-related and I am sure the House will understand if, indeed, with this particular Order I make reference to the following Order. In my judgment, it is not necessary to cover the ground twice. The total cost of the programme to be provided was estimated at \$80 million with the CDB providing \$9.1 million and the Inter-American Development Bank some US\$5.6 million while the contributing territories

to the University of the West Indies will contribute \$14.9 million.

The component relating to the Inter-American Development Bank deals with expanding the capacity of the University in the Faculties of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Agriculture. It includes, Sir, a component to continue the major revision of programmes of study and complete the transfer of the University's academic year to the semester system. It is intended to strengthen the staff by providing specialised training abroad and the hiring of visiting professors, to expand laboratories and activities in the field of bio-technology, food technology, chemistry, information science and environmental studies.

It includes a component to establish and operate a research and development fund, to expand and inter-connect the library and computer systems of the University, to build and experimentally utilise the initial facilities of a future science park, to build and operate a mathematics and science education centre and to provide resources to finance technical cooperation for the preparation of final designs for the campus networks of the computerisation component of the programmes.

In order for the programme to be complete there is also the component relating to the Caribbean Development Bank and the scope of that aspect of the project is to extend the network of the Schools of Continuing Studies in the region with the expansion of existing centres and the addition of new ones and to upgrade technologically the distance teaching experiment delivery system known as UW1DITE.

So we have, Sir, 2 basic aspects of the project. One relates to the borrowing of funds from the Caribbean Development Bank with the specific aim of extending throughout the region the network of schools of continuing education by the expansion of the existing centres and the creation of new ones and to upgrade the system whereby distance education could be extended.

The Inter-American Development Bank component is much more extensive and there are more resources involved there in that particular aspect of it. In order for the project to proceed, guarantees are required by the Governments contributing to the university, specifically in relation to those countries which will be the beneficiaries of the programme. 1.20 p.m.

The resolution before us relates to the approval for the guarantee by the Government of Barbados of a loan of US\$772 333 from the Caribbean Development Bank which is Order No. 5 that is before us and the Order that will

come but that is related relates to some US\$12 991 600 from the Inter-American Development Bank for the purposes which I have identified. These guarantees relate to funds which will be expended at the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies and the other Governments are expected to give guarantees in respect of the sums related to the relevant campuses as well.

I do not think that there can be any question relating to the need for the region to pay particular attention and to seek to provide improved training for the most plentiful of its factors of production, that is, the human resource component. Certainly, Sir, I do not think there can be any quarrel about that basic objective. The CARICOM countries will grow to the extent that they are able to improve the human resource capabilities of the region so that, by the quality of our labour force and by the quality of the human resource input into the mix that results in wealth creation, we should be able not only to deal with national development but also to contribute to and benefit from international economic relations at an improved level.

The University of the West Indies has demonstrated over the years that it is not only a major educational institution in our region but that it is fully cognizant of the responsibility that rests upon that institution to improve human resources and to provide enhanced educational and training opportunities for the people of the region. There is no one else who is going to do it for us. We in Barbados have to do it for ourselves and the provision of resources through the components from the various territories in the region together with the loans borrowed and guaranteed by the Governments of the region represent the metrics within which we will seek to give the resources to the University to do the job that the region requires it to do.

Sir, the objective is a sound one, the institution is one that is tested and tried and can deliver the goods and the financial provisions are necessary so that the job can commence at the earliest possible opportunity.

I therefore have great pleasure, Sir, in moving the passing of this resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan of US\$772 333 from the Caribbean Development Bank to the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies to finance a continuing studies and distance education project.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a pity that the Government does not match its performance with its words. The Prime Minister in introducing this motion today speaks very glibly of the importance of the development of human resources for the development of the region and,

by implication, for the development of Barbados. He said that it was at a recent Heads of Government meeting at which a decision was taken that priority would be given to human resource development. I think it is a pity that a Heads of Government meeting would have to decide on something that I believe that all political parties and all sections of the community of this country have accepted for decades as absolutely necessary for our continuing development. That pronouncement took me somewhat by surprise. When I say that the Government should match its words with its deeds I look at the amount of arrears that the Government has been building up with the University over the last few years and ask the question, "How sincere is the Prime Minister in the piety or the piousness" however you look at it of his words today when he talks importantly about the importance of human resource development and at the same time allows the University, over the last 5 years or so, to be robbed of important financing for continuation of the level and quality of education that it has been delivering.

There is no doubt at all that in the past triennium - because the University plans in triennia - the University has been unable and particularly the University branch at Cave Hill has been unable to do any serious planning of programmes, of development, of research, of restructuring because it could not count on the Government to pay the contributions that it should pay on time or at all.

This borrowing of money from the Caribbean Development Bank and from the Inter-American Development Bank reflects one thing only and that is that the Government has now come up with a way of offsetting the money that it has not been paying the University at Cave Hill over the last 5 years or so. So this is not a dramatic new departure. What the Prime Minister, in his capacity of Finance can do is tell us what does the Government owe the University of the West Indies and over what period has it owed the University money and which year recently has the Government paid the University on time. I would like to know, Sir, to find out what are the total arrears due to the University of the West Indies by the Government? I want the Minister of Finance to balance the amounts now mentioned in these two Resolutions, one US\$772 000 for Cave Hill - approximately BDS\$1½ million - and the second one of US\$12 million. I want him to balance these figures of what was owed before and what in fact the Government intends to guarantee now to these two institutions for Barbados. 1.30 p.m.

I do not want, Mr. Speaker, to tie the debate entirely down to the situation in Barbados but I must of necessity do some of that. This distance education the Prime Minister talks about - UWIDITE - distance teaching. What has that got to do directly with Barbados? The answer is nothing.

These things need to be explained because in hearing the Prime Minister talk you would think that Barbados is going to be a beneficiary of distance education. Distance education is targeted by the very name it is given for the non-campus territories. Barbados is not a beneficiary so when you hear that the Government of Barbados is guaranteeing \$1½ million to Cave Hill to finance distance education project what in fact it is financing is a project for Montserrat, Antigua, Dominica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines islands in the Eastern Caribbean.

I say this, Sir, because the aspect of that particular project that relates directly to Barbados is the one dealing with continuing studies. I believe a little time must be spent on that. I believe, Sir, that we have done studies in Barbados to show that the cost of a lot of the education delivered by the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill, can be delivered through other post secondary institutions at only a fraction of the cost that we are currently paying. And it is in the area of continuing education, the former Extra Mural Department of the University of the West Indies, it is in that area particularly that a number of savings are pointed out that can be realised.

The view has always been stated that the Barbados Community College by its structure, its accessibility, and I do not mean mere physical accessibility, its accessibility, provide a greater vehicle for the delivery of continuing education than the University of the West Indies. Anyone who has been remotely connected with that aspect of education in Barbados cannot but agree with that.

I am wondering then, Sir, why does the Government continue at a time when it finds it very difficult to pay the bill for tertiary education, continue to give support to University School of Continuing Studies in Barbados, when a close look of the offerings of that school would suggest it would be much easier to deliver and at a far lower price than currently exists. The Government has also to understand that a number of other things will have to be met rather than just say they are going to guarantee funds for university.

The Minister of Education could perhaps tell this House how many graduates of the University of the West Indies are unemployed in Barbados - cannot find work. He must also tell us, if he wants this to be a serious debate, what were their areas of study, in what disciplines do they have their degrees. He also has to tell us, Sir, what are the priority areas of study. Some have been mentioned by the Right Honourable Prime Minister. In opening this debate he talks about the fields of natural science, agriculture, engineering, environmental science, informatics and so on.

I would like the Government to tell us whether there is in fact a shortage of graduates in those particular

fields because again a study of the numbers will show that engineering graduates at the moment in Barbados are finding it extremely difficult to get jobs and there are a number of young unemployed engineering graduates.

The evidence will also show, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that there are a number of natural science graduates who are finding it very difficult to get jobs. And one needs not even talk about the agricultural graduates but tie this all in, Mr. Speaker, to what the Prime Minister has said in introducing this Resolution. He talks about priority areas of study and he identified the number but look at 3 or 4 of them, Sir. He talks of engineering. He said a number of unemployed engineers, but what is the point of talking about the training of more engineers at the point when there is no building construction in Barbados. At a time when there has been a dramatic fall-off in the amount of construction both in the public sector and the private sector, what is the point in talking about the training of more engineers.

If you look, Sir, at the field of agriculture. The Government has no identifiable agricultural policy and nothing that would suggest that the training of people in agriculture will work to their benefit. No intelligent Barbadian is going to study in a field and hope that something happens. He or she must have the view that at the end of the period of studies that there is a reasonable opportunity of him or her finding employment in that field. So what is the point in saying you will spend more money to provide more facilities for training people in agriculture when people who are trained in agriculture have difficulty at the moment in finding useful employment.

Now, I am not, Sir, suggesting at all that the human resources development, to use the new term that falls so sweetly off the lips of persons like the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union. Nice phrase, Sir, human resources development - it is nothing new but it is a new expression, Sir. There is no doubt at all, Sir, that for development to take place in any society there must be the development of people. Education is always perceived, particularly by the Democratic Labour Party Government, as an area of consumption. It is a department for spending money. Not enough attention is being paid to the fact that it is an area of investment. All the countries that have done dramatically well in the last 40 years, particularly those countries of the Pacific rim, have seen the importance of education and training in the context of investment and eventual improvement in production. Not so this Government, Sir. In recent times we have seen the Government cut back on areas of education expenditure, at a time indeed when perhaps they should be spending more on education. We have seen it at every level of education, not only at the tertiary or university level, but at every level. It is not until the Government of Barbados sees the

important factor of investment in educational spending that we will move out of the rut in which we find ourselves.
1.40 p.m.

One thing the Prime Minister has not mentioned, and I thought perhaps he would have, is the cost to the students of university education at Cave Hill and in the University of the West Indies generally. From what I gather, there has been some discussion between the Government and the lending agencies in Washington, IDB in particular, about the payment of costs for tuition by Barbadian students at Cave Hill and in the University of the West Indies generally. We do not know enough about that, Sir. The thing about it is that the Government does not say enough in advance, and we on this side want to know whether the Government proposes to accede to the pressure of the Inter-American Development Bank to start a policy of payment of fees by Barbadian students at the University at Cave Hill, and if so, when. It is important that we know this. There is a lot of disquiet among students who have just started and those who are getting close to that stage about whether their studies are likely to be disrupted at some early time in the future as a result of the Government imposing the payment of fees on these people.

I want very quickly again to mention two or three other aspects of this matter I believe the Government should spend more time looking at. This is the creating, the devising of programmes at the University of the West Indies that are suited to national needs. When I raised the question earlier about the number of graduates who cannot find employment in Barbados, and in what areas of study these people fall, I wanted to deal then, as I will deal now, with the restructuring of university programmes, what they teach at Cave Hill and the relative priority they give to certain areas of study. I know that the University cannot and must not operate in a vacuum, that there has to be a dialectical link between what the University perceives as its role and what are the pragmatic considerations of the community.

I see nothing in what the Government is suggesting, not only today, but in their whole education policy from the mouthings of the *de facto* Minister of Education or the mouthings of the *de jure* Minister of Education. The *de jure* one is the Honourable Member for St. George North, my Member of Parliament.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TOLL: That is why I am free to speak as I please. I hold no responsibility for anybody for anything other than the people of St. George. The mouthings of the *de facto* Minister of Education, the Right Honourable Prime Minister, who from time to time confuses the issue

and makes the water murky by coming after the *de Jure* Minister of Education and making statements that are diametrically opposite to those that that Minister has made. I do not want to spend a lot of time on it, Sir, but the most recent one is a classic, that in relation to the transition from primary to secondary education. Now the whole country is in some difficulty to understand what is the Government's policy or if it has a policy at all.

The Prime Minister, who is the *de facto* Minister, spoke this morning and although he hinted at the fact that out of a mandate from one of the CARICOM Heads of Government meetings that the Government of Barbados had decided to guarantee this money for a development programme at the Cave Hill Campus, he has not said with any particularity what this development programme is going to be. He spoke in general terms. I for one am anxious to hear the Government, if they would be good enough to vouchsafe a reply to the questions raised - they usually do not answer, Sir, part of their arrogance - and let us and Barbadians generally know what kind of restructuring of programmes of the University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus is contemplated that would meet the aspirations of Barbadians in this particular period.

He talks about natural science. Glibly again, Sir. The manufacturing industry in Barbados is practically at its last breath. Things are bad in the manufacturing industry and you would expect that at a time like this the Government would be paying far more attention to research and development in the private sector or as a collaborative effort between the public and the private sectors. What we desperately need is the infusion of new and creative ideas injected in the manufacturing industry in Barbados to lift the industry off what now looks like its death bed. But we do not hear anything about these great ideas or the development of research and development in the way in which we have seen it operate in the Pacific countries, which have been the subject of tremendous take off. In short, Sir, I am of the view that the Government is short changing this country by holding back expenditure on certain areas of education. They are almost like 'Breakdown', one step forward and two steps backward. That is how they are behaving.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I did not say that, Sir, to start a debate on calypsos, on Breakdown. There are two or three other considerations that must be taken in hand at this moment, and any intelligent reading of the situation would suggest that these things are matters of the utmost priority. The correlation between activities of the Barbados Community College and the University of the West Indies. 1.50p.m.

The question of Correlation between activities of the Barbados Community College and the University of the West Indies I have mentioned in previous debates, and I have been given superficial comments in response to the questions that I have raised. The Barbados Community College now has an Associate Degree and the last time I spoke about the correlation between the Barbados Community College and the University of the West Indies the Minister of Education gave me a reply that, with "great respect, did not really answer the point I had made.

It is not true to say that the associate degree at the Community College has been recognised up to now for accreditation at the University of the West Indies. This House was led to believe that inadvertently, because the Honourable Member for St. George North, the Minister of Education, I would say to his credit, is not one who has a tendency to mislead so I believe it was inadvertent I checked and I found out, Sir, that up to now the certificates at the Barbados Community College are not up to this point, although it has been talked about for many years, being taken into consideration for accreditation.

The other point relates to the question again of continuing education. A lot of what they are teaching in continuing education at a very high cost, university cost, is something that can conceivably be put in another part of our education system.

I understand that the University, contrary to recommendations by those in the educational industry, who know much better than I do, that the first year course in Remedial English at the University should be taken out of the University because it is expensive to administer, and be placed at a lower level. My own suggestion from my exposure to these things is that the money may very well be spent in the primary school; that when people reach university level and still have to be taught how to construct a sentence and how to be taught basic syntax something is very wrong with our educational system.

While I am not at this moment proportioning blame to any particular sector of education, I would suggest that the Government give serious consideration to ending the high cost of delivery of remedial teaching - I think they call it Use of English. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to think that at the University of the West Indies, in an English speaking country that has been so for over 300 years, entrance to that University has to be taught in the first year in a course called Use of English. Not only is it a savage indictment of the school system it is also a savage indictment of the policy makers. I know, Sir, that usually when you make these indictments the answer to the Government to everything that you say is, "Why didn't you change it while you were in Government?" That was 7 years ago. If the Government is going to spend all

its time rebutting reasonable criticism on that basis we will continue to be in the rut in which we are.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Government seriously give consideration to increasing and improving the resources in the primary schools of Barbados to assist students in remedial learning so that the problem is not postponed until they are 17 or 18 years and going to the university. I do not know to what extent is that course in Use of English useful in combatting imperfections, the weaknesses in the system, in the understanding and comprehension of English. I do not know to what extent it is successful but I do know that there has been a consistent refrain from the Teachers' Union of Barbados and the teaching profession of Barbados that the Government give greater resources to the schools, the primary schools in particular for addressing this particular need.

Reading is becoming a lost art, but of course you cannot lose something that you never had. The community as a whole had it. One of the things that used to cause me a great deal of satisfaction when I was a student in England was that every time you got on the tube and you saw black people sitting on the tube reading the newspaper you could say with almost absolute certainty that they were Barbadians. I would not call other countries. I do not want to speak in any pejorative terms about any other country but you could be almost certain that the person who was reading the *Daily Telegraph* or the *London Times* or the *Express*, who was black, was a Barbadian. Therefore, I, as a Barbadian, felt comfortable in going and speaking to the person behind the newspaper, confident that he would be & fellow countryman.

Not anymore, Sir. I go in the Law Courts on a daily basis and I see a number of the products of the educational system. I see young people under the age of 25 who are asked to read the oath in a law court when they are about to give evidence who cannot read the oath. A number of them you see in school uniform. That is the worst part, Sir. These are not ones who have slipped completely through the system. These are persons who are going to secondary schools and wearing school uniforms who tell the court they are in 4th form and they cannot read the oath.

The Government of Barbados then is coming and asking for this Parliament to approve a guarantee for something in the region of US\$14 million for the University. I must say here that we on this side have no difficulty in supporting any money Resolution or any support that comes to Parliament for the support of the University of the West Indies. We believe that there is not enough being done for it. What we would like to see is, instead of the Government approaching these matters in education in this piecemeal fashion bringing resolutions as

a single issue comes up, that the Government comes to us now to bring a comprehensive policy paper on education. 2.00 p.m.

We have not had a green paper on education for a long time. The same way that the public could be given an opportunity to discuss all kinds of things that are not very germane to the whole development I believe that it is time for the Government to come up with a plan, a paper on education touching all areas of education so that the public can have on hand a debate and to discuss what kind of educational policy we need for these times. I do not believe that anybody would be offended if we say that a lot of our educational system, despite changes over the years, our system is still fairly reflective of one inherited from the British that worked well at a particular period in our development but is unsuited for the demands today. One of the ironies of it, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that many parts of that educational system that have been abandoned by the British themselves who brought it here are still alive and kicking in Barbados. And in fact they bore no reality to our current needs.

I could spend the rest of the day going through one by one the areas that I refer to. But I would just give one or two examples to season the discussion. Take the 'A' Levels Advanced Levels, Cambridge Advanced Level Examinations even the British have made dramatic changes in that kind of exam. Now that we have moved into the semester system we are now creating a hybrid system. We have a high school education system that is British oriented and a university system that is American oriented. You are confusing everybody in the system.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: No. I am going to talk for long...

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I am going to talk for a while longer. Half hour at least.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: As you please.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George South has graciously given way because he indicates that it is his intention to speak for another half an hour or thereabouts.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It is time, Sir, for the luncheon recess and therefore I move, Sir, that the

sitting be suspended -1 acknowledge that the Honourable Member has not completed his speech - until 3.00 p.m. today.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative Without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 2.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for St George South.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I have completed my speech.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to a few specific queries made by the Honourable Member for St. George South. First of all I will not rebut any serious criticism that he makes and he is totally aware of that.

I will start at the end because I think we need to get on with the other things and hope we do not spend as much time on the second as we did on this. The cost of students in accordance with the Agreement at the University during the triennial 1993-96 indeed it is well known and there have been public statements in Barbados and there has been a discussion by a committee appointed by the University and the decision has been made by the University that the fees would have been increased from this September. In that case I was the representative. I was aware that there were all of these uncertainties within the various territories and I thought that we should have time to do 2 things basically:

- (1) to alert the public of Barbados that there will be a change in the next triennial which would be 1996;

It may seem far away but it is not far away for many of us in many areas. And:

- (2) that it will give us time to prepare and to sensitize the public as to what any new programme would be for the next triennial.

While all the other territories are now paying an additional 15% from this September we in Barbados indeed have held strain and we have not put on the 15%. This was not done - with all due respect to the Honourable member for St. George South - at any drilling or coercion by the IADB. This was a committee which was established by members within the University system.

The second thing I want to make clear is that it is generally known that there is a shake up at the University of the West Indies because the Vice-Chancellor has issued mandates to the University that the members of staff have to do certain things and they have to conform to certain things. We do not control that as a Government. But certain instructions were issued to the staff and they have to put themselves in order to conform with the requirements of the Vice-Chancellor. It is not anything instituted by the Government. That is the University management, the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor.

I would also say to the Honourable Member for St. George South I will never recommend any holding back or any cutting back in education if I were in control of the funds. I certainly would not. As a former teacher myself basically my heart is still in Education.

Your comment about the Associate Degree I think there is some misunderstanding when we talk about acknowledgement Credits are given. Credits are not given for every discipline but credits are given at the University. They are trying to formulate and to finalize the exact number so that they can say I will definitely get this number. It is an ongoing process.

The University has decided to switch the Use of English into the department or school of continuing education from this September. They have notified us that they have moved it away from the University main because I like you, was saying it is ridiculous to have Remedial English at University level when people would have or should have passed through X number of years within an educational system. If it is still required, I believe that it should not be; if they feel that there is still the need for someone to go through it then it would have to go into the field of continuing education as opposed to the regular University and they should pay.

In this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, it is quite v clear that the Government of Barbados is not spending money here. This is just a guarantee for the Government of Barbados to guarantee the loan to the CDB of US\$772 333 and to the IADB for the US\$12 991 600. We ore doing it here, in Trinidad they are doing it on behalf of the campus, in Jamaica they are doing it on behalf of Mona.

Aside.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: No, no. In this particular case, the University has to pay back the money. We are only guaranteeing. The other comment you have here about the arrears is very significant. We have addressed arrears. Honourable Members will remember that late last year I came in and we addressed arrears. We still have some left.

Aside.

Mr. Speaker, without trying to prolong my contribution, I wish to make the point that the University needs to play a new role, a more vigorous role in our country and in the region, making sure that an increased number of West Indians are trained there not only at the degree level but also at every level - certificate level, diploma level, short term programmes, weekend programmes, summer programmes. We need to see an outreach on the part of the University. We need to ensure that the concentration of knowledge and skills at the University is more widely shared because we are confident that on the experience of other countries that is one way of ensuring that we can make a developmental thrust forward by investing more wisely and broadly in the development of our human resources.

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

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
BY GOVERNMENT OF A LOAN OF US \$12 991 600 FROM
THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO
FINANCE THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME OF
THE CAVE HILL CAMPUS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST
INDIES

Hon. C. V. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, we have covered the debate, the facts are the same and I do move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 3.30 p.m.

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE VESTING OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT SIX ROADS, ST. PHILIP

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a rather simple resolution. Everyone is aware of the fact that there is an industrial estate at Six Roads but the land was never vested in the Industrial Development Corporation. We are seeking by this Resolution to vest this area of land at Six Roads in the Barbados Industrial and Development Corporation. The land contains 81 77.98 square metres and it abuts and abounds lands of the Crown, the Princess Margaret School, lands of the National Housing Corporation and Groves Plantation. The purpose of this vesting is to ensure that the Barbados Investment Development Corporation has the control of the property for the purposes for which it is being used, that is, for the development and use as an industrial estate.

It is a matter which we are seeking to tidy up because it has been long outstanding and wheresoever we find these

matters we seek to tidy them up. I think this is an area which is well-known to everyone and I am sure there was some discussion from time to time about this estate, but the fact of the matter is that we are now really seeking to ensure that it properly rests within the authority of the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation for the purposes outlined.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution seeking to vest the area of land described therein and located at Six Roads in the parish of St. Philip in the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation do now pass.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have responsibility for shadowing the Ministry of Housing and Lands and I want to make it clear that I require from the Government from time to time, prior to the Resolution coming before Parliament and before debate starts on any resolution pertaining to vesting or leasing of land, to have a copy of the plans.

Mr. Speaker, this is very important. I would like to be in a position to offer my very best advice to this Parliament, and I would be unable to do so if I do not see a plan and be in a position to carry out certain investigations. Without doing the necessary groundwork, one could find oneself agreeing to a resolution that is fraught with problems. I have the experience in that area. When you are dealing with land, Mr. Speaker, you have to be very careful, and it is not going to be a wise thing for me, speaking on behalf of the Opposition, to support resolutions without first having the plans. I need plans giving me sufficient time to find out where to locate the pieces of land.

I am not going to be satisfied any longer and I am sounding a warning to the Ministry that is supposed to give the Minister these plans to send a copy to the Opposition so that we too could make a meaningful input into these resolutions. As it stands, a copy of this Resolution was placed before this Honourable Chamber just today, this morning.

I do not know, and one must not assume, that each and every Member in here knows Barbados as a whole and where these bits and pieces of land are. One must not assume that, especially the area in question in Six Roads. No one can tell me exactly which is point A or point B. I hear a description about Princess Margaret School. I know Princess Margaret School but I do not know its boundaries. I know the Housing Area in the Farm but I do not know the boundaries. I know that there is an industrial area in Six Roads but I do not know its boundaries yet we have a portion of land here, about 81 000 square metres and you are asking me to endorse or give my support to this Resolution.

I am saying it is wrong and I am calling on the Government and I will hope that this is the last time that this is done. I am shadowing this portfolio and I expect certain courtesies and certain information to be given to me to allow me to do my job and to discharge my function and responsibility to this country and to this Opposition. Nothing short of that is going to satisfy me. I do not care what anybody thinks. I want to know that I can do my job to the very best of my ability so that no one can say I am one who likes to rubber stamp. I am sure the Honourable Minister would appreciate that because it would be helpful to him if he wants to be a good Minister. I am Sure he would allow for certain inputs. The people in the housing area in Six Roads would want to know exactly where this land is.

The plan is put here in front of me. How can someone reasonably expect me or anyone to come in here and look at this here which is now given to me, a little black thing here, that we cannot even see and tell me that I am supposed to agree to a resolution. It is only making laughing sport of me and the Opposition. I am saying that all of us in this Honourable Chamber should be treated with that courtesy of having the plans. There is nothing wrong with having a copy of the plans provided to each and every Honourable Member.

I have spoken time and time again on this. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is fair to me that I should be getting up here today and raising the same subject I would like to move on to some other area where I can take the Government to task, but as it stands I do not think this is really fair. I think that the Minister owes this Honourable Chamber some sort of apology for this. I have asked for it already. This is not the first time. I do not care what the Minister says in his rebuttal or reply I hope he will take what I am saying as constructive criticism.

I can understand the purpose for the Resolution. Yes. It is going to vest land in the BIDC. I can understand the reason for that. I am familiar with this process, but I am saying that there are certain things that must be done because there are some areas where there are some infringements and outstanding claims that people have as far as lands are concerned. That is why, when you are dealing with property and land in particular, Mr. Speaker, you need to be quite clear and certain that you are dealing with the land in question and that there is no question at all about it. 3.40 p.m.

That is why I said I am asking the Government to afford me this sort of information. We can come back here and find that we have acquired land that should not have been acquired. We have described land that is inaccurately

described. All of that. How am I to know that this land is accurately described?

I am glad that the Government is vesting this land in the IDC. I do not know if the Minister would care to tell us why it has taken so long to have this land vested in the Corporation. It might not be a matter of saying that the former Government or some other Minister did not do that because it is important We are seeing a movement towards certain things. You need to place this as an asset for the Industrial Development Corporation. This has to be clearly spelt out. I want the purpose of these resolutions to be made quite clear and stated clearly. We must not be in any doubt. It is not a matter of just a mere exercise of vesting of land. It would be vesting of land to give the Corporation some sort of assets. That is exactly what I want to know so that we will be in a better position to do some bargaining because I would like to see from all of these assets spin-off things like creating jobs and expanding the area.

I too would want to know - that is why I am asking - if there are any additional lands in the area which could be made available to would-be or perspective entrepreneurs because we know that there are a lot of people who would like to set up industries, they would like to buy land not only rent from the industrial estates, as Government experiences problems in getting money to build factory • space. I am asking these questions so that we could now move towards acquiring any additional lands in the area which could be made available, which could be acquired to add on to make additional lands available so that people who do not want to rent from the Industrial Development Corporation could purchase the land and build their own factory. That would also reflect on a policy where the Government could consider allowing these perspective manufacturers or investors land at a nominal cost. I think that is the direction in which I would invite the Government to go.

While I have no quarrel with the intention of the resolution I would hope that everything is done so that all these considerations are taken into account so that we could maximize the lands that are available there in Six Roads. It is an industrial area. Lands up there could be approved by the Town Planner for industrial purposes and since extension is going in that area, that part of the country, we would want to see the land acquired at this time so that there would be a land bank for industrial purposes. It augers well because we have to be planning ahead and realize that if we are going to attract industries and we are thinking of putting people back into work we would have to be thinking about making lands available to people who would build factories and employ people. All these are considerations.

I would hope that the Minister would give some consideration to my request which I think is reasonable, make available the lands. I must tell the Minister this. I am interested in this sort of exercise looking at land and so forth. It would enable me to look at the physical planning and make some positive contribution to the physical planning of Barbados. I hope that the Minister will respond to some of the queries I have made.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I first want to acknowledge that my friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East has taken on the shadowing of the portfolio of Housing and I think he says the Environment. He has also indicated that he has been elevated. I believe that he is now number 3 on that side and I want to congratulate him for that.

The point which is made about the availability of the plot and indeed the co-operation which we should have in these matters and particularly matters which are not controversial and even if they were controversial, it is a question of being able to have information that would enable a proper debate to take place. I have no particular difficulty with that.

But the Honourable Member must be aware of the fact that this area of land did have some controversy some time in 1976 in St. Philip during the by-election when I think the then Minister responsible for Industry had indicated at a meeting that the Government had moved to acquire an area of land for the establishment of an industrial estate at Six Roads. It was disputed and of course history has been able to indicate very clearly that in truth and in fact his assertion was completely truthful and I suppose history has vindicated him.

One would have thought that during the time that efforts would have been made to have had this land vested in the then Barbados Industrial Development Corporation but, like everything else, I suspect this is a matter that got buried in the bureaucracy. As I was informed the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation in seeking to ensure that all of the lands on which industrial estates have been established - that they are brought to book and that they have a clear understanding of the boundaries and they know exactly what they own from what they do not own discovered - that this land was never vested in the then Barbados Industrial Development Corporation. When the properties which the then IDC owned were vested in the new Barbados Investment and Development Corporation this area of land was not included. What we sought therefore to do is to regularize that situation.

Six Roads is an established industrial estate. Everybody is aware of that. I am sure the Honourable Member is aware of that. I am not trying to dispute the point which he is making about the availability or the late circulation of this Resolution. But since we felt that it was

not a controversial matter and that we were just seeking to regularize and to regulate this matter we did not anticipate that there would be much debate on it.

Taking the points which the Honourable Member has made I would want to give him the assurance that no slight was intended. We can be assured of getting the fullest co-operation from me in the discussion of these matters.

As far as the use of this land is concerned, I would just want to say that it is being used as an industrial estate. I am in no position to indicate further than that. The fact of the matter is that my concern is to ensure that the property is properly vested in the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation and it is for the Corporation to determine how they will use it and for what purpose it will be used. Really what we are seeking to do here today is to vest this land in the Corporation.

With those remarks I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution to vest the area of land described in Six Roads in the parish of St. Philip do now pass.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am asking, Sir, that the Bill relating to the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation Act, it is called the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation Bill, 1993 be called. I want to indicate to all Honourable Members that at this stage we will only have the introduction and at that point we will not have any debate beyond the introduction on this particular matter.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is correct.
3.50 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: It does not matter how it shapes I have given an undertaking. Even if the Honourable Member thinks of an immediate response and gives one, I will still have it deferred until Friday for further consideration.

ORDER NO. 8 - BARBADOS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION BILL, 1993

Hon. D. W. BOWEN: In moving, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of this Bill, I would like to make a

number of comments. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the Bill seeks to repeal the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act and the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation Act and to provide for the establishment of the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation.

The establishment, Mr. Speaker, of the new entity, the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation, is geared at stimulating, facilitating and undertaking the development of agriculture in an effective and coherent manner, while at the same time optimising the use of scarce resources.

It might be useful, Mr. Speaker, to recall the purposes for which the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and the Barbados Marketing Corporation were established.

The Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation was created by an Act of Parliament in 1965 with specific roles including the participation in such agricultural pursuits as the Minister approved. In addition it was to develop and manage on a commercial basis such plantations and agricultural lands as might from time to time be vested in it along the lines of course of Government's agricultural policy. As a corollary it was aimed at stimulating and encouraging participation by the private sector.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, was created in 1963 by an Act of Parliament for the purpose of stimulating, facilitating and improving the production, marketing and processing of produce in the island, particularly for the benefit of the producer. It was to secure the most favourable arrangements for the purchase, handling, transportation, exportation, shipping, marketing and sale of produce whether in the island or out of the island and in particular, Mr. Speaker, to assist agricultural and fishery cooperative societies to dispose of their produce to their best advantage.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Marketing Corporation was to secure the most favourable arrangements whether in the island or out of the island for the storage of produce and for the storage of such other matter or thing as the Corporation deemed fit.

Without doubt, Mr. Speaker, I think both sides would agree that both the BADC and the BMC have over the years made a considerable impact on the process of agricultural development in the country. On the one hand the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation has been able through its diverse activities to stimulate agricultural growth by using a two-pronged approach which could be classified on the one hand as commercial and on the other hand as developmental.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Marketing Corporation over time has provided specific centralised marketing services to the farming community with the ultimate goal of regulating, streamlining and boosting agricultural production and marketing.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that both sides would agree that despite the critical services which have been provided by the two institutions that there has also been the subject of scathing criticisms regarding their performance. The BADC has operated for some time at a financial loss although it has been given a subvention from Government annually towards its operating costs. During the period 1982 to 1992 BADC grants totalled \$31.38 million. In addition the Corporation has borrowed from the Barbados National Bank primarily to finance its sugar cane operations.

The net effect of this borrowing is the accumulated debt amounting to \$22 million. Other debts have also been approved to sundry creditors including the National Insurance Department to the tune of just over \$3 million. This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of concern to us and this is a matter that I will address later in the presentation.

If we can look, Mr. Speaker, at the role and the mission of the new entity the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, let me state, Mr. Speaker, categorically that this is not a rehash of what has gone before. It is not intended to be. It is intended to be a new • viable organisation which over time will stand on its own two feet

The role and mission of the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation is, Mr. Speaker, to assist Government in the execution of agricultural policy through the formulation and implementation of programmes which are service and developmental oriented as well as of an advisory and regulatory nature. 4.00 p.m.

The primary objectives of the new Corporation, and I list four, Mr. Speaker, are -

1. to stimulate, facilitate and to improve the production, marketing and processing of produce in the island, particularly for the benefit of the producer;
2. to secure the most favourable arrangements for the purchase, handling, transportation, exportation, shipping, marketing and sale of produce and in particular to assist agriculture and fisheries co-operatives to dispose of their produce;
3. to develop and manage agricultural lands as may from time to time be vested in it along the lines of the Government's agricultural policy; and

4. to undertake the development of agriculture in the island and to carry out, operate and participate in such agricultural projects as the Minister may approve.

The new Corporation, Mr. Speaker, will have a broad based mandate encompassing agricultural production and marketing services and will be Government's main instrument of agrarian reform and rural development. Thus the scope of the new organisation will include agri-support service projects, rural development projects, field research and production projects. To service these three project categories, the Corporation will be organised into the following five Divisions -

Administrative, which speaks for itself; Finance, Engineering, Marketing and Agriculture.

With respect to Administrative, Mr. Speaker, this Division will be centrally responsible for personnel and general administrative matters. The Finance Division will be responsible for central accounts and for ensuring the maintenance of uniform accounting procedures in all activities and divisions of the Corporation. It would provide all necessary accounting information to the office of the Programme Planning to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of all project activity and it will contain an independent audit section responsible directly to the Chief Executive.

With respect to Engineering, Mr. Speaker, this Division will have three components: Irrigation, farm equipment and workshop and cold storage and abattoir facilities. As regards marketing, the Marketing Division will provide the nucleus of all services relating to the marketing of agricultural produce and will consist of procurement services, selling and distribution services, both local and overseas, facilitating services which include grading, packaging, storage, promotion and so on, and experimental food processing and food promotion. This Division will work closely with the Agricultural Division and the Programme Planning Office in the areas of market research, information and market intelligence.

With respect to Agriculture, the fifth section - this is by no means the least of the sections because in my enumeration I called Agriculture fifth - it does not mean for one moment that it does not take pride of place. The Agricultural Division will form the nucleus of all agricultural services to be provided to the projects. These services will be divided into Extension and Information, Training, Agro-Technology and Field Research Projects.

Let me spend some time, Mr. Speaker, on the question of human resources as it relates to the new entity. Let me state clearly and up front the fact that the merger does not mean, or would not mean any wide scale

redundancies. There are 14 positions which will go as a result of post adjustment redundancies and so on. The establishment of this new entity will necessitate the recruitment and retention of well-trained, experienced and competent personnel if it is to function as we envisage. In addition to the need for some staff, it will be further necessary to put systems in place which will focus on enhancing performance and the tightening up of activities to ensure that personnel are fully employed and, as I stated at the outset, the optimal utilisation of their capabilities.

The Corporation will be under the direction of a Board of Directors which will be responsible and accountable to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. This Board will comprise a Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, a Managing Director, a representative of the Ministry of Agriculture and five other members. These appointments will be made by the Minister of Agriculture in due course. At the management level the Corporation will be headed by a Managing Director, critical support staff comprising a Deputy Managing Director, a Corporate Secretary and a Financial Controller. 4.10 p.m.

As I said, and it needs reiteration, there will be no wide-scale lay offs. But having said that, the new corporation will have to shed personnel who are over the retirement age whose functions will be integrated into the new activities and whose jobs have been made redundant as a consequence of the amalgamation and divesting of certain activities and whose functions will be effected by the streamlining exercise. The net result of this displacement of staff will have financial implications, representing the early payment of severance, gratuities and so on.

As far as the financial arrangements are concerned, the execution of the Corporation's activities will require fairly sizeable financial outlay, the brunt of which will be raised from the corporation's own activity. As a developmental organisation, however, its developmental costs will have to raise up-front capital and it is envisaged that the Government will be injecting the allocation of \$2.1 million to the BADC in the 1993-94 Estimates to the new corporation.

At another level^{^^} analysis the Corporation will have to meet the cost^{^^} operations since apart from the initial financial outSPB which I just alluded it is not envisaged that Government will be in a position over time to repeatedly inject finances to sustain its operations. In short, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the BADMC will have to strive to be a viable concern.

It is against this background and in that light that we on this side considered it both politic and prudent that

the various commercial operations of the former activity remain within the new corporation as a means of revenue generation. These operations will include, among others, the Bond, the abattoir facility, the shops at the Airport, operations pertaining to the collection of a cess, the motor tractor cultivation scheme and cotton production, marketing and ginning.

On the issue of cotton production, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be worthwhile for me to separate this and mention specifically that the new corporation will be well placed to carry out the functions of cotton production, marketing and ginning. We believe that the new organisation will have the land space required, the technology and the equipment as well as the human resource requirements. In this respect, therefore, Mr. Speaker, careful consideration will be given and indeed is being given to the timely phasing out of the Caribbean Cotton Industry Limited.

These activities which the CCBL formerly provided the production, marketing and ginning will now be undertaken by the BADMC as we move towards restoring viability of the cotton industry and, in the process, legitimising and enhancing the existence of a cotton industry in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, we will all agree that the ideal situation for the new organisation as far as accommodation is concerned would be one where it is housed under one roof but, unfortunately, at this stage that is not possible. While we on this side would move in that direction over time it must be said that certain functions will have to be carried out from Fairy Valley and certain functions will have to be carried out from the BMC on the Princess Alice Highway.

In concluding this introduction, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is my view that the new organisation, the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation, has the potential to assist Government in the execution of its agricultural policy but to be successful it would be necessary for management to put effective systems in place and at the same time proper control mechanisms and to place greater emphasis on the whole question of increased productivity.

Mr. Speaker, I beg that this

With these few words,
Bill be read a second time.

Hon. C. V. WALKER: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I beg that first consideration of this Bill be

postponed since they are not aware of what is going on.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am going to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.20 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I seek permission to revert to the Order of Business laying of papers so that we could lay a paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is seeking to recommit laying of papers on the Order Paper. There seems to be no objection then leave is granted.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1993.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving the suspension of this sitting because there are a number of matters we would like to have done and cleared this week. For this reason I am moving that the sitting be suspended until Friday the 13th August at 12.00 noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 4.25 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

ORDER NO. 8 - TO MOVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION ON SECOND READING OF THE BARBADOS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION BILL, 1993

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion this Honourable House heard that the Bill before us was seeking to amalgamate the operations of what was formerly the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and what was formerly the Barbados Marketing Corporation and among the reasons given for the bringing of this Bill which is before us was that the new entity which is being created will assist in the development

of agriculture and will also achieve a measure of agrarian reform. However, we on this side are sceptical and indeed are at a loss as to understand precisely the reason for the merger. If out of this merger Barbados could achieve a full rationalisation of agriculture, if out of this merger we will see the new entity cutting costs while increasing efficiency, if out of this merger we can see the total contribution of agriculture to national output and the national input increase, then it will be easy for us to be able to appreciate the reasoning behind the merger.

However, Sir, I want first to say that prior to this Bill which is aiming at marrying the BADC to the BMC, the BADC would have been designed to play a completely different role from the Barbados Marketing Corporation. To that extent then, Sir, the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation would have been an entity which would have been established to do something for the production and output of agriculture at the level of an operational sphere of influence where the BADC itself would have been developmental in thrust, developmental in concept, and would have been aiming to do something for production. While on the other hand, the Barbados Marketing Corporation would have been primarily a marketing entity.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, it means that the traditional role of the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation would have been totally and completely different from the role of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We are left to wonder why the merger in that the 2 entities that are now to be abolished played • completely different roles, how the Ministry of Agriculture can in a situation where the 2 entities were designed to play completely different roles come to this Honourable House to bring about something which at best can be deemed a cosmetic change. It is virtually change for change's sake.

We have already seen in this Honourable House a situation where the Export Development Corporation and the Industrial Development Corporation were merged under a single entity again in a highly cosmetic way when 2 completely different entities were merged into an operation which, as I understand it today, is not even going as well as it should be.

Sir, in respect of agriculture there are Honourable Members in this House who would be aware of the fact that in the mid-1960's when the Barbados Marketing Corporation was established there was at that time a definite and clear role for it as an important distributor, but in 1993, whereas the commercial and business culture of Barbados has grown and developed we are definitely not at all supportive of any governmental entity which has as its principal aim distribution. We are convinced that we have

an enlightened private sector which can enhance and develop without the need for a government entity doing purely distribution.

In recent times, if one examines precisely what the Barbados Marketing Corporation was doing insofar that its export section was not particularly doing well as an exporter it was doing merely importation and distribution. We are saying that in a situation where the world as a whole is talking about privatisation and divestment and encouraging growth and development out of the private sector and where a lot of people are of the view that the private sector should stand tall as a group of businesses that should be involved heavily in commercial business we are saying that the time has long passed for Barbados to have a state-run marketing entity whose primary role would be distribution.

We are therefore not at all supportive of this measure where marketing and distribution would be among the principal objectives of the new entity. What we want then to do is to encourage this Parliament to see agriculture as a productive sector which properly nursed along and encouraged has potential for the economy of the country. To that extent then, Sir, we are interested in the developmental aspect of agriculture. We would not want to see what happened to the ADC in the last several years repeated under this new entity. We are aware that in the last 7 years or so the total output by the ADC in respect of sugar production has diminished to an extent where several estates that would have been in production of sugar in 1986 were not in production in recent times and the many ADC operated sugar estates of which there were several that were virtually in grassland.

This side has already lamented in here the fact that when Barbados found itself becoming a net* importer of sugar there were lands owned by the Crown through the ADC which were lying idle. We have already lamented the fact that in a situation when Barbados was an importer of sugar we had the resources here that could have been exploited and utilised to enhance sugar production and, under this misguided Government, we ignored development of these resources.

Barbadians have been lamenting the fact that where Barbados was compelled to import sugar from Guatemala in recent times there existed every opportunity for the Government to have sought to bring more lands back into sugar production, especially arable land owned by a government entity like ADC. As we are considering this Bill before this Honourable House we are looking both at the timing of the Bill and the thinking behind it and we are mindful that in the same way that the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation grew out of the Export Promotion Corporation and the Industrial Development

Corporation that this new entity has come about amalgamating 2 different entities not so much because the Government has any confidence that its new entity will be doing better than the 2 to be abolished but primarily because the Government of Barbados is bowing to IMF imposed duress. There is no doubt about the fact, Sir, that were it not for the IMF inspired we might very well have a situation where this Government would have been seeking to maintain and retain both the BMC and the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation as separate entities. But because of Government's flirtation with the IMF, because of Government's determination to efisure that it would be successful in maintaining IMF surveillance we have before us today a Bill before Parliament which is aiming, exclusively, to amalgamate 2 separate entities primarily because that is what the International Monetary Fund wants the Barbados Government to do. 12.15 p.m.

But I would like this Honourable House to remember that before this Bill came to abolish the ADC up to the year 1986 the ADC sugar estates were producing 45 082 tonnes of sugar cane. In 1986 when the Barbados Labour Party demitted office the total output by ADC operated estates would have been 45 082 tonnes of sugar cane. That figure gradually diminished to such a degree that in 1992 the amount of sugar cane produced by ADC estates have fallen to a mere 7 000 tonnes. A scandalous situation, Mr. Speaker, especially in circumstances where by 1990 it would have been obvious to the Government that output in sugar had been declining and that something had to be done to save sugar and where the Government itself had an entity called the Agricultural Development Corporation with large estates like Swans, Bath and River to mention some and where by 1990 it was transparently clear that Barbados' sugar production as a whole has been declining, where Barbados by 1990 had become an importer of molasses, when the Government should have taken the ADC and gotten the ADC to produce sugar out of those estates which have been in grass.

In addition to that we have also had a situation where, apart from the fact that ADC estates were not producing, these estates were still costing Government substantial sums especially since they had to be managed and manned and when they had labour forces they were doing little or nothing. It is our hope on this side that when this new entity is established that something will be done to get the estates formerly under the tutelage and ownership of the ADC to begin producing sugar again.

I have heard one spokesman in recent times indicate that we have the potential to produce as much as 80 000 tonnes of sugar. We on this side have no quarrel with that. We would indeed like to see 80 000 tonnes of sugar produced but, at present, the figures for 1993 would

indicate that in 1993 we would have produced nothing more than 48 000 tonnes, a ridiculous situation, Sir.

What I am cautioning this Honourable House about is this, that if a new entity emerges and this entity is unable to utilize and mobilize resources to get agricultural production going then the merger would have been a total and complete waste of time. I am also skeptical about this particular aspect of the merger. You would know that the programme of structural adjustment, as devised by this Government, was a programme where very often the Government was conscious of its financial resources and very often the Government either had to cut cost or was made by the International Monetary Fund to cut cost. This particular aspect that is before us now is the aspect of cost cutting. I have heard nothing from that side to indicate that the new merger will cut cost in terms of saving the revenue of the country. I have heard nothing that the merger will increase efficiency to a degree where the resources deployed in agriculture whether sugar or non-sugar agriculture would be better made use of, I have heard nothing to indicate that as costs are tempted to be cut that total output would be increased. Indeed I have heard nothing to indicate what long-term plans the Government has for the total resuscitation of agriculture even though everybody knows the potential of this most important sector.

What this Honourable House wants to be assured of is that any new mechanism whether legislative or at the level of policy which is being brought, that is relevant to agriculture be a mechanism that would see agriculture get a shot in the arm, that would see agriculture receive the boost it direly needs. In that way to the extent that we on this side are anxious to hear from the Government what plans there are to boost agriculture, we also want to know from the Government what plans, especially what plans relate to this new entity, the Government has .not only for increasing total output and total exporting of sugar but also what plans the Government has to push the export aspect of agriculture to a further degree. Everybody knows that traditionally rum, molasses and sugar were our principle agricultural exports. But we are wondering what other plans the > Government has to maximize exports so that the country can earn some foreign exchange out of increased exports in agriculture.

We are also wondering about Government's much vaulted flirtation with cotton as something that the Government had seen as having potential to bring about increases in foreign exchange and we are also wondering to what extent this new entity would have anything to do with cotton production. For as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, this Government's attempt so far at revitalizing cotton have been met with all sorts of nuances, all types of insinuations and, clearly,- up to now the population

of Barbados is yet to be convinced that cotton was supposed to have been produced in the last 5 or 6 years and has really impacted profitably on the economy of Barbados.

In essence what we on this side are anxious to know, Sir, is:

- (1) Where are we going to actually save and cut cost in relation to total cost to the country in terms of costs in the agricultural sector? What are we going to say? What costs are going to be cut, Sir?
- (2) To what extent are we going to see our exports increased?
- (3) To what extent are we going to see more sugar produced?
- (4) To what extent are we going to see measures designed to improve Barbados' non-sugar exports?
- (5) To what extent are we going to be able to make use of this entity to get cotton going the way it should be going, Sir?
- (6) To what extent this new entity will be able to increase the contribution that agriculture can make to national income and total output of the country?

We are also mindful of the fact that in the agricultural sector generally this year there have been some developments and even though I wish to incur your impatience by raising issues that you, Mr. Speaker, may think should not be raised in this debate in that we are discussing agriculture in a fairly holistic way, in respect to the developments in sugar, I want the Government to tell this Honourable House whether in view of the restructuring of the sugar industry, after the establishment of the new management company whether there are any indications that for the next financial year our actual output of sugar would be increased. I understand that those heavily indebted estates, as well factories controlled by the BSIL, are supposed to receive some attention from the Government and I am therefore asking, Sir, in what way have the new methods, including the agricultural management company already manifested a potential to assist the sugar sector in the foreseeable future, Sir. 12.25 p.m.

Sir, in conclusion it is our view that the concept of marrying a marketing entity to a developmental entity is a type of marriage that is unwieldy in that the separate functions of the two entities that will be abolished are foremost in the mind of Her Majesty's Opposition and we are not at all convinced that bringing a marketing company to amalgamate with a developmental company is a well-thought out and well-conceived idea.

We are also mindful of the fact that a lot of cosmetic changes that have been made in tourism, have been made in industry and insofar that we have no positive proof, no clear indication, that we are benefitting in any substantial way from the two previous mergers we are asking the Government through its Minister to give the necessary assurances to this House that this new entity will be one that will not just serve a mere nuisance value. With those observations, Sir, I am obliged to you.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am terribly disappointed with the way how Government is handling the public's business. I have here before me a Bill:-

- (a) to repeal the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act and the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation Act, and
- (b) to provide for the establishment of the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation Act and related matters.

I would have thought that to begin with this Bill would have dealt exclusively with these matters but I want from the outset to ask some questions and make some observations. I would want to know what on earth has the Barbados Board of Tourism and the Barbados Tourism Authority got to do with this Bill? But it is embodied in the Bill. If you look at the Third Schedule you will see that... I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to hear the Members from that side now, when this Bill was circulated. I can understand. I am a legislator and therefore I have enough commonsense to understand what is presented to me. I want to know how did the Cabinet...

Hon. M. A. KING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no mistake in this. The position is, there is ... I am saying you are misleading the House. A decision was taken to amend the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act and the Barbados Tourism Authority Act to embody the provisions in those two bits of legislation which are contained in section 26 of this Bill before the House so that the transitional provisions in relation to pensionable service and transfer of assets would be the same in relation to these three new corporations

which were being amalgamated, the IDC, the Tourism Authority and the BADC.

So that in order to save parliamentary time I was advised by the Chief Parliamentary Council that the techniques of achieving an amendment to all the bits of legislation was to include section 28 in this Bill specifying the enactments in a schedule which would amend the other bits of legislation and the Law Revision exercise in due course would pick that up and transfer these bits of amendments into the appropriate bits of legislation. I am advised that that is a drafting technique which is used to save parliamentary time rather than bringing separate amendments.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the Honourable Members on the other side have to react like that, because all I am now saying is, I have heard an explanation from the Attorney General and as he agrees, it is an unusual thing.

The Minister who introduced this Resolution had a duty to explain this and not wait on me to ask the question. Had I not got up and said that I do not know when this explanation would have been given. Furthermore, I thought the Attorney General should have got up after our spokesman and given the explanation and not allowed me to raise the question. This is not a typographical mistake. It was deliberately done. I want Honourable Members to understand there are people out here as sharp as everything when it comes to these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I have to be concerned about these things because I remember when we dealt with another Bill some time ago we departed somewhat from what was the norm and I was told in explanation to this Honourable Chamber that this was a new form of drafting. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is this, now we have resorted in this Bill to the old form of the drafting of a Bill. You see this is why I said sometimes they confuse me and the public with it. When they dealt with the Technical and Vocational Training Bill I asked why it is they were vesting authority in the Board itself to appoint members of the Board and I was told that that was the direction in which Government was going. What I am saying is that this Bill has resorted to placing the power back in the hands of the Minister to appoint members of the Board.

Now these are things that the public ought to know. You cannot just get up in here and tell me sit down that I am entering into new waters. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I was given that estimation. If you are going to be consistent I do not want to be told we are going in this direction and now to find this Bill reverted

back to the old system of having a Minister appointing members of the Board.

The Government must understand what they said. They cannot say one thing in the morning and then tell me something different in the evening. I said I stand firm when it comes to matters of policy on Government matters.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government if it recognises in this Bill that the new Corporations would have power to dispose of, that is, sell property or assets of the Corporation? And if that is so, is the Government aware that some of the lands that are now being vested, which belong to the ADC, in this new corporation are tenantry lands and there are tenants who are qualified under the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act? I am only asking a question. Why would you vest tenancies in this new corporation? I would have thought that a better way to deal with this is to sell off those lands and vest the other lands in the new corporation. I would think that would be basic common sense. In other words the Ministry of Housing and Lands could have offered the qualified tenants to buy those lands. What do we have now? A situation where *you* vest the whole area of land, including the tenancies, in this new Corporation. Do you know what that is going to mean? It is going to lead to confusion and a lot of problems, and I want the Government to understand it is heading for some serious trouble in this country, because those tenants are going to do just like the people in St. George and put in those Form 1's. I will be calling on them to put in the Form 1 under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act and on this new Corporation to sell them the land at the mandatory 10 cents per square foot. 12.35 p.m.

There is another problem to that when you ask them to opt to purchase. Is the Corporation in a position to start to convey those lands to the people? Let us say they put in their Form 1's tomorrow morning or as soon as this Bill becomes law. What will happen? This new Corporation will have to hire a surveyor and attorneys at law in order to carry out the requests, that is, to convey the tenancies. Are you putting this new Corporation in that bind straight away? That is what you are doing. You have them tied. I would have thought that a better way of dealing with this matter is to hand over the lands, vest the lands free of all encumbrances. That is what you should be doing, but you are giving them problems not only out there to develop agriculture and assist people in marketing their produce, but you are now putting them in the real estate area to sell those lands to the tenants. You know what is happening, this is not something I am reaping up. People now want to have the lands, they want security of tenure and they are going to be calling on the new Corporation to sell them the lands and you will find that the monies which the new Corporation has will now have to be spent in hiring surveyors in order to provide the plots. These are

the problems, so I am asking whether the Corporation is in a position to effect these things. I am going to say no, because it is too early. Even if it is in a position, I want to know why the Government did not do this before.

Another thing that concerns me is this. The lands that are being vested in this Corporation, according to the Second Schedule, are not the best productive lands in Barbados and in a number of cases they are marginal or can produce nothing at all. Most of it is rab land. I am saying that it is foolishness to vest in a Corporation that has to deal with farming, production and marketing of produce to give them lands that you can do nothing with. I do not want Members to feel that I am speaking off the top of my head, the land mentioned at paragraph 8 of the Second Schedule, the land that runs below the Ministry of Transport and Works on the right hand side coming right down the Pine East-West Road, then it goes right across to Ilaro Court, is prone to flooding. I know the land. What are you going to produce there? That was the site of the Agricultural Exhibition a few years ago and when rain fell people were scampering. All the water comes off St. Barnabas and comes down through MTW and settles in there. The only thing which grows on that land is grass for cattle. Are you really telling me that that is something to vest in this new Corporation? It is not even good enough for housing.

You are setting up a new Corporation. I am saying that you had enough time to consider these things and make sure that when you set up this new Corporation that it becomes economically viable. It is now saddled with some dead wood, because you can put nothing on some of the parcels of land. Just like some of the land in St. Joseph, nothing is being grown at Joes River. I know the area, some woods. Are you going into forestry now? When you look at the lands at Joes River, formerly lands of Joes River Plantation, in the Second Schedule, you will see that this land, 32 acres, on which used to grow canes, is now all pasture. Are you seriously vesting this in the new Corporation? To do what? What is it going to do with it? All it will have is a big portfolio of land, which is nothing but dead wood.

If you are going to put this land into production, I submit that you will have to have equipment in order to plough these lands back up, and some serious thought will have to be put in that, but I know the area of land in question and it is impossible to do that.

I am going to move on to the same Second Schedule, because we are going to deal with that at Graeme Hall. Look at that. How much is being grown at Graeme Hall? A few fruit trees. The Minister should know that most of the produce there is stolen. I would have preferred to see more productive lands vested in this Corporation so that

you would enable it to start off and actually make some impact on the functions it is supposed to perform.

I am shadowing physical planning and I have to advise the Government wherever possible, or even draw to the Government's attention, what they can do with some of these lands. I am going to submit that the Government should look seriously at Graeme Hall, since it lies between housing development, to dispose of that land for housing purposes. It is impossible for Graeme Hall Plantation as it now stands, with the ABC Highway passing through there, to think in terms of having those lands cultivated for any number of years. Let us think about forward and future planning, because the housing developments at Amity Lodge, the new one at Elizabeth Park and at Waldron's Park tell you that people are moving to the east. All these areas - Antigua Terrace. Look and see what is going on. The developments are stretching eastwards. I am saying Government should look at that. Government might be best advised to consider handing them over to the National Housing Corporation to enable them to put in roads and sell to Sites and Services. It is impossible for us to think that we could have any real agricultural development in that area as it stands. 12.45 p.m.

People know that a lot of stealing takes place there and I am speaking from knowledge because people have told me they can go in there and carry away the pumpkins and the cucumbers. The fellows go up there when you have melons and they steal and pelt them all about the road. They scatter them about the road. So what I am saying is that you must think seriously about what you are doing. I would think that the Government has to look at the lands in Sedge Pond and land in St. Andrew in Four Hills. Yes, it has some potential but what I am saying is, wherever possible look at how best you can get rid of what will be deadweight that this new corporation is expected to carry. These are some of the problems.

I would think that the Government needs also to look at the Act again because I see here where it refers to the Minister and it does not say which Minister. I will look and see which Minister it refers to. I could only imagine it means the Minister responsible for agriculture but I would like the Minister to say that since in the Act the interpretation spells out the agent, Board, Corporation, produce and producer. I am just putting this for the Government or the Minister himself to consider to spell out which Minister.

The Minister of Finance is the Minister, as I understand it, who will be responsible for backing any loan for the new corporation but, at the same time, the Minister comes in here and seeks parliamentary approval for any loan for the new corporation. I am saying that I would

have some difficulty with understanding why it is you say that if you want to dispose of any assets of the corporation, realising that there is heavy parliamentary approval, just the Minister who is not spelled out in this Bill should acknowledge that he has been notified and that the Board proceeds to dispose of the assets? I would think that in the same way it is not sufficient to say the Minister. I think that the Minister of Finance should also be informed in this Bill and nowhere at all in the Bill can I see it.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to raise 1 or 2 questions. I hope that this new corporation will understand that there are some people who are driving vehicles belonging to the BMC around the place. Some of them are used for political campaigning.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Don't force me to call names. It will embarrass certain Members in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has come to the end of his time. Just finish off.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I would just want the Government to understand that it does not augur well when some people are using the BMC vehicles or vehicles belonging to the Corporation at nights and wasting a lot of gasoline, causing the Government a lot of problems. I am saying that those vehicles if not in use should be placed in the Ministry or on the BMC compound and not used for private purposes. I know of cases where officers are chauffeur-driven in BMC vehicles. I am only drawing this to your attention. I am not calling any names. I am asking the Government to look at this because it is causing a lot of embarrassment and I think a word to the wise is enough on this matter.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I want to underscore the points that have been made by the spokesmen on this side and to add my voice in support of the view that this step before Parliament represents a large waste of parliamentary time.

I must confess that those of us who are familiar with the history of this country since 1937 get the strange feeling that these years are wasted years; that we may not very well be proud of this Parliament that has succeeded thus far, in my view, in wasting a considerable amount of parliamentary time and cutting back in a very significant way the gains of the masses since 1937 in this country. I think that today is a further illustration of time wasting on the part of this Parliament.

We have seen several illustrations in the last 2 years. The merger between the Industrial Development

Corporation and the Export Promotion Corporation has not been justified to date. The Minister in introducing the Bill made no attempt to justify the merger. He as much as conceded that it could not be justified. Nevertheless, it was one of those cosmetic changes, changes for change sake which we were involved in. The same thing is happening today in relation to the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

The Minister was very careful in his speech to repeat the year that each corporation came into being. He read from the Act the functions as set out in law of each corporation. He indicated the amount of people that would lose their jobs in the merger. He apologised for the fact that everybody will not be housed under one roof. He pointed to the indebtedness of the BMC and the ADC to the banking system and he concluded his address. He, too, was careful not to make any attempt to justify the purchase. Perhaps it is a tribute to his honesty. There is a commentary on that because there really could be no justification.

This is, as we well know, another dictation by the International Monetary Fund on the Government and the people of Barbados. But I am not surprised that the 2 institutions attracted the attention of external agencies because the real truth is that these institutions particularly under the Democratic Labour Party Administration have proven themselves to be grossly inefficient parastatal organisations that have a large tendency to attract scandal.

There is no doubt, as was pointed out by the principal spokesman on agricultural matters on this side, that the BADC since 1986 has become one of the premier inefficient parastatal organisations in this country, an organisation, that I insisted when I was Minister of Agriculture, has to be directed to high efficiency in production realising almost 46 000 tonnes in 1986 could now find itself in 7 years producing 7 000 tonnes of sugar. That decline which has been dramatic continues and we have had no indication of any attempt on the part of this Administration to halt that decline. All the good work that had been going on at the Barbados Marketing Corporation in emphasising export production at a time when we had Tarn Dew melons, sweet peppers, hot peppers and several other crops, including eggplant, being exported to the markets that we had identified in Europe. All of that came to a dramatic halt as soon as the Democratic Labour Party Administration came into being.

We have seen public institutions being diverted to private ends and that is in effect what has been happening to these institutions under the Democratic Labour Party Administration. We on this side have found words to prevent the merger so no one must be in any doubt that we in the Barbados Labour Party are not opposed to

these cosmetic changes, changes for change sake which represent a gross and serious waste of Parliament's time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are going to be serious about agriculture for the future we must really be looking at these institutions in relation to a 5-hole test. The institution should be concerned with increased production with export and foreign exchange increase. It should be concerned with research and diversification of crop activity and it should be concerned with helping us to increase food production. These are the divisions, the directions in which any such institution in agriculture should be focussing on. But the Minister tells us that the Corporation would have divisions dealing with finance, not important, somebody has to control the money, administration, marketing, engineering. But he was careful to omit exports. He was careful to omit research. These are important new directions in which we ought to be looking and taking the country, if we are serious. But what we are witnessing today is a continuing drift in the leadership of our agriculture from the public sector. What we are witnessing today, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Government has no clear thoughts in relation to agricultural policy and agricultural leadership in this country. 12.55 p.m.

I take issue, in a modest way, with the Honourable Member for St. James North who spoke insofar as he might have given the impression that the Government institutions in agriculture should be competing in any way with the large private sector plantations. I do not think that that is the role of the Government agencies in agriculture. That is not to say that a large portion of the Government plantations ought not to be devoted where it is practicable so to do to sugar production. But the Government should particularly be doing things that the private sector will not do and does not find it economical to do or does not have the say to do. For example the Government agencies should be taking the lead in finding alternative crops so that the diversification crop should be particularly part of the focus and the responsibility of either the two agencies working in collaboration or a merged agency. But you cannot justify the merger unless you are focussing and emphasizing diversification.

In terms of where the country is today, it makes no sense to talk of a new agency in agriculture unless that agency is widely concerned with exports. The Barbados Labour Party has a particularly proud history in relation to the management of the Barbados Marketing Corporation in the period running up to 1986 when we were last in office. We established an institution called BASIS which was a statistical and information service available - to the farming community - telling them where there were likely to be shortages, where there were likely to be excesses guiding the farmers so that they could avoid gluts.

The Barbados Marketing Corporation in those days had contracts with the farmers for the production of the melons, the sweet peppers, the hot peppers, the eggplants and the other crops which we were exporting to Europe. We had a facility at the airport and that is where the packaging used to be done. It was from that facility that the produce would be packaged, boxed and go straight to the aircraft and be exported. We were making large strides. Each of the steps involved in the planting right through to the putting on the plane, the farmers and all those concerned had begun to manage. Certain plantations such as Bath where there was water, large acreage-at Bath had been diverted to the support of this export effort. There was reason to believe that, given time, we would have found a permanent place in the markets of England or Holland and other European countries for our produce. To date I cannot understand why it is that such an important and worthwhile project collapsed under the Democratic Labour Party's Administration of the BMC since 1986. But that is history.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not beginning to talk sensibly and seriously about agriculture in terms of where the country is today unless we get back to increased production, diversified production and exports because we need the foreign exchange. I am disappointed that the Minister could speak of this new agency, of the divisions of the agency, of its role and there was no mention whatsoever of export, there was no mention whatsoever of diversifying activity, there was no mention whatsoever of research. But he was heard proudly to announce that it would have a division dealing with administration, finance, engineering. All of these marginal areas - obviously they are necessary - and forget completely and ignored what ought to be the central focus of any new organization.

In my respectful submission it reflects the continuing drift in agricultural policy and the fact that this administration has no clear thoughts or any thoughts at all with respect to agriculture and its future in the Barbadian economy.

I hope that efficiency would be emphasized and at the end of the day we would take Pope's words and examine Pope's words as our guiding words:

"With forms of Government" he

said:

"let fools contend."

Whatever is best administered. At the end of the day we can divide as to whether there should be 2 organizations or 1 or even 3. But I think that at the end of the day what we ought to be concerned about is to have an efficiently managed and run organization directed to the particular goals which I have identified.

It is because the Minister never gave any indication that the organization will be focussing in these areas on the specifics that I have indicated and which I consider to be very necessary and very relevant because I feel that we are on solid ground in condemning this merger as no more than cosmetic, no more than change for change sake and as a serious waste of Parliament's time.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member who spoke before I addressed you hinted, in his closing remarks, at the extent to which these organizations are mismanaged and tended to be - the BMC in particular - and the extent to which they have attracted scandal, I think the Government has a duty to make sure that the best people, not political people necessarily, man these organizations both at the level of the Board and at the level of the staff.

I think the Minister has a duty too to ensure that there is close supervision of what happens in these organizations. The Barbados Marketing Corporation was almost born inefficiency and scandal. I remember as a young man in this country the organization was not 2 years old when it ordered over V₄ million crates in anticipation - 1961 or thereabouts - of some large produce, I believe it was yams to be shipped. The produce was not realized and there were not enough warehouses in Barbados to house the V₄ million crates. It was an organization born in inefficiency and scandal and except for short periods in its history it has never been able to avoid that. That is an absolute fact. I think that we have an opportunity to make a new beginning and I think it is important that the Minister send forth the word to all those who will be connected with it so that this must be a new organisation, not only in name, but in the way it sets about doing its business and in terms of the results. But nothing less will suffice. 1.05 p.m.

The Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation has been unfortunate in the sense that it has been given the responsibility of managing estates that were for the most part in the low rain fall area and were not the best lands available in Barbados. In fact River Estate is an extreme illustration of very bad land. It is called P6 land, I believe in technical jargon. Notwithstanding that, the Barbados Labour Party was able to realise from those estates a contribution of 46 000 tonnes of canes up to 1986.

In 1985/86 we realised that and we made the optimum use of what we had. We insisted that things be run tightly and we realised results. Since then it has been a sorry tale of all down hill, inefficiency and wastage, under utilisation and I think we must bring an end to all of that. Unless that results, history will record that we have wasted our time this day when we consume public's time and Parliament's time in merging two institutions to continue much of the same.

I lament the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we can get no leadership in agricultural policy from the Government. I lament the fact, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture remains one of the areas that can make a significant contribution to increased food production and food security, to savings of foreign exchange and to export earnings, and that all of the areas that will lend in that direction that those areas are being neglected and ignored.

Sir, I want to appeal to the Government, not only to bring a new institution into being but to fashion for us a new policy in the ways in which I have indicated so that at the end of the day we would not have wasted our time.

It is being said in a *sotto voce* remark, the real truth is that the Government of Barbados is not in control of anything, including policy and it is for that reason it may be asking for too much in asking that there be not only a new institution but a new policy. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that we are not in a position to support this Bill but no reason has been advanced as to why this merger should take place at this time or at all.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all let me start by saying that I intend to support the Bill before this House which seeks to bring the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and the Barbados Marketing Corporation under one legal unit. To support my argument I will go through some of the argument put by the other side which would lend itself to even support the argument for the amalgamation.

The principal speaker started by saying that we have reached the stage in Barbados where private enterprise is efficient in the marketing of goods and services and particularly our foodstuff and therefore there was no longer any necessity for the Barbados Marketing Corporation to get involved in trading *etcetera*, since he would like to see this into private hands, which I agree with.

He went on to say that if this is one of the principal objectives in the rationale of the operation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation that he would like to see that aspect of it go, which means automatically that from their side they see that the only role that the Barbados Marketing Corporation should have been playing and is playing is the marketing of agricultural produce, the helping of the planning of production of the said agricultural produce and the overall providing of the type of environment that would allow the increase in production in non-sugar agriculture for marketing. Therefore, we have that the aims and objects of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to be at its optimum and best use should be concentrated on marketing of agricultural produce.

Let me state here, it is not fair that because the principal speaker in a short introductory motion did

not make mention of things like food promotion and food programmes, export promotion, agro-industry *etcetera* to feel that this is not part of the programme.

Now the other agency, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with was the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation that had as its role the promotion of agricultural development in Barbados, particularly in the areas of developmental work. Let me go back to the historical development of that. Barbados unlike many Caribbean countries never had any Crown lands. Barbados started to develop its land resource from purchases and the first purchase goes back to Haggatts for the express purpose that the sugar industry that was in private hands then and still is, in the parishes of St. Andrew has reached the stage where it was unprofitable and the owners were seeking to get out of it. In order for the Government at that time to continue the employment in places like Haggatts, Bawden and River etc. the Government bought those lands.

Now let me go to the Member for St. Michael South East. He stated and he read from the inventory that the majority of these lands are not suited for agriculture. These are lands that should be more suitable for residential purposes. He made a case that there are a lot of tenancies and he took for arguments sake Overhill Plantation, Greenland, and said that these are very marginal agricultural lands.

Now what is the other big argument. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is unfair to classify the Government agency, , if it is being so classified, as being inefficient and wasteful because you have a reduction from 45 000 tonnes of sugar in 1986 to 7 000 which I am going to deal with, and not so label the same accusation against private enterprise that has seen the consequential reduction in sugar between 1986 and now, the same waste lands and private lands, in areas where there have been a lot more productive lands.

Let us take some of the best lands suited from places like St. Thomas, St. John and St. Joseph and you will find that the agricultural situation in Barbados, Mr. Speaker - and I am not making any excuse for Government. What I am trying to say is that you cannot....

Let us be frank. If you have a situation where I have 10 acres of very marginal lands and you have 90 acres of the best producing lands in Barbados and you see a consequential reduction due to a number of factors which we all know, I will say it is not fair at this time to say as well that Government is doing nothing to get the sugar industry back on the road, because we all know of the tremendous amount of effort that has been going on over the last 6 months to bring about a complete revival of the sugar industry. We all know the complete effort that has

been going on. As a matter of fact, there should come before Parliament very shortly a Resolution to raise funds for a lot of money to enable the restructuring of the sugar industry to continue, and therefore it is not fair to say that nothing has been done. The Government has accepted the fact that the sugar industry is not now in the state that we want it to be, and the Government as a policy decision has stated that they want to return the sugar production in Barbados to 80 000 tonnes. The problems associated with that had a lot to do with the viability and the economic return of the sugar as it is, as well as the fact that most of them were hamstrung in debt, which led to the fact that the commercial banks came to the stage where they were not disbursing funds for the ready and speedy preparation of them, so all of it is tied up in the situation that the economic situation of the sugar industry, which is a private industry, and when we take an industry where there are about 40 000 acres of land in Barbados against a backdrop that Government controls about 3 500 acres of land, it is not fair to give the impression that those 3 500 acres of land are completely responsible for the total reduction of sugar production in Barbados. 1.15 p.m.

We have to examine the fact that like any enterprise, unless it is economically viable, there is going to come a time when the persons in that enterprise have to make the critical decision. The Government has now decided that they would have to bring about the type of environment by heavy investment of millions of dollars to return the type of environment which would make the sugar industry again become viable. We have admitted and we realise that we need to bring about both of these things.

Let me get back to the point of the reduction in the production of sugar on the Government's estates. One of the things that has been admitted is that the ADC lands should have been used for the development of other crops. Let us look back to the conscious decision on the reduction of sugar at the appropriate time. We all know what the decision was. It was the conscious decision of a Government, in the very best interest and after looking at it, to decide that there is some merit in trying to develop a cotton industry. Whatever has become of it, there is still merit in cotton as a crop. It has had its difficulties and it continues to have its difficulties, but you cannot blame Government at any time if after a careful examination of the potential foreign exchange Government had decided they should try.

The same thing with Tarn Dew melons. That was a crop that did very well in small acres, but when we expanded the acreage for the Tarn Dew melon, we discovered that it developed a fungus. We went to the stage where we introduced plastics and we put the melons on top the plastics and we still had the same problem.

Everybody who is in agriculture would tell you that a crop can do very well on small acreage but as you expand the acreage you introduce additional pesticides and unless you keep on top of it you will have the problem. That has been the problem with a lot of the new crops we have been looking at in Barbados. They have done very well on 5 to 10 acres, but when you translate that into commercial acreage - 50 to 60 acres - you find that you have crop pests that our crop research people, with the best will in the world, have not been able to lick, so you keep going back to them.

If you realise then that one of the roles of the ADC was also to work on developmental crops, you cannot then say, against a background where there was an overall island reduction in the production of sugar cane, plus the fact that ADC was trying to develop additional crops, that the reduction in the ADC's production of sugar cane is pointing to the total mismanagement of the ADC estates.

All of us realise that non-sugar agriculture does best when sugar agriculture is doing good, because of the rotational nature of the sugar cane, so the more acres you have in sugar, obviously the more acreage you have for rotational crops, which would mean that with the increased acreage of rotation crops you will have better production. It is not true to say that these things have not been done, because I am certain those of you who have done some research on it would realise that there has been an increase in yield per acre planted in every single non-sugar crop in Barbados. With the exception of yams, which have a problem with the virus, the yield per acre has improved. You take potatoes, peppers, all the vegetable crops have increased in yield. You have a problem with onions, because you run into the rust disease which has not yet been licked. So some years you have a good onion crop, the next year you have the disease, onion blast, on which the best minds in the world have been working. When I was at the Ministry we invited experts from all over the world to come and look at the onion blast and none of them to date has been able to provide an effective remedy for onion blast. Therefore, any year you have a blast in the onion crop you are going to have a reduction in the acreage.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has realised that we have to return the sugar industry to a stated 80 000 tonnes, increase production and variety of non-sugar crops, as well as provide an effective agency for the marketing and co-ordination of the production of those crops and facilities for data research, market research, *et cetera*, for the export of these crops all over the world. Against this background it was figured that the 2 organisations would be complementary and therefore there was something to be gained in bringing the 2 organisations together. One is a production aspect of agriculture and the other one is the

marketing and export aspect of agriculture. I see nothing wrong in bringing those 2 organisations together to bring about what we hope would be an effective efficient organisation that would redound to the interest of what all of us want to do, that is, the improvement of agriculture in Barbados and its contribution to the GDP of Barbados.

Let me quickly have a look at the proposed structure of the organisation. You have the agri services which will deal with extension, agronomy, farm management, field research, livestock section, rural development and land settlement, dairy development and sheep development. Then you have the marketing services which deal with sales, agro industry, food promotion, experimental food processing, export programme, as well as the statistical and reporting aspect for research and market purposes. Naturally, you have the administrative and personnel section, which brings the 2 together, you must have a finance and accounts section and an engineering section.

We must agree that one of the problems in agriculture, particularly sugar agriculture, has been the cost of labour in the sugar industry, and we have all decided that if the sugar industry is to be brought to its maximum efficiency, wherever possible it must be mechanised. Not only the sugar industry, but a lot of non-sugar crops could be mechanised as far as possible to remove that additional cost to the industry. Therefore, if you need to make that conscious decision, which you must make, naturally you have to have a look at engineering. One would realise that one of the shortcomings of non-sugar agriculture is the lack of irrigation, so you must have an irrigation section, a section looking at farm equipment and the mechanisation, wherever possible, of all the aspects of farming, both sugar and non-sugar, as well as proper storage, proper packaging, *et cetera*, of perishable foodstuffs. As long as you are concentrating on the expansion of the stock industry of the livestock industry you have to look at a proper abattoir to make sure that that aspect is taken care of. So I see as well, a maintenance programme. The proposed structure I think is relevant and I see that you have your agro-services, your marketing services, your complementary administrative and financial services. You have a look at the engineering and that type of aspect - irrigation which is needed - and you bring them together in an effort to once again bring the production and the marketing of the agricultural produce of Barbados under an organisation. 1.25 p.m.

We seek by so doing to remove any duplication to improve the ability of the organisation to do proper production planning for the food crop to match the production with the export, to look wherever possible to maximise on the irrigation possibilities of Barbados for those crops that need that type of irrigation - the same onions we were talking about. There are other crops that can

do better by that as well as to allow for the proper research in the overall industry and to make sure that this agency is one that would be able to best chart the future policy of production marketing of agricultural produce of Barbados.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to this Bill before the House and like everybody else hope that it brings about those efficiencies that we hope for and like any Barbadian who thinks well of his country that we will once again move the agricultural production to the stage where it plays a meaningful part in the contribution of GDP in Barbados and in the employment aspect of Barbados.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like first to thank the Members on this side who have spoken and for so cogently focussing the nature of the charade on which we are asked by Government to embark through this particular debate. In many respects one has to refocus the issues that these Members have raised after the Member for St. Philip North almost succeeded in drowning the debate in his normal innuendo and detail.

The force of the Opposition's argument, which has been so well represented is simple: we are here not because the Government truly wants to amalgamate the ADC and the BMC, but we are here because the Government of Barbados unfortunately is being governed by a policy agenda which is not of its own manufacture. It truly must be said in this debate that as part and parcel of its stand-by arrangement with the International Monetary Fund the Government of Barbados committed itself not only to meeting certain financial criteria but the Government of Barbados also agreed to put certain policy changes into effect. And one of those policy changes which the Government agreed to put into effect was to amalgamate the BMC and the BADC whether or not the Government of Barbados wanted to do so.

You would look in vain in the manifestoes of the Democratic Labour Party to see any evidence of any commitment on its own part to amalgamate the BMC and the ADC. In many respects, Mr. Speaker, we have to oppose this for the very reason; that left to itself the Democratic Labour Party would oppose it. Were it not for the IMF saying that you have to amalgamate the 2, the Democratic Labour Party would not of itself say the 2 should be amalgamated.

It has to be clearly said that this exercise is sterile and unless the Government itself admits that we are here today because:

- a) the Government committed itself as part of the IMF to amalgamate these 2 institutions;

- b) that the Government failed to do so within the time schedule prescribed by the International Monetary Fund;
- c) that the failure of the Government of Barbados to amalgamate these institutions as part of the policy arrangements agreed to with the International Monetary Fund comprised the Government of Barbados having access to over \$20 million of IMF funding;
- d) that the Government of Barbados now, Sir, interested in having the International Monetary Fund provide extended surveillance facilities to the Government;
- e) that in order to get access to those extended enhanced surveillance facilities of the International Monetary Fund the Government has to put in place all of the policy arrangements that it failed to comply with under this IMF stand-by arrangements;
- f) that one of the most important outstanding points of issue is precisely this measure before the House;
- g) that it has a timetable that must be complied with; and
- h) that we are here today because the Government of Barbados is anxious to have that enhanced surveillance programme in place and its determination to amalgamate these 2 institutions, whether we like it or not, must be complied with by a particular time period and this House is being called upon for those reasons and those reasons alone to exercise itself in this really, really sterile exercise.

I think the Government should say so, Mr. Speaker, because I am not going to be party to any exercise when we come to this House and commit ourselves to actions merely because the IMF say so. In every respect our major objection to this exercise on which we are being asked to be involved with today is that there is no stronger reason for it than the argument that the IMF says that we must do it. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful. It is truly shameful that a Government of Barbados should be so reduced that it is committed to doing anything that an institution says that it must do whether or not any sensible logic can be found to inform its actions.

I am saying that in this particular instance we can see no sensible logic that can inform the course of action upon which the Government of Barbados is embarked. I

would want to deal with that issue from many different perspectives. The most important perspective that must be dealt with is how this particular course of action relates to the overall privatisation policy to which the Government of Barbados says that it is committed to. Let us deal with that issue.

The Government of Barbados, Sir, would have the public believe that it is committed to a policy that says that it should not be involved in commercial activity. Where it is involved in commercial activity and those commercial activities or enterprises are losing money, the Government of Barbados should sell those commercial activities in the belief that putting them in the private sector they would be more efficiently run and that the subsidies that those enterprises previously used to put on the Government by way of budgetary subvention would be removed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, if that is government policy, then it would seem to me to be difficult to rationalise the retention of the ADC in whatever form as a losing commercial enterprise when the same Government that tells us that the justification for privatisation is that you must sell the losing enterprises and want to sell the BNOC. I must ask the Government to the extent that you are committed to a privatisation policy, how do you rationalise wanting to sell the BNOC that is profitably run and efficiently run while retaining the ADC which year by year is a charge on the public purse? How do you rationalise that within the context of a policy which says that the justification for privatisation is that in every instance where an enterprise is of a commercial nature and is a charge on the public purse the Government should look to rationalising that enterprise's long-term relationship with the economy where possible by putting it back in the hands of the private sector? 1.35 p.m.

Where does this stand, Mr. Speaker? Where does the amalgamation of these institutions which, unlike the IDC and the DPC have commercial functions? Where does this amalgamation stand, I am asking?

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: ADC runs 12 estates.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The heckling on the other side, Sir, I am begging you...

Mr. SPEAKER: I surely.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. speaker, Sir, among his other defects the Honourable Member has now developed deafness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us get into that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Am I going to get additional time for these interruptions from the Honourable Member for St. John?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will use my discretion but the point is you cannot listen to him. You are speaking to me.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am very clear in what I have said that the ADC has commercial functions. The Government has committed itself to a privatization policy which says, in effect, that where an institution has commercial operations that are being unprofitably run, its policy will be to try to have those enterprises of a commercial nature put in the private sector. Where does the policy in relation to the ADC and its commercial operations stand in the context of the Government's*overall privatization policy and how do we relate that to Government wanting to retain this in circumstances where it wants to sell the BNOC which is profitably run? That is the first issue. There seems to be a lack of clarity in what Government is doing. -

The notion of amalgamation of enterprises obviously is a policy that any Government should have the option of exercising in circumstances where there are clear economies to be realized from amalgamating the enterprises, in circumstances where bringing the institutions together is going to allow functions to be rationalized, where bringing the institutions together is going to allow the streamlining of the institution in such a fashion that putting it together is going to make the new institutions stronger than the sum of the two that were there to begin with. That, Mr. Speaker, could be the only rationalization for amalgamation, that by putting two institutions together we cut out waste, we reduce duplication of functions, we create a system by which existing resources can be more effectively utilized so that at the end of the day, we end up with an institution which is stronger than the sum of the two pre-existing parts.

If that is the criterion that must serve as the basis upon which amalgamation is to be understood as a potential Government policy, we are saying on this side that it is not enough merely to take pre-existing institutions together, make no changes in their organic structure, make no sensible changes in terms of the rationalization of their human resources, but just throw them together. By throwing their functions together and throwing their two names together Government hopes, at the end of the day, that can amount to true amalgamation. We are saying

that in this particular instance that all that is happening here is that the Government is listing the functions entrusted to the two former institutions throwing them together, throwing the two names together and telling us that they are doing something by way of amalgamation.

Our argument on this side, Sir, is that in the context of the present and prevailing circumstances in Barbados this is a complete waste of time. The Barbadian agricultural sector as a whole, Mr. Speaker, is in a state of crisis. The sugar industry has fallen in terms of output from 111 000 tonnes to 48 000 tonnes. The question that must arise therefore is, if we are going to continue to have a developmental institution in agriculture located in the public sector what are the precise developmental functions which we want a state enterprise to exercise at this juncture? Do we want the ADC to continue merely to be a collection of estates which happen to be owned by Government and trifle here and there sometimes with some Tarn Dew melons and some sweet peppers or can there be a larger and more important developmental function prescribed for the institution given the context of the crisis that faces the sector at this time?

I am saying that you look at the legislation and all that the legislation is seeking to have the ADC do in the future is what the ADC has done in the past.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Marginal.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has complained of asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John wants to keep talking with me because I feel he has fallen in love with me but I am afraid of that, Mr. Speaker. I would be glad if you could tell him I do not want him to keep talking to me in that kind of way, whispering all the time. I am afraid of him whispering to me.

But I come back to the central point, Mr. Speaker.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the fundamental point I am making in this debate is that we have a glorious opportunity now to give serious and critical consideration to the question as to what kind of developmental function should an enterprise in the state sector perform at this time, in relation to agriculture? I believe that this legislation will serve only as an umbrella under which ADC continues to

operate some commercial estates, when ADC continues to do some things that are marginal in the context of the overall operations of the agricultural sector. To that extent, Mr. Speaker, to cite what is happening at the ADC as developmental will be as much a pretence in the future as it has been in the past. We have to face the reality. In terms of developmental functions what ADC is doing today has truly been marginal in relation to the real agricultural requirements of this country.

Given that the sector is now in crisis do you want to perpetuate a situation where the functions of the Agricultural Development Corporation are not truly developmental?

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: It has been marginal. The fact that I was Chairman of the Corporation does not stop the conception of the ADC from the outset in nineteen sixty something from being marginal. It has always been marginal. The Agricultural Development Corporation in terms of its functions has been historically perceived of as an institution which manages Government's estates. Anybody who wants to get into this debate and does not want to deal with that reality is wasting time. The Honourable Member for St. John may want to say that I was the Chairman of ADC and I am criticizing its concept. But that is my prerogative.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard the Honourable Member.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: But I am hearing him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable Member for St. John to keep quiet, say nothing. Continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am going to restrain myself...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked him to keep quiet.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: The essential point, Sir, is this: that the crisis that exists in agriculture gives us a serious opportunity to rethink how the sector should be developed in the future. I truly believe that if you are going to have a developmental institution in agriculture it should be concerned primarily with strategic planning for the sector as a whole. It should be concerned with enhancing the Government's capacity to do strategic planning for agriculture, not only for Government estates but for the sector as a whole. Therefore, at this time given the crisis in agriculture and the weakness of this country to be able to give effect to strategic plans for the sector, the role of ADC should be moved away from just managing estates

to dealing in a developmental sense with strategic planning. It is a shameful thing, Mr. Speaker, that in 1993 we have in Barbados to be importing management skills through Booker Tate to tell us how to manage agriculture in this country. And if the Government is serious about exercising its developmental functions in agriculture then that developmental function to be exercised by Government is to make sure that the need for things like Booker Tate in the future should never again arise in this country. 1.45 p.m.

That Government's responsibility in relation to the development, Mr. Speaker, obviously should be to enhance our capacity to manage our agricultural affairs and to plan the use of our agricultural affairs. If you are talking about the ADC assuming that function in the future I am with you. But if you are going to carry forward the ADC only as a number of estates that happen to be owned and run by Government, Sir, I say we are wasting time.

Sir, to the extent that that kind of issue is not at all being addressed in this legislation I am saying, Sir, that this is a totally sterile institution. This is a totally sterile exercise to be undertaken by a totally sterile institution.

Sir, amalgamation also, in my view, should involve reorganisation. You can only in my judgement justify the amalgamation of two institutions if you are going to bring them together structurally so that the resources of the two can make the functioning of the whole institution more efficient.

Now you have listened to the presentation by the Minister of Agriculture but at no instance has the Minister indicated the nature of the structural changes that will be made resulting from the amalgamation of the institutions, Sir, to cause us to believe that this new institution will be stronger than the sum of the two institutions which it is replacing. And the question arises, Mr. Speaker, whether given the nature of the two institutions to begin with, whether it was in point of fact possible to fuse them in the manner in which the Government would have us believe that the two institutions could be fused. That arises from the fact that from their very inception the BMC and the BADC were doing two fundamentally different things and the division has become even sharper with the passage of time.

The BMC now, Mr. Speaker, is largely an importing agency that makes a revenue from exercising a monopoly control over the importation of some lines of produce. That is its largest function today. It is an institution which imports sugar. It is an institution that imports a selected range of commodities which the Government entrust it to import and it makes a profit by being able to charge a cess on those particular commodities. And its institutional

capacity has evolved to enable it to give effect to its role as being largely an importing institution.

I am told that it also is involved in some management respect as well with the exporting of commodities. But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at what the ADC has in place by way of structure and institutional resources, and when you look at what the BADC has in place in terms of structure and institutional resources, the scope for realising economies by bringing the two structures together would seem to me to be almost negligible. But in the absence of a case cogently argued by Government to establish that there can be economies realised by bringing the two institutions together structurally, we on this side feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is such a waste of time.

We are also arguing that it behoves the Government and it falls as the responsibility of the Government to justify to this House that in point of fact economies can be realised, that there is scope for rationalisation, that there is scope for the two institutions to so merge as to make better use of existing resources and nothing of that kind has been argued today by the Government in this debate. What we have heard, Mr. Speaker, is that as a result of the amalgamation 14 people will lose their jobs.

Now, Sir, this brings us to a question that the Member for St. Michael South East was implicitly raising. If we had a Government or rationalisation as a result of amalgamation it would seem to us that if 14 people are going to have to lose their jobs then the first persons that will have to lose theirs are those exercising functions that bear no relationship whatsoever to the new concept behind this particular institution.

The point that the Member for St. Michael South East is making is that a situation has been allowed to exist, with almost the complicity of Parliament, where this Government committed itself to a situation where Ministers of the Crown should not be allowed to drive MP motorcars or have chauffeurs and so on. But an officer of the BMC was provided with a chauffeur and a car on a 24-hour basis in contradiction and in contravention of Government's stated policy.

Hard things will have to be said in this House, Sir, if you are talking about sending home people as part and parcel of rationalisation. Will the rationalisation now mean, Sir, that the Government is going to cut out the inefficiency implied in having an officer of the BMC chauffeur driven and provided with a chauffeur on a 24-hour basis? We have to ask that question in this House.

If you are going to tell me ...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I have not given the Speaker a person's name. But, Sir, the Government cannot come to this House and tell me they want to rationalise institutions in order to cut down on staff and do not also at the same time look at all of the Board's areas where it cannot justify...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are coming to the end of your time. You have two more minutes. I will give you until 2.00 o'clock.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I am told that the interruptions by the Member for St. John would justify my ...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is why I have given you. It will be longer than 30 minutes but lunch time will do.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, it is not enough for the Minister to come to this House and speak in terms of sending home staff without convincing this House that there is a rational system being put in place to determine who among the staff should be sent home first. I am saying that we know about things at those institutions that are irrational. And if a rational process of staff compression is put in place by the Corporation, Sir, that we are not going to support... And I am being brutally frank, Sir, we are not going to be supporting the sending home of productive staff from those institutions when people performing roles that are extraordinary, if performed in relation to Members of Parliament and Ministers are allowed to continue in place.

I also have to say that it would have been helpful if the Minister of Agriculture had presented this House with the financial condition of the two institutions that are about to be amalgamated. 1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, if you are going to amalgamate 2 institutions with a view, as the Government says, to putting the new institution in a position where it must run on its own resources, and if you know that one of the 2 institutions has from year to year been an institution that has incurred losses, then if the 2 institutions at the end of the day, when amalgamated into one, must be commercially viable, the Government has an obligation to tell us what is the financial condition of the loss making institution at the date when it is to be amalgamated and what are the precise plans that the Government has in mind to make the ADC part of the institution so viable that it does not constitute a drain on the BMC part of the institution.

The Government has told us that soon after the new institution, the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Institution, will have to finance its own operations. We know that the ADC has not been able to

finance its own operations. The BMC has been able to do so, but not to the extent where the BMC can subsidise the operation of the BADC. Therefore, if you are telling me that you are amalgamating with a view to having these 2 institutions brought together to finance themselves, you are going to have to satisfy me, in the absence of evidence that the BMC's surpluses can support the ADC's losses. The Government has a responsibility to give us a detailed financing plan for these amalgamated institutions.

I want to let the Government know that we will be holding it to its word. In the future it cannot expect any support from this Opposition for any subsidies to this new institution, because it has declared at the outset that this institution will have to finance itself.

I think we also have a responsibility to satisfy ourselves as a House that the Government has not given this institution a crocus bag with which to carry water. They should tell us how much new equity they want to inject into this institution to make sure that the ADC part of it can evolve as a viable institution because of the injection of new capital. They should tell us about the financial reorganisation of the affairs of the ADC. It is my responsibility, therefore, today to press the Minister of Agriculture not to commit this institution to a dismal future by reason of his failure to give this House the benefit of the main element of the financial plan that will cause one loss making institution, being married to a profit making institution, at the end of the day to be an institution that can break even. I have not heard that. And as I conclude I want to say that the lack of a clear specification by Government on important aspects of this institution really indicates that the heart and soul of the Government is not in this. If the heart and soul of the Government is not in this, it would truly be unreasonable for the Government to expect that the heart and soul of the Opposition should be in it.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.00 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking your leave to revert to the Order of Business on the Order Paper in order to lay some documents and to give notice of another.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, then leave is granted.

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, and by command of the Cabinet, I lay the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations, 1993.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I should like, Sir, to give notice of the Local Loans (Amendment) Bill, 1993.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Local Loans (Amendment) Bill, 1993 be read a first time.

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

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

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am to report that the Films Bill, 1993 was passed in Committee with amendments.

CONTINUATION OF ORDER NO. 8 - THE BARBADOS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION BILL, 1993

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to deal with a legal aspect which has been raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East, on which I rose on a point of order. That related to what is in essence Clause 28 of this Bill which includes in the First Schedule amendments to the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act and the Barbados Tourism Authority Act, bits of legislation which were passed, the Barbados Tourism Authority Act earlier this year and the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act in 1992. 3.10 p.m.

The position is that there is a section in this Act before us today, section 26, which relates to pensionable service and transfer of assets. It covers contracts entered into by or on behalf of the original Marketing Corporation and the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation before the commencement of this Act; arranges for the transfer of the rights and obligations under any contracts entered into by the existing corporations and the new corporations. Similarly, any rights, privileges, duties or obligations etc. of the old corporations will automatically transfer to the new corporations. It relates also to the transfer of assets, liabilities and so forth of the older corporations into the new corporations.

Now the issues to which this section relates in all 3 of the Statutes, the BADMC, the Tourism Authority Act and the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Acts. The clauses in relation to all the Acts are identical and cover the same issue so that rather than come back to the House, with separate amendments in relation to the Tourism Authority Act and the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act the technique has been used in this legislation as has been used in other areas of law and in other bits of legislation to put in a clause which pulls together the amendments in relation to similar issues although the subject matter of the statutes might have been different.

There are a number of instances where that has been done. First of all let me go back as far as 1975 where you will find that there are various Law Revision (Miscellaneous Amendments) Acts which cover such a wide range. In one statute you find that...

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: What the clauses say is that the amendments specified in the Schedule should be made in relation to the enactments in the Schedule. They cover such diverse things, for instance, in this 1975 Act you have amendments in the Schedule covering the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act, the Police Act, the Registered Sugar Factories Smoke Control Act, the Public Service Commission legislation, Affiliation Proceedings, Oceanographic Research, Consumption Tax, Customs, Land Development Duty, Perjury, Legislature Privileges and Immunities. In other words, a whole variety of diverse bits of legislation which we put together in one Statute.

One may look at what is done in what is called Miscellaneous Amendments Acts. Let's look at 1981. The Administrative Appeal Tribunal Act which was to provide for the establishment of administrative appeal tribunal for Barbados and for related matters. In that Administrative Appeal Tribunal Act there was a clause just like the clause which is included in this Act which in the Schedule included amendments to some statutes like the

National Insurance Appeal Tribunal Act, the Severance Payments Tribunal, the Income Tax Appeal Board and the Land Valuation Board.

You found amendments to statutes like the Interpretation Acts, the National Insurance and Social Security Act, the Airline Service Business Tax Act, the Betting and Gaming Duties Act, the Customs Act, the Entertainment Tax Acts, the Rum Duty Act, the Hotel Proprietors Act, the Hotels and Restaurants (Sales Tax) Act, the Income Tax Act and a whole host of different divergent matters.

In 1979 in the Trustee Act, for instance, you had amendments being made to the Administration of Estates Act, the Succession Act and one can go through the various bits of legislation. In 1985, the Income Tax Act making amendments to the Shipping Act, the Insurance Act and so forth.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that although the amendments may not relate to the subject matter of the statute itself it is a system which is used to save parliamentary time. It creates no problem in the long run because the law revision exercises which are done by the Law Revision Commissioner every year always extract the amendments wherever they occur and put them in their proper places in relation to the proper statute to which the amendment relates. So that sooner or later these amending statutes tend to become spent and in the process of time this section 28 of this Bill before us today will become a spent provision and the amendments which appear in the Third Schedule of this Act would be incorporated in the appropriate legislation, the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act and the Tourism Authority Act respectively. So there would be no difficulty in the years to come in finding where these amendments will occur because the law revision exercise would take care of any difficulty which would otherwise have occurred were that exercise not to take place.

One may argue that the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation and the Tourism Authority Act have nothing in common with the Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation but that is not so. The issue which is being dealt with is an issue which is common to all 3 of them. The transfer of the assets is the common thread. It should have been in the original and it was not, and therefore we are taking the opportunity to put it in now and to insert the amendments on an occasion like this rather than come back and waste parliamentary time by bringing separate Bills in relation to the Tourism Authority and the Investment and Development Corporation. 3.20 p.m.

It is a point of substance which relates to the substance of the Bill. It is not an issue, it is a matter of law

revision and drafting techniques in respect of which I am prepared to accept the advice of the experts on this matter. As I said it is not a point of substance which relates to the merits of the Bill before us. I suggest that the time of the House would be far better spent in not dwelling on issues like this.

Hon. D. W. BOWEN: Mr. Speaker, before I move the passing of this Bill, I would want to respond to a number of comments made by Members on the other side. I would have to deal with them individually, Mr. Speaker, since to a large extent the contributions themselves were contradictory. They contradicted one another and therefore you have to separate them out and deal with them one by one. The contradiction, to my mind, shows that that side does not have any clear perspective of agriculture and where agriculture should be going.

I would take this opportunity to show that we do have a clear perspective on agriculture and as I have done since taking up the portfolio of Minister of Agriculture, I have on many occasions enunciated a clear and definitive Government policy, DLP policy on agriculture.

The Honourable Member for St. James North who unfortunately or, probably, fortunately is the main speaker on agriculture on that side raised a number of issues. He spoke to the question of the rationale for the merger. I am unsure whether he was here when I introduced the Bill but for the records of the House it behoves me to set the record straight again in this regard and to speak to the question of the rationale. As I said then merger or the decision to merge the BADC and the BMC was based on a need to make the management of our agricultural resources as efficient as possible. I also, from time to time, in speaking on the impending merger stated that the production and marketing sub sectors are not well integrated and therefore the merger or the new corporation would be seeking to integrate these sectors. I also said that the new corporation would aim at improving productivity, improving marketing, developing programme and projects to encourage greater participation. It cannot be over emphasized that central to the whole concept and question of merger is the optimum utilization of our resources thereby improving efficiency and productivity.

Mr. Speaker, consistent with its mission to assist Government in the execution of its agricultural policy, the placing of a high emphasis on the implementations of the programmes which will be service oriented and developmental in nature will take place. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, added impetus will be given to the revenue generating aspects of the merged entity in order to defray operational expenses.

It should be noted too that a budget of projected expenditures and revenues has been drawn up and it

should be noted that a list of programmes will be pursued subject, of course, to the approval of the Board of Directors. Regarding these agricultural programmes the specific objectives will be:

- (1) to encourage farmers to increase the output of agricultural commodities such as the deficit between agricultural commodity imports and exports and, if possible, to generate a surplus;
- (2) to encourage production especially for the export market both intra regional and extra regional;
- (3) to promote the adoption of farming systems which are environmentally friendly and which can enable farmers and farm workers to realize the optimum level of income; and
- (4) to promote sustainable agricultural development.

The Honourable Member for St. James North also raised the question of the future of the cotton industry and its integration into the new company. I should state, for clarification, since certain doubts seem to have arisen from what I said on Tuesday that the merged company, the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation will take over production and ginning of cotton. The core staff which is presently attached to CCII will be integrated into the BADMC. I refer to staff like the Agronomist, the Accountant, the Ginney Manager, the two Ginney Technicians and a Supervisor of the field operations based at Spring Hall. But CCII will continue to deal with the marketing aspects.

Since, Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean Cotton Industries Ltd. will remain on the register of the Registrar of Companies, the company will be used as a clearing house for the marketing of cotton. As I said, that would be its primary function and as a distinct function from the operations of the BADMC.

If I could respond to a couple of issues worth response from the Member for St. Michael South East who spoke about the land in the Pine at the back of the MTW which he said was prone to flooding and which he seemed to be saying to me should not have been vested in the new corporation. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that the land is prone to flooding and it is for that specific reason why, over time, the Ministry of Agriculture has retained that area for developmental purposes mainly the planting of a number of grasses. That is an integral part of agriculture. I am sorry that the Honourable Member is not in his seat to hear this. There is the misconception from time to time, persons passing the area believe that the land is there running to work goes on in terms of planting of grasses on that land.

The Member for St. Joseph raised a number of points most of which were adequately dealt with already on this side by the Member for St. Philip North, a former successful Minister of Agriculture. The primary issue he raised seemed to be along the lines of the formation or the structure of the company where he seemed to have been questioning or suggesting that export functions and research functions were being left out of the new organization or in any case were not highlighted. This is far from the truth. With respect to research, the Agricultural Services Division will take care of research as well as food promotion, extension, rural development and land settlement. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that contrary to what the Honourable Member was suggesting that we on this side do have clear thoughts on agriculture and on agricultural diversification which again is a matter that the Opposition raises from time to time - our policy on agricultural diversification. And clearly, Mr. Speaker, without a policy on agricultural diversification the non sugar agriculture could not continue to grow at the rate it has been growing over the last 4 or 5 years and we would continue within the new entity with this thrust on agricultural diversification. 3.30 p.m.

The whole question of export will be taken over by the marketing division. We will continue, Mr. Speaker, to retain developmental lands such as Spencers and Fairy Valley and the lands at Graeme Hall.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter and the Leader of the Opposition, it is not usual for him, Mr. Speaker, to speak on agriculture and therefore I could understand why he floundered on an area, the traversing of which is a little unusual for him. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would want in due deference to him as the Leader of the Opposition to respond to what he said whether he makes sense or not. He asked certain questions like why do we keep or retain ADC when at the same time divesting BNOC.

Mr. Speaker, if I may term it as the BADC aspect of the BADMC, will continue to be an important instrument of agricultural development in Barbados and while to some extent, and as a former Chairman of the BADC he probably should be speaking from a position of knowledge, while it could be said that the developmental aspect or the developmental work of the BADC was marginal it has to be put in the context of the amount of resources which over time have been applied to the BADC. And as I said on Tuesday it would be simplistic to view the performance or the success, if you like, of the BADC, purely in terms of dollars and cents. There is no way you could view a developmental organisation in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9.

CONSUMPTION TAX (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2)
BILL, 1993

Order No. 9 was called - To move the Second Reading of the Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1993.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals delivered in the House of Assembly on March 15, 1993 the Minister of Finance announced, among other things, a series of trade reform measures including the liberalization of trade through the abolition of non tariff barriers such as quota systems, licensing requirements, minimum GIF values and the negative list. It was stated then that the removal of these non tariff barriers will be replaced by the institution of a temporary surcharge on certain categories of goods including furniture and agricultural items. It was also indicated that the range of goods, as well as the level of surcharge to be applied on imported goods would be determined after consultation with interested parties.

As a result of that, a ministerial sub-committee was established which consisted of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, the Minister of Labour, Consumer Affairs and the Environment and the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce together with the Customs and Energy Division so as to concretize the proposals and prepare this framework and a timetable for implementation of these measures.

The meetings were held also with a technical committee which held discussions with private sector organizations to seek the views of various interests represented by their sectors. This would have included the Barbados Manufacturers' Association, the Barbados Hotel Association, the Chamber of Industry and Commerce and the Barbados Agricultural Society. The meetings with those private sector groupings discussed both the items to be removed from the licensing regime, those to be retained, those to be protected by a surcharge as well as the level of surcharge to be applicable to each of the items.

In pursuance of that, Mr. Speaker, the legislation relating to the Consumption Tax is before us. This is a consequential amendment which provides that the surtax imposed on goods listed in sections (b) and (c) of the amended Customs Tariff is not to be taken into account in calculating the chargeable value of imported goods. In addition to that, the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order has been laid which caters to those goods that were removed from the licensing regime but which are to be protected by the imposition of a surtax on the customs

value of goods imported from non Caribbean community countries as well as the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import) Licence Regulations, 1993 which relates to items in the First Schedule imported from any source which must be licensed and items in the Second Schedule which need only be licensed if they are from extra regional sources.

Based on these discussions the committee identified 3 lists of items as follows:

List A items: recommended for removal from the licensing system which do not have adverse implications for the productive sectors of the economy.

List B items: recommended for removal from the licensing regime but for which protection will be given through the institution of a surtax. The level of the surtax is a flat rate of 100% GIF across the board for List B items except for a few non sensitive items for which the surtax is 100% GIF less the value of the import duty chargeable under the Barbados Government's tariff.

List C: items recommended for retention on licence. This list is made up of a wide range of goods of special importance for a number of reasons. They include primary , agricultural products, edible oil under the oils and fats protocol, motor vehicles and other sundry items which have environmental and security implications.

The Order would reflect those items on (a) list and the regulations would reflect the items on list (b) and (c). You would have to compare list (a) with what existed before to determine the items which have been removed. List (a) would be shown under the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations. List (b) would be shown under the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Order.

On the issue of licensing of CARICOM goods, broadly speaking the policy objective is for the complete removal of the licensing regime from CARICOM imports. So that the items identified at what we would have called List (c) but which in fact is attached to the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations would be subject to licensing restrictions from extra regional sources only. However during the course of the discussions it became apparent that Barbados needs to be adequately protected from the unregulated importation of items which have environmental and security implications.

The Cabinet therefore agreed that the items which I described as being List (c) with environmental and security implications for Barbados should be subject to the licensing system irrespective of whether imported from extra regional or regional sources. Consequently this is reflected in the legislation which is broken down into two Schedules,

the First Schedule and the Second Schedule. Schedule 1 of the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations contains the items which require a licence when importing from either regional or extra regional sources. That list includes fireworks, chemshield which is a defence method, mace and similar products, handcuffs of plastic, handcuffs of iron or steel, ratchet knives, springloaded knives including flick knives, public transport type passenger motor vehicles, motor cars and other motor vehicles principally designed for the transport of persons other than those of heading 8702 including station wagons and racing cars, chassis fitted with engines for the assembly of coaches and buses, chassis without engines for the assembly of coaches and buses, yachts and other vessels for pleasure or sports, coin operated amusement machines, equipment and accessories for gambling or parlour games excluding gaming machines, for example, black jack tables, table counters, hand counters, roulette wheels, dice boxes, croupier's rakes. Those are the items in the First Schedule. Then in respect of the Second Schedule these are items which require a licence from extra regional sources only, items like live poultry, meat and swine, ham, bacon, fish fresh or chilled, milk, condensed milk, birds' eggs, tomatoes, onions, shaddocks, primary agricultural produce, oils, vegetable fats, beet sugar, soap, organic surface active agents, cleaning materials. So that in pursuance of this policy the orders have been made. In respect of the particular legislation which is before the House, Mr. Speaker, the Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1993 which seeks to amend the Consumption Tax Act CAP. 63 to provide that the surtax imposed on goods listed in "Section D and Section C of Part 1A of the Customs Tariff is not taken into account in calculating the chargeable value of imported goods. 4.10 p.m.

The chargeable value of imported goods as defined by section 10(1) of the Consumption Tax Act for the purpose of calculating consumption tax payable on imported goods is the aggregate value of the goods as defined under the Customs Act, that is, the c.i.f. value and the amount of any customs duty payable thereon. For example the c.i.f. value of an imported item is given as \$500 and a 10% import duty on that item \$50. Therefore the chargeable value of the item for the purpose of computing consumption tax payable on that item is \$550. The consumption tax rate would then be applied to that value.

Section l(b) and l(c) of Part 1 of the Customs Tariff, a new section introduced by this Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1993 to give effect to Government's policy on trade liberalisation. As I said, the goods listed in these sections of the Customs Tariff have been removed from the licensing regime and will now be under the order under the Customs Tariff.

Section l(b) contains garments, furniture and other products which are locally produced in sufficient quantities to merit protection through the surtax. Section l(c) also contains locally produced items which it is considered do not need the same level of protection as those listed in Part IB. The goods contained in these new sections also appear in Part 1A of the Tariff and the rates of duty they attract in Part 1A have been taken into account in computing the applicable level of the surtax to be applied.

The essence therefore of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that in computing the chargeable value of goods the import duty is not taken into account twice, thus the omission of the surtax on the goods listed in the new sections IB and 1C of the Customs Tariff when computing their chargeable value.

I do not think there are any other matters, Sir, that relate to the piece of legislation which is before the House and I should be happy to provide any explanations relating to that or to the orders and regulations which have been made pursuant to that legislation to the House if necessary. I beg to move, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have had the honour to serve in this Parliament since 1984 but I must confess, Sir, that I have never in my entire parliamentary career heard a presentation that has been so convoluted and confusing and that clearly, Sir, was intended, not to enlighten the House but really to confuse the issue.

In the matter on which the Government is embarking, Mr. Speaker,...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Objection must be made to that kind of language. Sir, what the Honourable Member is doing is imputing improper motives to me in that he is suggesting that I intended and did in fact confuse the House of Assembly. Therefore I believe that he should withdraw those remarks.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the words "intended" and substitute the words "have had the effect of failing to enlighten the House". Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. The matter on which Government has embarked through the introduction of this legislation is a very serious matter. The Government is embarked on the endeavour of seeking to change an entire trade regime.

We have, Mr. Speaker, to take the matter of a change in a country's entire trade regime very seriously. We need to know what goods will be affected, what goods will

not be affected and this Opposition has not been provided with documentation that will enable us to determine which goods will be affected and which goods will not be affected.

The Minister who introduced the matter spoke in terms of a list A which we have not yet seen, a list B and a List C which we have only just seen. I had to bring it to the attention of the Leader of the House, Sir, that yesterday I had, in order to prepare for this debate, to ask Parliament for a copy of the Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Order without which, Sir, the proposed change 'to the Consumption Tax Act cannot be understood. Members on this side have not received the Customs Tariff Order, Sir, without which the change in the consumption tax does not make sense. Then there is an additional piece of legislation that is now being circulated for the first time that bears upon the Miscellaneous Controls ...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: An unsigned and undated piece of legislation. Sir, this is a very serious interference with the rights of the Opposition in this matter. We are not in a position after the presentation of the Minister, and he seems to be upset by my stricture, to know which goods will be affected.

Nobody in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I am very serious on this point, can go to a constituent and say that as a result of a measure passed by this House today that a particular good will be affected. The Minister who introduced the legislation, Sir, just spoke in terms of a List A - I have not yet seen List A - and a List B and a List C without bringing any clarity to the issue.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. The commentary relating to List A, List B and List C was only a comment I was making in relation to how the Committee has classified the good. However I also referred those comments to the subsidiary legislation which had been laid so that for the purposes of my explanation, I used List A, B and C, but that is not what is relevant to the legislation. It was relevant to the explanation.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, we have a very genuine difficulty in this matter which we want the Government to understand. Some time last year the Member for Christ Church South drew reference to the fact that there was an Aide Memoire prepared by the World Bank that committed Government to a particular approach towards trade reform. That approach would have involved the Government dismantling the existing system of import licencing, restrictions and quotas called non-tariff barriers and replacing those non-tariff barriers with a tariff or something equivalent to a tariff.

The Minister of Finance then said, Sir, that he could not be held responsible for the actions of minor officers in the Central Bank of Barbados who may have given commitments on government's part to the World Bank. He pooh poohed, Mr. Speaker, the notion that the Government was committed to a process of trade reform that would have involved the elimination of import licencing, quotas and other non-tariff barriers and their replacement by a tariff or something equivalent to a tariff.

What we are here being called upon, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to deal with is precisely the elimination of import licences and other non-tariff barriers and the conversion of those non-tariff barriers into a tariff in much the same way that Trinidad has done it and in precisely the fashion as set out in the Aide Memoire that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister said was not of his manufacture but was the work of some minor officer. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it therefore behoves this House to know what are the goods on List A, what are the goods on List B, what are the goods on List C. In short, which are the goods that the Government intends to take off import licensing? What are the goods that the Government intends to keep under import licensing? And by implication, what are the goods that will now attract this surcharge of 100% that the Government is talking about? The Minister of State, who introduced this matter, has given this House no basis upon which it can take a sensible decision on the matter. It relates to the fact that we are none the clearer after he has spoken as to what precisely are the goods that will continue to carry import licences. His merely drawing reference to a list cannot help us on this side if we have not had the benefit of seeing the list ourselves and being able to discern from the list what is Government's policy. That is our consideration.

Thus far I have seen Section B and Section B set out in the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act. I have not yet seen the Miscellaneous Control of Licences Regulations. I genuinely therefore do not have the informational base upon which I could truly join with Government in discussing whether its approach to trade reform in this matter makes sense or not. That is our basic consideration first and foremost in this matter. This matter is too important for the House to trivialise it. It really is too important to be dealt with in this fashion, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: No, I am very serious. The question of trade reform and trade liberalisation is too important to the future of Barbados for us to deal with it in this haphazard manner without the House being fully seized of all the information that would allow -us to take

sensible decisions in this matter. It reflects on the way in which Government is organising its business. It reflects poorly and adversely on the way in which the Government intends to conduct its business, that it would want this matter to be proceeded with...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, it reflects very adversely on the level of organisation in Government itself that it would want to proceed with this matter without our having a sufficient information base.

Mr. Speaker, this question of trade reform is critical. The Minister who introduced the matter introduced it as a series of details. But there must be a policy and a principle involved worthy of being introduced in this House to explain why Government is doing what it is doing. The Minister stuck closely to his brief without giving the House the benefit of a conceptual background that would enable this side in particular, and his side as well, I do believe, to understand why some of these measures are being thought necessary.

To begin with, GATT, the international treaty that regulates international trade, has from its very inception committed itself in its Articles of Agreement to the precept that member countries and countries that are signatories to GATT should use tariffs rather than non-tariff barriers as the basis upon which they provide protection for their industries. Many countries, in contravention of the GATT, have gone ahead and put in place a number of non-tariff barriers in order to provide protection for areas of their own domestic production which they think are deserving of protection. Some of these include agricultural processed products. Most food products are in some respects protected in every country of the world. Most countries as well, Mr. Speaker, provide protection through non-tariff barriers to a lot of their garment production and a lot of their basic industries where the technology that is being utilised is easily absorbed, and where domestic employment can be created by producing the goods at home rather than by substitution. Therefore, all international institutions generally tend to require that as part and parcel of their relationship to Governments, if the Governments are not in compliance with the requirements of the GATT, they should do so and wherever possible replace non-tariff barriers with tariff barriers in order to continue to provide protection for their industries.

What is being contemplated as a matter of policy in this issue is that the Government of Barbados has been using non-tariff barriers to protect certain lines of local production. It is now being proposed, as I understand it,

that those non-tariff barriers should be replaced with tariffs. So by increasing the tariffs on extra regional imports the price of extra regional imports would rise, and locally produced goods that compete with those extra regional imports should have a chance to continue to be viable in our local market. I believe that, roughly speaking, that is the intention...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Quiet please. Quiet! Quiet!

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a fundamental matter here, because there is a large number of industries in Barbados that have grown up behind the shelter of non-tariff barriers and are providing employment for Barbadians. The Government is now going to change its policy and it is now going to provide protection to some industries in Barbados by removing the non-tariff barriers like import restriction and replacing those non-tariff barriers by a tariff. The question that the House must ask is what precisely is that list of goods* that the Government believes to continue to be deserving of tariff protection. Why has that list been decided on in preference to another set of goods? The Minister who introduced this matter did not take the House into this particular issue.

Equally, Sir, we have to ask the question why the rate of 100% and why a uniform rate has been arrived at by the Government of Barbados. I am asking this question, Mr. Speaker, for a very precise reason. We have to search into all aspects of this matter and I would like the Minister who introduced it to answer why is there a uniform rate being applied across the board. Are we doing this only because the World Bank and other institutions take a similar policy off the shelf and apply it every place without modification? 4.30 p.m.

Or is there a logic to it? When you apply a tariff it provides protection by causing the price of the extra-regional import to rise hence giving our local producers a chance to compete on the local market. The imposition of a common tariff therefore means that all goods produced locally face the same kind of price differential *vis-a-vis* extra-regional imports and need the same kind of price increase on their competing imports from the rest of the world in order to compete on the local market.

It must be clear that there would be some goods being produced locally that might need a 75% level of protection, some may need a 50% and some may need a 100% level of protection to be able to allow them to compete locally with imports from the rest of the world. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, the price difference between some local

goods and their relevant competing imports will be different as compared to the price difference between other locally produced goods and their foreign competing imports. Why has the Government decided upon having a 100% across the board rate as the basic price protection in circumstances where the price difference changes from goods to goods? Are you just throwing everything into a pot and accepting this approach? Even if we accept the need for protection, and I accept the need for protection, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there is going to be a price effect. When you are protecting commodities by using tariffs you also have to bear in mind that the consumers may have to pay the price.

So you have to minimise the effect on the consumers who have to bear this price increase by making sure that any protection that you provide to your local producers is not excessive. Is the Government in a position to tell us, Mr. Speaker, that there may not be some level of excessive protection provided to some lines of production which do not need 100% surcharge on the price of inputs to be competitive? Can the Government give us that assurance, Mr. Speaker? Has the Government done its homework in this case?

Sir, I would find it surpassing strange if every local producer in Barbados needs a 100% surcharge in order to be competitive with goods being produced in the rest of the world. I made that point because of this consideration. A lot of what the Government is doing now is in order to comply not only with the policy agenda of these institutions but also to comply with a timetable. The Government has to get this legislation through by a specific time. So the concept of policy is one consideration; the time in which the policy must be executed is another consideration.

We cannot be satisfied that the Government is coming to this House not properly prepared and is asking us to accept a policy that would increase the price of goods in Barbados merely because it has to comply with a timetable set by an international institution. We cannot do that, Mr. Speaker. We would be abdicating our responsibility to the people of this country if we join with this Government, if we don't do our homework in this Parliament precisely because the Government would not do its homework in its departments.

Mr. Speaker, what is the basis for a 100% level of protection? Would it not have been possible in order to minimise the effect on consumers to have some goods carry a 25% surcharge, others a 50% and so on? At the end of the day we have to protect the consumers of the country.

An additional point I need to make is this. When these measures come to the House in the form of

Budgetary Proposals by the Prime Minister they generally are uncosted. But when the Prime Minister presents them he generally presents, as with the case this year, a statement of the financial implication of the entire package.

If you will recall, one of the issues that we raised during the course of the Budget presentation this year is that the Prime Minister was indulging in an element of over-taxation because when the Prime Minister presented the cost of those things that had been costed he was raising enough money to cover the gap identified in Government's revenue. But there were in the package commitments to increase tax, as in this particular instance, for which no costing had been given and which we knew when it came to the House would be increasing the price of commodities and Government taxation by an amount beyond that stated by the Prime Minister.

Now, I therefore need to ask the Minister of Finance by how much will the imposition of this surcharge increase Government taxes. I know the Minister might want to argue that they are not revenue enhancing measures; that they are for protection. But there will still be a revenue implication. It is conventional for the Minister of Finance to say that these measures are intended primarily to be protectionist measures but nonetheless there will be some revenue raised by them.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am coming to the conclusion that either Members do not understand the Rules or they are deliberately attempting to disrupt the work of this House. The Honourable Member for St. Peter has been given an opportunity to speak and I would expect the Honourable Member to speak to me because I am not worried or concerned about what other people say sitting in their seats. If we are going to debate like that we could as well look for somewhere else.

Please, will the Honourable Member continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I accept your ruling in the spirit in which it is intended; but one cannot help hearing an irritable interjection from the Member for St. John who believes that he can be as careless as he wishes, to be as amateurish as he wishes to be and expects the House, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot... I am not interested in the conduct of persons in the debate. If you want to know what tolerance is, take it from me. I am very tolerant and patient. So continue.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I will put my case very clearly. When this matter came to the House as a Budgetary

Proposal in March of this year it was one of those budgetary proposals that the Government was not then in a position to cost because the details had not been worked out. The Government now is in a position to tell us what is the likeliest revenue implication of the introduction of these measures. Although the principal purpose may be to provide protection, notwithstanding there will be some benefit to the Treasury. The Government cannot possibly expect that it should come and introduce a 100% surcharge on goods and ask the House to believe that the imposition of a 100% surtax on goods is not going to give rise to an increase in revenue.

If the Cabinet is being told by the Member for St. John that the imposition of 100% surtax on goods in this country is not by any stretch of the imagination going to give rise to any increase in revenue, particularly in circumstances where import restrictions are being removed and these goods can come freely into the country and then I would urge the Cabinet to look for other advice because you cannot tell me you are going to free up the importation of these goods. 4.40 p.m.

Because you cannot tell me that you are going to free up the importation of these goods - they come free now, you are not banning them, they can come free now into Barbados - and you are increasing the tax on them and there will not be revenue implication. That is madness. If Cabinet had been so advised I am saying that Cabinet is being misled. "There must be revenue implications. This House is deserving of a statement from the Government as to what are the likely revenue implications. If it is modest, say so. But do not tell us that there is going to be no revenue implications. We have to press this issue because too many things are left hanging when the Minister of Finance comes to the House in March...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. At no point in this debate did I address the issue of revenue. I have neither said that there is a revenue implication nor that there is not a revenue implication. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member must not give the impression that I said or did not say that there were revenue implications.

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I never said that the Member spoke to the revenue implications. But when I said that there are revenue implications, he said what kind of economist can I be - from his seat - and it was loud enough, Sir, for me to hear it. I was just trying to show what kind of economist I am. I am glad he has backed off the point. There must be a revenue implication when you are going to remove import restrictions. The

goods can come in now but they will come in with a surcharge on them. What are the revenue implications?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is the kind of matter that is serious enough for the House to take very seriously. A lot of goods are going to be affected by these measures. A lot of employment is going to be affected by this measure that is before the House! The livelihood of a number of people are going to be affected, whichever way. Some companies will find themselves now enjoying tariff protection, others will find themselves not enjoying tariff protection. But we are none the wiser as to the composition of it because the House does not have the informational base upon which to proceed sensibly in these issues.

Let me say, as a matter of principle that we cannot on this side... We really are not opposed to the notion of providing protection to industry. We are not opposed, we cannot be opposed to safeguarding Barbadian jobs by giving our domestic producers an element of competitive advantage relative to imports. This is not only because it is good for our jobs, but because we live in a world where, despite what the international institutions from time to time say, all countries in the world provide protection for their industries. We believe that in addition to developing employment in Barbados through export production that there has* to be an element of job creation through support for efficient import substitution. We believe in that policy and we will support it.

The Government just cannot throw anything at us in the manner in which the Minister of Finance has sought to throw this matter at us. It is too critical, Mr. Speaker, to employment in all of the constituencies that we represent for this House to deal with this issue in this lighthearted, cavalier and careless way. On this side there is not a mood on the part of my Members to participate in a debate where they have not seen the documentation. I have spoken to you on this matter so that justice should be done in this House. Despite the Government's rush in this matter, we on this side have not had the documentation in keeping with the rules of the House. We want to study this matter in all of its ramifications. I have spoken in this vein to ask you to protect the rights of the Opposition so that this debate[^] should not proceed without our having the opportunity to fully analyze the information that is now only being presented to us, Sir, at this 23rd hour.

I am seeking, in the light of the disadvantage that we are facing on this side, that further detailed consideration of this matter should be deferred until our side has seen all of the facts and can descend on all the particulars and contribute to this very important debate in a more forthcoming manner.

I am obliged to you, Sir. I would seek your protection, Mr. Speaker, for my Members in this particular matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: All I want to assure the Member is that I have listened to him and every effort, within my power, to alleviate some of those conditions will be tried. I will try my best. But you must remember that a lot depends upon the leaders of both ...

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed until the documents are circulated. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as a Member of this House, I wish to reiterate the points made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say this.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We in this House have been trying to get...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. The Honourable Member can raise the question of further consideration but to move may be a different matter. The Honourable Member may speak. I just merely wanted to explain that point.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am well aware of the fact, Sir, that it is the intention of the Government to slip through, in this back hand method the Government's supine acceptance of the dictation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in relation to the trade regime.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot accuse - because he has to by implication be accusing - me, the mover of this Bill of seeking by some back hand measure or method to do something that is spineless and at the dictate of somebody else. He may tell his friends that kind of thing but I am not going to stand for it. I do not think that this House needs to be regaled with those kinds of epithets and those kinds of remarks about people week after week. I am not, myself, going to stand for it. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member...

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What we are not going to stand for in here is the fact that the Opposition...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order and requested a ruling. I have always argued that if a Member makes a broad statement for clarification it rests on that Member to determine whether the Honourable Member is included in that sort of broad statement. It is left to the Member to determine whether he includes that Member or not. It is up to the Member to determine that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I just want to make it clear. I rose in here...

Mr. SPEAKER: But you have not included the Member in that broad statement.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the Government.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the Honourable Member...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is a Member of the Government.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What do you object to? I am on solid ground. I will withdraw anything that the Honourable Member objects to.

But, Sir, the point is that the Government of Barbados has repeatedly in this House refused to engage the Opposition in a debate on the implications of the International Monetary Fund's programme and the World Bank and the Inter-American Development's Bank programme with respect to the existing trade regime in Barbados. It was clear to this side that the Government of Barbados would have to change the existing programme and we have tried, repeatedly, to extract from the Government what was the Government's view on this matter. The Government has refused.

Today I say that these measures are measures which reveal the true extent of the Government's wholesale acceptance of the dictates of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank's programme in respect of trade and they will result in further additions to the record levels of unemployment in Barbados. Let us deal with that. We have heard not a word from the Minister in introducing this matter as to what impact these measures are likely to have on existing levels of employment in Barbados. .

I feel that it is an insult, an outrage and a vicious violation of the rights of Members of this side, for anyone to carry these measures to a conclusion today. I want to say this and I want the public to know that the document that was handed to me today as the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations when it was handed to me had no date in it. 4.50 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I have one in front of me. If the Honourable Member got one without a date, there are others.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The point is, none had a date.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has complained that his did not have a date.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I am a Member of this House. In none of the papers that were circulated to me prior to today were these documents in it and I regard it, Sir ... I ask you, as Speaker of this House, to demand that Members on this side get their rights. We cannot deal with legislation ...

Hon. B. M. TAUT: On a point of order, the House is not debating any subsidiary legislation. The House is debating a Bill which was properly put in the hands of the Honourable Member, so the Honourable Member is fulminating ... The Bill does not have a Statutory Instrument, it has to be laid on the Table of the House. It is not being debated. It is not before this House.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, asinity always reveals itself. If it was of no relevance why is it that the Honourable introducer of the Bill referred to it? Tell me that. It is obvious that it is an integral part of the total package and what I am saying is that you cannot expect this House to deal with important matters of this nature when today for the first time, after we came back from lunch, this document was laid on the Table. He gave notice of it for the first time after he came back from lunch.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us look at the sequence of events. After -lunch today was the first time that any Honourable Member in here was aware of the fact that the Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations was being laid as a document of this House. And we are being asked to consider a Bill...

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Could you find out from the Clerk, Sir, when this was done because this is the first time I have mine. Secondly, Sir, I want to point out this. I could not get a copy of the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order which was also laid today. Nobody got a copy of this circulated with their papers last week. This is the first time that I have seen a copy of this. We are not going to allow this to occur in here. I have been around here long enough to know what the rights of the Opposition are. I know what the rights of the Opposition are. You cannot tamper with the rights of the Opposition in here. You are not going to be able to do that. If not we will break up the whole of this House in here. We can break it up too, you know. Don't let anybody fool you.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No Member got a copy of this. You cannot ride rough shod over Members' rights in here. We must deal with this.

Mr. Speaker, among my papers, I never got a copy of this. When we look at this, Sir, we see this order may be cited as the Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order. We cannot find anywhere a Customs Tariff (No. 1) Order.

Sir, I am not finishing my speech. I would like to know whether, in- the circumstances which have been drawn to the attention of Your Honour by all the Members of this side, by the lateness, the incapacity and inability of them arising from the lateness to do justice to this important subject, whether we are to continue debate today or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am trying to arrive at a conclusion based on what I have asked the Clerk to do for me.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, let me just go through the events. The Bill itself was circulated on Tuesday. What the Member is complaining of is that document was circulated late today.

"Standing Order 42.5: An interval of not less than five days shall elapse between the first and second readings of a bill, unless the House on motion made and questions put, agree to proceed with the bill at any earlier date, or forthwith."

But these Standing Orders, including this one, were suspended and when the suspension was taken, no Member objected to the removal of that Standing Order. Therefore as it stands, the Standing Order has been suspended and what happens in that case would have to be some kind of relationship between the Leader of the House and probably the Leader of the Opposition to sort out some of these matters. The matter now cannot be rested in my hands. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to speak on a point of privilege? I am not going to get into any argument, I will have to state my position. It is a fact that I received the Consumption Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1993 on Tuesday, but this Bill states, in clause 2:

"(1A) For the purposes of subsection (1)(a), the surtax imposed on goods specified in Section B and Section C of Part I of the Customs Tariff shall not be taken into account in calculating the chargeable value of those goods."

Mr. Speaker, if that is part of the Bill and I did not get a copy of those Customs tariffs, how am I going to debate the Bill? This is the point....

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought you had made the point.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: No, I am not finished. What is more, Mr. Speaker, is that this Bill forms part of the trade liberalisation exercise, which is an extremely important exercise that is due to take place in Barbados, and I cannot understand why it was difficult for my colleagues to say to the House that they are going to start debate on the trade liberalisation exercise in 2 weeks' time and come prepared to start on it. I do not understand the reason why this has been brought, this other document which forms part of this, and another document which forms part of the same exercise, have now been given out. I heard the noise and I was wondering what was going on, so I had to get a copy. I have now seen it.

I just wanted to put my position, but I feel that to ask this Honourable Chamber to continue debate on this Bill in circumstances where some Members have not even seen part of the whole exercise is asking too much of Members of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even if all of what the Honourable Member said is true, we go back to the basic principle, which is the Rules of the House. These Standing Orders were suspended, not today, but from last Tuesday. That is the option for Honourable Members in respect of whatever the condition may be. If the Chair is to take any stand in the matter, my stand must be taken by this particular document. Even though all of what the Honourable Member has said is true, that is what the document says.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I do not think Your Honour should be put into a position where Your Honour has got to fall back....

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It does not matter, the point is I can take the instructions. We all operate on the basis of some kind of instruction. The point is, Sir, that the importance of Government's business is determined to a large extent by the exigencies of the circumstances. One needs to find out what are the exigencies in the circumstances.

It is clear on both sides of the House there has been an absence of the amount of preparatory information which Members feel they should have for a proper debate. In the circumstances, Sir, the Government does not wish to bulldoze anybody, to railroad anybody, the Government believes in the principle that everyone should have an opportunity to prepare their case, unlike certain Honourable Members in the House.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member continue? Will the Honourable Member please complete what he is saying?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Therefore, in the circumstances, Sir, we have no objection to postponing the matter, so the Honourable Member will move formally that further consideration of the Bill be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Correct procedure.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move that further consideration of the Bill be postponed.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business. I do not know if Honourable Members on that side are ready to proceed with any Private Members' Business. If they are not, Sir, I beg to move that the House therefore do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 24th day of August, 1993 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.08 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES****Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3772**

Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of Tuesday,
July 20, 1993.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER**Mr. SPEAKER 3772**

Receipt of Accounts and Statements for the
month of April, 1993 as prepared by the
Accountant General.

**MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL****Mr. SPEAKER 3773**

1. Letter from the Acting Governor-General
informing the House of Her Excellency's
absence from office to August 15, 1993.
2. Message No. 4/1993 from the Acting
Governor-General informing the House
of the appointment of Mr. Owen
Seymour Arthur as Leader of the
Opposition, and the revocation of the
appointment of Mr. Henry deBoulay
Forde as Leader of the Opposition, both
with effect from 1st August, 1993.

PAPERS**Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 3773**

The International Business Companies (C.M.G.
Capital Ltd.) (Rate of Tax) Order, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3773

The Report of the National Housing Corporation
for the financial year 1990-91.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES**Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE 3773**

Reporting that the work of the Joint Select
Committee on the Films Bill, 1993 was
completed but the Report was not yet ready. He
asked leave to lay the Report later in the sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER 3773

Statement on the Interim Report of the
Committee of Public Accounts laid in the House
on 22nd June, 1993.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES**Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3778**

1. Barbados Agricultural Development and
Marketing Corporation Bill, 1993.
2. The Consumption Tax (Amendment)
(No. 2) Bill, 1993.
3. Resolution to approve the vesting in the
Barbados Investment and Development
Corporation of a parcel of land at Six
Roads, St. Philip.

FIRST READING OF BILLS**Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3778**

1. The Barbados Agricultural Development
and Marketing Corporation Bill, 1993.
2. The Consumption Tax (Amendment)
(No. 2) Bill, 1993.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES**Hon. H. B. St. JOHN 3779**

Congratulating Mr. Owen Arthur on his
appointment as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, 3779; Hon. P. M. Greaves,
3779.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**Hon. P. M. GREAVES 3779**

Suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20,
42(5), 43 and 44.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE GUARANTEE BY GOVERNMENT OF
US\$772 333 FROM THE CARIBBEAN
DEVELOPMENT BANK TO THE UNIVER
SITY OF THE WEST INDIES 3779

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 3779; Mr. L. R. Tull,
3780, 3782, 3783; Hon. C. V. Walker, 3785,
3786; Hon H. B. St. John, 3786; Dr. R. L.
Cheltenham, 3786.

ORDER NO. 6 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY GOVERNMENT OF US\$12 991 600 FROM THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES.....3788

Hon. C. V. Walker, 3788.

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE BARBADOS INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF LAND AT SIX ROADS, ST. PHILIP 3788

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 3788; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 3788.

ORDER NO. 8 - THE BARBADOS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING CORPORATION BILL, 1993 3790

Hon. D. W. Bowen, 3790.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD 3793

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1993.

RESUMPTION (Friday, August 13, 1993)
ORDER NO. 8 (resumed)

- Mr. R. C. Eastmond, 3793; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 3796, 3797, 3799; Hon. M. A. King, 3797; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, 3799; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 3801; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3804, 3805, 3806, 3808.

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....3809

Miscellaneous Controls (General Open Import Licence) Regulations, 1993.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....3809

The Local Loans (Amendment) Bill* 1993.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....3809

The Local Loans (Amendment) Bill, 1993.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE 3809

Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Films Bill, 1993.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS (resumed) ORDER NO. 8 (resumed)

Hon. M. A. King, 3809, 3813; Hon. D. W. Bowen, 3810; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3812, 3813.

ORDER NO. 9 - THE CONSUMPTION TAX (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1993 3814

Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 3814, 3820; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 3815, 3816, 3817, 3818, 3819; Hon. H. B. St. John, 3820, 3821; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 3821, 3822; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 3822.

SUSPENSIONS 3784, 3793, 3808

ADJOURNMENT 3822

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BLACKMAN, Mr. H. A. (St. Michael South) BOWEN, Hon. D. W. (St. Michael South Central) BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East) BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East) CHELTENHAM, Dr. R. L. (St. Joseph) EASTMOND, Mr. R. C. (St. James North) FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church South) SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John) TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South) WALKER, Hon. C. V. (St. George North)