

THE House of Assembly Debates (OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 26, 1993

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., LLJB., (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)
Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Health)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation and Leader of the House)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of 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.)
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.
Miss B. A. MILLER
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. G. W. PAYNE

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood. Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session. MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, January 19, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Minutes of the meeting that took place on January 19, 1993, have been circulated. I move that they be taken as read and be confirmed.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1992 as prepared by the Accountant General.

2907

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice today that replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 19 and 20 asked by the Honourable Member for the City are ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

lion, P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

I just want to repeat once more, Sir, the undertaking I gave to the other side on the last occasion we met that on this day as soon as we have concluded the matter which we are about to embark on, that is, the Barbados Tourism Authority Bill, at that point we then go to Private Members' motions to deal with the Resolution to take note of the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Finance, *The question that those several Standing Orders he suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 5 - THE BARBADOS TOURISM AUTHORITY BILL, 1993

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my contribution to this very important debate. I would wish to start by indicating that Barbados has developed and maintained an image as an attractive holiday destination which offers a high quality tourism product. The success of the industry has been such that it is now expected to play a major role in the export-led strategy for growth in the overall recovery and development of the economy of Barbados.

The importance of tourism must be viewed not only in terms of the number of people it serves and the vast substantial human financial and physical resources it employs, but it must also be viewed as important because of the potential benefits which tourism and related activities can confer on individuals and society as a whole. It is the major source of jobs, income and tax revenue for the Government and the expansion of this industry is vital to the overall growth of our economy. It is also highly desirable in this entire situation that there should be the highest possible coordination between the activities of Government and the private sector if the economic benefits of the industry are to be maximised.

Over the past 10 years or so, many more developing countries have become involved in tourism as part of their efforts to diversify and expand opportunities for economic development. It is within such a highly competitive environment that Barbados must undertake concerted and concentrated efforts to improve the quality, attractiveness and uniqueness of its tourism product and services in order to be competitive and to sustain tourist interest.

The growth prospects for Barbados' tourism sector must be viewed against the overall trend in international travel as well as the domestic policies and strategies to sustain further development of the industry. To some extent the prospect for tourism will also depend on innovative follow-up promotions and marketing activities as well as the development of competitive tourist products, services and related facilities.

My Government will therefore seek to promote further success and development of the industry by maintaining a flexible but aggressive marketing thrust. The development thrust must be geared

towards the expansion and diversification of the tourism industry to reduce its dependence on a narrow range of activities and markets. The overall strategy will be mobilised to channel investment to selected areas of activity having tourism potential and leading to increased employment, value-added and linkages with other sectors of the economy. This should provide the necessary support for the promotion of Barbados as an international tourism destination. As is well known, Sir, my Government has put together a national comprehensive economic recovery strategy to lead Barbados out of the international recession. That economic strategy is based on stabilising the economy, particularly in respect of the fiscal deficit and the external account. It is also based on laying the foundation for the recovery of growth. 12.30 p.m.

That policy is working. Tourism is at the centre of the "recovery. For 1992 some 785 094 visitors (these are tentative figures) including cruise ship passengers visited Barbados. When this is compared with previous years it will be seen that remarkable progress is being made in the recovery of tourism which in turn will feed into the overall national recovery. So what this means, Sir, is that there has been some moderation in the negative growth in the economy and this is very heartening. It is a move in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, these things have not happened by accident. It is the result of hard and positive work in the tourism sector both public and private. As far as the public sector is concerned, we have restructured the Board of Tourism and the Ministry of Tourism and we have put a \$9 million marketing programme in place. What this Honourable Chamber is now engaged upon in the second

2908

reading of this Bill is to put in place the legislative framework within which the policies and direction for tourism matters will be dealt with.

Sir, we have listened very carefully in this debate and a number of charges have been made. There has been the accusation, by Members on that side, Sir, that there is no rationale or broad policy objective informing the establishment of the new Barbados Tourism Authority. That is just not true, Sir. The new Barbados Tourism Authority Act must be viewed against the Government's broad policy objectives as they relate to the vital tourism industry. It is therefore envisaged that this new legislation and the bodies created under it will be the vehicle through which the Government will seek to promote and implement its policies. The Minister of Tourism has already outlined some broad considerations which the Government is seeking to promote and in addition to this broad policy consideration let me stress the following:

The broad policy objectives to the Government in respect of the tourism policy and the rationale for the legislation and the new Authority are as follows -

1. To provide for the effective means of promoting and marketing Barbados as a destination for tourists on a world-wide basis. To provide the private sector with a more effective means of promoting tourism efforts and a forum for removing obstacles to overall tourism growth in order for Barbados to remain competitive in the world tourism market place,
2. To optimise the contribution of tourism related industries to the economic prosperity of Barbados,
3. To make opportunity for and the benefits to tourism and recreation in Barbados accessible to residents of Barbados and foreign countries and ensure that present and future generations are afforded adequate tourism resources and attractions,
4. To promote quality, integrity and reliability in all tourism and tourism related services offered to visitors to Barbados,
5. To ensure compatibility to tourism and recreation with other national interests in the areas of conservation and environmental protection,
6. To encourage the preservation and use of Barbados' historic and scenic environment to enhance its appeal as a destination for international tourism,
7. To create, maintain and further inter-sectoral linkages with other productive sectors and with service sectors such as education, culture, sports and health, and
8. To set out a course of action that is considered appropriate in an effort to move smoothly towards a

more efficient and viable tourism industry.

So much then, Sir, for the charge that there is no broad policy or rationale for the introduction of this legislation and for the establishment of the Authority.

I move to another accusation, Sir, which is also without foundation; that charge coming again from the others on that side rests on the statement that the new Barbados Tourism Authority Act represents no change from the old Barbados Board of Tourism Act. That accusation was made and again I wish, systematically, to refute that particular charge.

I will therefore highlight some of the major differences between the 2 pieces of legislation -

1. As far as structure is concerned, under the new Barbados Tourism Authority Act, the Authority will be administrated by a Board of Directors. The Board will consist of a Chief Executive Officer and not less than 5 and not more than 8 other persons appointed by the Minister.

On the other hand the Board of Tourism Act provides for a Board of not less than 8 persons without stipulating the maximum number on that Board. This situation in many cases led to very large boards which over time became unresponsive to the needs of modern tourism promotion. 12.40 p.m.

The new Act by limiting the size of the Board seeks to create a more responsive and action oriented body which can best serve the needs of Barbados* tourism going into the 21st century and beyond. In appointing persons to serve on the Board, the Minister will have regard to individuals who are experienced in activities connected with tourism and travel, marketing, finance, economics, business, hotel management or international transportation or who hold special qualifications in the areas referred to. Under the old Act, this provision was not included in the legislation. That legislation merely stated, and I quote:

"The Board shall consist of such number of members not being less than 8 as the Minister may from time to time appoint by instrument in writing."

2909

That is **what it \$aid**.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not know what you are trying to import but, Sir, I am not hearing asides.

Secondly, in respect of disclosure of directors' interests. The proposed legislation requires directors of the Board to disclose any interest that they may have in a company with which the Authority proposes to make a contract or transact any other business. A director wjio falls under the above provision will be prohibited from taking pan in any deliberations or discussions of the Board relating to that contract or business. Under the Board of Tourism Act, there was no such provision included. The new legislation, in making such a provision, seeks to ensure that justice is not only done but that it is seen to be done. Therefore, this represents another point of departure between the two pieces of legislation. You see, Sir, the Opposition makes charges but, when you come to refute the charges, they are not interested in the refutation. They can squirm as much as they like, but I will go through patiently the differences and we will answer point by point.

Thirdly, as far as functions are concerned under the new Tourism Act, the functions of the Authority have been expanded in an effort to transform the new Authority into a marketing oriented body. The main functions of the Authority will be the promotion, development and regulation of the tourism industry so as to optimize the contribution of tourism to the overall economic development of Barbados. The functions assigned to the Board under the old Act did not provide for this central focus.

Fourthly, Sir, the tourism marketing plan. The Act makes it mandatory for the Authority in cooperation with a Tourism Advisory Council to adopt a tourism marketing plan for Barbados' international tourism promotion. The Barbados Board of Tourism Act contained no such requirement. The new Act seeks to ensure that priority is accorded to the marketing of Barbados' tourism.

Fifthly, as far as finances are concerned under the old Act, there was no provision outlining what constituted explicitly the funds of the Board and how such funds should be applied. The new legislation specifically and clearly states what constitutes the funds and resources of the Authority as

well as how such funds should be applied. The new Act makes provision for the keeping of proper accounts and for such 'accounts to be audited. It also provides for the Auditor General or some other auditor, as the case may be, to have access to all information, books, documents, cash and securities of the Authority. This is an effort to ensure greater accountability in the finances of the Authority.

Sixthly, licensing of tourist accommodation. The Board of Tourism Act does not provide for tourism accommodations to be licensed. Under the new Act, tourism accommodation will be required to be licensed. To qualify for a licence under the Act, applicants would have to meet certain minimum standards as set out in the legislation. This is seen as one way in which quality, integrity and reliability in the sector will be promoted.

Seventhly, in respect to the Tourism Advisory Council, criticism has also been levelled that the establishment of the Tourism Advisory Council will not bring about any changes. Well, that is to be seen. That is a statement about what will happen and we cannot establish the *bona fides* of that. Time will tell. But the new Act establishes a Tourism Advisory Council which will be entrusted with the responsibility of advising the Minister on any matter connected with tourism as the Council thinks fit or that may be referred to it by the Minister. Sir, that includes the entire functioning or effectiveness of any aspect of tourism. This is a very broad function. Yet in another way, Sir, this is a departure from the existing legislation.

While on this point, Sir, very much was made of a clause relating to the payment of members of the Tourism' Advisory Council. That is on the basis of a permissive clause. I believe it is Clause 6, Sir, of the Second Schedule which entitles the Minister, if he so desires, to pay to members of the Council remuneration and allowances as he determines. Let me stress again, Sir, that this is only permissive and I would like to make it abundantly clear that there is no present intention. I certainly have no intention of providing funds for such payments. It is only members of the Board of Directors of the Authority who will be remunerated. It will be a voluntary body of civic minded persons. I want to make that absolutely clear.

Sir, I have outlined therefore a number of differences and departures from the existing legislation and I hope that those, accusations and charges will be laid to rest. Let me stress again. Tourism has been brought to this particular point under the existing legislation. Ministers of Tourism have used that legislation in order to put in place policies and practices for the advancement of tourism, and they have been successful, Sir. I refer particularly to the current Minister of Health, who is a distinguished Minister of Tourism and laid the foundations for that particular industry, as well as the present Minister of Tourism, who is doing an excellent job, and that is accepted on all sides, particularly by the Member for the City. They cannot but accept that, Sir. 12:50 p.m.

2910

I thought I would take this opportunity to point out that we have been making progress, that there is recovery now if we take the past 3 or 4 months into account, that the turn around in tourism has hopefully started, that a trend has been set and that this recovery in tourism will lead to further recovery in the overall economy of Barbados. I am sure that all Members and all persons in this country are pleased to note this development. We wish to see further improvements and I hope that we can all work together to do what is best for this vital sector.

Thank you.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be proper for the House to quickly pass over the empty speech of the Minister of Finance, since in every sense it neither added nor subtracted from the presentation of the Minister of Tourism. I can only infer that it was intended in some respects to put the Minister of Tourism in his place. All it did was to affirm what Government policy is in relation to tourism,

as if the Minister had not done that, certainly with more wit and with more humour than the Prime Minister himself. I must say, though, that the Minister did follow his script closely and managed to convey his knowledge of the tourism industry with all the emotions of original discovery.

Be that as it may, Sir, I believe we have to go back to the speech of the Minister of Tourism. Last week this House was regaled with a long but tiny speech from the Minister of Tourism, which in many respects failed to come into contact with some of the important issues facing the sector and, in an even more fundamental respect, shared the deficiency of the speech of the Prime Minister by failing to explain precisely why we are here today debating this important piece of legislation on tourism.

Mr. Speaker, the change in the role of the Board of Tourism, as indeed the change in the role and structure of the Export Promotion Corporation and the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation, is not an initiative that the Government of Barbados has taken of its own accord. There is going to be a change in the role and the structure of the Barbados Board of Tourism because that represents an institutional precondition, agreed to between the Government of Barbados and the international lending institutions, governing this country's access to multilateral financing in order to carry out a structural adjustment programme.

We have heard contributions from the other side. We have heard about Government's policy - the Minister of Finance just spoke about his Government's policy. But nowhere is there being stated the simple truth, that the Government is being put to the necessity of having to change all of its structure and the rob of ail of its institutions, not because the Government wants to do that, Sir, but because the international institutions have required it as a precondition for financing.

In many respects, Mr. Speaker, a lot of these changes, which are nonsensical changes, are being forced upon Government by middle level executives and international civil servants who crawl out of cubicles in Washington to impose upon the Governments of the Third World their own concept as to how the world should be organised. For example, the thing is so ridiculous that we have a situation where anything goes. If you were to ask yourself the question if you had to give a loan to restructure the agricultural industry in Barbados, what would be the chief institutional requirement you would want to put in place, obviously you would say you would want to make sure that the financial institution for agriculture is an institution which can dispense funds in a way that maintains its integrity as well as can satisfy the working capital needs of the agricultural sector.

But what do we have, Sir? We have a situation where in order to get funds from these institutions the Government of Barbados has to agree that the ADC and the BMC have to be amalgamated. I want to say to the House that the amalgamation of the ADC and the BMC has no bearing at all on the price of peas in Pie Corner or on the agricultural sector in this country.

I want to start dealing with the institutional stalemate we are involved in with this debate. This whole thing is a waste of time because all the House is being called upon to do is to agree with the Government that it must comply with certain institutional strictures these institutions want it to follow without regard as to the real impact it is going to make on the Barbadian economy.

In my view, Sir, Barbados needs to see involved in the tourism industry not just a new governmental institution, but a new breed of entrepreneurs who can do for Barbados' tourism what people like Butch Stewart and John Issa have done for Jamaican tourism. We are not getting that. I am saying to the Government that this institution is old wine in old wine skins. It is a new institution that will have certain cosmetic changes to its structure, but it is not going fundamentally to affect the fortunes of tourism in this country.

I also want to make the point that this House has not been given the benefit of a full disclosure by the Government of Barbados as to the institutional preconditions it has entered into with international monetary institutions, the World Bank and the IADB. Slowly, but surely, those institutional preconditions are being made apparent, as today. But I believe this Government is not properly representing the interest of

the people of Barbados in its relationship with those multilateral institutions, because it is agreeing to too much meddling and too much policy nonsense as part of its preconditions with those institutions. I want to repeat, for example, that the Barbados Labour Party does not believe that any international civil servant, who is employed with the International Monetary Fund, should be making any policy statements in this country which bear upon Government policy, or appears even to commit the Government of Barbados. I do not believe that those international civil servants, who come to this country from time to time, should be allowed to go willy nilly into statutory institutions collecting information. The proper approach is that there should be a liaison officer appointed to work with them, they should be attached to the Central Bank or the Ministry of Finance. We have a situation now in Barbados where all of the statutory institutions in this country are gripped in a form of terror when the IMF is coming to go into departments to examine their books and tell them what they are supposed to do. 1.00 p.m.

That, Sir, should not be allowed. I am also of the view that this nonsense about institutions outside the Government meeting with the IMF to put a case to the IMF is disrespectful of the role of Government and it should be stopped. The Government of Barbados has a relationship with the international monetary institutions by law. Their case should be put to the relevant Minister of this country.

Asides.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I believe that there is one Government and if the trade unions of this country have an issue of policy they should deal with the Government. In my view this notion of meeting with the IMF to put their case is disrespectful of Government and it should be stopped. I give the House the assurance that the Barbados Labour Party will under no circumstance meet with the IMF. If we have an issue, Sir, it will be dealt with in here.

In 1982, we had IMF people come to Barbados. You cannot tell me what their names were. I do not even remember what their names were. But now we have IMF people in Barbados who are local celebrities. I believe that the whole relationship between the Government and the IMF has been badly handled. There is a new mendicancy that has overtaken policy in this country and it really must stop. The sum total of it is captured in this legislation. The notion of privatisation and divestment very often involves not only the sale of public property but the taking of Government out of having anything whatsoever to do with strategic sectors of the economy. You not only divest yourself of property but privatisation also entails that the Government should also divest itself of its functions. In many respects, Sir, the way in which the international institutions see divestment involves divesting yourself of property and divesting yourself of function.

This legislation is to divest the Government of Barbados of any important function insofar as it was initially structured to strip the Minister of Tourism of any policy role in relation to the tourism industry. I want to repeat that I share many of the goals of privatisation, mainly the fiscal goals, but I believe that no Government of Barbados should resile from the responsibility of becoming involved in any of the major productive sectors of this economy, if it is in the national interest.

I believe that the Government of Barbados should build houses. I believe that the Government of Barbados should be involved in sites and services because there is a tremendous demand for it. I believe that if there are new initiatives of a commercial nature that should be embarked upon and that can help Barbados's tourism that no Government of Barbados should resile from being involved in it, privatisation or no privatisation. So I cannot support any legislation that comes to this House, given the tremendous role that tourism is now playing in Barbados or can play in the future, that says that no Government of Barbados should have a role to play in this strategic sector of this economy.

To that extent, I could not support this legislation because it emasculates the Government of Barbados in relation to its being able to...

Hon. M. A. KING: On a point of order. I made the point last week that there was an omission in the Act. I took the trouble to point out the actual phraseology of the clause that was omitted. What the Honourable Member is doing is building his speech on an omission. The amendments cannot be done in Second Reading. Amendments are done in Committee.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Member continues. I made a ruling on the matter last week to the extent that there would not be any in-depth debate on the matter that I ruled on. I take it that the Honourable Member is not developing that. The Honourable Member is just making reference as far as I can gather.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I will go back to the Prime Minister's speech of March 1992 where he promised this House that there would be a new tourism authority and that one of the new things it would have would be executive responsibility. He said that March 31, 1992. We now have coming to this House a piece of legislation that invests, executive responsibilities that used to reside in the

2912

Minister of Tourism in the new tourism authority and they tell us it is by chance. It is not by chance that we have coming before this House a piece of legislation on tourism that vests executive authority, not in the Minister, but in the Board.

The Prime Minister promised that on March 31, 1992 so it is not a mistake or omission. It is as a result of the insistence of the international multilateral institutions that the Government as a Government must be stripped of its power in relation to policy and that the power must be vested in the private sector quasi statutory institution. I am saying that the Opposition is not in support of the notion that the Government of Barbados in relation to the strategic sectors of this economy can have no future important role to play in them.

I want to go on, Sir, as my time is limited. Mr. Speaker, since 1986, an anti-export bias has been infused in Government's fiscal policy. Year by year, I was accused by Members on the other side of making the same speech. In a sense, Sir, if I was making the same speech it was because Government was making the same mistake year after year. Year after year, the Minister of Finance came to the House and told us that the economy was in wonderful shape but he was going to impose a new increase in the level of indirect taxes. In 1987, we had a situation where the then Minister of Finance introduced \$55 million in new consumption taxes and stamp duties, both of which fell on inputs used by the tourism sector. We warned that that kind of approach would eventually put tourism in a position where it would be uncompetitive.

In 1988, this Minister of Finance came and imposed \$110 million in new taxes. In 1989, he increased the rate of indirect taxes, again bearing on the tourism sector. In 1990, he had a no-tax budget. In 1991, he had 3 bites at the cherry: he raised the rate of indirect taxes 3 times.

Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to everybody in this House and everybody in Barbados that tourism is a sector that operates in the international economy. In order to be internationally competitive a sector must be able to have access to its inputs as close to international prices as possible. It should now be clear, Sir, that the policy, year by year of increasing the indirect taxes, particularly on goods that are used by the tourism sector, has in fact been a considerable factor explaining why the tourism industry in this country has lost its competitiveness.

The Government has access to a study done by William Loehr and James Emery called "Competitiveness and Structural Adjustment in Barbados". A summary on tourism includes these considerations. First of all the cost of food and beverages put Barbados at a disadvantage when compared to other Caribbean tourist destinations. It goes on:

"Import duties are higher for the tourism sector in Barbados than they are estimated to be in other Caribbean islands and public policy does not appear as supportive to tourism as it is for other sectors. Compared to its contributions to foreign exchange earnings, agriculture and manufacturing received a disproportionate amount of policy encouragement."

Mr. Speaker, this becomes a very critical issue. I believe that in order for the tourist industry to become competitive again it must be able to have access to its inputs as close to international prices as possible. It means therefore that this House and this country have to be committed to a policy which should be in

contradiction of all that has been done since 1986, that you cannot year by year come and increase indirect taxes on food and beverages even going to the stage of a 20% luxury tax on many of the things that have been used by tourism and then expect the sector to succeed. 1.10p.m.

In my view it becomes an imperative that if the tourism sector is to recover, and if it is also to lead to the general recovery of the Barbados economy, there is need for fiscal reform to put the tourism industry in a position where, to begin with, it has the same status as, for example, an enterprise in the manufacturing industry which is exporting all of its goods.

Sir, let me develop that point. Any enterprise in Barbados in manufacturing that sells all its goods to extra-regional markets is allowed to have access to its inputs free of duties because it is recognised that an enterprise, in order to compete in the international market, must be able to have access to its inputs at international prices. If it makes profit, as you know, it is allowed a heavy rebate on that profit to the extent where the taxes on its profits are no more than between 2% and 3%. Tourism operates in the international environment in no less a sense than any enclave enterprise in manufacturing, that sells its goods to international markets. The most important policy the Government of Barbados must now announce and commit itself to is to bring about a new deal for tourism, as a matter of priority, that would allow tourism to have access to inputs as near as possible to world prices as the circumstances would allow.

Mr. Speaker, this becomes an issue for this reason. In a recent speech to this House on January 14, the Minister of Finance promised the country and this House a reform of the indirect taxation system. But that reform is going to come 2 years from now. If tourism has to wait 2 years

2913

for a change in the fiscal environment within which it is now operating, the sector is going to die. That is the reality. It would have been more to the point, given the crucial role of tourism in this economy, for the Government to have put tourism on the front burner and if not to fully adjust, to make some serious adjustment in the fiscal environment within which the sector now operates rather than for even manufacturing. There can be no doubt that the sector has been put in a position where either it must now buy inputs at cost plus those high stamp duties and consumption taxes on import duty making it uncompetitive, or if it does not do that, it has to buy inputs from highly protected local manufacturers. The sector will not retain its vibrancy once that environment exists.

I am fortified in this position, Sir, because, as was mentioned by my colleagues who spoke previously, the recession in tourism in Barbados preceded the international recession in tourism. It started in the last quarter of 1989. The latest report from the Caribbean Tourism Organisation shows that in 1992 there was growth in regional tourism by about 3% but between January and November the Barbadian tourism long-stay visitors continued to decline by about 2.7%. The point therefore is that the Barbados tourism industry, where the long-stay visitors are concerned, was in recession before the rest of the international industry. Now the rest of the industry has started to recover, the Barbados' industry is not sharing in that recovery. It should tell the Government...

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: You are in charge of the Government now. It should tell the Government that it has to look directly at the domestic factors which are putting this industry in a position where it goes into recession before the rest of the industry, and when the rest of the industry is out of recession, that is still in it. The fiscal environment, the high and excessive rates of indirect taxes on the industry had, as early as 1989, started to put Barbados in an unsustainable position where its tourism performance was concerned. I am urging Government, and the Opposition will support any structural approach by Government, to change the fiscal environment within which the industry operates. In short, tourism stands in need of a new deal now, not 2 years hence, if this country is to go forward.

Therefore, I am of the view that for the Minister of Finance to come to this House and give a speech without coming into contact with the fiscal problems that face the sector indicates how far we are lost. He seems not to be aware, Sir, although the reports prepared for his Ministry are speaking to it eloquently of

the extent to which his own policies have dug a very deep hole for tourism. And to the extent he has contributed so massively to the problems of this sector, I am saying he now has a massive responsibility to help pull it out. I therefore expect that as soon as the Budget, and no later, the Government must address itself directly to the question of a new fiscal arrangement for the sector. We do not believe that 2 years will suffice.

I want, Mr. Speaker, in the limited amount of time left to me, to say that in relation to the new Board, I would like to see the opportunity of structural adjustment programmes in Barbados used by Government as a way of bringing new, young, talented people into some serious roles in this economy. One of the great disappointments of the last 2 years has been precisely that the Government does not seem to understand that economic crisis creates an opportunity for new thinking, and new people to begin to play new roles in our economic environment. I believe, Sir, and it is my strong conviction, that the Democratic Labour Party has used the last 2 years to too large an extent for giving important positions to a lot of people who have nothing new to bring to bear in public life. I have already had need to speak very strongly about the appointment of persons as our ambassadors for trade. There is the need for a new entrepreneurial spirit even in the public sector.

There is no point this House agreeing to our just creating a new institution in terms of structure without insisting that the Government gives very serious consideration to creating opportunities for new, bright, young people who can bring a new policy approach to bear in important national areas. No young person in Barbados, including young members of the Democratic Labour Party, have been given any opportunity in the course of the last 2 years to help try to bring this country out of its economic crisis. The Government is going back to the same old, tired hackneyed people who have done and contributed so much to putting Barbados in its present predicament.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West will understand the point I am making because as a young person he was once given the opportunity to operate on the national stage in terms of trying to help bring new ideas in the development of the industrial sector of the economy in the country. The Democratic Labour Party has not used the opportunity of structural difficulties in this economy to give new people, even bright, young Dems, an opportunity to operate in important national areas. They are recycling some old hacks. There would be no point this House being told by the Minister of Finance that this is a revolutionary new piece of legislation....

Aside.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, an institution is only a collection of people. If there is going to be the bringing to bear of a new approach to tourism, one

2914

would expect to see new, young people with a different approach staffing these institutions when they are reformed. I fear the opportunity will again be used as it was used in the case of the amalgamation of the IDC and the EPC by the Democratic Labour Party to find ways, not of bringing a new approach to bear, but finding ways of maintaining a longstanding position for irrelevant members of the Democratic Labour Party or persons who really and truly do not have any contribution to make. I am of the view, as I said, that in many respects what we are doing here, by way of agreeing to this legislation on tourism, is going to be marginal to the future of the industry. Because the experience now is that important change in the industry is being brought about, in some countries in the Caribbean, by the emergence of new entrepreneurs. In summary I would like to see, in Barbados tourism the emergence of persons like Butch Stewart and John Issa and persons who are developing new tourism products, persons who are developing new approaches and new concepts as to what the modern industry is about. We have not seen that in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The Barbados tourism in general seems to be behind the times and this legislation, Sir, to the extent that it does not even begin remotely to address itself to the question of the development of entrepreneurship, is just going to lead us to an institutional stalemate. 1.20 p.m.

The Opposition, Sir, still is not satisfied, even given the statement by the Minister of Finance and Prime

Minister that the Board, in terms of its functions and structure, is not going to be anything other than marginally different from the old Board. He lists, Sir, a range of functions such as promoting Barbados which is not new and so on. For these reasons, Sir, the Opposition is very unsettled and has the greatest difficulty in supporting this legislation.

I close therefore by saying, Sir, as I began, that I am not going to be supporting measures brought to the House by the Democratic Labour Party which represent part of that Party's overall arrangements with the international institutions but which are passed off in this House as initiatives of the Government of Barbados. The Government of Barbados should be frank enough, Sir, to tell us that they are doing what they are doing, not because this is what they want to do, but because it is an institutional pre-condition of the IMF programme. It is something that the Government of Barbados has agreed with the IMF. The Government of Barbados, in addition to its financial targets, has also agreed with the multilateral institutions that it is going to change the structure and the role of most of the statutory boards. This House, Sir, has never been given the benefit of a full disclosure by the Prime Minister as to what all those changes entail. They are going to fundamentally affect how a large number of Barbadian people live. We will not, as a matter of principle, be supporting these kinds of initiatives when this Government comes to the House and purports that these changes are Government policies without telling the House that they are, in point of fact, things that Government has agreed to with these institutions. In particular, Sir, we are not going to be supporting these institutional changes which are as nonsensical and as vapid and as lacking in purpose, Mr. Speaker, as those which are now presently before the House. I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, anybody who listened to the main thrust of the contribution of Members of the Opposition in this particular debate would believe that the future of the Tourism industry rests almost exclusively, certainly because of the amount of effort that they have put into raising that particular issue, on the power of the Minister of Tourism. Nearly every speaker spent considerable time in the debate pointing out that there were attempts, by this legislation, to denude the power of the Minister, to take away his powers of policy making, to reduce his functions and so on.

Now you have said that we should not proceed on that basis because it is correct that the Honourable Attorney General pointed out that there is a section to be inserted into the Bill. But I am saying that all of that argument, whether it is made in here, or on the outside, is based on a premise that is utterly without foundation. And it is a misrepresentation. Anybody who gets up in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and says to this House, that any Act, which is passed by this Chamber, which does not have in it, Mr. Speaker, a general provision which gives a Minister, any Minister, power to give directions to a Board and as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has no power at all, is really not aware of the existing legislation in Barbados.

I heard people over there, people who were Chairmen of Statutory Corporations which did not even have a section like that in it, who said that this is the first time any Government has attempted to denude the power of a Minister. Now, I was a member of that same statutory board at a later point, and I knew what the powers of the Minister were and I assumed that he knew them as well. But we were told at the point when that important point was made by the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, to keep quiet and listen carefully, this is a seminal and important point and we were told *sotto voce* by some Members on that side, "You have to listen to this point, this is the crux of it, this is the essence". And the person who gave that advice was the Minister of Tourism when legislation was passed in this House establishing a statutory corporation and it had no section empowering the Minister to give directions to the Board. So it is not a first. Now, I don't agree with it. I agree that such a section should be in legislation but it is no point misleading

2915

the public and saying this is the best debate that ever took place in the past...

Hon. H. B. St JOHN: On a point of order. I spoke in this debate. I am not accepting any charge from the Honourable Member that we misled the public in here in respect of any criticisms we made for the lack of power. That is unparliamentary. He cannot say that.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that based on that important misrepresentation, lack

of understanding, about the law of Barbados, lack of memory, lack of careful research, lack of due diligence, all of those things ... There are at least 4 statutory corporations in this country, now, Mr. Speaker, including one in the tourism sector in which there is no such section which gives the Minister power. It may give the Board the responsibility to seek his approval for certain things but does not give the Minister power to give directives to the Board. So that argument has to fall to the ground immediately. You can read the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation Act, you can read the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation Act, you can read the Child Care Board Act. The point I am trying to make is that I agree that such a section should be in the legislation but the fact that it is not there does not cause any doubt in the minds of the operatives in those institutions that the Minister makes the policy. So that any concept that the absence of such a section

Asides.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not going any further with it, Mr. Speaker, because as I say, the facts are there, the law is there and we have never had any doubt in Barbados about the ability of the Minister to make policy in certain sections. I do not expect the Honourable Member for St. Peter, as he did in the last debate, to get up and acknowledge that he has made an error or that his colleague - not he, I am not going to do that to him - has made an error in suggesting that this is the first time that legislation has come here like this.

The point I want to make is that we have made the position clear, that there is no attempt by the Government to reduce the role of the Minister in relation to the development of tourism policy. But there is no Minister who should be of the view, in any sector in which he serves, that he alone is the residuary of all knowledge and at his feet must lie the final decisions in relation to any aspect of policy. Although this was an omission, I am saying that one would have thought that Members of the Opposition who are always so ready, Mr. Speaker, to attack Ministers for dereliction of duty, for failure to perform properly and they should let other people come and do, I am surprised to hear are arguing so vociferously for this strong power to be given to the Minister. But it is a credit to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central because they realise more than anybody else the phenomenal impact that he, as Minister of Tourism, has had on the sector over the past 5 years. They recognise that tourism was lifted out of the doldrums. When a Minister was fully responsible and then subsequently jettisoned in favour of a lesser... 1.30 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not talking about that. I am talking about a real Minister of Tourism. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South's record was quite sorry a record as it was. He never had time to get his act together. It took the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and his successor to pull tourism around. It would be foolhardy of any Government to suggest by way of legislation that it is seeking to reduce the power of the Minister of Tourism.

Now let me deal with the substance of the arguments adduced by the shadow spokesman for Tourism, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph. Every time we have a piece of legislation coming to this House which seeks to change institutional arrangements in public statutory corporations or any other area of Government's activity Honourable Members on that side say and are parrotting constantly that changing the name of the Board will not change anything.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: In the period 1976 to 1986, there were a number of institutional changes in Barbados. The Honourable Members on that side can take credit for changing a number of institutions. When they created those institutions, there was no guarantee that there would be a change. If all you did was to create the ^institutions and nothing happened after that, then you would have failed in your responsibility. I am saying to you that you changed institutions and created institutions. That was done, Mr. Speaker, and it is my understanding that institutional change is an important facet of structural change in a country and that sometimes institutions themselves are unable to be responsive to what is happening around

them. To give effect to structural change, you sometimes have to super-impose institutions or create new institutions, not only to create the appearance of change but to help people to understand that the new institution has a new mandate and a new mission to carry out different objectives. That is part of human life. I do not know that when the Honourable Members introduced institutions and changed institutions anybody on this side in those days would have railed against them simply because they changed the institutions. Even if they

2916

did, perhaps they might have been a bit misguided as Honourable Members on that side are now, Mr. Speaker. There is validity in institutional change. There is great validity in it and, in particular, in relation to the changes that Barbados is going through. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an attempt at any political deception or distraction. This is legislation that is clear for all to see. The objectives are set out and the new arrangements and the way in which the institution is being configured are in the legislation. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that part of the process of structural change in the Barbadian economy is going to require these institutional changes.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter cannot argue, on the one hand, that competitiveness is a major problem in the tourism sector to the same people to whom others have been arguing that for a long time. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the new Tourism Authority under its new mandate is going to have an opportunity to look at the issues of competitiveness, marketing and all of the other issues relating to the development of tourism and to make new and fresh suggestions to the Government of Barbados. There is nothing wrong with that. It is clear that sometimes the way in which institutions that presently exist function is that they are unable to respond to those new challenges and they do not seem to be able to get their teeth into the issues of change that are important.

The point that I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this new institution has created a new structure and is a formidable distinction from the existing arrangements under the Board of Tourism. It establishes a Council to assist in policy making and a Board to implement policies. Now, I understood in the course of this debate Honourable Members on that side, particularly the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, to say that the former Minister of Tourism recognised that there was a need for some kind of advisory committee but at that time there was a lot of resistance. Well, I do not know where the resistance came from. I am assuming that his Cabinet colleagues must have resisted it or prominent "members of his political party must have resisted it, but the point is that, if it is a desirable feature, it does not seem to me that it should be met with the kind of criticism that is presently being advanced by Honourable Members of the Opposition.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point is that you acknowledged that the concept of an advisory committee or council was desirable and that there was resistance to it when it probably should have been implemented. All I am saying is now that it is being implemented and the Minister is required to set up a council, that he is required to take advice and listen to ideas from that council. It is the kind of thing that should be applauded rather than criticised in the way that it is being criticised by Members of the Opposition. To say that you had a council does not answer the question, because it was an informal council and any Minister could have dispensed with it if he wanted. Under this legislation, the Minister is required to establish the Council and to take advice from the Council in relation to tourism policy.

Assuming that this legislation remains on the statute books, no Minister can feel that he must create a tourism policy and guide tourism policy in this country without having inputs from entities and individuals critical to the development of tourism. As I said, it is something that has to be acknowledged as being desirable. You cannot appraise and reprobate at the same time. You cannot say that it is a desirable thing and, when the Government introduces it by way of legislation, turn around and say that something is wrong with the structure of the new entity. That is the kind of criticism that has surfaced in this debate which is unworthy, in my view, of the intellect of the Honourable Members of the Opposition.

Another point that was made is that a new Act is not necessary, which again is a specious point. That is a point which has been carried by persons who know no better to the public and discussed as if it is a major consideration. They say that all you have to do is to amend the existing legislation. Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Attorney General brings amendments to legislation in this House, we constantly hear the

criticism that comprehensive reform of the law is desirable. When you bring the comprehensive reform, you hear that the amendment is the route that you should take and not the comprehensive reform. How can you win in a situation like that? A new Act is in effect, an amendment of an old Act. It changes the law and therefore this legislation seeks comprehensively to put in a package the initiatives Government will be taking in terms of the structure of the Tourism Authority in Barbados. 1.40 p.m.

That is a facetious distinction which I do not think should be accepted. We opted not to go the route of piecemeal amendments to legislation and we opted to go the route of comprehensive reform, so that in one document Barbadians are able to see what the institution that is going to be responsible for Barbados' marketing and promotion and development of tourism is all about. I think that is a positive development. I want to deal with the issue, Mr. Speaker, of competitiveness, because it has been raised in substance by 2 Honourable Members and it is a valid point that has not been missed. The Honourable Member for St. Peter should be aware that when an economy is growing the sectors that are growing fastest should theoretically bear the largest taxation.

Aside.

2917

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is the principle. You cannot tax those that are not earning. The only way Government can get taxes is to tax those areas that are showing some kind of growth. What happens is that after a while, as I understand a normal economic theory, when either transition or some kind of decline takes place, one should adjust one's tax policies, one's fiscal policies, to take account of that decline and seek to shift it. The point is that we are operating in a situation in Barbados right now, Mr. Speaker, where the major sectors are in decline. There is not any option about shifting the burden of taxation and this is why comprehensive tax reform is what we are now doing. The object of that comprehensive tax reform is not to deal with competitiveness in one sector without trying to deal with it in the other. But as we get to the phase of introducing the value-added tax, which one hopes should generate more revenue for Barbados, the removal of the heavy taxes with the cascading impact, of consumption and stamp duties and so on, should take effect.

The point is that there is only one way to do it. It has to be done by a phased approach. We cannot shut down the Customs Department tomorrow and Inland Revenue and wipe the slate clean and start over again. That is not the way Government functions. We accept, and all of the advice we have been given in relation to all the sectors.....

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON:.....that may be a value judgment and a policy decision you have to make. I accept that, but the point is there is more advice the Government receives on sugar, the sugar sector, non-sugar agriculture -they are now complaining that they did not benefit from any of the concessions we recently gave to the other sectors ~ the tourism sector and the manufacturing sector and you have to make a choice in relation to them, what is going to be the source of the revenue to fund Government's ongoing commitments. You cannot say you are going to remove all the taxes on all of them, or remove all the imposts on all the inputs in all of those sectors unless you have some alternative means of raising revenue.

One economist in Barbados has suggested that we move away from personal income tax and indirect tax altogether and we tax property only.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Okay, but I am just telling you these are options, all of which one has to consider. I have seen worse suggestions, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the object of the tax reform Government is undergoing, and particularly the movement towards value-added tax, should provide considerable relief for the tourism sector. The Government, of course, would like to be in a position tomorrow - and the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows this - where it could remove all of those heavy burdens which are in the tourism sector, but at the same time there is pressure from some members of the

Opposition - not the Honourable Member for St. Peter, I must say in all fairness to him - but some of his colleagues have been pressuring the Government to give relief to the manufacturers. There are some who pressure you -to give relief in the sugar sector. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South in the debate on sugar made it very clear about the position of the sugar industry today and the impact of Government's tax policies in the agricultural sector. These are valid points, but you cannot remove all the taxes and all the burdens on everybody at the same time. So the issue of competitiveness is one Government has to deal with.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: We could not wait 6 months with the manufacturers either. We were told from the time the duties were imposed on the manufacturers that they would not last 4 weeks. They were locating to St. Lucia and Guyana overnight.

Mr. Speaker, we have to develop a tax policy which reduces the burden on those sectors which are successful and reduces the burden on people who are using economic resources efficiently. There are some people who hold the view that the persons who should be taxed are those who are not using economic resources efficiently, so that they would use those resources more efficiently and be able to generate income to pay the taxes which are put on them.

I understand the constraints and I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter more than anybody else understands the constraints involved in the relation to our phase in direct taxation, and we have started. On January 14 the Minister of Finance announced in this House that we were removing the imposts on toiletries and other accoutrements or paraphernalia, and in addition to that we have expanded the list of items which form part of the Schedule under the Hotel Aids Act and will be giving those items* exemption from stamp duty, along with the exemption from consumption tax which they now enjoy under refurbishing programmes. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that one hopes that those concessions would contribute to some improvement of the capital stock in the tourism sector and make the sector more vibrant
The Honourable Member for St. Peter called the names of 2 Jamaican businessmen in the tourism sector of whom he says we have to attract their approach to tourism to Barbados.....

Aside.

2918

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: their approach to entrepreneurship. I am not saying you want them, but what I am saying to you is that it is remarkable that at this very time those same Jamaican businessmen, who you value for that entrepreneurship, have either acquired properties in Barbados or are about to acquire properties in Barbados. That must say something about the tourism product in Barbados today. The same 2 businessmen the Honourable Member for St. Peter has spoken about...

Asides.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ... not before 1986, in 1992.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I have some order please? I said order, please. 1.50p.m.
Now the Honourable Member for St. Peter said that we need local investors.

Asides.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Peter is making the point that we need entrepreneurs like that. I am saying to this House that those same entrepreneurs whom he values are now investing in Barbados. One has already invested in the purchase of a hotel, one of our major properties in Black Rock - the Sandals Resorts. You have not credited the Minister of Tourism for being able to attract

that kind of investment to Barbados. It did not take place in your time, yet we are being told that this is what we have to do when it is already happening.

The second Jamaican businessman that the Honourable Member speaks of, as I understand it, is presently showing considerable interest in the purchase of some hotel properties in Barbados. I will not say any more on that.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. John is misrepresenting the point I am making. I make the point, by which I stand, that Barbados needs a spirit of entrepreneurship from its local people in the tourism industry. Whether other entrepreneurs from elsewhere come to Barbados is not my issue. We need to develop Barbadians with entrepreneurship in tourism. Therefore, I must tell the Member for St. John that he is misrepresenting what I said. They are 2 different points altogether.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not misinterpreting anything. I would be very happy myself if the persons who purchased Paradise Hotel...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ... were Barbadians with the same qualities which the Honourable Member for St. Peter has mentioned. All he is really saying is that we do not have Barbadians like that here now. Cunard was not making Paradise available yesterday. Paradise was available for purchase for a long time. That is not a new point. We know that we do not have that entrepreneurial skill. I am saying that the Honourable Member for St. Peter has to be conscious of the fact that he has made the point in this House on several occasions that, when you do not have the skill or the knowledge you can purchase it. He talked about globalisation of services, and when you do not have that skill or knowledge of your own you can purchase it.

Mr. Speaker, investment by those persons in the Barbadian tourism sector is going to have a positive spin-off effect. They are bringing that new concept to tourism which the Honourable Member says is so vital to entrepreneurs in this country. I feel that just having them here is going to have a positive effect on tourism, and I think that is something for which the Government should be congratulated. Every day you hear in this country that there is no new investment, the country is going down the drain and nobody is interested in Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure Honourable Members understand the rules of the House. They will all be given the opportunity to make their responses to the Bill. I cannot permit a Member to be interrupted continually for long periods. I would ask Members to use discretion in their asides.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point is that 2 of his premier hotel entrepreneurs are investing in Barbados at this time when the cost of inputs is so high, when Barbados is supposed to be going down the drain and when all the comments we hear, the litany of woe from Members of the Opposition, are taking place in this country. Something has to be wrong with their perception of change in this country.

Mr. Speaker, nobody out there is being sidetracked by what they are saying. Despite all of the criticisms and despite all of the commentary that originates from that side, people are still investing in this country - in hotels, in golf courses and in other developments and that is going to produce some growth in the Barbadian economy shortly. I cannot give you a date although you would like one.

Asides.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, what I want to hear from Members of the Opposition in relation

to competitiveness is this. The Honourable Member for St. Peter calls for a clear and frank discourse on economics and I am committed to that, too. I want to hear from the Opposition. You know what we are doing. We have published the phased reform of indirect taxation. I want to hear from you what are your priorities in terms of concessions and to which sector they should be given.

I want clearly to understand because I do not wish the manufacturers of Barbados to believe that the Opposition was in any vanguard to give them any kind of succour or assistance. There were some Members over there who agreed that the duty should be removed but the Opposition was not in any vanguard to save the manufacturing sector. We have to be very clear on that. I want to understand where the priorities exist in relation to concessions that should be given and the kinds of tax policies that Government should adopt. That is the kind of frank and clear discourse that should be given. We have already outlined what our policies are in relation to reform of indirect taxation and I would like to hear from Honourable Members what kind of prioritisation they would wish to give to that.

One Honourable Member makes the point about what is earth-shaking about the Bill. We have set out the changes that this Bill will usher in the legislation of issues relating to disclosure of interest, the requirement of the Board of Directors to have a marketing plan, the licensing of hotels and the establishment of a Tourism Council. Those seem to be reasonable objectives and reasonable changes in the context of what we want to achieve.

I want to make 2 final points, Mr. Speaker. The first relates to the question of persons who are selected to serve on Boards in Barbados. I do not wish to reduce any criticism that any Honourable Member over there wishes to make of anybody. They are entitled to say what they want about any citizen of this country. I really consider it demeaning when persons of eminence in this country, whom the private sector have chosen, sometimes to head their biggest and most successful corporations, can be chosen by Government on the basis of that ability to sit on a Board and contribute to national development and all that we can hear from Members of the Opposition is that these people are yardfowls and we are reorganising institutions to provide jobs for yardfowls and for all kinds of party hacks.

I consider that demeaning, Mr. Speaker, because I will tell you this much. There are Members of political parties who sit on Boards some of whom may be there because of their political interest, but there are also members of successful private sector corporations in this country who are members of political parties and that does not make them yardfowls or party hacks. I really have great difficulty with it. The concept of this talk is that this is a "job for the boys" exercise. If that is what they have come into the House of Assembly to talk, I think I should be spared from that and I feel that anybody who is interested in the future of Barbados and institutional change would ignore all of those fatuous arguments. They are not relevant to the institutional reforms that we are...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Government values very highly the contribution of some of those outstanding citizens both in the private corporate world and in the public sector who sit on boards of statutory corporations. For example, when I look at the Board of the new Barbados Investment Development Corporation all of those persons are persons - certainly I have never known them in any political context - who, in the private sector, have made a great contribution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to interject here. I do not think the Honourable Member needs to stress that jxtint much more for the very reason that Standing Order 28(9) specifically deals with the conduct of people in their judicial functions. The problem is when we have these generalisations. It is extremely difficult to apply that kind of interpretation. I have already said in this House that I view the term "yardfowl" not suitable for a place of this standing and dignity. Those people who use it ought to spend a little time and follow what are good parliamentary expressions and the meaning of parliamentary expressions. I have already said that. I wish Honourable Members would put those terms in the right place. 2.00 p.m.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, you have said it better than I could say it. I am not defending anybody who is a member of a board. I am simply saying that I consider it demeaning to try to reduce the

status of those persons by giving the impression that you would ^x carry out a whole institutional reform to fill a board with persons who do not have the repute which is desirable to sit on a board. Any implication like that is undesirable and I agree with you.

The last point, Mr. Speaker relates to the role of international institutions in Barbados. It is really justice....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has gone over his time. Just conclude very quickly.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, it is poetic justice that the Honourable Member for St. Peter, then a public servant, could tell this Honourable House that in those days the members of the teams of the international institutions were not known in Barbados. In fact, it is

2920

well known in Barbados that in 1982 the members of the Cabinet themselves did not even know the IMF was in Barbados so I am not surprised by that particular remark. That is where I wish to end my contribution to this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member who last spoke has broken the rules of this House by saying that members of Cabinet in 1982 were not aware of the IMF programme in Barbados. I draw to Your Honour's attention that, laid on the table of this House in this session, was the document constituting the agreement between Barbados and the International Monetary Fund in 1982. In the said document it specifically said that the programme was discussed at Cabinet before it was entered into.

Certain remarks made by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the records.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House be suspended until 3.15 p.m. this day.

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

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3.15 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. . 2.06 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues on this side in criticising the bringing of this Bill to this Honourable Chamber. I too feel that it is not necessary to bring a bill of this nature to serve the purpose for which it is supposed to serve. I feel that the Act which sets up the Board of Tourism does have some clout in it and there was room for improvement. But I am not convinced that it was necessary to abandon that Act and replace it by this new Bill which has set up a Tourism Authority. It is like having cold soup being warmed up with a couple of dumplings and some meat thrown in. It is still soup. I feel the amendments could have been made and then come with a tidier piece of legislation which would have embodied all of these several amendments.

I consider it a waste of time coming in here to debate this new Bill. I say that because I would have wanted to hear from the Minister, or a spokesman from that side, how many jobs are projected through this arrangement. I do not want to hear any loose or varying statements that jobs are supposed to be derived from this exercise. The public out there is not interested in talking about jobs. They want to have an idea so we can reduce the unemployment which now runs well over 25% in the work force. I am concerned about that so no new legislation whether it is to make a government look good for doing something revolutionary or something new, would suffice. It would not satisfy me at all because every day people out there who are

desirous of working are unable to get work.

I see tourism as a sector in which we should work feverishly in order to create employment. I would like the Government to be a bit more specific and I would say something to them. Government is talking about setting up this Tourism Authority to regulate and involve the private sector. That sounds fine. But I want the Government to understand at the same time that whereas they are talking about giving incentives to people in the tourism industry, yet on the other hand they have just introduced a measure which will affect the same people who work and survive through the tourism industry. I refer to the hike in gasoline and fuel charges. You cannot tell me on the one hand that you are thinking about reviving or making the industry one from which people could make a living and at the same time introduce measures which would prevent people from making a decent living. 3.20 p.m.

I feel that a decent living is what every Barbadian is entitled to and any measure which seeks to reduce that income earning capacity for any worker in Barbados will be of grave concern to me. I want to make this abundantly clear, the hike in fuel will affect the taxi drivers. They will be called upon to pay at least \$1.20 extra per gallon for gasoline. We must also remember that they have already been complaining because tourism has been weak and they were unable to make sufficient money to pay for their vehicles. Now you have the imposition of a gas hike and this certainly would anger them more, driving them into more serious trouble. That is what I want to hear the Government address. What sort of relief are you bringing to those people?

We must also look at other forms of transportation. What about those people who operate coaches? Whether they are diesel propelled or gasoline propelled it means that those people have got additional costs and we must look at them. They are the poor people. They are part and parcel of this tourism industry and we have to think about it. We talk about packages that originate abroad and people here in Barbados cannot reap certain benefits because some of the profits are left abroad. I have to be concerned that when visitors come here, the dollars which they have

2921

are spent by people who work in the tourist industry. I am worried about that. Any additional costs by way of gas hikes or fuel hikes will mean that those products are going to be more expensive.

I will go so far as to say that now the measures are known the additional hike in gasoline will not find its way into the pockets of those taxi and tour operators. We have the same problem. I want the Government to tell me if this Authority is going to guarantee any increase in tourism and if they say there has been an increase in tourism over the past year what are you changing now for? I would have thought that what you would do is to identify the areas of problem where you have weak markets and concentrate your promotion efforts there and try to strengthen the Board of Tourism. I cannot understand the argument. I find it difficult to accept an argument that the mere setting up of a new authority would bring any additional benefits to Barbados. What we need in Barbados is to address the problems that confront tourism. We have to think about the problems of crime against visitors in particular and arrest some of the lawlessness in Barbados. Try to put people back to work so that there will be a bit more peace in this country.

We have to talk about law and order. We have to think in terms of what has happened in Barbados over the last year, where there has been reduced staff at NCC. When you look around Barbados now you can see the country needs debushing. It needs beautifying again. What are we doing? These are things that the tourists look forward to when they come here and I would want to hear what is the policy on that. Are you going to see to it that NCC is strengthened so that they can once again beautify Barbados? I feel that one of the things that attract a visitor firstly is what he sees around the environment and there is a lot to be done around the airport. The first impression and the last impression of the visitor to a country is vitally important. We need to look at these things. As I said, it is all right talking about the Authority. That is one thing but we have to look at how best we can present our product at home.

We have heard the Minister and the Government talk about sports tourism. I want the Government to understand it is all right talking about sports tourism but we have to understand that if you are talking about sports tourism it is either that when the visitors come here you have facilities available to them so that they

could use them; or, the sports that you have in Barbados are of a standard that the visitors would wish to leave their hotels and go out and enjoy a game.

Now we have to look at that and I would hope that any new authority would consider looking at how best we could give reality to what is called sports tourism. Loosely, sports tourism is, to some people, linking the Ministry of Sports to the Ministry of Tourism. That is all it means to them. And it is not that, Mr. Speaker. It is not just employing someone who was an outstanding member or an outstanding sportsman in the area of tourism. That is not sports tourism. We have to understand what we are talking about. If, as the Minister said he wants to attract people, golfers from Japan and elsewhere, into Barbados he has to understand that facilities must be here and we must be able to promote them and stop having an unclear policy. We have an unclear policy as to what we are going to do. We need to take decisions and go ahead and let those decisions be realised.

I would like to see, even on the curricula of the schools, the subject of tourism being taught. If we recognise that tourism is one of the main planks of our economy then we have to address this serious problem in the schools so that people at a very early age will recognise the importance of tourism to our economy. I want to hear policies enunciated by the Government. There is a wonderful opportunity the Government has now to incorporate it as part of the Social Studies syllabus in the schools. I know it might be very difficult to teach tourism as one subject but I know it is not difficult to include it in a syllabus called Social Studies. I am calling on the Minister, or for the Government, to consider that. That is why there is such a negative attitude towards tourism, because they hear about tourism but they do not understand what it is. It is something we have to take seriously like agriculture. They talk about agriculture and growing crops and they do not understand what is meant by mechanization of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that we are thinking in terms of restructuring. The approach to tourism must change. It is all right bringing people from abroad. Yes it is all well to go on promotion tours but we have another problem even when we go abroad to attract people to Barbados. I want the Government to take into consideration or to be very serious about this whole question of transportation. The Minister, not too long ago, went to Australia. I heard him here, last week, in his contribution explaining the difficulty in getting people in Germany coming to Barbados because of the connections from Australia to Barbados.
3.30 p.m.

I was taken back because I did not know that it was more difficult to get from Germany to Barbados than from Australia to Barbados. That is what the Minister said. Do you know why this is so? This is so because we have not negotiated the air transportation. I am going to say to the Government that you can go out and do all the promotion that is possible; if you do not have the aircraft or the air freight arrangements, you are going to be at square

2922

one again. That is one of the problems. That reminds me of the problem that BWIA is having in being regarded as a regional carrier. Lots of things are happening in the airline industry. I would think that Government should, within their tourism policy, make provision for transportation. No matter what you do and no amount of promotion will succeed unless you have airlines to bring the people to Barbados. It is very, very important. The other side is talking about an Authority and what this Opposition is opposed to. Sir, I will say this. My position is simple on this matter of the powers of the Minister to have a say on a Board. I agree that, if the Minister does not know how to use that power, do not give it to him. I think that that is what the Government might have intended in this. That is my opinion, Mr. Speaker. I think it was deliberate because they found out that the Minister cannot use it and, therefore, decided to omit it deliberately. I said that this is my opinion, Sir. I do not want to reflect on anyone's integrity. That is why this side is so concerned. We feel that that power of the Minister should be reinstated in the Bill so that any other Minister who knows how to use it may use it. That is all we are saying. I do not want the Government side to get out there and think otherwise. We are not worried. It could be there, but it depends on whether you are capable of handling the powers when you get them.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there has been a decline in the environmental standards in Barbados. I

want the Government to understand this that you have to think in terms of repeat visitors. People come to Barbados. We can talk all the talk in here about attracting new markets. That is all right. But we have to ask ourselves whether those people are going to come back. What is the Government doing to ensure that people will come back to Barbados? That is important. One time and do not come back! Then we are going to Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong and all about the place. That is why I support the Minister. I know that at the same time this Bill was intended that he cannot go on any more promotion trips. We feel that is not fair to him. That is why I join my colleagues on this, Sir. I was vexed when I saw it because I think he would have done a good job even if just to see the West Indies win the World Series.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to understand 1 or 2 things before I go any further. I want to correct something that the Minister, when he introduced this Bill, said I think it is only fair for me to get up and set the record clear. Hansard is read and it is a document held for posterity and I do not want it to appear from what the Minister said last week that there was any truth in what he said. I want to make this abundantly clear. When the Minister said that I handed him a letter of dismissal, there is no truth in that because the Minister knows full well that a Minister should not hand anybody a letter of resignation. I am not a message boy. He knows that this quality person would not deliver him a message. I am not a messenger. He knows that. There is no truth in that. I just want to set the record straight because my contribution will be read too. I want to go on record that there is no truth in that. The Minister also went on to say that I disagreed with him and that I said certain things to him. That is not true. This is all right when we are discussing in a light manner, but Hansard is too important a document for me to ignore these things. The truth of the matter is that the National Sports Council, on which the Minister served, came up for renewal on which the Minister was a member and he was in Australia on an assignment as Manager of the West Indies team. When it went to Cabinet and as the Minister said in here last week that Cabinet decides, it decided that he would no longer be a member of the Sports Council. I want that written in the record so that no one hearing his contribution will point a finger at me. I want to correct that. It is only fair because the Minister said that he does not want people to mistake him and he got up and objected. I have a right to get up and set the record straight.

Sir, I want to pass on. I want the Government to understand too that we have to look at the cost. I go back to this whole question of fuel charge and what it can do to our tourism product. All these things would hinge on whether our hotel rates are expensive. Some years ago we heard criticism that our hotel rates were too high and people were turned off because of that. I just want the Government to understand that it must watch closely what the increase in fuel charge will do to rates at the hotels. Let us be sober about this. They can rant and rave on what they feel, but I am going to be realistic. I want the Government to understand what I am saying. It means an up in rates and makes it very difficult for the hoteliers to operate at the same cost. We have to watch that and see whether or not the promotions will not be in vain because of the same criticism that the rates are too high. I am saying that when you increase the fuel charge that you see it immediately on the electricity bill. I suppose someone will get up and say: "Well, Government has been offering incentives through the solar system." But there is no solar system that will assist in defraying or reducing the electricity cost.

Sir, I am asking Government to look at that. I would like the Minister to address that particular problem. It is one that he cannot escape. He cannot get up and deny that the hoteliers will have to operate like that. That is another area which Government should look at and see how best it can offer some kind of consideration to these operators. We are looking at reducing cost. Yes, we support Government's initiative in offering certain concessions to the tourist industry. Yes, we support that and it is

2923

ry much welcomed in this time of recession. We also want to see agriculture and manufacturing grow and this position will support any initiative that Government sees in order to keep those 3 engines of the economy going. It does not matter whether we tell you that. We have been saying that ever since. It is just a matter of these things coming too late and we have to see what damage has been done and whether the medicine has been introduced too late in the life of the patient. That is what are concerned about. 0 p.m.

This Opposition is not irresponsible, and no attack and counter attack by the Government will prevent us from saying what we have to say in the interest of our country, have said repeatedly that no Member over here is

going to be that irresponsible as to make statements which will affect the smooth running of this country. But we have a duty to point out to the Government when it is doing something wrong which will not be in the interest of this country. We see a flaw or oversight and they should welcome any comment by the Opposition. Why are they going to abuse the Opposition? I am a Member of this loyal Opposition and I am prepared to say this: Thank heavens we have pointed out the errors and the Government has taken note and taken heed and is prepared to accept the amendments. That is the role of an opposition.

I do not want to hear from the Government side any attacks on us. I want the Government to look at the problems that confront this country. The crime situation needs to be addressed and must be addressed. I want to hear that the new Authority or the Government has put in place a plan which would go hand in hand, or alongside, i.e. setting up of this new Tourism Authority. We have to put those measures in place. I want the Government to look at whatever arrangements they have in the light of what is going on in the world and what we are hearing now about the West Indies and other things, to find out whether we can have reliable, frequent, air carriers to and from Barbados. The Government should be negotiating all along to make sure that we have this form of transportation.

I hear the criticism that the Board is too big. It is not our problem that the Government is now trying to reduce its size. Everybody knows the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was the Minister who expanded the Board of Tourism. That has to be put in the record. The present Minister of Health was the Minister of Tourism and he expanded it to about 19 or 20. Anything said by that side now to reduce it to a sizeable or workable number can only be a criticism of the Honourable Member, and he got up here laughing, because he does not understand it was a reflection on him. I agree that sometimes these Boards are too big and are not effective, but at the same time it does not say that a small Board is going to be effective in any case. It depends on the quality of people you put on it and their ability to work. Some of them are allergic to work and others, as a reward for some other consideration, are put on the Board. I am going to say something now which is very important. We had better, with all we are doing now, try to find out how the staff of the Board of Tourism feels. There is a lot of rumbling down there and I would like to know that the staff is treated fairly and properly, according to the best established principles and standards. For too long people have sat and watched a lot of wrong things going on. I am hearing some things and I am beginning to wonder if the Government is serious. I do not want to hear that these things are implemented. There are members of staff who have worked hard on the Board of Tourism, beyond the call of duty, and it will not be fair for them to be overlooked for certain jobs that they are capable of and qualified to do while others are brought in over their heads. That would create confusion and undermine the purpose and the objective of the Authority.

Let me start with that. Anybody will tell you that where the industrial climate is suspect, there must be problems for that institution. We have to have the manpower at the Board of Tourism. We have had problems down there with them and all is not well. I want to tell the Government that. There are signals out there that all is not well at the Board of Tourism. The staff is not satisfied with what they are hearing, but because of these hard times they have to put up with it because they want to keep their jobs. That is the reason. Do not think that because they are holding on they are happy and satisfied with the arrangements. You have to look at that. I pray that Government will take into consideration what is happening there and treat the staff properly.

I know how it is done, you know. You change a Board to get rid of people and I hope that is not one of the reasons behind this. Because you feel the Board cannot do the job, you bring in a new institution with new conditions and you have an opportunity, with a new Board and new members, to do the work you cannot do.

I want also to warn the union which represents those workers because there will be some changes. I have not heard them say whether they have been consulted on this change and their input. No one representing the workers has spoken. I know that in this sort of transition the unions, those who represent the workers, should be involved and I want to be satisfied because I know about industrial relations. There is going to be a lot of problems. We are asking a lot of questions if this matter is not handled properly. The unions should be involved. Let me know whether they have made an input. The Minister did not say that in his presentation. We want to know all of this so

that there will not be any hitches when this Authority gets underway.

I have pointed out some of the problems that need to be addressed. You are going to hear some other rumblings out there with the fare hikes and we have to look at that. That must be controlled, because it would have a bearing on the delivery of our product. We need to remove all these problems so that we can all get on with the job. While welcoming the Government's declared initiative to improve the product, I feel that it has gone in the wrong direction, because the setting up of a new body does not allay the fears which exist in the industry.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be too long because a lot of the major points which should have been made have already been made by the speakers who preceded me on this side. Since we met today the Government has now circulated to the House certain amendments to the Bill, one of which introduces a new Clause 12 giving to the Minister a power to give policy directions to the Board of the new Authority. 3.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the original Bill circulated as long as October 1992 from the Ministry to the private sector had no such provision in it. Therefore, I still find it extremely difficult to accept that the Government's policy, as initially thought out, was not to deprive the Minister of power in order to pronounce on policy matters. I am making statements in this country that are factual whether in this House or outside. It is an afterthought, having heard the criticism from this House, for the Government now to seek to make the alteration which is being made by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I underscore the point because I can recall statements coming from the Government's side as well that this so-called new authority would almost have independence and powers similar to those of the Central Bank. I remember that very clearly.

I am going to explain why that was the Government's policy. I think other Members have said it has been under pressure from the IMF. Government is caught up in this so-called restructuring that it is talking about, institutional and otherwise. Really it has lost its ideological and policy direction. I am therefore not surprised that there are so many different signals which are coming even from the measures which Government introduced in this House.

The Government would know that recently, for instance, the Swedish Government abolished its tourist board and said that the matter of tourism policy should now be a matter for the private sector. That feeling is one that is enunciated very clearly by the IMF and the World Bank and the IDB and is a policy that was being sold to the Government and the Government was falling for it.

It is not a policy that is suitable for small developing economies such as those here in Barbados which are dependent particularly on one industry almost as a mono-culture which tourism has become for us. As a matter of fact, if the Government had been listening to those persons regionally who have been researching this problem, it would have read and seen that the best advice from the Caribbean was to reject the IMF dictates on this matter. Therefore I find it very difficult when the Prime Minister gets up and glibly tells us that this was really only a private sector viewpoint. I really find it almost impossible to accept the Prime Minister's word even as I found it difficult to accept his word on the IMF and devaluation, and events have proven me to be correct. I think it is the Prime Minister in his verbalistic dance which has always some excuse to give us on these matters.

I say to the Government it must think out policies that are clear and unmistakable in their direction in making changes in Barbados. I am very happy to see that it has restored that policy. We are different. The private sector here will never generate the money in order to take on the full cost of marketing Barbados. It will never generate all of the ideas which are necessary to give direction to how we go in tourism or in any other industry for that matter.

While I readily concede that the private sector has a role to play we, ourselves, may have to push the

private sector into playing the role that it ought to play in this economy. When I speak about the private sector I do not only speak about the former Big Six. I am talking about the whole growing number of entrepreneurs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the majority ownership of hotels in Barbados is with the Barbadian people and that is a good thing. A lot of the small hotels, in particular, are locally owned, I would like to see that ownership widened. Therefore, I am very concerned with the privatisation of Heywoods. Even if Government has to withhold the privatisation plan for a while some of the sale of those shares must involve some local participation particularly among the widest economic class in Barbados.

I have always deeply felt that we have to enfranchise people in this country in economic terms if we are not to get the problems of race as well as the problem of class bludgeoning us out. Do not make any mistake of it. They are not isolated problems. They are twin problems. The next generation of Barbadians are going to be confronted with them in a very serious way.

We must, therefore, as planners in this country, aim our economic policies, particularly in the prime industry,

2925

towards making sure that people have a stake in this country. When therefore the Honourable Member for St. Peter speaks about this I do not think it is any answer for the Honourable Member for St. John to say merely that he has attracted 2 Jamaican investors. What has happened, certainly in the case of what has taken place there, has been an exchange of one form of ownership from outside because Cunard must have got permission to take out the money that was being brought in by the other person.

What I want to see is new investment expanding the capacity of the tourist plant gearing tourism towards an optimum size that we can manage in the context of an Island such as ours, of our size and our economic indices. The problems confronting the tourist industry are not new in 1993. This Bill is not a solution to all of those problems.

I addressed the Barbados Hotel Association on April 26, 1990. I will lay a copy of the speech as a document of this House. I pointed out then that despite the fact that tourism had become our first billion dollar industry and despite the fact it was now making such a valuable contribution to foreign exchange and making the difference between the collapse and the survival of the economy of Barbados we were leaving its problems unattended for too long.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, once again I have been proven right in this country because when the rot set in even worse, in 1990-91, in tourism itself, we saw the complete collapse of the Barbados economy. We have had a consistent period of negative growth moving from recession into slump, but the warning was there. I analysed then that some of the problems were made by the Government itself either by its acts of commission or its acts of omission. Some of them still confront us.

Let us take the Government's failure to develop convention facilities. What sensible Government would have spent \$11 million to \$16 million on constructing Sherbourne as a priority to have it now 40% finished, old iron rotting, whereas that same \$16 million could have been poured into the tourist industry and directed into proper convention facilities. Don't tell me that the convention facilities is the gymnasium.

Barbados is still not in the top class when we call for convention facilities. The convention business as part of the long-stay visitor arrival business is still an important part of the development of tourism. 4.00 p.m.

I said then, Sir, that one of our problems - I am talking about April 26, 1990 - was lack of proper yachting and marina facilities. We are almost 3 years on. In fact I have been articulating this before. Where are the Government's concrete plans, if any at all, being put in motion for developing facilities?

The Leader of the Government came down here today and he talked about the different licences. I am going to attack those to show that his arguments were wrong. But it is the lack of direction from the Minister of Finance as Prime Minister and head of the Cabinet, who puts his emphasis on the wrong things at the wrong times and too slowly that has virtually collapsed the Government and the economy, including tourism. One really has to say this in debate because unless it is repeated, people tend to forget it and get into a euphoria by the sort of words we hear. But I am talking about concrete matters that one has to do in a

concrete way. They are related very much to this debate where tourism is still the No. 1 earner for Barbados and the one with the quickest potential for getting us out of the rut the Government and the Prime Minister has thrown us into.

I talked then in my speech on April 26, 1990 of the wastage of advertising expenditure. I referred in particular to the wastage of half a million U.S. dollars that took place with the firm in New York that collapsed and went into bankruptcy, that is, a million Barbados dollars to Vanbrunt. Those are the matters we have to remind the public of. That is not going to be wiped out by bringing an institutional so-called framework with a couple of features that are changed when we are talking of serious things. The same problems occurred in Montreal in advertising. The Government must not get away in the debate and keep telling the country that nothing is wrong. We are making all these tremendous changes and the problems have come because of some worldwide condition when most of them are man-made in here by a government that dithers, delays and cannot take effective action in time. Look at the problem with Trump. Trump was supposed to be the saviour. I can go through a whole set of wastage. It came and went and was not a trump card for anything other than for a few people. These are the tremendous problems we are having.

Let us talk about law and order on the beaches. In my speech again in April, 1990, to the Hotel Association I pointed out that the Government was not dealing timely with the problem on the beaches despite the size of the Police Force. Jet ski legislation took us a long time to get down here. Those are realities. If you are directing the Government you have to be sitting down on your Ministers daily and coordinating and urging them in many different ways in order to get moving. I am not putting any blame at any Minister of Tourism on this one. I believe the problem was beyond him and it should have been in the Prime Minister's hand. I am not accepting for one moment that Saddam Hussein sat in Baghdad and caused the Barbados industry to be in the position it is in today. But you see, the Prime Minister argues in this way. He gives you part of the story and he leaves out important parts.

2926

He comes down with a well prepared speech in which he jumps into the debate first and makes people believe that reform is working - I am going to try to get his words. He says now we are improving in tourism and we are back on a growth period. Now, why does he say so? The Minister takes and puts together the cruise ship figures and the long-stay visitors. When you are judging an industry such as obtains here, the major impact comes from your long-stay visitors. Two things have happened. We have lost market share in long-stay visitors in the North American market and have been losing it for some time. We have been lucky that our currency position was such that we got the benefit without much action on our part of what was happening with the currencies in Europe. But we have lost market share and we have continued to decline in these vital areas for long-stay visitors. Although last year most of the Caribbean destinations improved, Barbados itself went negative. The figures up to November last year do not seem to show that we have done much better than the year before. So I am not as optimistic as the Prime Minister is about this.

Let us take one of the other problems I highlighted then which still persists with us. The Minister is saying it is very difficult to get airlines to come here etc. and obviously they promise you things. In April 26, 1990 to the Hotel Association I stressed the unavailability of airline seats as a major problem confronting us. I remember very well when Pan Am collapsed. I remember then 2 Ministers of Government, not one, running up at that time to get something in place. I remember the Minister of Tourism in particular coming back and saying how they had got Trump and this was the solution.

Now, firstly, my accusation against the Government is that they were too late in monitoring what was happening in the airline industry. Many people who were reading the periodicals and newspapers and analysing what was happening would have seen that coming. Our actions should not have been a last minute running up to fix the thing right. We should have been out there before hand making the right contacts and trying to have the correct solutions. Even when we said we had put it right it came to a stop. I am asking the Government what is the position now? What are the long-term plans it has in hand to ensure that Barbados, up to the year 2 000 in the foreseeable future, would have available to it the number of seats

needed to build the industry up to about 500 000 annually?

Mr, Speaker, I agree tourism has a role to perform and probably is the only sector that can perform the role for bringing about quick, economic potential development here, solving the socio-economic problems and helping us to stabilise the economy. It is, in my view, the centre-piece of the service industries. For economies such as Barbados, we have to become service oriented. It is not that I am writing off manufacturing, nor am I writing off agriculture.

We have to attend to those as well but it is extremely important that the one we can do best with we should put our emphasis on. That is why I was a little disappointed with the Honourable Member for St. John when he dealt with the problem of competitiveness. His response to the Honourable Member for St. Peter was to say that when an economy is growing fast, the temptation is to tax that economy and, therefore, when problems sefer in then you start to look to probably alleviate the tax.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order. I said the sector. When the sector is growing the tendency is to tax that sector because that is the only source from which you can get revenue.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: What I am saying, Sir, is that there is a time when Government will only get growth from reversing taxation but we knew, Sir, as long ago as 1989 and in 1990, I was making the point that there was a tremendous burden being placed on the hotel industry by the nature of the increasing indirect taxes and that therefore we had to reduce them. I said I would make my speech a document of the House, Sir, and I want to read from it, Sir: 4.10 p.m.

"The time has come for Government to put a halt to the draconian tax measures which have been the hallmark of fiscal policy over the past 3 years. Future increases in Government's revenue must come from the growth of the economy and not from hikes in the tax rate. The Barbados Labour Party is committed to the reduction in the burden of the direct taxes on a basket of goods used by the ordinary man and woman and on commodities which are used as critical food and beverage inputs by the tourism sector."

Now, Sir, that is a clear policy. When I hear them say that you don't hear policy from the Barbados Labour Party or that we are just there... Those were the days they were saying I was just jumping for power. All Henry Forde wanted was power. But they were a correct analysis of this country's problems and offering concrete suggestions for them. If the Government had had any sense and listened it would have stolen the ideas, run with them and most likely would still have retained the Government for having stolen my clothes and run with them. It did not steal the clothes. The Democratic Labour Party used a subterfuge language and confused the people and it has ended up landing themselves and the country in a tremendous hole. One of these days somebody will objectively analyse what I said and when I said it and how I said it and understand that on this side of the House, under this leadership, there has been a clear understanding of this country's problems and the way in which to go about providing the solutions for them, Sir.

I want, Sir, in the other few minutes that I intend to speak and that are available to me to revert to a few

2927

problems with the Bill. Firstly I want to talk about the cruise ships position. I believe that the cruise ship tourism is going, for the foreseeable future, to be the fastest growing area in tourism. Not necessarily as my friend, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South reminds me, in money. We cannot because it is the fastest growing sector neglect the promotion and the marketing that is necessary for it for the long stay visitor. Someone who comes from Europe and stays 9.5 days contributes in the long run more than the cruise ship visitor who passes through for a few hours and shops here. But we need that cruise ship visitor and because the economies on which we depend are spending on the building of cruise ships we must therefore be in there ahead of the developments in the market and make use of it, as Leroy Sisnett saw so clearly back in the early eighties. Only last week I was reading the *Financial Times* where they said the biggest cruise liner that has ever been built in the history of the world is now being built in Italy at a cost of US \$400 million by one of the lines which fly into Barbados. I believe therefore we must position ourselves to maximise the haul from the cruise ship industry, particularly since 53 per cent of all cruise ship passengers come to the Caribbean. That is a high proportion.

We must recognise that our competition in this regard is coming not only from our brothers and sisters within the Caribbean including Mexico for this purpose, but it is coming from the Pacific rim countries and in particular we have to recognise that Singapore sees itself as the major hub. But what is it doing? It is not only talking. Singapore has recognised that it has to put on the ground and in place, the measures to make use of the opportunities that were there. Therefore this Government must look after the infrastructure of Barbados. It is a disgrace when you drive down the West Coast, for instance, to see the state of that highway. It discourages people. It is a disgrace to see the condition under which we have allowed the bush to grow wild all over Barbados. These things are not conducive to the condition. We must be ahead in the developments at the seaports and also in our ex bond or in bond duty free[^] shopping. We must be ahead in this regard. And whilst I know that there has been some discussion with the private sector, through the Inter-American Development Bank, for the development of better facilities at the port in Bridgetown, I believe that we have to put much more accent on that and try to push it as fast as possible. I believe that we should also expand in a proper manner the duty free shopping.

I have seen the reports coming out of Foreign Exchange Committee and they have adverted to the matter rather cursorily; not in the detail that it deserves in my view. Time does not allow me to go into their recommendations and some other ideas I have on the matter, Sir. But we must take it seriously beyond a mere foreign exchange committee. We must take it very seriously in the planning units, not only in the tourism sector but in a coordination of the Ministries responsible and the new Tourist Board is not going to coordinate that policy. It must be coordinated at a higher level than we are getting. That is why I believe it will be necessary to get your planners within the Governmental structure, not merely on Government Boards, sensitised and responsible for policy. In this regard we differ from Sweden and some of the other countries that are thinking of abolishing ministerial direction in this way.

The cruise ship business is one that we really have to attend to much more seriously than we are doing now and Barbados should aim to become a home port for cruise ships. We have to do a lot more, not only with legislation but with a lot of other things that we are doing.

Sir, the prospect for growth in tourism worldwide is quite significant. By 1989 there were US\$2 450 billion in that industry. Today it is well over US\$3 000 billion. It is the fastest industry in the world, outside of entertainment and sport, the other 2 fast growing industries which are related. I think we also therefore have to deal with them.

I want to advert to a point I would have expected to hear the Government's policy on entertainment. I would also have expected to hear the Government's policy on how it is answering the competition that will come from St. Lucia and Cuba when both of them move to casino gambling. What are the Government's ideas on that? Government sat down without telling us its ideas. I want to hear its ideas. I want to hear the Government's ideas. They are the Government. Tell us what are your ideas, Sir. I have to ask how they are going to deal with the matter. Let them tell us how they are thinking on this matter and whether investors that are coming to them are raising the issues. Has the Government got a clear cut policy on these matters? What are they saying on it, Sir? I am asking and if you come to the House to discuss tourism you are the people who are in the driver's seat. Tell us what is your policy. Don't wait until you find out what the Opposition is thinking. I want to hear the Government. How does it see its competition out of Cuba and matters of this nature? I want to hear the Government on it. The country wants to hear the Government on it.

The final point I wish to make on this Bill, Sir. I do not accept the Prime Minister's characterisation of some of these so-called measures as any new measures. He listed 6, Sir. I have to answer them because he was dealing in particular with the position enunciated by the Honourable Member for St. Joseph who opened the debate on our side and the contribution of the Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

2928

Now the Government says that for the first time there is licensing of tourism accommodation. I say the Prime Minister obviously does not understand the Act. In 1982, regulations were made under the existing law to deal with the whole question of registration classification and licensing. If a Prime Minister today is going to get up and make a big intervention with a well prepared speech in here and tell the House that this

Bill is new because he has licensing of hotels in it and this is a departure, I say he is not fit to be Prime Minister of the country on matters of this nature. He does not understand what he is dealing with. As long ago - the regulations are from 1982 and he has not researched his work properly. If you are leading a Cabinet and you do not do the research, well you cannot understand this matter. 4.20 p.m.

Sir, the Prime Minister also said that it will now have a function to transform it into a marketing thrust. The Prime Minister should know that every year consistently 2 things happen in marketing. There was no long-term plan in marketing. Every officer reported from destination overseas to the Marketing Manager who provided an overall plan. If you want some of the expertise in the Tourist Board, he knew some of them. I am not afraid to say so but then the Ministry also did it. The Annual Marketing Plan to legislate it, in practical fact, is nothing new if you were following tourism in this country, What is the point in coming down here? Do you mean you are putting it into law now? But it is something that you can achieve by administrative means and it has been achieved.

Sir, he said too that the report had to be audited. Do you mean that the Board of Tourism Reports have never been audited? The Auditor General could always call for it. My concern, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill is that when the Minister gets the Report that we are concerned with the provision that he should only give it to the Public Accounts Committee as soon as is practicable. Now I have difficulties with that because my experience as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee tells me that, when I write to Ministers and say that you have got a report from a statutory "board in your hand, I do not get the response as promptly as to satisfy the Public Accounts Committee that we can do our job. It is important and I am going to stress it. The Public Accounts Committee has an important role to perform in relation to these statutory boards. But Ministers must lay the reports quickly within a limited time frame so that if there is any corruption that people are alleging, founded or unfounded, it can be investigated and I can make a report here. But the Public Accounts Committee of this House will never function properly until we straighten out things like this and I regret to see this legislation therefore coming down in this manner.

Sir, the other thing is disclosure of directors' interests. What is new? There has been a direction given even before the Labour Party succeeded the Democratic Labour Party in 1976. I have heard the Right Honourable Errol Barrow say in this House that he always directed to anybody sitting on a statutory board that they had to make a disclosure of interest. What is new about that? Do you mean that it did not happen under this Government and under this Prime Minister's directions. I really regret to say that his excuse for the reason of updating the legislation is quite lame.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has run out of time.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, what we have here is that Government believes because the IMF has requested institutional change that it must make something look as though it is new. I regret that I am deeply disappointed by the Government's thrust in tourism at this time and its failure to take the concrete steps which we so badly need in this country.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, to some extent, I have been pulled into this debate with reference to matters for which I believe that I have some responsibility. Nobody has ever said that this legislation which is proposed will be the panacea for all the tourism ills, if there are any, and I presume that there are some, that exist in this country today. Nobody ever said that. All that this Bill does, Sir, is to provide a framework and infrastructure within which to launch a constructive attack on these problems and provide a better environment in which tourism can flourish in this country.

Sir, I agree with some of the things said on the other side that it is important if tourism is to make any significant progress in Barbados that it will be necessary to have a sufficient airline capacity in order to provide the kind of support that tourism will require. Now these things are easy to say. We can say that very easily, but to get these things done it is exceedingly difficult. Very recently, Sir, those who might have been following the trend in airlines over the past few years will note the turmoil that exists in that industry. British Airways announced that 1992 has been the most turbulent of years for the airline industry in the world. It was stated, and I do not remember the exact figure, that probably \$300 billion in losses have been incurred by the airline industry during the past year, 1992 alone.

Sir, it is so easy to say go out and get airlines to come into Barbados. In that environment, Sir, how is it easy to get airlines to come into Barbados? It is not as if we have been sitting doing nothing within the

Ministry in terms of trying to attract airlines into this country. This is something that occupies the attention of the Ministry for which I have the responsibility on a daily basis. There is no day that we are not discussing among ourselves and

2929

persons overseas ways and means of getting services into this country. I go back almost from the time that I became Minister and I can go back from the collapse of Eastern Airlines. At that time two Ministers as well, not only after the collapse of Pan Am, went first to Miami and then to New York. We had discussions with various airlines in the hope of being able to attract airlines into this country. We spoke with Delta. We hope that we could have had some discussions with United at the time. We were not able to meet with them for various reasons. Meanwhile, Eastern Airlines announced that it would recommence flights into Barbados and that new service that recommenced only lasted one month or 6 weeks, as the case may be. I think it recommenced sometime in December or early January and by the end of January it ended. Sir, in 1991, Pan Am collapsed. It is all right to say things but they collapsed. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly an airline in the United States that has not filed for bankruptcy. One has to understand in the first place the North American culture as it relates to bankruptcy proceedings and for one reason or another these companies, corporations or what have you file for bankruptcy. The fact that an airline has filed for bankruptcy or any company has filed for bankruptcy does not necessarily mean there will be a discontinuation of the operation of that company or corporation.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Precisely, they filed under Chapter 11. This does not mean that it is going to collapse. 4.30 p.m.

There are airlines in the United States of America who have filed for Chapter 11 status under the bankruptcy laws of the United States of America to secure protection from their creditors. This does not mean that they will collapse. Some of them do this and come out of it. Pan Am did it and Pan Am did not come out of it. The fact that it did it does not mean it was not going to come out, but when Pan Am collapsed the Minister of Tourism and I and some of our respective officials and persons from the Board of Tourism went to Atlanta and met with officials of Delta. Delta at the time seemed very interested in the discussion we had with them. We came back to Barbados and sent them all the information we had on Barbados, we put together a video on Barbados and we tried our best to get the Delta service running into Barbados.

When Pan Am collapsed, United bought out its South American service and United has been travelling into the Caribbean, if only into Trinidad, but via its South American rotation. So that United flies into Trinidad & Tobago out of Caracas. I will probably come back to that a little later, because I understand that will cease sometime later in this year. <We made tremendous efforts, we did all we could, in order to invite additional services from other airlines into Barbados. I am talking about scheduled services, I am not talking about non-scheduled services, because we are forever seeking to get non-scheduled services into Barbados.

Some time last year, Sir, I again made a visit, this time to Dallas, and we spoke with American Airlines. We wanted American Airlines to do a number of things. They were about to start the Miami service and we asked them to start a service out of New York. There were other services we were trying to get them to do that are not now traditional services into Barbados, for example, Sir, like a service from Orlando into Barbados, because we felt we could capture a significant portion of those European visitors, perhaps, and others who fly into Orlando. There are several services from several countries into Orlando on a weekly basis and we felt we might be able to capture some of those visitors, particularly European visitors who have long vacations, who might spend a week, a week and a half or 2 weeks in Orlando, and we were hoping we would be able to attract them into Barbados or the Caribbean for at least one week. To do this, however, we must have a service from Orlando to Barbados. We spoke not only to American Airlines about it, but to BWIA and British Airways. We have not as yet been able to attract any of the airlines to fly from Orlando into Barbados. Atlanta is considered to be almost a home port of Delta, but we have not been able to get Delta or any other airline to fly to Barbados. Happily, Sir, I think it is well known

now that American Airlines is putting on an additional service in a few days' time out of New York. That is one of the things we discussed when the Minister and I went to New York in 1990 or thereabouts to speak also with American Airlines, not only with Delta. At that time, the time of the collapse of Eastern, American Airlines was rearranging its services into the Caribbean via the San Juan hub. We tried at the time to explain to them that it did not make sense mounting the service from New York into Barbados because Pan Am ran a profitable service from New York into Barbados and we felt it would have been inopportune at that time for us, and probably for American Airlines as well; if they were to discontinue that service, but they had a number of services from several different cities into San Juan and they felt it best to shuttle passengers from San Juan into Barbados. I am glad to see they have now come back around to the position of again mounting a direct flight from New York, as they had done it before, into Barbados as well as a direct flight from Miami into Barbados.

We had other discussions with American as well which involved other services, but I will not go into that now. Suffice it to say we have not been leaving it to

2930

chance to see if anybody would want to come and mount the service into Barbados, because we realise that Barbados does not owe anybody a living and there is no good reason why they would necessarily want to fly into Barbados. Obviously, Sir, if it made good economic sense they would do this, but our belief is that we have to go out in the marketplace and try to encourage these traditional airlines to fly into Barbados. We have met, as I have explained, Sir, with limited success and that is the American market I am speaking about.

Now we have problems on the Canadian market. Here again the turmoil in aviation has caught up with the Canadian companies. There is no Canadian company I know of which is not in trouble. The flights from Canada, I understand, are coming in half empty. That is the whole point I am making, that all the services, not only services to Barbados from Canada, all the Canadian airline companies, wherever they come from or fly to in this world, are in difficulties. Air Canada has served us for many years. That airline is in tremendous financial difficulty and it is the same with all its competitors in Canada.

Only very recently Air Canada has been hoping, with Trinidad, to make a bid for LIAT, but in the end I understand Air Canada has stated it is concentrating its energies on acquiring a stake in Continental and therefore it is no longer interested in acquiring any interest in the equity of LIAT. There are a number of tour companies with private non-scheduled aircraft that from time to time fly into Barbados. We no longer have WARDAIR and the other companies that flew into Barbados. Some of them have gone out of existence. Barbados suffers as a result. To get a flight out of Canada, it is my opinion that we would have to mount the service from Barbados to Canada and back. I am hearing that the flights are coming in half empty. Would that then make sense? 4.40 p.m.

The United Kingdom and Europe. What has been done about those? Two years ago, I paid a visit to The Hague and we had discussions with a Dutch aviation company. We sat down and wrote out an air services agreement; uh the Dutch. It was done in 2 meetings. One meeting in Holland and one in Bridgetown. Air Holland, as a result, started a service out of Europe into Barbados. Unfortunately, here again, the confusion that exists in the air forced Air Holland to discontinue.

We have been having discussion with another Dutch company, Maarten Air to fly into Barbados. Maarten Air expressed an interest in flying a service but it needs to combine it with air service through Manchester into Barbados. At the time, there was no airline offering air service out of Manchester. Honourable Members might remember that when Air Tours had been operating at the highest peak and bringing in a number of visitors out of Manchester British Airways decided that it too would put a service out of Manchester in competition, I believe, with that non-scheduled service.

British Airways went off that service and the Air Tours service out of Manchester was discontinued even for the non-scheduled service. Maarten Air was quite prepared to do this. Unfortunately, because of air politics, Maarten Air was unable to get the service through Manchester into Barbados and therefore did not start.

We have services, Sir, out of Germany. BWIA flies out of Scandinavia but it is discontinuing it. There were 3 points in Germany. There was Cologne, Frankfurt and Munich. I understand they will be reduced to one. There is a flight out of Zurich. I understand that BWIA is discontinuing its service from Toronto to Barbados. That for us is particularly galling because it is through Barbados, as the Honourable Member for Christ Church South would remember, that service was commenced at all. Now that service will move from Toronto to Trinidad via Antigua and leave Barbados to Air Canada. Air Canada will fly Montreal/Toronto and perhaps St. Lucia/Barbados.

Sir, these are some of the difficulties that we have been experiencing. As I said, that particular service is galling to us in Barbados because it was Barbados' service and it was only over the past 3 or 4 years that Trinidad was able to concretise an arrangement with Canada and have that service as a Trinidad service. We have problems in Europe. We have a problem in Canada. There are problems in North America. We have been making efforts to fill the voids by approaching other tour companies. We tried to get Air Aruba to fly out of Germany into Barbados with the blessing of Lufthansa and using a Lufthansa tour company. That was not possible because of German politics. We still have Lauder Air flying. We still have Air 2 000 and LTU. We have a number of airlines Honourable Members have not heard of flying the non-scheduled services into Barbados. If we were not to do this our tourism would be in a very bad way. It is true that some of them only fly air-sea transfers.

In my opinion, the cruise ship passengers have shown the greatest growth in tourism over the past few years. This past year I understand that the number of persons brought into Barbados on those vessels will exceed 430 000 which is a record. Every year it is growing and every year will be a record until it ceases to grow.

I think we have to value the cruise ship passengers. We have to offer them better facilities. Honourable Members over there have heard me on this before. I have

2931

stated as our objective - the idea was mine, Sir that we must provide better facilities at the Terminal in Bridgetown for those cruise ship passengers. We have to provide better port facilities. We must not get the cruise ship passengers and the cargo all mixed up. We have to separate them. We have separated them now to some extent. We have to do hard and feverish work to develop the terminal point of entry into Barbados. Marina. The way the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke one would get the impression that marinas were something invented in recent years. The idea of a Marina never existed while they were the Government. The Leader of the Opposition can now come and force us to have marina facilities for Barbados. I wonder what they were doing when in Government. They did nothing about marina services, as far as I am aware.

Asides.

Hon. P. M GREAVES: I would be interested to hear what they did when they were the Government. 'The Carlisle Bay Scheme was a Marina? Something to hold a few moes? I was down there on Sunday and I observed what went on. That cannot hold any Marina. That is out of the question. Let me say this, Sir, I believe I have said it before and I will repeat it. We were looking at the North one time for the establishment of a Marina... 4.50p.m.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We were looking at the area very close to Heywoods Hotel. It was not as far as Six Men's. It was just north of and contiguous with the Heywoods property. We were even looking at doing some land reclamation on the land side to provide marina facilities inland. We had aerial photographs and all kinds of things done. We brought in some experts to advise us on the establishment of marina facilities. The Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation made available to us 2 Australians to look at and advise us on the establishment of marina services in Barbados. Those experts advised against the St. Peter site. They felt because of the currents it was not the best place for the citing of a marina. Instead...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: St. Lawrence is madness too, Sir. There is a large reef off St. Lawrence. No wonder nothing was done during their time to make a recommendation like St. Lawrence...

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member continues to mislead this House. The Honourable Member knows that during our time a study was made of Carlisle Bay. He knows that and he has now gone back to the place we had identified.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Who studied Carlisle Bay? There is no record on our files at all in the Ministry about any study being done on Carlisle Bay for any marina. That little reclamation that was done in Carlisle Bay near Cowell Street, I believe, was for the ships to take out the night soil, somebody said. That had absolutely- nothing whatsoever to do with any marina.

The experts have recommended that we should utilise an area from the Harbour Police Station right down to the Pierhead. What is more, Sir...

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is correct. The private sector has to be consulted, says the Honourable Member. He is a private sector person too. The experts recommended the Screw Dock should become some part of museum piece, but it can also be put to good use, as I already understand, a good practical and economic use. My understanding now is that the Government sector is about to reactivate the Screw Dock and put it to good use. All of this is predicated on the removal, unfortunately or fortunately I do not know, of the Defence Force from the Pierhead.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We will find some place for it. I agree with the Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

But, Sir, let me also say this. It has to be a private sector development, not a Government development. Government will never be able to undertake it because of the kind of costs projected for this development, unless we get the cooperation of the owners who will be affected by it, who can also be shareholders in that company. The report is that the marina and the accompanying facilities could be a loss but can be profitable as well. It cannot be profitable as a marina by itself. It needs other supporting facilities to make it profitable. The Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation is looking at it as a project. I understand they have been trying to put together a group in order to make this project profitable and worthwhile. I believe, Sir, I have been talking long enough on the things we have been doing out of my Ministry in the interest of tourism. I can end as I began. I believe we are on the right track. We have to make sure we have things done right. We will be wasting our time in this Parliament and everywhere else unless we get things done right and done as they should be done. If we do get them done right, it is my opinion that we in Barbados can benefit

2932

significantly from this almost single sector, tourism, that we have. But, Sir, it is important we do it. It is important we push it because it is, in my opinion, the best salvation for Barbados at this time as perhaps it is for most of the countries in the Caribbean. We have a lot to recommend us. The others have a lot to recommend them as well. The point here is that Barbados is not alone in trying to attract tourists to their country. As it stands now, it has now become an industry that is embraced by virtually every country in this world, including Eastern Europe. Therefore we have to be very careful. We have to make sure we maintain all those necessary supporting activities in an orderly way. If that is done, I believe what we are doing here will be worthwhile.

I thank you. ,

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to reply to some of the assertions made in the debate. Just let me say that I spent about 3½ to 4 hours speaking on this measure. I did so fully cognisant of the fact that there would be lots of comments made about this Bill. I do not intend to be contentious. I certainly would like to thank those Members who have made constructive criticisms and, indeed, who have made some great input in the debate. Of course, there are others who would tend to grandstand. For that reason, Sir, I will simply ignore those contributions. I think I have an hour but I will try to finish in a few minutes, Sir. All I wish to say is that when the students, in another 10 or 15 years, research this Bill and look at the contributions, I think you will find - although I think comparisons are odious - I think you will find, between 12 o'clock and 4.30 p.m. last week, I think, Sir, you will find a lot of substance in that contribution. So much so, Sir, that although it was declared as lacking in content, there was some measure of regurgitation and obviously they were just repeating exactly what I had said. 5.00 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that, on the manner of policy, I thought I had read into the record exactly what that policy is and those who read my contribution should recognise that. The changes. I told this Honourable House about the changes. I will confess, Mr. Speaker, that I did not say everything after all. Indeed, had I known it, I would have said the biggest change was the policy directing power of the Minister. When the Member for St. Joseph mentioned it, I seemed to recall that it was in the first draft.

Now, Sir, I am no more sanctimonious than anyone else. I wish to say that I have no desire to move away from the truth and I would just speak it and whoever does not like it can do what they like. It was in the first draft and somewhere between the first draft and the Bill presented here, Sir, it dropped out. It is as simple as that. You may laugh as much as you like but that is the position, inadvertently so, Sir. I think Government has sought to include it. I think the best thing to do, Sir, is to tell the truth. If you want to hear the truth, Sir, stick with me.

There were some other comments which seemed to insinuate that there is some effort to take away power from a Minister. Just let me say this, Sir. I have been Minister of Tourism for well nigh 7 years and, for some time, for 5 years, the shadow Minister of Tourism. I therefore have no intention, Sir, of making anybody in this Honourable Chamber believe they can shake my faith in my own ability. Neither can anyone else anywhere. I personally believe I would listen to comments, to constructive criticism, but quite frankly, nothing that I have heard in this Honourable Chamber convinces me that there is any great knowledge that I do not have of tourism. It is as simple as that.

I will challenge anyone anywhere, Sir, on any type of debate on tourism. I have travelled far and wide representing Barbados and the Caribbean in tourism matters and therefore, even though I am quite prepared to take advice from my colleagues, the Opposition or anyone in Barbados, Sir, I am not allowing them to run away with the idea that I inherited the job. The day that I feel that I can no longer do it efficiently, Sir, I will go home. It is as simple as that. So let us just remember that. I say that with all clarity and honesty. There was a comment from the Member for St. Peter that the costs of food and beverages were not competitive in Barbados. That is true. I will admit that. I intimated during the debate that those were the types of things we were looking at. You may recall, Sir, that I had said we had met with all the social partners at Heywoods for 2 days and had gone into these things with a fine tooth comb. Sir, perhaps they were not listening.

Sir, I think I need to look at the position where there was some comment about the respective stances of both Governments in power. I said, Sir, that both Governments had had councils and the Democratic Labour Party Government had moved away from the question of a small Board of Tourism and a council and had gone for a larger Board while I had gone for a smaller Board, subsequent to that. So with this Council and the Authority, we have gone full circle. I wish to say that there is hardly any point in criticising the Government for things that have already been done.

There was some comment about Trump. Sir, I believe that I have said, in this House, already that when we saw the demise of Pan Am and Eastern we tried desperately to get replacements. We had gone to Homeric. Homeric, as

2933

I recall it, Sir, were charging something like \$900 000 and were only doing about 30 rotations. We went for Trump because they said they would do 36 rotations and eventually did 40. Sir, you may well recall that in this very Chamber there was a hue and cry and there were assertions that Trump had old planes. Anybody who wanted to travel by Trump, when they heard the comments emanating out of this Honourable Chamber would obviously not fly with Trump. I would not blame them if that were the comment of responsible politicians. The truth was, Trump's planes were some of the best planes - modern planes - that flew into Barbados. So, I need to make those points, Sir.

The Member for St. Michael South East wanted to know if the Unions were involved in this decision. All I need to say is yes, the Union has been represented on the Board of Tourism for the last 6 years I have been Minister and obviously, Sir, they would have been involved.

On the question of the staff, I can only say that my specialty, outside of politics, has been personnel management and public relations. I have always insisted that staff should be happy and job satisfaction was always one of the things we would go for. Sir, in the last few months we have been having courses to stimulate staff and the new Board which will be marketing oriented. That will continue.

On the question of the ability of Board members, I can only say, Sir, that I have 14 members on the Board today and I would put them up for keen scrutiny by anyone in Barbados. I do not believe you will find any one of them wanting, or indeed any member of any Board under my control for the last 7 years, so I need not worry about that.

The question of facilities as far as sports tourism is concerned, is elementary. You cannot have sports tourism unless you have facilities. It is so simple, Sir. We have developed the infrastructure. We have developed multi-purpose courts, we have improved our cricket grounds. The gymnasium, Sir, is not of my making and I need to say that I think some measure of brilliance attended it when I had something to do with it. The idea was not mine and I never said that it was.

Sir, it was said that I said there was an increase in tourism in the last year. I never said that. What I did say was that the Member for the City has tabled a question in this Honourable House about the decrease in tourism in the last 4 years and I said I did not answer it because it was not true. There was a decrease in 1990 and another one in 1991. I said that, even though we had taken great care to beef up our efforts this year as of July and we had increases in August, September and November, I was not going to put my neck out for December. Indeed, the Member for Christ Church South agreed with me because I said that I was very wary of the condition in Europe where there were great devaluations of currencies. I have the figures here and they speak to that. Although there has been an increase from Germany by 47 per cent in December, there was a decrease from other European countries by 27 per cent which, you may recall, I predicted. 5.10 p.m.

Sir, I also wish to speak to the question of new markets. Whatever we may do, even if we look at the marketing thrust and we go and look at product development and research, even if we look at the training procedures and tourism in schools as someone alluded to, Sir, I would say that as we have been looking at that for the last 3 or 4 years, the problem is that you have to train teachers to teach tourism. Simple. This we have been doing through CTO for the last 3 or 4 years and I think we are getting somewhere.

I also wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that even when we have done all of that we have to look for new markets. Only 2 days ago, Sir, we had the pleasure of a delegation from Japan here in Barbados. This came about through World Travel Market where 2 months ago we met the Japanese delegation and they expressed a desire to come to Barbados. They paid their money and came to Barbados. If you are going to look at the Japanese market, Sir, you have to look in terms of golf courses, tours, honeymoon settings and duty free shopping. Those are the 4 areas to which the Japanese will come in very large numbers. Even so, Mr. Speaker, if Japanese begin to come to Barbados tomorrow, we are still behind Jamaica who had some 15 000 arrivals from Japan last year, Aruba, Cayman Islands and the BVI. Sir, to get into the Japanese market, along with St. Lucia, we are in a race with many other members of the Caribbean Community. That is it, Sir. The Japanese will try and come. I saw the newspaper report that the Japs are coming. There are no problems there at all.

Sir, we feel that we should go to the Pacific rim. We have to go as well to Japan, Australia, Africa and

South America. These are the places, Sir, where we have to make some definite impact. Therefore, I need to deal with that. Members of the Opposition are always in a jocular mood about Australia. Perhaps some of them feel that Australia is the land of milk and honey and that to be there means you are not going to come back or something like that: I went there 17 times. It might be too many if you feel that way, but I am just saying that some of us are just very privileged and others will have to stay here. Those of us who have a meaningful impact to make on the international world should go and those who have an impact to make in Barbados will have to stay here, Sir. It is little wonder that, if I go to London within 20 minutes of my arrival at Heathrow, BBC-1 would want me on their programme

2934

that politicians in England have striven for months to get on and with little success. It stands to reason why the prestigious *Daily Telegraph* would want to have an exclusive interview with Wes Hall and Sir Gary Sobers. It is because of that, Sir, I thought it would be opportune for us to piggy-back on the test matches being played in Australia to market Barbados.

I do not mind people in jocularly saying we went to watch cricket, but watching cricket is not one of my past times nor is it one of Sir Gary's either. If you were to say that going to the races was, well then I would agree. I take great objection to people casting aspersions on my character and seeming to say that I have no integrity and that I leave here and go and watch cricket

Sir, nothing is further from the truth. Just let me explain to this Honourable House what happened. The Australians came here in October of this year. Twenty-five travel agents came to this country, Sir, for the express purpose of looking at Barbados, our hotels and how we live. Having heard so much about us in the cricketing world they decided they would wish to come here. Some of them came here because the previous year I had gone there and had spoken at length on the television and radio stations and to the travel agents. I had asked them to come to Barbados and so they did, Sir. Now when they came here in October, they were taken around Barbados and decided that they loved it as much as the Japanese love it. We are wonderful people and people love us. It should be no surprise to Barbadians. What has happened, Sir, is that they went back to Australia and told great stories about us. They said we were wonderful people and that people should come to Barbados.

Sir, a few reasons why we went to Australia, Sir, because I do not wish to run out of time. It has been our policy to retain the existing markets in the United States of America, Canada, Continental Europe, United Kingdom, the Caribbean and Latin America, but we wanted to expand into the other markets in those very countries, in other words, Sir, to go into the traditional market and also of necessity to get into the non-traditional market. I have said this many times before but I need to say it again for emphasis.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, we felt we would piggy-back on the Australian cricket tour and use the high profile of Sir Gary Sobers, Gordon Greenidge and myself in that area to market Barbados to the Australian people. We thought that we would do interviews on radio and television and in the print media and try to see as many rotary clubs, airlines, oil companies, pharmaceutical companies and others who are tailor-made for GIT traffic. They are the ones who would stay at Sandy Lane, Tamarind Cove and the upper bracket hotels. At the same time, we thought we would look at the sports tourism fusion and we would ask them to send sporting teams who would stay at the intimate hotels. That was the position, Sir. 5.20 p.m. We also knew that the Australians are No. 3 in the world as far as travellers go and we knew they had spent \$7.8 billion in 1991 in overseas travel, \$5.1 billion of which was spent, on goods and services and \$2.3 billion in air fares. We knew that they were compatible with West Indians, that they had the same colonial history, were lovers of freedom and therefore we had to address certain perceptions. We had to address their perception that Barbados was far, far away and they could never get there. All we needed to do was to let them know that it was 12 hours from Sydney to Los Angeles, then 5 hours to Miami and 3 hours to Barbados.

We also had to tell them that there was an air fare of Aus.\$1 250 from Sydney to Miami and that for another

\$250 they can go to any part of the Caribbean. All we needed to do then was to get them away from the idea that if they were in Miami they had to buy, as some of my friends have done over the last 30 years, a Miami-Barbados-Miami ticket. That is foolishness. I told them they could buy a Sydney-Los Angeles-Miami-Barbados-New York-London ticket as they go around the world. That is what we did. Having been educated by us in that way, they understood what we were saying.

Another thing, too, Sir, the Australians travel in the cooler months of April to October. As you know, Sir, they are South of the Equator and their winter falls between June and August. They are now playing cricket in Australia because it is their summer, as it would be winter now in England because they are North of the Equator. Sometimes lawyers do not remember their first form geography and therefore I had to illuminate the dark corners of their minds. We wish them to come between April and October, which coincides with our slow period, the period with which many years ago we had a seasonality problem. That is so simple, I do not know why they find it so hard.

Let me now deal with the money.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Crop-Over is in July-August and we have about 38 000 people coming to Barbados then. Do not deal with me in things that are state of the art. You do not know very much about it. May I just tell you, Sir, that while the 6 of us were there we had 62 interviews on radio, television and in

2935

the print media. They are here documented and can be made documents of the House and put in the Public Library, if necessary. I will only say that when I was leaving Australia I happened, in a matter of a few days, to look at the newspapers in relation to our travel and they were all filled with Barbados. I wonder if I can make this a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can paraphrase it, you can memorise it, you can do whatever you want.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, the Opposition would like to know that that beautiful face is mine and that all these are areas of Barbados, with the West Indies team, Sir Gary Sobers... This is only a handful of papers I picked up as I came away. Do you know, Sir, if in 2 weeks I had collected all of the publicity material Barbados got I would have overweight as I came back? That is a fact. You know I would never tell a lie. I am only saying that these are the 62 engagements we had in a mere 2 weeks. The Prime Minister does not even know this. I have not reported this to him.

Mr. Speaker, we decided we would go into an arrangement with Qantas, American Airlines and 3AW, a very powerful station in Melbourne, where we would advertise them in all of the programmes we were doing and they in turn would give us good prices as we went. I recognised that this undertaking would be such a big one that it might be regarded as being expensive, and so I set out to make sure to minimise the cost. I did not want to take just Sir Gary and Mr. Gordon Greenidge with me, we needed to take officers. We are politicians and might not be always here, but public officers are always there, and having written extensively in the files on what went on, there should be some continuity. We decided we would deal with those airlines. There are so many things here, some of them are getting misplaced.

We decided to promote Barbados. If every Minister of Tourism had used this type of presentation worldwide, Barbados would be forever on the top of the ladder. We advertised Sir Garfield Sobers, Yours Truly, Gordon Greenidge and the 3 Barbadian members of the West Indies team. I did not want the West Indies team to think it was mandatory for them to come, but lo and behold they came, every one of them to a man. Many of these brochures were put on the tables at all the prestigious dinners around Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. This one says: "Barbados Carnival Spectacular. Qantas Airlines, 3AW and American Airlines, hosted by the Barbados Board of Tourism. Meet top West Indies cricketers and the legendary Sir Garfield Sobers, Wes Hall..." - that is what brought the people. This was another brochure, the sort of thing we are dealing with. "Sun, sea and sports. Barbados, the best it can be." There again, that is why Qantas and American Airlines came in.

We had a message from the Minister and from the Barbadian hotels with an 8 day 7 nights per person, calendar of events for the whole year 1993. Then at the end, Contours Travel with the booking conditions. This was expertly done, in a most professional way. This is not a figment of anybody's imagination. As it turned out, Sir,, we negotiated with American Airlines to give 2 first class passages from Barbados to Los Angeles return and the others at discounted prices. We then arranged with Qantas to have discounted fares from Los Angeles to Sydney then Melbourne and back to Sydney, to Brisbane and back to Sydney to do the presentations there. The prices were as follows. It cost US\$12 697 for the passages of 6 people. As I said, 2 of the passages from Barbados to Los Angeles were free first class and the others were economy. Yes, Sir, I flew economy from Los Angeles to Australia. I wouldn't do it again. It took 14 hours. I did it because when the officer could not get upgraded and I was told it would cost BDS\$5 000 for the difference between the first class and the economy I said, "No Sir, I will be with you guys!" 5.30 p.m. When we went to the Qantas office there were 6 officials there and they called in 30 regional managers to listen to the Barbados delegation. The manager immediately said he was sorry he had-not realise our position and that when we went back we would go first class. I heard it said that Government should not do that. Let me tell you, Sir, the Government should work in cooperation with airlines and indeed the hotels. We bring people here for them. It has always been the case when you had familiarisation tours and it was always the case that arrangement was made. It is no sense saying on the one hand that there is wanton spending of money and then on the other hand that Government should not make any arrangement. Governments have made arrangements all the time. There was a time when there were arrangements between x Government and British Airways and there was a measure of complimentary travel. I was not the Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister was not the Prime Minister then. Since we are going to talk about that, let's be straight.

Hotel accommodation. It cost US\$10 237 and that is for 2 weeks. We were upgraded like the West Indies team to very comfortable and congenial surroundings at the price of AUS\$150. Everyone sitting over there, except the Member for St. Andrew, has been a Minister in the Government of this country. They know where they stayed, how much money was paid and who went with them. Therefore I need to say that a king-sized suite in Sydney, Melbourne or Adelaide for US\$150 is a bargain. Sir, that is exactly what happened. It cost US\$10 237 for 6 people for 2 weeks.

2936

The receptions. What we did, Sir, was to invite tour operators, travel agents, cricketing personnel, all of the clubs in the area - netball, basketball, cricket, football, cycling clubs. Then we decided to throw the receptions open to the public. Sir, who in 3 cities paid AUS\$50 each to come in. So there were people invited and others who paid. I will get to that so that you will see the exact cost. It was a dinner and drinks reception. That is how it is done in Australia. You invite people to come. They eat and drink and there might be some measure of cricketing talk. You hear on television Australian cricketers like Whitney, despite his upbringing, which was like mine, from the proletariat. He was well spoken as I am. Therefore, we need to have our cricketers as ambassadors.

Why on earth should Sir Garfield Sobers be thought of as a guy from Beckles Road to whom we should just throw a pittance? I say, Sir, that it warmed my heart to move into a room with 11 000 people and when Sir Gary walked in there was a hush, then an eruption. Sir, those people love him. Why can't we love that gentleman? I am saying, Sir, that as long as I am Minister he will go to the comers of the earth promoting Barbados because I feel he should go. If I am not the Minister of Tourism, fair enough. Last night, it would have been a calamity throughout the Caribbean had they scored another 2 runs. We must not pretend that we do not listen to our cricket. We are the best cricketers in the world. We are the best at nothing else, except perhaps body building. I do not know if we have the best lawyer or doctor in the world or doctor but I know we have the best cricketer.

•Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, we had to pay the hotels in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane for the dinner and drinks, \$33 132 at the 3 receptions.

The *per diem*. As you know, if you go to St. Lucia and you go to Australia 14 000 miles away the *per diem* is the same. If you are telling me that going for 2 weeks is too long, I will say that I was Minister of Labour

and I have in a few times okayed the officers going to ILO for 4-6 weeks. The Unions, too, go for 6 weeks to Geneva and it is very expensive there as it is in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane.

While I am at it, I wish to say in reference to wanton spending that, while I was in Australia, I got the princely sum of \$250 entertainment money. I went from Australia to Cancun. US\$250 in Cancun is a lot of money. People are apt to believe that when you go on these trips... I know that ex Ministers over there do not feel so because they have been in it.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I took Rohan Kanhai and his wife...

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: ... from Newcastle to dinner in King's Cross. Lots of people go to King's Cross for other things but I went there to have dinner. I paid the bill, AUS\$395, just for 5 of us, a Japanese dinner with personal service. It meant that my \$250 was gone in just 1½ hours. Whenever I travel on behalf of this Government I carry along a few U.S. dollars because I know that a man of my standing has to buy more drinks and be more entertaining and would probably have a wider circle of friends which, as a Minister, is expected because of my status, not because of my standing in a monetary sense. Members over there know when they go overseas the Minister is the one who pays. I wish to say that when you look at the hotel accommodation at \$10 200, the airline tickets of \$12 687, the *per diem* of \$12000... 5.40 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, I am a serious man.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the Honourable Member has 30 minutes. It is still half an hour.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I am saying, Sir, that on the *per diem* for 2 weeks for 6 people, a Minister will get \$60 for meals, \$40 subsistence and \$15 for travel.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: It needs revising, of course. A Permanent Secretary and any other officer gets \$55 for meals, \$35 for subsistence and the same \$15 for travel. I get \$115 a day and the other members get \$105. I am saying in an expensive city we were out of pocket money. There is no doubt about it. I take great objection to people telling me that I should pay back money because I went to watch cricket in Sydney. I am very serious about that.

Sir, the total expenditure, therefore, would be U.S. \$74 182. But the revenue side I must now explain. Out of the 600 people who came to the presentation in Melbourne, 232 paid \$50 to come in. Out of the 800 people who came to Sydney, 348 people paid \$50 to come in. Out of the 450 people who attended the Brisbane presentation - nobody has ever seen 450 people in Brisbane at any thing really of significance until then - 157 people paid. We had a revenue side of \$25 208.

2937

Mr. Speaker, the reason I could not say this the day after I came back was - I can add and I knew that the hotel accommodation, the *per diem* and the airline ticket would probably come to \$74 000 - what I did not know when I was there, how many people had paid 50 Australian dollars to go to a function where we were putting on the Barbados video and things like that. We had a West Indian Band. We had U.S. \$25 000 at the gate. No Minister of Government has ever been able to get that sort of revenue advertising Barbados. If we spent \$74 000 and got \$25 000 it is obvious the net cost was \$48 000 and that is what it cost for 6 people to go to Australia for 2 weeks. I am saying that no other presentation or promotion in Barbados has gained so much for this country for so little money in the whole history of tourism in Barbados. I speak subject to no correction. There is nobody who can tell me they have ever had a promotion anywhere in the world of this calibre for U.S. \$48 000. That is the position. We had 62 interviews.

Sir, I will tell you something. We had an interview with a television company which is going to come here

and do 10 shows out of various sections of the City of Bridgetown and they are beaming it right back to Melbourne and Sydney. That is the measure of our effectiveness in this market. Therefore, I need to let all Barbadians know.

There is a man, Sir, I do not recall his name, neither can I say it in here, who wears a bow tie all the time. He wants to know how much money it cost. Let every one tell him that it cost U.S. \$48 000. There are letters in the papers insinuating that there is something amiss.

We had 62 interviews and 3 fantastic presentations of Barbados. You know, Sir, that Sir Garfield Sobers and Gordon Greenidge are still in Australia? Last night they had a Barbados night in Adelaide. I came back and I said, "Oh Lord, I wish we (Barbados) could go to Adelaide and Perth and let the people know about Barbados." Sir Garfield Sobers, Gordon Greenidge and the other Barbadians have gone with a Barbadian night with the West Indies flushed with rousing and resounding success. I am very glad that has happened. Sir, I need not tell you the influence of Sir Garfield Sobers, Gordon Greenidge and yours truly in the West Indies dressing room. I need not tell you that there was a great transformation from a shattered team then to roaring lions. Six hundred runs on a Sydney spinning wicket is no idle boast. It has never happened before and it probably will never happen again because we are not going to be there.

Sir, all this money also includes overnight in Miami. I left here on Christmas eve, overnighted in Miami and all Christmas day I was flying economy class to Australia for my country. Only last year I was privileged to be invited to Australia to speak at a testimonial dinner for Peter Burge, first-class all the way. There were insinuations in Barbados that I had gone to look at stadia and all measure of things until they found out that this Government had not paid a cent for me to go anywhere. I had gone on my own steam. My contacts were so good that I was able to go out there and make a speech which is, as usual, now one of the great speeches in cricket, and one of the classics. It is there for prosperity.

Aside.

Hon. W. W. HALL: It is there for posterity. Sir, prosperity from the point of view that in another 10 years I will be expected to get royalties the likes of which have never been seen in the annals of cricket. This is true. This is no laughing matter, Mr. Speaker.

I just wish to say that everything here is taken care of. The Board of Tourism has all the figures. I just wish to tell the Members of this House that nothing is amiss. We went to Australia purely and simply to promote this fair land, to recognise that we in Barbados must look for other markets and if we are going to do so we have to do it in an efficient way. No one knows that Australians have been here. The way people talk there was a report in the Press that if 10 people...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to accept that.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Sir, it was written by a former Minister of Tourism. I have no brief for the gentleman. I am not saying he has not made a contribution. I am not saying he cannot still make a contribution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not said that.

Hon. W. W. HALL: I know you would never say that, Sir. My lifestyle is not such that I would want to criticise you in such a way as to cause you harm. I do not suffer bitterness. I need not pray for anyone I do not need to pray for. I pray on the spur of the moment as it comes to me.

But, Sir, this has now come to me that when the Barbados Labour Party were in government in the 1980s, do you know that no less than 400 Australians came here every year from 1980 to 1985? The least number of Australians in the last 12 years to have come to Barbados is 378 in 1986. In the last 10 years 6 000 Australians came to this country. Is not that a market that I, as Minister of Tourism should look at? How many Japanese have come here? Let me tell you how many Australians have come here, in 1986 - 387; 1987 - 457; 1988 - 581; 1989 - 643. That is the best year in the history of tourism when 461 237 people came here. In 1990 there was a decline

all over the world; we had 643 again coming from Australia. In 1991 - I admit it is when the Australian cricket team was here - it was 947 and I have not yet got the figures for 1992. In other words, 6 000 Australians have come here in the last 10 years and I wish to also say one pertinent point. You see, Sir, I have them going. They need to now say hallelujah and we will all be in unison. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member should wind up his speech.

Hon. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one pertinent point, Sir. The length of stay in Barbados of the Australians ranges from 15 days to 17 days. You know what that means, Sir? They have not come here on any cruise ship, they have not come for 10 hours. They came from 15 to 17 days. They are people who spend a lot of money and I am saying that is a market that I verily believe we should penetrate.

Asides.

Hon. W. W. HALL: There is a part of the Bible that says that God will scorn the scorners. Watch yourselves over there! I really mean that, Sir. It is not a matter of born again. It is that people do not like to hear truth. My going to Australia or even if I go to Japan, is no different from any one of the Members over there, or any one of the Members over here who have gone to Hong Kong, to Korea, who have gone to Japan, China and the Philippines. Sir, I went to work after a long and arduous task. I went to work the next morning. I got in here at 8 o'clock in the evening and I was at work the next morning. I did not have an hour's rest. So when we are talking and fooling the public about deception, let us remember that the records of all Ministries are still there. Public workers who were working there 20 years ago are still working now. The records are there. They only need to be looked into. We know where everybody went.

Sir, I know I have another 10 minutes. I will say this now, Sir, if the Prime Minister ever tells me that I am more dangerous than a hurricane I will look the Prime Minister in his face and tell him he can have his job. I say that. You must show some measure of respect. Respect is mutual on this side.

Sir, everyone has spoken today and there were no interruptions. Even though I can hardly hear myself I crave your indulgence for the next 5 minutes to tell you that anyone listening to the Speakers today would believe we have not really done anything. I alluded to the fact that I have spoken to everybody. I have listened well. Some people listen and don't hear. I have listened and I have heard. I wish to say, Sir, I know the views of the social partners. I know there are people out there who would like to run the Ministry and not put up 10 cents.

I think the Opposition talked today about Butch Stewart and John Issa. Butch Stewart has 6 hotels in Jamaica. He spent US\$12 million last year advertising his hotels. There are 33 000 travel agents in the United States of America and on each desk he has something advertising Sandals.

I am saying, Sir, I have no brief of sharing the cake. I have no brief to share information or participation but I say, Sir, that when politicians go into the highways and hedges, are spat on inadvertently, Sir, and are given a ministry I say, Sir, that they need to have the cooperation of all concerned, but I do not think that people should run the ministry for them.

We talk about Sweden. It is a different situation here. Everybody knows what the Swedish Government has done for the Tourist Board. The Jamaican Government is now negotiating with the private sector to pay half the money, 50 per cent. That is what the Jamaican Government wants, 50 per cent from the private sector.

When we were having discussions with the World Bank, the World Bank official was of the erroneous opinion that the Barbados Hotel Association and the private sector paid half of the entire bills for promoting Barbados. They paid half of the \$12 million we paid last year, in other words we are still waiting for the \$6 million, and so, Sir, our situation is one like this, that we are looking at our policy, at our product development, at our marketing thrust, at cruise tourism. We know what it entails, Sir. We are looking at harassment, crime and heritage tourism.

I have never denied that Leroy Sisnett has played a great part in cruise tourism. I would never do that, Sir. I say openly, yes. That is why I invited him to the retreat and I think he was a big man to come. The others

believed they should not come unless they got paid and those who were very vociferous in the newspapers did not come, there you are, Sir, a lot of talk and they would not condescend to come and let us all reason together. They -would never do that, Sir.

We should be very proud, Sir, for today the CTO signed an agreement with the EEC for \$11 million, under the Lome III Financing Development Plan for work in Europe, \$11.2 million in Europe. Now, on February 3, I should be going to New York - I can't really say yet because the Cabinet has not agreed yet -I should be going to New York to sign for that regional marketing programme which will cost the 33 countries in the Caribbean \$15 million. The Governments will put up \$4 million and the private sector \$11 million. That will

2939

be launched on February 3. Sir, that is an image building thing in the market place. I think small countries will piggy-back on that and we will see something coming out of it. The one that was signed this morning is expected to bring 90 000 additional tourists from Europe to the Caribbean for the next 3 years. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, since we have come to the situation after 5 years of protracted negotiations, of looking for consultants and coming to conclusions, we are now going to receive \$11.2 million for Europe and then we are going to spend \$15 million in the United States of America. After all of this confusion, as if nothing has been done, Sir, I am reporting to you and this Honourable House that we are definitely making massive strides. 6.00 p.m.

The Member for St. Joseph said that I am a great enunciator with no implementation. Those are implementations, Sir. Barbados looms large in CTO. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South knows all about that. He was a big partner in the CTRC movement and he knows about it, Sir. I just wish to say that it is a great day that has happened and I feel we need to make sure these things are known to the public.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank the Members on both sides for any constructive points they have made regarding tourism. Tourism is a very flexible industry, but it is the greatest in the world nonetheless. That is a fact. I know we are under keen scrutiny. I know that although we have only one Tourism Minister in Barbados but there are 250 000 here who are only experts but shadow Ministers of Tourism. Everybody is a shadow minister and, therefore, I have to be on my P's and Q's. I do not mind that, Sir. It is good for me, but I do wish to make known the plans of the Ministry of Tourism, to end by giving you a bit of our future plans. The tourism product embraces more than the hotel sector or the private sector. It comprises all the national assets of Barbados including its roads, airport, seaport and other facilities in which successive Governments have invested hundreds of millions of dollars. Since the socio-economic development of Barbados is so heavily dependent on tourism, Government as an agency representing the national interest must definitely involve, and chart the course of the industry in collaboration with the private sector to ensure a sustainable development. That part of our policy I enunciated last week and again today. That is what will happen in future.

Mr. Speaker, over the past week I have tried, Sir, to tell this Honourable House what are our aims and aspirations. I am certain, Sir, that you understand quite well that I have spread my wings very far. I have searched deep and I have gone high. I have done everything possible to get a consensus. That is what I have striven for so that all of the social partners can get together and let us see how we will go in tourism, the CTO, the private sector, vendors, unions, tour operators, travel agents, restaurateurs, the people who run little hot-dog carts, people who are selling on and near the beaches, wing-riders and all of the others. If that is thought wrong, Sir, I defy any Member of this House to tell me how that is the wrong approach. I defy any Member of this House to tell me that they are right and all of the people who are important in tourism are wrong.

I, therefore, have great pleasure in winding up this debate to pledge my continued support for these policies. Sir, I pledge that I will try to make sure that all of the ills that were spoken of today in terms of who will go on the Board and who will not go will be removed. I wish, Sir, that we will be able to put in place the Authority comprising 8 people plus the Chief Executive Officer to carry out our marketing

policies and product development structures who will be prepared to be advised by the Council which will also be made up of people very knowledgeable in tourism in this country. If that is done, Sir, with the very enlightened staff we have in the Ministry of Tourism and the cooperation of the social partners, I have absolutely no doubt that tourism, enhanced as it will be with all of these things that we have put into it, will continue to thrive and thrive so well that we will lead where others can only follow. I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, Hon. W. W. HALL, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. D. W. BOWEN, Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, Mr. T. C. ESTWICK and Mr. J. O. TUDOR - 13.

NOES: Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. G. W. PAYNE and Mr/L. R. TULL - 8.

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed. 6.1Qp.m.

2940

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 2 stand part, I wish to indicate that there are a number of amendments which have been circulated and I am going to formally move these amendments as we go along.

In Clause 2, as the consequence of an amendment which will appear later in the Bill, it will be necessary to amend the definition of "Council" and to substitute the word "31" for "30" appearing in the last line of that definition.

I so move, with those amendments, that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, in Clause 2 the definition of "tourist accommodation" appears to me to be sufficiently wide to cover the occasional renting out by Barbadians of part of their properties to tourists. We all know that occurs on a very regular basis in particular areas of Barbados - St. James, St. Michael, Christ Church and a few other areas. As I understand it, under the terms of this Bill that "tourist accommodation" would be the subject of registration and control. I want to know if this is the policy, because you have a specific definition of "tourist accommodation".

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I will check the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, Sir, because I think there is a definition section there which says that it does not apply to anything in the tourist sector, or words to that effect.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I could be more explicit. Clause 24(1) states: "A person who desires to operate any tourist accommodation shall apply in the prescribed form to the Authority for a licence....," so if you have a wide definition of "tourist accommodation" and it is sufficiently wide to cover any place where accommodation is offered to tourists for reward, it is my understanding, when you take that definition in

conjunction with Clause 24, that people who rent out a room, an apartment or whatever it is, as they do at the present moment, need to have a licence in the future. I just want to know whether that is clearly understood, that people who offer that type of accommodation which is provided in Barbados by using part of their homes periodically have to apply for a licence, because I can take you to Scarborough and Oistin in Christ Church and in housing areas now and show you places which are used.

It is very, very wide. If that is a new policy, just say that it is your policy, but I do not want it to go in there to people hounded down subsequently and have it said that nobody understood that was the impact of the change. I want to tell you about practicalities. Are you telling me that you are going to have sufficient staff to be able to police all of this accommodation? That is all I want to know.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is asking a valid question and I think the answer is yes. If we are going to control the quality of accommodation that is offered - because it takes account of a guest house, an hotel or any other accommodation - anyone who intends to offer their property to tourists for reward should apply for a licence. I do not see anything wrong with that, because we need to know who is doing it, where they are doing it, why they are doing it and what they are doing.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Is the Minister of Health saying then that if 3 students come from Trinidad for Crop-Over and they are going to pay somebody a small peppercorn for the week leading to Kadooment, the owner of the premises then has to apply for a licence?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Can I make the point here? Mr. Chairman, the definition Clause includes "guest house". It says:

"guest house" means any premises in which

- (a) sleeping accommodation is provided in 3 or more bedrooms;
- (b) a charge is made for the accommodation provided; and
- (c) meals are served to residents;

"hotel" means any building or group of buildings (whether contiguous to each other or not) and the grounds appurtenant thereto that operate as one business venture..." etc.

"tourist accommodation" means an apartment, a hotel, a guest house or any other premises or place where accommodation is offered to tourists for reward."

When you apply for a licence for tourist accommodation, you would apply for the appropriate tourist accommodation, whether it is a guest house, a hotel or any other premises. I certainly think that such a person who is going to accommodate the 3 persons coming from Trinidad should have proper health facilities and should normally apply for the licence required under the Health Services Act. Therefore, if you have an empty house you should pay the people to stay in it before somebody comes in and vandalises it.

2941

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Yes, but the point is, if you are running a guest house right now you have to apply to some authority within the Government, so you would get your licence to have a guest house, which licence would not have the same stipulations as one to run a hotel. So "tourist accommodation" simply means you would apply for the accommodation that is appropriate to your quality of accommodation. I think that is as it should be.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the mischief in the Clause I am trying to draw to the attention of the Honourable Members is not guest house, it is not hotel, it is not apartment, it is "other place", it is the width of the words "other place", especially when you look at it - I would ask Honourable Members to bear with me - in conjunction with section 23 which now says that you cannot use any place for tourist accommodation without an application for a licence. Section 24 sets out what you have to provide in order to get the licence and an interesting thing about it is that you have to come to the Minister with a certificate from the Commissioner of Police that the owner or operator of the premises to be used as tourist accommodation has never been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty or violence. 6.20 p.m.

It goes to a certificate from the Chief Fire Officer. No problem.

Section 24(e) requires a certificate in respect of the premises to be licensed which has been granted under the Health Services (Building) Regulations, 1969. So it presupposes in respect of the other place that you have a health licence. We know that if you are a guest house, a hotel or an apartment, you have to have that to get your licence, but what I am trying to bring to your attention is that the width of the draft clause is exceptionally wide. It covers any place at all.

If you wish to say that renting out a room in your house for reward - not 3, there is no restriction of numbers - will necessitate in the future that you have to get all of these things, we know what a guest house is. Implicit in the definition of a guest house is the provision of meals. People who rent out their houses to students...

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member would give way. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas earlier took care of the point raised by the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member pointed out that there is other legislation that takes care of rentals. A person who comes here as a student who is going to need accommodation is not a tourist and he is not so classified.

Hon. M. A. KING: I understand the point raised by Honourable Members. I think what the definition is intended to encompass is those places which are used habitually as apartments, guest houses or hotels or any premises which are habitually used as accommodation for tourists. What I suggest might be an appropriate adjustment to the clause. We are talking about premises. I think we want to catch premises where accommodation is habitually provided to tourists for reward as distinct from -being occasionally. Is that what is intended to be captured? I do think that would cover it. We will take note of the point and check it later on.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say that we have to decide whether we are having a departure or not. It is my view that if we are in fact going to control accommodation and what is offered as accommodation in the country and if we are going to be having classifications then this is in order as it stands. We cannot constantly come up with a theory or a policy and then water it down to accommodate some people who are doing something that is contrary. We are having a definition of what constitutes tourist accommodation.

We have some people in this country right now who offer tourist accommodation in the most atrocious conditions, in the most atrocious circumstances and when the people leave Barbados they have an opinion of Barbados that is not beneficial to Barbados in the future. Therefore, if people have to apply, they have to apply.

The Authority has a discretion which it will exercise and if, for example, an Honourable Member who has reached a certain age and has a large house realises that he or she can accommodate 3 or 4 persons occasionally, in certain circumstances, then he will apply for a licence for tourist accommodation. One assumes that the Tourism * Authority will exercise its discretion in the manner that the Honourable Member expects. Therefore, if you have a licence which says what you are able to accommodate it means that you cannot have prostitution and a number of the other things which some people might wish to have. We are not talking about a bed and breakfast. Somebody who is providing a bed and breakfast will get proper accommodation and get a licence accordingly.

Hon. M. A. KING: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, just to tidy the phraseology. The definitions of guest house, apartment and hotel all talk about providing accommodation. In order to tidy that definition with the definitions which proceed the Bill I would just move that the words "provided for" be substituted for "offered to" tourists.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we now have some interesting definitions and statutory conundrums. Under this Act, the word "guest house" is now defined as meaning "any premises in which sleeping accommodation is provided in 3 or more bedrooms; a charge is made for the accommodation provided; and meals are served to residents". Under the Hotel and Restaurants (Sales Tax) Act a guest house is defined this way:

"an establishment or apartment where accommodation, food, drink or any service or facility ancillary thereto is provided for reward;"

I just think, Sir, that the time has come when we should standardise these definitions. There is overlapping. Under the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, Cap. 230A, there is a reference in the definition of premises as:

"of every description and includes buildings and structures whether or not attached to the soil together with the curtilage thereof, but does not include a guest house within the meaning of section 2 of the Hotels and Restaurants (Sales Tax) Act let out as sleeping accommodation for reward to transient guests including tourists;"

I think some use can be made of the language because the Attorney General had in mind inserting in the definition a word like "habitually". As I said, so that we have this question of the width of the definition properly clarified, I would really suggest that the Minister refer these definitions for further consideration to the draftsman. I really do not think in the tourism legislation we should have the Tourist Board Act, which I shall still call it, giving one definition of guest house and the Hotel and Restaurant (Sales Tax) Act which applies to the same type of establishment giving a different definition for guest house. I think we have to make up our minds as legislators what a guest house means in law and have that definition run through the relevant legislation in a consistent form. 6.30 p.m.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I too have some difficulty with this question of tourist accommodation because, as it says, "'tourist accommodation' means an apartment, a hotel, a guest house or any other premises or place where accommodation is offered to tourists for reward." The reason why the Honourable Member for Christ Church South raised this question is, for instance, we know there are some Bajan guys who attract some tourists to areas like Gall Hill or Silver Hill in Government rental units.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Let us understand. If you are talking about the law you have to be quite clear. I am telling you what obtains. There are some people who go around the hotels and at the same time there are some people who want something cheaper. Some of them are more at home in that neighbourhood. The fellows may take \$10 and these people go and live there. What I am saying is it is exactly this sort of accommodation which is included in "any other premises or place where accommodation is offered to tourists for reward." Are you telling me these people should be licensed? How are you going to stop this? How are you going to police this sort of activity? There is no provision for it.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Members may have spent some new time looking at these matters but the truth is the definition which now appears for a guest house is the identical definition that appears for guest house in the present Act, the one which is operating now. The 2 of them have never been harmonised. They seemed to have created no problem. We do not deny the efficacy of the point made by the Honourable Member that all definitions of all phrases appearing in statutes passed in the same House ought to have the same meaning with respect to the same subject. One cannot gainsay that as a principle, but the truth is that as the draftsmen move from age to age they change things. Apparently it has not created any problem. This has been lifted from the old Act. I dealt with tourist accommodation. I am not going over that again.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I just want to draw to the Honourable Member's attention that research was done

by no less a person than the Prime Minister.

*The question that Clause 2, as amended, stand part was passed.
Clauses 3-9 were called and passed. Clause 10 was called.*

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 10 there are many forms in which similar provisions are drafted in legislation but I believe this form is perhaps the least favourable of all. I do not believe in this day and age the clause should be drafted so that, even when it comes to appointment of the lowest paid person in the establishment, the Minister has to have a say in whether that post is going to be established and that no salary in excess of a set sum may be determined by the Authority who cannot go ahead without the Minister's final approval. It seems to me that we are getting these things wrong. I do not believe this is an area at that particular level where the Minister ought

2943

to have to intervene. I can understand the Chief Executive and the Deputy but I find it difficult to understand why every possible job must now be encompassed in subsection (2) whereas there are other sections of legislation drafted, I believe including the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation Act, 1992, which has provisions drafted completely differently. I think it is too wide. I think from the Minister's point of view he does not need it.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: He says he does not have to exercise it but once. The point is it is there and there are Ministers and Ministers. The Honourable Member should know that. We are legislators and we should therefore try to put the best provisions with the best protection available. I just want to register, Sir, my view that I do not believe Ministers have to get down to appointments at that level in governmental affairs in a statutory authority to which they claim they are now giving more freedom of action to. I regret very much to see this provision coming back into legislation in this day and age.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, let me say something. I do not subscribe to that view at all. I believe that it is merely preservation of a principle. The Minister is responsible to Parliament for the expenditure of the statutory corporations. We cannot blow hot and cold. Earlier the same Honourable Members were indicating that there was an attempt to emasculate the authority of the Minister. A Minister does not have to pay attention on a daily basis to how many messengers an authority might have. But the ministerial responsibility is delegated by the system of Government we have. When we have a statute that manifests that system of Government we must not be afraid to recognise it. I hope it does not mean that the Minister is going to be like a school teacher out there checking to see, for as I said in a previous debate, a Minister who is going to do that will ignore the law anyhow. It is the same step that appears in almost all the other legislation. We had this identical debate over another Bill. I am not going to get involved. I do not have a problem with it and, frankly, if you cannot take the Ministerial responsibility you do not need the ministerial part at all. 6.40 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when one looks at Clause 10 as a whole I think the inescapable conclusion is that not only is the Minister to approve the terms and conditions and remuneration, but also the person who is being appointed. We are dealing with Clause 10. Clause 10 makes it abundantly clear that, subject to subsection 3, the Authority may appoint and employ such officers, agents and servants as it considers necessary for the proper carrying into effect of this Act, at such remuneration and on such terms and conditions as the Minister approves in writing.

Listen to Clause 3. "The officers and other employees who, at the date of the commencement of this Act, are members of the staff of the Barbados Board of Tourism shall upon that date comprise the staff of the Authority." So that the only people the Minister does not have to approve are those people who were appointed at the date when this Authority came. Do not let us get away from what it says. It says: "Subject to subsection (3)". The only exception you have is subsection (3). Subsection (3) says that people who are employees prior to the coming into effect of this Act and who were employed by the Barbados Board of Tourism, automatically are employed by this Authority. In respect of anybody else in the future the Minister has to approve the person, the remuneration and the terms and conditions of service.

Asides.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If it does not mean the person then you do not mean in subsection (3) what it says. The officers and other employees who, at the date of the commencement of this Act, are members of the staff, shall upon that date comprise the staff of the Authority. That is what it says. That is the transferral.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I cannot accuse the Honourable Member of not understanding these Clauses. I think, therefore, he has misinterpreted the legislation. You have to go back. Sir, Clause 9(1) says: "The Authority shall, with the approval of the Minister, appoint a Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer."

The only persons that need the approval of the Minister are spelt out in 9(1). Clause 10(1) deals with "... at such remuneration and on such terms and conditions as the Minister approves in writing". That is all that is required to be approved. It says, subject to subsection (3), which is the grandfather Clause; those who are already employed do not have to reapply. So, subject to subsection (3), the Authority may appoint and employ. Now, if you go back to 9(1) what it says is this: "The Authority shall, with the approval of the Minister, appoint...". So the approval to appoint applies to the Chief Executive Officer and the Deputy Chief Executive Officer. All other persons may be appointed by the Authority but the terms and conditions of service shall be approved by the Minister in writing. That is all. I think if the Honourable Member examines the clause he will see that is so. It is straightforward.

2944

The question that Clause 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 11 was called and passed. Clause 12 was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I am moving that a new Clause 12 be inserted at this point and that the existing Clause 12 and subsequent Clauses be consequentially renumbered. The proposed Clause 12 is in the document which has been circulated and reads as follows: "The Minister may give the Authority directions of a general nature in respect of the policy to be followed by the Authority in the performance of its functions under this Act and the Authority shall comply with those directions."

I am moving that this Clause be the new Clause 12 and also that the succeeding Clauses be renumbered appropriately.

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

The question that the new Clause 12 be inserted and the succeeding Clauses be consequentially renumbered was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 13 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 13 as renumbered stand part there is a typographical error in that the second word "authority" should read "Authority". Also "made by the Minister of Finance" should read "made by the Minister responsible for Finance". With those amendments I move that Clause 13 as renumbered stand part.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clauses 14 and 15 as renumbered, were called and passed. 6.50 p.m. Clauses 16 to 19 as renumbered were called and passed. Clause 20 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 20 as renumbered stand part, I just ask that there be noted an amendment in the third line of that Clause which now reads Section 18. That should read Section 19. That is consequential on the renumbering of the

paragraphs. With that amendment, I move that Clause 20 as renumbered stand part.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir. *Clause 20 as renumbered was passed, Clause 21 as renumbered was called and passed. Clause 22 as renumbered was called.*

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to move that Clause 22 as renumbered stand part.

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

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to speak on this clause because it affects the work of the Public Accounts Committee. The former Clause 21 affects the work of the Public Accounts Committee and I wish to use the experience which I have gained on that Public Accounts Committee to tell this House that it is very important that reports of statutory boards which spend public funds should be laid within specific, defined times in the House. The public of Barbados is obviously now conscious of how their money is spent. The public expects full accountability to be given as soon as possible and for the Public Accounts Committee to exercise its powers to summon chairmen and directors of statutory boards, financial officers of statutory boards, Ministers, if necessary, responsible for statutory boards to examine the accounts of boards. It has been usual in legislation to say that the Minister shall lay before Parliament a copy of the report as soon as practicable after receiving that report. Those words, "as soon as practicable" have received the widest possible interpretation and Ministers have not laid reports on time. At present, we are frustrated in at least one instance in getting on with the work of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not intend anymore in public life to take blame for anybody on anything at all unless I consider that I justly deserve it. Sir, I am saying that if the Public Accounts Committee is to be effective Parliament must take into its hand to lay down a set time. The Authority has not later than 5 months from the end of the year to submit the report to the Minister. If the Minister has it for 5 months after the end of the year, then there is no reason why the Minister cannot look at that report, get what explanations he deserves, place it before Cabinet and get it to the House within a maximum of 42 days thereafter. I find it very difficult, Sir, and I am going to move an amendment which says that the Minister shall lay before Parliament a copy of the report referred to in sub-section (1) within 42 days after receiving that report and to delete the words "as soon

2945

as practicable", I believe that it is important for accountability that that should happen. Sir, I move that the words "as soon as practicable" in sub-section (2) of the section 22 as renumbered be deleted and the words "within 42 days" be substituted.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Honourable Member does not insist that the actual proposal be inserted because "as soon as practicable" does have a particular meaning as he knows. Sir, one cannot disagree with the sentiment which motivated the call for a specific time. Perhaps what we can do is to ask the Attorney General to look at putting some specificity into this clause but not fix it as you say. The policy position still has to come from some kind of consideration. I am only saying to the Honourable Member that he should not insist on having it inserted now.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I think this is a matter that extends beyond this particular piece of legislation and the principle of getting the reports to the point or place where they should go in the fastest time is one that is acceptable. I am not sure myself whether it should be 30 days or 60 days, Sir. 7.00 p.m. Inasmuch as earlier in the debate I heard how many things can be done and were being done administratively, it may be that the 42-day rule might be applied at the start administratively and we have to look at the situation in relation to other reports - because I believe there are still reports which are outstanding for many years; I believe in the days of the Democratic Labour Party and in the days of the Barbados Labour Party there may be reports outstanding - for to go and pass this amendment now may only put us in breach of what is practical and what is prudent.

I would suggest that we look at this administratively in the first instance to try to get it, and after we look at it and we find that it is not being done, then you can raise the matter again or we will raise it ourselves. We

will start with that aspect of it administratively. The point has been raised and it has been made and I think we will take note of the point.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, may I just make the additional point. The problem raised by the Honourable Member for Christ Church West about the failure to get reports laid, is invariably because the authority responsible for making the report has not made the report. We know the length of time that authorities responsible for preparing and submitting reports take in submitting them. I do not know, but I suspect there are not many cases where reports have actually been submitted to the Minister and the Minister has held those reports up. I think those must be unusual cases, because there is no reason to hold them up. They are public documents thereafter anyhow and once the Minister gets the reports I believe they are almost invariably laid in Parliament, so that the pickup which needs to be dealt with is the authorities who are responsible for making the reports. I think that is the prime issue which needs to be addressed. I am also concerned about the delays which take place in that regard. Let us look at the whole thing, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, comprehensively in relation to all reports which need to be submitted to Parliament and come up with a comprehensive solution to the entire problem.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I just want to make one point, Sir. If a Minister gets a report from a statutory corporation and the report is inadequate or contains foolishness, the Minister has received the report but according to the law he is required to lay it within a particular time. If he comes down here with a report that is inadequate, he still has the responsibility.

I want to make another point The Honourable Member said he was bringing this matter before the House because of some difficulty which he is having in the Public Accounts Committee. The Honourable Members in this House collectively are in no position to discuss reporting when it comes to the Public Accounts Committee, because that Committee has not reported to this House since 1972. I understand the Honourable Member's position, but we have also to be clear. The last time they started talking about a report was when they thought it was expedient to do a little politics about some aspects of one matter they were investigating. I thought they would have reported by now.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept the arguments advanced by any of the other Members on this Bill. I want to first address the question of the Public Accounts Committee report. One report has been laid in this House by the late Right Honourable Tom Adams. The reports of the Public Accounts Committee since then, even under the Right Honourable Member for St. John, the late Errol Barrow, were lost, cannot be found, the Minutes cannot be found, cannot be written up and what not.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Well, they had never been written up and we could not find some of them. That is the position. I am trying very much in order to get a report going. My experience and the experience of the Committee is that when it comes to statutory boards the argument is . that you can only enquire into them when the accounts

2946

have been put before this House. That is part of the advice given to the Committee so that the reports must get before this House within a proper time.

Clause 22, as renumbered, says that the Authority must lay a report not later than 5 months from the end of any year. It submits a report containing not only an account of the performance of the operations of the Authority, but a statement of the audited accounts. We are interested in the audited accounts obviously if we are to carry out our function as a Public Accounts Committee. The Authority has to submit it within a specified time to the Minister.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Never mind, the Minister must, in my view, be accountable to Parliament, not later

than a specified time in order to bring that report here. I do not mind what the time is - 30 days, 60 days, whatever it is -so that the Public Accounts Committee can perform its duty.

The Honourable Member says we have gone political, Sir. I have gone to the extent of writing to a Minister to ask him to lay the report and I have not even got the courtesy of a reply from this Minister who has got up to talk on this matter. Then I am going to hear about politicking. I am Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I am finished taking blame for anybody in anything.

Aside.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Not the Honourable Prime Minister, the Minister of Health. I wrote him and he has not replied.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member give way for a moment? The actual state of this particular matter is that an amendment has been moved and seconded. I would have to have some guidance as to whether you are speaking on the amendment. 7.10 p.m.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Sir, before you get guidance. The Honourable Member said that he wrote to the Minister of Health and did not get the courtesy of reply. He wrote to the Minister of Health and asked the Minister of Health to lay the report of the St. Joseph Hospital. The Minister of Health is trying to get the report on the St. Joseph Hospital. Does he want me to write and tell him that the matter is receiving attention? I will send him a response with the report. I am not going to waste my time writing him what the Civil Servants would write. If the Honourable Member would consider that a courtesy I will do him that courtesy. He should not give the impression that he has not had a reply because of a lack of courtesy. I apologise to the Honourable Member for not being courteous to him and the Committee. I give him the assurance that he will have a reply next week but he will not get the report because I do not have it. He will have a reply but no report. As soon as I get the report, he will have it.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: On a point of order, there are 2 motions before the Committee. I had moved that Clause 22 as renumbered stand part. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West has moved an amendment to Clause 22. As I understand it, Your Honour is putting that amendment first.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question was put and agreed in the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 22 as renumbered stand part was put and agreed in the affirmative without division.

Clause 23 as renumbered was called and passed. Clause 24 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there is a consequential amendment on the renumbering of the sections. In the first line of Clause 24 as renumbered rather than reading subject to section 34 this will now read subject to section 35. I am moving that Clause 24 as renumbered, the old Clause 23 as amended, stand part. Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
Clause 25 as renumbered was called.*

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 25 as renumbered stand part, I wish to draw to the attention of the Committee that an amendment to Clause 25(2)(a) has been circulated and I am proposing that Clause 25(2)(a) as amended in the draft which has been circulated stand part. The reason why the provision is made for prescribing the offences is that, as it stands, it is perhaps too widely drawn as an offence involving dishonesty or violence. Violence could be an offence under the old

section 35 of the Offences against the Person Act which might be a simple battery. There are some small offences of violence

2947

and dishonesty which this should not necessarily cover. If we draft the Clause and provide for the prescribed offences to be set in regulations, the regulations can then set out in detail those offences which will render a person unfit to hold a licence as an owner or operator of a hotel.

Mr. Chairman, there is a further amendment, but I am not too sure of the draft which has been circulated. In the Bill which has been laid in the House subclause (c) reads: "... that the approval of the Minister required by regulation 3 of the Health Services (Building) Regulations, 1969 has been obtained." There was a draft in which the words "approval of..." were left out. That whole Clause should read: "proof that the approval of the Minister of Health".

I move that, with those amendments, Clause 25 stand part.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I take it that the Attorney General by the amendment says it is too wide at the present moment. Of course, having amended it now, it permits greater width. I hope that in consideration of the prescribed offences attention will be paid to the fact that we have examples in Barbados of people who deduct National Insurance Contributions, in particular, have not been paying them in and have actually been convicted for that offence. I take it that will be a prescribed offence.

You did not have it before, but it is a matter of some importance. I will tell you why. Many people feel that there are establishments which faithfully carry out that obligation at great expense to themselves. It is a very important point. I know that, obviously, the import of that would be great when you come to the fact that we have now expanded the definition of "tourist accommodation" and are now getting at what Honourable Members would call "the small man"; but never mind that. The point is you have to take into consideration in the prescription of offences, that there are offences other than violence and dishonesty, so you must have another category there. 7.20 p.m.

The other point I want to make, a very valid point, is you have shifted your language here. Both sections 23 and 24 deal with operators. When you come to getting a certificate from the Commissioner of Police you are also placing an additional burden on the owner too. What you are saying in section 24 is "a person who desires to operate..." Why do you change it from operator and then bring in owner? If you are dealing with operators and saying that nobody shall operate these things, stick with operators because an operator has to go all around the place to find the owner. The Commissioner of Police has to investigate 2 people, not only the applicant but the owner.

You have shifted it now when you come to subsection (2) although section 24 says:-

"(1) A person who desires to operate any tourist accommodation shall apply in the prescribed form to the Authority for a licence to operate that tourist accommodation.

(2) An application for a licence shall be accompanied by

(a) a certificate from the Commissioner of Police that the owner or operator..."

It is wrong. "Owner" should be deleted.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I note the point which has been made by the Honourable Member. I suggest the Clause as it stands should remain. We will consider it further.

The question that Clause 25 as renumbered and amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 26 as renumbered was called and passed. Clause 27 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 27 as renumbered stand part subject to one minor consequential amendment in subsection (5), line 2, "section 27" should now read "section 28".

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

The question that Clause 27, as renumbered and amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman - On a point of... I am not sure if it is a point of order because it is passed and is sought to be recommitted. The problem you have is I do not think it is any different to the Profession, Trade and Business Registration Act...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The only problem is that the Clause has not been recommitted.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: On our side we are suggesting to put the argument on it before the Honourable Members...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If there is further discussion the Clause would have to be recommitted otherwise it will go . as passed.

2948

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee agree to recommit this Clause?

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee make up its mind whether it is going to recommit it? If not we will move to Clause 28 as renumbered?

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the recommittal of this clause? I hear none. You want to make a point on it?

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I understand the House by its silence has agreed to recommit it so I will speak. Normally in instances where there are renewal of licences there is always what is called a grace period within which to get the renewal because there may be administrative and other bottlenecks that have occurred.

I believe I am correct in saying that in the registration of all licences, there is a time normally to January 31. Take the registration of people under the Profession, Trade and Business Registration Act. The licence expires on December 31 but you have until January 31 within which to register and the registration is obviously valid as from the 1st of January the year to the 31st of December of the year. That gives the administration as well time to carry out the various exercises. You will find that normally the bulk , of registration is done within the first 15 days or so. There are a few stragglers but everybody iries to get licensed within that time. 7.30 p.m.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty with this Clause because I do recall that when I looked at the draft Bill I discussed the matter with the Chief Parliamentary Counsel and I raised the question as to the use of January 1 in each year. Some discussion did take place as to whether that date should be January 1 or some later date. My recollection is that the Chief Parliamentary Counsel indicated that the licence is valid until December 31 in any year and a new licence should come into effect and be in place by January 1 of the succeeding year and .that during the month of December any person seeking to renew a licence should take steps to have their licence renewed. It seems to me as if the law as it stands is certain. If an applicant, as the owner or operator of a business, knows that his or her licence expires on December 31 and needs to get a new licence renewed before January 1 in the following year, the application should automatically take place before the end of the previous year. So that is the background against which the Clause was allowed to remain as it is. I have heard nothing which would change my view on that at this time. If on reflection further consideration needs to be given to it, it will be so given. For the time being I see nothing wrong with the Clause as it stands.

The question that Clause 27, as renumbered and amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 28, as renumbered, was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving Clause 28, as renumbered, there is an amendment to 28(2)(d).

There is a new formulation of Clause (d). The new formulation will read as follows:

"The person to whom a licence has been issued has been convicted of a prescribed offence."

This is to make this consistent with the previous Clause which was amended in this regard. So that the offences again, as in the previous Clause, would be prescribed by regulations.

I move that Clause 28 as amended, the old Clause 27, stand part.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious Clause because it now confers the right, in one case, on the Authority to suspend and cancel the licence of a person and it could cause tremendous loss of money, as well as tremendous loss of goodwill. The things that must be certain in this are the time limits within which various actions may be taken.

Now, the Authority may suspend a licence and shall notify the person under (2) that the licence has been suspended. When it suspends the licence under sub-clause (3), it has to give the person notice in writing of the proposed suspension and the person then has 30 days to submit to the Authority in writing the reasons why it should not be suspended. It merely says that the Authority shall, after the expiry of the 30-day period mentioned in (4), make a decision taking into account the reasons submitted to it. Where a licence has been suspended the Authority shall in writing notify of the suspension and the period of suspension and require the person to comply within the period of suspension with any direction given and notify the person whose licence is suspended that he may apply to the Minister for a review.

It is my view, Sir, that in these clauses which affect people's rights in this way, the time within which the Authority should give its final decision on the suspension should be a limited time. To say it will give it after

2949

the expiry of 30 days, could mean any time after except we should imply within a reasonable time. I suppose that is as far as the Courts will go in construing that position. But we are dealing with a small country where a person's goodwill could be wiped out within a short period of time. The criticism which I make in relation to suspension also applies in relation to the Minister's power of review. You notify the person under subsection (c) of section 6 that he may apply to the Minister for a review. He may apply to the Minister not later than 30 days from which notice is given and for the purpose of this, Sir, I must deal with both cancellation and review. I have unfortunately to deal with the clause coming up because then the Minister has no limited time within which to carry out the review and to notify of the outcome of that review. I respectfully submit to the Committee that this is too wide. The Attorney General said of the earlier clause that it was certain. This is an area where you need certainty more than anything else in dealing with suspension and cancellation of people's right to earn a living and to carry on their business. We need a certainty and we need time limits specifying not later than a certain time within which these matters can be adjudicated and carried to the Court 7.40 p.m.

Whilst I agree that we have the Administrative Justice Act to exercise some control over Ministerial review and discretion, yet I seriously will urge this Committee and the Government to consider redrafting these Clauses to put in the protection necessary for people's property rights in a case such as this, Sir.

Hon. M. A. KING: It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that where a person whose licence has been suspended applies to the Minister to have his suspension reviewed during that time the suspension should not be in effect. Until the decision is taken to suspend, there seems to me to be no problem. Now the Minister takes a decision to suspend. Once the decision is taken certain other rights arise. Under Section 28, any person who has been prejudiced by a review of the Minister has a right to apply to the Court to a Judge in Chambers for a review of that decision.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: The point is that until the Minister makes a decision there is no prejudice. The Minister would be stupid to delay making a decision for a long time. If the Minister makes no decision, the man goes on operating. Why do you want to tie him down? If he does not make a decision, that is his problem. The man continues to operate.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to the Honourable Attorney General, sub-clause (6) says that where a licence has been suspended in accordance with sub-section (1)(a) or (b), the Authority should notify the person whose licence is suspended of the suspension period, require the person to comply within the period of suspension with any direction given by the Authority and notify the person whose licence is suspended that he may apply to the Minister for a review of the decision.

There is nothing which says that in the meantime that sentence, if I may call it so, is itself suspended and has no effect. The Minister must follow me on this, Sir. We are going to have a lot of legal battles about this clause. There is nothing which says that he can continue to operate. I would prefer if he had an express clause to that effect because under sub-clause (b) he has to give the time. In sub-clause (c) he has to notify the licensee that he can apply to the Minister for a review, but the suspension has been taken. In my view, in those circumstances it seems to me that there is a difficulty. You will see that clause is given a little different way of drafting. Under Section 28 where a person applies to a Minister for a review of the decision to refuse, suspend or cancel a licence and is aggrieved by the decision of the Minister he may appeal to a Judge in Chambers whose decision shall be final.

Sir, I believe there should be time limits. I am repeating myself on that but I have to repeat it. I would respectfully suggest that, if the Attorney General is going to contend that the effect of sub-section (6) of the section is not to allow the suspension to take effect, the law should make that certain. This is going to be very controversial.

Hon. M. A. KING: I take the comments of the Honourable Member. If there is need to review it, I will do so.

The question that Clause 28 as renumbered and amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division with the Opposition Members being recorded as dissenting from that Clause. Clause 29 as renumbered was called and passed with the same dissent as in Clause 28. Clauses 30 to 33 as renumbered were called and passed. Clause 34 as renumbered was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that Clause 34 as renumbered stand part subject to substituting a technical change of section "24 from section 23", but that line 2 of the Clause called should now read "section 24", subclause (2), the third line, "section 25" should now read "section 26", and subclause (3), the first line, "section 19" should now read "section 20". 7.50 p.m.

2950

The question that Clause 34 as renumbered and amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Clause 35, as renumbered, was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there are 2 adjustments to Clause 35, as renumbered, the old Clause 34. Section 23 at the end of the clause now becomes section 24 and, to make the clause consistent with others, in the second line after "the owner" the words "or operator" should be inserted. Subject to those amendments, I move that Clause 35, the old Clause 34, stand part.

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

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Can the Minister tell me whether there are any premises that are at present licensed under the existing Registration and Classification Act? If such premises are licensed, the normal thing is to accept that as valid and not ask for a reclassification. Have any been done for the year?

Hon. B. M. TAUT: Mr. Chairman, a list of those registered in 1992 has been in the newspaper for the last couple of weeks, so it stands to reason that there is not likely to be any licensed for 1993. So they will be starting from scratch.

The question that Clause 35, as renumbered and amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 36, 37 and 38, as renumbered, were called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that the First Schedule be the First Schedule to the Bill, there are a number of "amendments which need to be made. I am moving that paragraph 6 be deleted and that paragraph 6 of the circulated amendments replace that Clause 6.

¹¹ 6. A director other than the Chairman or Deputy Chairman may at any time resign his office by instrument in writing addressed to the Minister and transmit the instrument through the Chairman and, from the date of the receipt by the Minister of the instrument, the director ceases to be a director."

Also, I am moving that paragraph 16, as circulated, replace the existing paragraph 16, but subject to a further amendment. Paragraph 16 which has been circulated reads as follows:

" 16. The decisions of the Board shall be by a majority of votes and in any case in which the voting is equal, the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman presiding at the meeting has, in addition to an original vote, a second or casting vote."

The amendment I am suggesting will make it consistent with the other Clauses in the Schedules. There may be occasions where a person other than the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman may preside under the First and Second Schedules. In paragraph 14 of this Schedule it says -

" 14. The Chairman or, in his absence, the Deputy Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Board and, in the case of the absence of both, the directors present and constituting a quorum shall elect a temporary chairman from among their number who shall preside at the meeting."

So as to reflect that formulation, Mr. Chairman, in the First and Second Schedules I am moving that paragraph 16 should read as follows:

¹¹ 16. The decisions of the Board shall be by a majority of votes and, in any case in which the voting is equal, the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman or temporary chairman presiding at the meeting..." so after "Chairman" take out "or" and include after "Deputy Chairman" the words "or Temporary Chairman".

Subject to those changes, I move that the First Schedule, as amended, be the First Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, in moving that the Second Schedule be the Second Schedule to the Bill, there are again one or two minor stylistic changes which are necessary. In paragraph 5, for instance, just to make the language consistent stylistically with other parts of the Bill, for the word "must", substitute the word "shall" in line 3. In paragraph 7, the first word of line 3, again "shall"

replaces "must", and in paragraph 12, the fourth line, the second word, after "has" there is a comma.

2951

With those amendments, I move that the Second Schedule be the Second Schedule to the BUI.

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

The question that the Second Schedule, as amended, be the Second Schedule to the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Third Schedule was called.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Third Schedule be the Third Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. B. M. TAITT, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill, with amendments, in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.' 8.00 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. W. W. HALL, seconded by Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for the City is not in her place. I will therefore instruct that the Replies be laid on the Table.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this single Bill has engaged our attention for several hours stretching over almost 2 full days. I am moving that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, February 9, 1992.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Speaking on the adjournment, I should wish to draw the attention of the House to the resplendent way in which the Speaker is robed for these proceedings. I just took notice and I wonder whether the robes were recently laundered or whether they were new robes. They look very resplendent. The wig, however, seems a little incongruous. I hope there might be some colour in consonance with the robe. I certainly wish to congratulate you, Sir, on the resplendent attire. *

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, the reason why we cannot start Private Members' Business at this time is because of the late hour, but I have the assurance of the Honourable Leader of the House that on the next occasion we will take Private Members' Business in Private Members' time.

I had hoped that the Honourable Member would have adjourned the House until next Tuesday, given the importance of the Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St Peter as Item No. 4. Having regard to the fact that the Honourable Leader has said the time has been taken up for 2 days in trying to discuss this Bill, I would ask that the 2 motions also standing in my name be not taken off the paper, having regard to

the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to assure the Honourable Member that I have already spoken with the Clerk in respect of those 2 Resolutions so they will remain. To the Prime Minister, it is just that there are times when we need restructuring and the restructuring has started with the robe. I hope funds will be available to complete the head gear if need be.

The question was put and agreed to in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 8.05 p.m.

2952

CONTENTS

MINUTES Hon. P.M. GREAVES.....	2906
--------------------------------	------

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, January 19,1993.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER.....	2906
------------------	------

Receipt of Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1992 as prepared by the Accountant General

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS Hon. B. M. TAITT.....	2907
---	------

Notice that Replies to Questions Nos. 19 and 20 were ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	2907
---	------

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO, 5 - BARBADOS TOURISM AUTHORITY BILL, 1993.....	2907
---	------

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 2907, 2909,2945; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 2910, 2911, 2913; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 2914, 2915, 2916, 2917, 2918, 2919; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 2920, 2942; Mr. H. deB. Forde, 2924, 2926, 2942, 2943, 2944, 2945, 2946, 2948, 2949; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2928, 2929, 2931; Hon. W. W. Hall, 2932, 2934, 2935, 2936, 2937, 2938; Hon. M. A. King, 2940, 2941, 2944, 2946, 2948, 2949, 2950; Hon. H. B. St. John, 2940, 2941, 2943, 2947; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2940, 2942; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 2940, 2941, 2942, 2943, 2945, 2946.

SUSPENSION.....	2920
-----------------	------

ADJOURNMENT.....	2951
------------------	------

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 2951; Rt. Hon. L.E. Sandiford, 2951; Mr. H. deB. Forde, 2951; Mr. Speaker, 2951.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter) BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East) FORDE, Mr. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North) HALL, Hon. W. W. (St. Michael West Central) 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)