THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 7, 1994.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at **10.20 a.m.**

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Economic Affairs, Tourism, International Transport and Minister for the Civil Service)
Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Deputy Leader of the House)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and Leader of the House)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Justice and Minister for CARICOM Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)
Mr. N. K. SIMMONS
Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Leader of the Opposition)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Hon. C. V. WALKER, J.P., (Minister of Health)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Mr. E. E. GREAVES, G.C.M., B.A., Ed.M.
Mr. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., J.P.
Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.
Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.
Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.) (Minister of Finance)
Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.
Miss B. A. MILLER
Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)
Hon. J. O. TUDOR, J.P., (Minister of Labour, Public Works, Community Development and Sports)
Hon. D. W. BOWEN, B.Sc. (Accounts) (Hons.) (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)
Mr. G. W. PAYNE
Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., LL.B.
Hon. T. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., LL.B., (Minister of Education and Culture)

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Minutes of Tuesday, 31st May, **1994.**

Before the Honourable Leader confirms the Minutes, first let me welcome all of you in the Gallery to this session. Many of you have been here before and some of you are here for the first time. You are termed "strangers" in the Gallery. I will not read the entire Order that deals with you who sit in the Gallery, but I want you to remember that the Standing Orders say "Strangers must be silent during debates and must at all times conduct themselves in a fit and proper manner." What it really says is that you should be silent, and by inference no cheering, no clapping. I think that will help you to enjoy the day's sitting.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber of a

meeting which was held on 31st May, 1994, I am advised have been circulated and I therefore move that they be co rmed.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before we embark on the Orders of the Day, I think it is very appropriate that we should suspend certain Standing Orders. I am therefore moving that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment of our last meeting I indicated that today would be reserved to deal with a matter of some importance, a matter of which notice has been given by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the Prime Minister. 1 move that that be the instant Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business is the instant Order of the Day. Order No. 8.

RESOLUTION THAT THIS HOUSE HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER AND THAT HIS APPOINTMENT OUGHT TO BE REVOKED

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member speaks, I just want to say to the House that on this Resolution each Member has 30 minutes, I intend that when it comes to three minutes within the end I shall indicate to the Honourable Member that his time is coming to a close. That includes the mover of the Resolution, every one.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, before I speak I should ask for clarification as to whether the 30 minutes time limit applies to me as well in my capacity as mover of the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what the Standing Orders say.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on 5th May, 1789 the British political philosopher, Edmund Burke, speaking on the occasion of the impeachment of Warren Hastings observed: "An event has happened upon which it is difficult to speak and impossible to remain silent."

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has had a long and distinguished history in the governance of all the affairs of this country. There were occasions in the distant past when Members of this Assembly took a stand against the tryanny and the might of an imperial power in the defence of what they at that time conceived of as the rights and privileges of this Parliament. With the advent of Independence in 1966, the unrelenting preoccupation of this Parliament has been with the orderly and the progressive development of this island, the improvement of the welfare of our people and the building of a strong and a vibrant parliamentary democracy within the context of the provisions set out in the supreme law of this land, the Constitution of Barbados.

Within this tradition this Parliament has from time to time found it necessary to enquire into the behaviour of its own in circumstances where the behaviour of Members has been construed to be contrary to the orderly and the progressive development of this island and the welfare of its people, offensive to the provisions of our Constitution and at variance with our resolve to build in Barbados a strong and a vibrant parliamentary democracy.

The event that I seek to invite this Honourable House to embark upon is a matter upon which it is difficult to speak, because it does not just involve an enquiry into the behaviour of one of our own, but it invites this House to censure and to express no confidence in the statements and actions of a Prime Minister and to recommend that his appointment ought to be revoked. This is a matter which cannot be taken lightly nor frivolously. And this House will observe and respect the fact that the Opposition has been in no mad rush to bring this matter to Parliament.

It is, however, a matter on which it is simply impossible for this House to remain silent, since it will determine whether this Parliament will continue to reign supreme in presiding over the orderly and the progressive development of this country.
10.30 a.m.

The precise matter before this Parliament has been occasioned by the actions and the statements by the Right Honourable Prime Minister in relation to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer for the Barbados Tourism Authority, and it is set out in the following terms:

WHEREAS the Barbados Tourism Authority Act, 1993, provides:

that the Minister responsible for Tourism shall appoint the Board of Directors of the Barbados Tourism Authority;

that the Authority shall be responsible for the policy and general administration of the Authority;

that the Minister may give to the Authority mandatory directions of a general nature in respect of the policy to be followed in performance of its functions;

that the Authority shall, with the approval of the Minister, appoint a Chief Executive Officer and a Deputy Chief Executive Officer; and

that the Chief Executive Officer is subject to the directions of the Board and is responsible thereto for the execution of policy and management of its affairs:

AND WHEREAS the Board in August, 1993 appointed a Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the then Minister responsible for Tourism, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of St. Michael West Central, and, contrary to the provisions of the Act, the appointee did not assume office;

AND WHEREAS the appointments of several directors of the Board were thereafter simultaneously revoked by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, as Temporary Minister responsible for Tourism, before the end of their period of appointment, and other persons were appointed to the Board.

AND WHEREAS the Board in December, 1993 appointed a Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the then Minister responsible for Tourism, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of St. Lucy, and, contrary to the provisions of the Act, the appointee did not assume office:

AND WHEREAS neither of the two Boards above appointed the present Chief Executive Officer and there was therefore no request for the approval of either of the two former Ministers of his appointment:

AND WHEREAS the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, as Minister responsible for Tourism, thereafter revoked the appointments of all directors of the Barbados Tourism Authority during their tenure of office and reconstituted the whole directorship of the Authority:

AND WHEREAS that Board has appointed a Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister as the substantive Minister responsible for Tourism and that appointee has assumed office:

AND WHEREAS the Right Honourable the Prime Minister at all material times and, in particular, in a Prime Ministerial address to the Nation of Barbados on Wednesday 18th May, 1994 articulated as his position in relation to the appointment in terms

that "the position of a Chief Executive Officer should be filled by internal promotion";

that he positively limited the freedom of choice vested by the Act in the Authority beyond his legal right to give general directions on policy under Section 12; and

that he required a specific appointment to the post of Chief Executive Officer, contrary to his legal right:

AND WHEREAS the Right Honourable the Prime Minister has said, in particular, that the three Honourable Ministers who resigned over the issue were "diametrically opposed" to the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer:

AND WHEREAS the Honourable Members for the respective constituencies of St. Michael West Central, St. Lucy and St. James South were not party to or at any time concerned with the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer to that post and the Right Honourable the Prime Minister has in that connection imputed to those Honourable Members jointly and severally, while they served as Ministers of the Crown, actions contrary to the proven records of the Barbados Tourism Authority in relation to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer.

AND WHEREAS the aforesaid actions by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister have undermined the authority, credibility and prestige of the office of Prime Minister:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House condemn the actions and statements of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister in the matter of the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority to his office:

BE IT **FURTHER** RESOLVED THAT this House has no confidence in the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and Member of this Honourable House for the Constituency of St. Michael South:

AND BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED BY THIS HOUSE THAT the appointment of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister ought to be revoked.

Mr. Speaker, the actions and the statements of the Prime Minister in relation to the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority provide the occasion and the material circumstances which form the foundation of this Resolution before the House.

It is important to grasp, Sir, that arising out of the material circumstances and the action and statements of the Prime Minister in relation to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority are three fundamental charges which the Prime Minister of this country must face and which will serve as our basis for asking this House to censure the Prime Minister, to express no confidence in him and to recommend that his appointment should be revoked.

What are these three fundamental charges of which I speak? Sir, the statements and action of the Prime Minister in this particular matter represent a direct challenge to and have undermined the principle and practice of Cabinet Government and the principle and practice of the collective responsibility of Cabinet as enshrined in the Constitution of Barbados.

We are saying on this side that the Prime Minister of this country, by his statements and his action in the particular matter before the House, has sought to transplant on our political system a form of Prime Ministerial dictatorship that is alien and repugnant to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of this country and that, if this House allows this to take hold, a virulent and dangerous threat will arise to the functioning and the preservation of this democratic system of Government which we seek to preserve in this country.

The second issue, Sir, is that the Prime Minister, although he is only the ***primus inter pares*** in Cabinet, occupies a critical position in Government. At all times, the credibility of the Prime Minister, the trust that must be reposed in the office and the holder of that office must be preserved. We are arguing on this occasion that the actions and the statements of the Prime Minister in relation to the matter before the House have been such as to undermine public confidence in the credibility in the office and the present holder of the prime ministership of this country.

The third fundamental charge that we are levelling at the Prime Minister, arising out of the material circumstances surrounding the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer at the Barbados Tourism Authority is that it has involved a drastic misuse and abuse of the powers of the Prime Minister as I will demonstrate.

Mr. Speaker, I start with the first charge, the question of the manner in which the actions and statements of the Prime Minister have destroyed and are in dangw of destroying the principle and practice of collective Government in this country as enshrined in the Constitution. I will refer to Section 64 of the Constitution of this country. It says:

> "(1) There shall be a Cabinet for Barbados which shall consist of the Prime Minister and not less than five other Ministers appointed in accordance with the provisions of section 65."

Section 64(2) says and I want to stress this:

> 'The Cabinet shall be the principal instrument of policy and shall be charged with the general direction and control of the government of Barbados and shall be collectively responsible therefor to Parliament."

Sir, that is enshrined in the Constitution, and it puts the Cabinet, not the Prime Minister, at the centre of Government. It enshrines the principle and the precept of the collective responsibility of Cabinet and the responsibility of Cabinet for its actions to this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time, various Prime Ministers and members of this House have had to speak in a forthcoming manner in this Parliament as to what that principle and precept mean.
10.40 a.m.

I was privileged to be in this House on July 22,1986, when a former Prime Minister gave the best and fullest definition to the manner in which a Prime Minister should operate to give the fullest meaning to the supremacy of Cabinet, the principle of collective responsibility and the supremacy of Parliament in relation to the actions of a Cabinet.

I must tell this House, Sir, at page 80 of the Debates of Parliament for 1986, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Errol Walton Barrow, came to this House on the occasion when this House was being asked to approve a Resolution to borrow some money on the Japanese market. He made it clear and said he was embarrassed to speak in the debate. He said "I do not agree that the Minister of Finance should go to Japan". He also said he did not agree that the Government should be borrowing money. Then he went on to say "I have to support the Resolution or walk out". The records of this House will show that despite the fact that the Prime Minister was fundamentally opposed to the actions of his Minister of Finance, he was man enough to respect the Constitution of this country. Although he was the only Member of Cabinet in that debate who said that he was opposed to the Minister of Finance, he recognised that he had to support the Resolution in support of the principle of collective responsibility.

The present Prime Minister of this country himself, Mr. Speaker, has had reason and occasion to speak to the question of the powers of the Prime Minister relative to the powers of Cabinet and the principle of a collective responsibility of Parliament. I have to refer you to the Debates of Parliament for 1983, Hansard of March 14, 1983 and I am reading from page 3076. It is Mr. L. E. Sandiford and he spoke on that occasion in these terms:

> "It is right that at times we should stop in this country amidst all of the flow of the passing of legislation, amidst all of the talk about different Ministries and departments and so on, and study what is happening to the political power structure of the country.
>
> When I hear the definition of the Office of Prime Minister as being *primus* inter pares, first among equals, there is no way in this country that the Prime Minister is any *primus* inter pares, any first among equals.
>
> That must have been so when the office first emerged, but today the Prime Minister is so far ahead of the other members of Cabinet, especially because of his control over the Cabinet Office and through the Cabinet Office in terms of the coordination of power that the old Latin phrase – I do not mind how it is pronounced – is not really applicable today. He is more than No. 1, he is it; so much so that what we have in this country, I am, positive about it, is not Cabinet Government. We have Prime Ministerial Government in this country, and we had better understand it, and what we are trying to do is to ensure that the Prime Ministerial Government in this country does not run riot, that it has to be controlled by different centres in the Government."
>
> I had better repeat that, Sir:
>
> "and what we are trying to do is to ensure that Prime Ministerial Government in this country does not run riot, that it has to be controlled by different centres in the Government.
>
> I want to see the members in the Cabinet have a greater say in what goes on in this country. I want to ensure that if they do not speak up for themselves, if they allow themselves to be sidelined..."

Then, Sir, he was interrupted by asides. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of this country from as far back as 1983 recognised a dangerous trend in this country, in his view, towards Prime Ministerial Government contrary to the provisions of the Constitution; and he recognised then, as he said in his own words, that we had to ensure that Prime Ministerial Government in this country did not run riot.

We are charging, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular instance Prime Ministerial Government has run riot to the point where Prime Ministerial dictatorship is about to take route in this country and it behoves this House to act now to stop this cancer.

You may ask, Sir, what is the evidence for this? The evidence for this is to be found in information already in the public domain spoken of by a former Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, when he said that in relation to the appointment by his Board of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority, that as far as he was aware one man, and one man alone, was opposed to that appointment but the might of that one man, and that one man alone was allowed to carry.

Now, Sir, if you have to find a clear representation of Prime Ministerial dictatorship I would suggest to you that you would look in vain for it. It is on record and in the public domain that one man, and one man alone, stood against sections 9 and 12 of the Barbados Tourism Authority Act being carried into effect and the will of that one man, and that one man alone, the Prime Minister of this country, carried.

I want to suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an isolated instance. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South has spoken in this House time and time again of events arising in 1991 and continuing after 1991 where fundamental actions that could affect adversely the livelihoods and welfare of the people of this country were entered into as a result of the will and decision of one man, and one man alone.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in relation to the charges that have been made in this House over and over again by the Honourable Member for St. Philip South in relation to the events leading up to this Government having to enter into a programme with the International Monetary Fund, to have wreak so much havoc on the welfare of the people of this country. One man, and one man acting alone, was at the centre of activity in this country. I say to this House that history will not absolve us if we do not today put a stop to this cancer.

I also say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the office of the Prime Minister is too important in this country for the credibility of that office and the credibility of the holder of that office to be undermined by there being clear evidence that the Prime Minister of the country is not telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

This House has to face the facts, Sir. In this particular matter what is at issue fundamentally, as I have cited in my Resolution, is that the Prime Minister has made one

statement in relation to the material circumstances surrounding the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority and that statement has been contradicted, not by me, not by members of the Opposition, not by some people in a foreign land, but by three former members of his Cabinet.

I say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that is an occurrence without precedence in this country. It is an occurrence without precedence in any other parliamentary democracy. And it has created the basis for the undermining of the credibility and the trust that the people of this country must put in the Prime Minister of this country. This House today has to face this issue.

I will say again, as I have said in relation to the question of the practice of collective responsibility, that sad to say, that was not an isolated incident either. We have seen and heard in this House in 1992 during the course of a Budget debate this Prime Minister rise before this Parliament to tell this Parliament that an agreement had been reached with the trade unions in relation to the reduction of severance payments and we have heard in this Parliament a member rise to his feet and contradict the Prime Minister of this country on a matter as fundamental as the rights of the workers of Barbados. It must stop.

I do not want to go back, Sir, into the business of the Throne Speech. I have already raised that before Parliament. I do not want to have to go into the business of the Letter to the International Monetary Fund when false charges were made about how increased amortisation payments in 1990 were at the base of our economic problems and the record is that rather than an increase, in 1990 amortisation actually decreased. I have already referred that to Parliament.

The Prime Minister of this country enjoys no standing of trust and credibility with the public because in too many instances on matters of fundamental importance to the welfare of the people of this country, it can be shown by just a casual examination of the facts of the matter, that the Prime Minister has not been telling the truth.
10.50 a.m.

I say, Sir, that in the matter of the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority that there is a glaring discrepancy between what the Prime Minister has said, between what former Ministers in a position to speak on their own behalf have said, and that glaring discrepancy has undermined public confidence in the function of Government in this country and that this debate is about having this matter cleared up. I am taking the side of those who say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the Prime Minister issued false allegations to the people of Barbados in his Ministerial Statement on Wednesday, May 18, 1994.

The third charge is that in this particular matter we have seen the worst misuse and abuse of Prime Ministerial powers ever in the history of this country. Section 23 of the Constitution of this country says and I quote:

> "no person shall be treated in a discriminatory manner by any person acting by virtue of any written law or in the performance of the functions of any public office or any public authority."

I want to repeat that a little more slowly, Sir:

> "no person shall be treated in a discriminatory manner by any person acting by virtue of any written law or in- the performance of the functions of any public office or any public authority."

It is a shameful thing. It is a shameful condition without precedent in any civilized society for a Prime Minister of a country to call a citizen of that country – who is eminently well qualified to apply for a post to make his or her contribution to the development of that society – and apply pressure to him or to her to cause that person to withdraw his or her application for the post.

It is the most shameful aspect of this entire matter. It has been in the public domain without any contradiction from this Prime Minister that, on the 28th of January in order to get his own way to undermine the collective responsibility of Cabinet, he called a Barbadian citizen, employed by an international institution in this country, to get that citizen of this country to withdraw his application for a post for which he was admirably well qualified and in a position to make a fundamental contribution to the further development of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is too serious a matter for this House to treat lightly. The Prime Minister may do what he wants to do with members of his Cabinet. They may allow him to do what they wish him to do to them despite the fact that our Constitution speaks in terms of the collective responsibility of Cabinet.

We however have a responsibility in this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the Prime Minister of this country even if he feels he can ride roughshod over his Cabinet, he must not be allowed to ride roughshod over the rights of the citizens of this society. That fundamentally is what this debate is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has 3 more minutes.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: I have said there are 3 fundamental charges against the Prime Minister which this House simply cannot ignore today. He has worked

assiduously to undermine the supremacy of Cabinet. He has worked assiduously to destroy the concept of the collective responsibility of Cabinet and the responsibility of Cabinet to be answerable to this Parliament. The facts are incontrovertible.

I am charging also that the Prime Minister has, by his actions and statements, worked to destroy public trust in the office of Prime Minister and it is a dangerous development which we must address through this debate. I am sure that the actions and the statements of the Prime Minister in relation to this whole general matter have involved the worse abuse and misuse of Prime Ministerial powers ever experienced in the history of this country.

The fact of the matter is this that we must condemn the Prime Minister because, by his very words, he knows better. That is why his contribution to Hansard on March 14,1983 is the noose by which this Prime Minister should be hung. The fact is that he knew better. He knew what the situation was and that means that he was in a position to do better. He said that he knew that there was a movement towards Prime Ministerial Government in this country. He condemned it in the strongest possible terms. He urged upon all of us, Sir, that we should do everything to ensure that Prime Ministerial Government in this country does not run riot.

I feel that I have brought the right thing to the right place at the right time. Today this House must make a determination as to whether Prime Ministerial Government in this country should be allowed to run riot or not. I say to the House that, on the evidence before us, history will not absolve us, if we do not together, as a Parliament, vote in support of this Resolution.

I therefore respectfully beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I rise, Mr. Speaker, to second the Resolution before this Honourable House and to reserve my right to speak.

Hon. M. A. **KING:** Mr. Speaker, this Resolution before this House, as presented by the Honourable Member for St. Peter raises a fundamental question as to what type of Government we want to operate under and what is the system of Government to be practised.

The Honourable Member has spoken about Prime. Ministerial power, about the system of Cabinet Government. He has quoted liberally from the Constitution. We have to recognize that in talking about the Prime Minister we are talking about an office in which the Constitution vests the power to advise the Governor-General on the appointment of Ministers. The Constitution says that the Prime Minister is the only person who has the right to advise the Governor-General on who the Ministers of the Crown who will form the Cabinet will be. It is the Prime Minister who has the right to determine the portfolios which those Ministers will have and manage. In every sense of the word the buck stops at the Prime Minister. When Government succeeds it is the Prime Minister who gets the credit. When it fails it is the Prime Minister who is criticized.

You would recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the enquiry which was held by Sir Herbert Duffus following on the change of Government in 1976, I think it was, that Sir Herbert Duffus made the point that all roads led to Barrow. Has anybody in this country got any doubt in their minds that in the Barbados Labour Party Administration all roads led to Tom Adams. If anybody has any doubt in their mind about that, they do not understand what was going on in this country.

We have the problem which has arisen as a result of an appointment of Chief Executive Officer of a statutory corporation. It must be ironic that the Prime Minister has the power to advise on the appointment of Ministers. The Minister has, by the Tourism Authority Act the power to approve of an appointment of Chief Executive Officer for the Board of Tourism. The law is that the Board appoints subject to the approval of the Minister, so that the Minister has a statutory duty to perform in approving or not approving an appointment by any statutory corporation. It is not the position that a Minister is under any obligation to accept any appointment which has been put up by a Board, because a Minister has a ministerial function to perform in exercising a right whether to approve or not to approve.

11.00 a.m.

I was making the point that it is ironic that a Prime Minister - and I make this point generally - has the authority to appoint a Minister, the Minister has a right to appoint a Board, but some are saying that a Prime Minister should have no right whatsoever in saying who should be appointed as Chief Executive Officer of a Board. I am not making that as a final, fundamental conclusion, but do you realise how absurd a situation could be? Because in this particular case which we are talking about, what was there to prevent the Prime Minister from appointing the person who is now Chief Executive Officer to be Minister of Tourism? Do you realise that the Prime Minister could have appointed that officer to be Minister of Tourism?

What I am saying is that you are talking about Prime Ministerial power, but if you do not accept and believe that by the Constitution of Barbados the Prime Minister

has considerable power, you do not understand the Constitution of Barbados. And you are talking about first among equals? The Prime Minister does not get the same salary as other Ministers, the Prime Minister has other allowances and perks which other Ministers do not have. Is he equal to them? Let us not waste time going down that road as to the effect of Prime Ministerial power, because in so many instances in the Westminster system Prime Ministers exercise a tremendous amount of power, and those who do not believe and understand that do not understand how the system works. Do not tell me you have a Constitution which is going to operate one way for Prime Minister Barrow, which is going to operate one way for Prime Minister Adams and which you are saying must operate in a different way for Prime Minister Sandiford. What reason and what rationale could be behind that?

The quotation which was extracted talked about containing Prime Ministerial power. That is true. We have to be concerned about the containment of prime ministerial power and you over there must be equally concerned about that. The fact is that you cannot have a leader who is bereft and derived of power and whom you have so emaciated that he cannot lead effectively. That is a prescription for chaos, and the Honourable Member for Christ Church South knows that. Leadership has to be strong in order to succeed. If you doubt that, you try mamby pamby leadership and see what happens to you.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: There is no question about dictatorship, we have a democratic process here. When you are talking about tyrants and dictatorship, you are talking now about control by tyrants and dictators, about every aspect of the freedom of the people whom they govern. Can anybody in their right mind say that every aspect of the freedoms and the liberties of the Barbadian people are governed and controlled by the Prime Minister? Anybody who makes that suggestion cannot be rational. What you are not doing is recognising that we have a democratic system in which from time to time the actions of politicians are subjected to public scrutiny. You go before the polls. To date, thank God, we still have a system of free and fair elections, and it is that aspect of the democratic process which has to click in and which must be important and which we have to make every effort to try to preserve intact to ensure that our people and our citizens have freedom of choice in electing people to office. If they do not approve of the way in which a Government governs a country, it is the people's right and duty to say that to the politicians in election time and we have to respect the democratic process in that way.

By this motion of no confidence, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is presuming to tell me and to tell Members of this parliamentary group of the Democratic Labour Party whom they should decide not to have as their political leader and as the Prime Minister. From his seat as Leader of the Opposition he wants to direct and instruct me as to who should lead me. I am saying you cannot tell me that, you have no right to tell me that and I fundamentally object to you, by this Resolution, seeking to tell me who should not be my political leader. I am diametrically opposed to that. You had better believe it.

Together with my political colleagues on this side, together with the members of the Democratic Labour Party, we will decide who will be our political leader. We should decide that. You do not have any say in that and you should not, by some left-handed and back-handed means, try to inveigle people on our side to try to support you in trying to destroy the Democratic Labour Party. That is what you are trying to do. You are trying by your initiatives to use the Members on this side to destabilise this Government.

Asides.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, when the present Opposition was in Government and we had a substantial motion of no confidence against one of their Ministers for spending public monies, or presiding over the spending of public monies, improving his own property in St. Lucy – and I say we had a cast iron case against him – they joined ranks. They knew what he had done was wrong, but they joined ranks and supported him. We in the Opposition then could not count on the support of any members of the Government in supporting a Motion of No-confidence against one of their own. That has been their fashion throughout government. Whenever you pointed out wrongdoing, you could not count on any support from the other side in a vote of No-confidence against them; but today they are counting on a vote of No-confidence succeeding against the leader of our party with the help of our members.

11.10 a.m.

I am saying that in the political system which we operate we should not be party to that. The Constitution recognises for practical purposes a two-party system because there is institutionalised the position of Leader of the Opposition. He has a job to do. The Government has a job to do. You have a job but part of your job is not to try to induce people over here to bring down the Government. Use your own members to do it. We will not join or should not join with you in hying to bring down the Government. I will never support you on that. I am telling you about my own philosophy.? I will never support you in trying to bring down...

Aside.

Mr. **SPEAKER:** I want to remind Honourable Members – please I have no intention of giving time

overruns neither am I listening to asides. Will the Honourable Member proceed?

Hon. M. A. KING: I think we have to look at this motion in its proper perspective. From before the last Election obviously the Opposition was seeking to displace the Government. We have no problem with that; but then there were certain elements in the community as well which have a basic and fundamental objection to any Democratic Labour Party Government and certainly before the last election they made no bones about their wishing to bring down the Democratic Labour Party Government.

There was that statement in the Press by a Gang of Four who had put a statement in the Press against the Prime Minister. In the aftermath of the election, that same Gang of Four continued the process of trying to bring down the Prime Minister. Each of us has our sectional interests to advance and to advocate. They have their sectional interest to advance and to advocate and we understand that.

There are others in the community as well. There are a number of columnists who write from day to day in the Press who have never made bones about where they stand in relation to the Democratic Labour Party and of what they would like to see happen to the Democratic Labour Party. There are some, not all, among the clergy who have views which are diametrically opposed to the Democratic Labour Party. Again that is probably why the word comes so easily and one is perhaps inclined to use it. A number of columnists – whether they wear bow ties or not is besides the point, but the point is we know their view – never have the interest of the Democratic Labour Party and their one mission is to seek to bring down the Democratic Labour Party Government by whatever means.

When this issue surfaced, it was something for them to pounce on and to make a big issue of it as if it is one of the greatest constitutional issues possible that could affect the liberties and freedoms of the citizens of this country. It is in the interest of the Opposition to exploit that.

There are, Mr. Speaker, a number of political terrorists in this country who go out of their way to try to put all kinds of pressures on all of us on this side with a view to creating havoc and destruction in the Democratic Labour Party. There are some of us who will stand up to it. There are some of us who will yield to it but we always have to be on our guard and once you find that the appeals are made to all kinds of things. They will appeal to you. "If you have got your country at heart", "History will judge you". Well, let history judge me. "History will judge you" if you don't do this or you don't do the other. They are trying to terrorise this Government out of office but I say to them and to all others I will not be terrorised by them or by anybody else.

I have my own views about issues. I have no concerns about my intellect. I am not for sale. Nobody is going to buy me and whatever judgment I exercise in the final analysis it will be my judgment. I will operate. So let nobody feel that I am going to be terrorised as a result of whatever actions they take, whether they are right, whether they speak, whether they telephone or otherwise.

One has to exercise independent judgment and to do what in the final analysis you perceive to be right and what in your own judgment is the proper course of action you should take for the good of your country and for the good of the political party to which you belong.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things which are basically and fundamentally wrong with this Resolution. They talk about not telling the truth. This Resolution has in a number of inaccuracies and a number of things which are untrue. So are we saying we should censure the Leader of the Opposition for not telling the truth to Parliament? Let me point out what I mean.

In the second preambular paragraph:

"WHEREAS the Board in August 1993 appointed..."

The Board in August 1993 did not appoint anybody. If we are talking about a date the correct time would be July not August.

In the third preambular paragraph where the. Resolution speaks about "several directors of the Board were thereafter simultaneously revoked by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister" – not true. Not several, nor all. Nothing was revoked by the Prime Minister at that time. The Minister then responsible for Tourism who was not the Prime Minister revoked those appointments.

The next paragraph:

> "AND WHEREAS the Board in December, 1993 appointed a Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the then Minister responsible for Tourism, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of St. Lucy, and, contrary to the provisions of the Act, the appointee did not assume office:" That is not true, Mr. Speaker.

11.20 a.m.

I do not think that the Honourable Members on the other side could produce any records of the Board which show that maybe the Board decided on the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer. They know what the practice is. They write to the Minister. The Minister invariably takes the matter to the Cabinet, that is where you talk about the collective responsibility, and once the appointment is agreed, the Minister then signifies the approval to the Board.

What I am saying is that in this instance as well as in the instance previously referred to in relation to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, the process of appointment, I am choosing my words carefully, was not complete so if the process of appointment was not complete then the person could not assume office.

The other point is, Mr., Speaker, that if, as they are alleging, this process of appointment was complete and the appointee did not assume office, the appointee would have had a cause of action. If you appoint a person to a job and then do not let him take up the job he has a cause of action against you so that these two people, if they were appointed, and if they can show that these two persons had been appointed to that office, they would have had a cause of action against the Authority.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole number of other things in this Resolution which are erroneous but I do not have the time to go through them all because my time is running out.

I am going to move at this point certain amendments to this Resolution as follows:-

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has six minutes more.

Hon. M. A. KING: So therefore this is perhaps a good time to start them. In the second preambular paragraph " AND WHEREAS the Board in August 1993 appointed", I am proposing that we delete the words "in August 1993 appointed" and substitute therefor the words "in July 1993 decided on the appointment of'.

Delete the word "with" in line 2 of that clause and substitute the words "subject to".

In line 4 of the said clause delete all the words from "and contrary to" to the end of that clause and substitute therefor the words "but the process of appointment was not completed".

In the third preambular clause, that is the one which says "AND WHEREAS the appointments of several directors of the Board were thereafter simultaneously revoked delete all the words from "simultaneously" in line 2 of that clause right down to the word "Board" in line 5 and substitute therefor the words "revoked by the then Minister responsible for Tourism, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of St. Lucy".

In the 4th preambular clause, delete the words in lines 1 and 2 "appointed a Chief Executive Officer with" and substitute the words "decided on the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer subject to".

In line 4 of that clause delete all the words from "and, contrary to" to the end of that clause and substitute the words "but the process of appointment was not completed".

In the 6th preambular clause delete the word "all" at the end of line 2 and substitute the word "several". Delete the words "during their tenure of office", and delete the words "whole directorship" in line 4 and substitute the word "membership".

In the 8th preambular clause delete the words in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of that clause, that is the clause "that he positively limited the freedom of choice", etc.

In the 10th preambular clause "AND WHEREAS the Honourable Members for the respective constituencies of St. Michael West Central, St. Lucy " in that preambular clause delete all the words beginning in the second line "were not party to" to the words "Chief Executive Officer" at the end. In other words "were not party to" the end of that paragraph and substitute the words "did not at anytime support the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer."

In the l lth preambular clause delete all the words in that clause.

Now we come to the operative paragraph, Mr. Speaker. Delete...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has half a minute to go.

Hon. M. A. KING: In the operative paragraph in the first line delete the word "condemned" and insert the words "take note of'.

In the second operative paragraph delete all the words from the words "has no confidence in" to the words "St. Michael South" at the end of that clause and substitute the words "take note that the Right Honourable the Prime Minister has given leadership to the country particularly in critical times".

In the final operative clause delete all the words in that clause and substitute therefor "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House continue to endorse the policies and programmes of the Government as enunciated by the Right Honourable Prime Minister".

11.30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments I beg to move that the Amendment to this Resolution be taken and that the Resolution, as amended, be the Resolution to be approved by this Honourable House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the Amendment moved by the Honourable Attorney-General and I reserve my right to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir, I am asking for guidance. Obviously we cannot without the benefit of the Amendment being circulated deal with this matter any further until they have been circulated because I would like to look at the Amendment in the light of the fact as to whether I am to make a submission to you, Sir, to invite you to rule as to whether these are genuine Amendments or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have instructed the Clerk to circulate the Amendment and I presume they should be circulated in a very short space of time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I would also ask for you to give a ruling as to whether or not a member is not entitled to 2 speeches, one on the original Motion and one on the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not clear on the question the Honourable Member asked.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am asking you to give us your guidance as to whether, in the light of the terms of the Motion, Honourable Members are not entitled to 2 speeches, one on the original Motion and one on the Amendment. The Amendment raises a number of very new matters.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, if I may be of assistance here. I have the 21st Edition of Erskine May. At page 336 this matter is addressed on Amendments superseding a question. On an issue raised by the Honourable Member it says:

> "The debate that follows is not restricted to the Amendment but includes also the content of the Motion both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions."

That suggests that, as has happened before we would continue the debate taking account, as one wishes, of either the Amendment or the Motion for a combination of both.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think what in essence you are saying is that we have one Motion before the House and an Amendment is only part of that one Motion.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: The question raised is whether where an Amendment is moved to a Motion whether it is in order for either those members who have already spoken to be able to speak again without prejudice to their right if they are leading the Motion to wind up or whether, members who have not spoken will have 2 speeches. Mr. Speaker, it is not only one matter that is raised. There are 2 matters that will arise on this matter. It is not simply a matter of my learned friend reading from a limited part of May's Parliamentary Practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I said before it is all considered to be one motion. The Amendment to that motion which will give members the opportunity to speak either on the Amendment or the Motion. I am following the precedents we have set before. We had allowed one speech to be made – that is how we interpreted it here – and allow the one speech to be either for... But the Leader of the Opposition who introduced the Motion has the right of reply.

I understand the Honourable Member if you have 2 speeches.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir on a point of order and privilege. I have been in this House for the past 5 years and the precedents of this House go back very far and that is why very often I refer to trying to set the precedents down.

I have heard rulings in this House that where an Amendment has been moved to a Motion and on the assumption that that Amendment has been accepted that persons who have spoken on that Motion have a right not only to speak on the Motion which was originally moved but a right to speak on the Amendment. If the person like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is the mover of the Motion he has the right to reply to his final Motion as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, he is going to reply. That is the position. He will have the right of reply.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am asking the Speaker for a ruling.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I have heard that ruling in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I probably was not clear enough in what I said. Let me repeat what I said. I said it was one Motion and members could either speak on the Amendment or the full Motion at the time they were speaking. But what I am trying to say to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West was that the Leader of the Opposition would not be deprived of a right to reply. The Amendment came after – and this is only in the case of the Leader of the Opposition. The Amendment came after and

I said he would have the right of reply. That is what 1 was saying all the time. You have a right of reply. He can reply to the Amendment as well as he could reply to his main speech. That is the point I am making.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You still have to rule on the validity of the Amendment, Sir. I have not heard a ruling as to whether you accept the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I have accepted it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You have not got it, Sir. You have not got a copy, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do have a copy but I asked that they be circulated.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I see you have a copy, Sir. I understand. Your Honour was treated with greater respect than us. You were given a copy in advance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Honourable Member should interpret it in that way. The Amendment needs to come to me to certify it. I have to agree with it so I have to see them. In that case, I would have seen them. Can we proceed?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: On a point of privilege, Sir, I do not wish to trivialized this. The Honourable Member over here moved an Amendment. How could it be circulated to the Members over there and not over here. I am a member too. I am entitled to have mine at the same time he gets his.

Mr. SPEAKER: My understanding is, from this side of the House, that they have not had enough time to see the Amendment.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I have not seen it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to adjourn for 5 or 10 minutes so that Members will have it. I will adjourn for 5 or 10 minutes until that is done.

Hon. M. A. KING: There was one aspect of the Amendment which was left out. With your leave and the leave of the House I would ask that the Resolution, as circulated, be taken as the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection it is, but if there are objections, then it cannot be.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I just want to draw to your attention the fact that it is the wisdom of experience. I knew that the Honourable Member was not reading his Amendment correctly. And now we have 2 specific clauses:

> "AND WHEREAS the Right Honourable Prime Minister has identified Tourism as a key sector to lead the recovery of the economy;"

11.40 a.m.

The Honourable Member never said that. Do you mean he did not even read his own amendment right then?

> "AND WHEREAS the Tourism Sector in the year 1993 and so far in 1994 has so fostered growth and has thereby contributed to positive growth in the economy:"

Now, Sir, seriously, we are having an amendment here which obviously is being introduced to widen the debate considerably. This is a diversionary obstructionist tactic, but the point is that Honourable Members with this are entitled to some time to check that.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the benefit of the Honourable Member, my own concern would be whether the amendments are relevant to the motion. When I saw them they appeared relevant,to the motion in the context of what I saw. That was my only concern.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Oh, I see, Sir. Your Honour had an opportunity of considering those two clauses. I would ask you to consider whether this is a contradiction to the motion that is before us, because an amendment has to contradict a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the circumstances I have already given my ruling to it, because it was submitted to me. That is the end of the matter.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Do I understand Your Honour to have given your ruling before Members have had the opportunity to see this?

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have done with the main motion.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, with respect again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have treated them both in the same way.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, may I please make my point, with respect?

Mr. SPEAKER: Sure.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: If an amendment is being moved in the House, although there is the courtesy to show Your Honour the amendment beforehand, it is an amendment which must either be accepted finally in this House as an amendment, and Members must be aware of the amendment. When the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central had sat down, the amendment he had moved and was seconded before this House was not the same as the amendment that is now being put.

Asides.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I must deal with the matter, Sir, with some silence in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree with the Honourable Member. Let us have some silence.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I am not trying to trivialise this debate at all. It raises very fundamental matters, both procedurally and substantively, in this House and the substantive matter which it now raises is where an amendment is of this nature, whether Your Honour is ruling before the amendment is even heard of by the Members and Members have had an opportunity to make representations to Your Honour as to whether this amendment is a valid amendment or not. The House cannot proceed other than by listening to those representations. If, in the midst of the Honourable Member seeking guidance, the Honourable Member then seeks further to amend what he has just amended, that even compounds the way in which the House is proceeding.

With respect, Sir, I submit that Your Honour will have to reflect on your ruling after you have heard Members. In fact, with respect, I submit that Your Honour should never have ruled at that stage.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am saying to the Honourable Member, even if I said "rule", it is the same procedure and process that I used to deal with the original motion, that is, if it cannot succeed beyond me, then it would not reach the House, because there may be such sections of it that in my view may be contrary to certain aspects as to how the amendment should be ruled. When the amendment was put to me, I put it that I had no difficulty with the wording – as I said with the original motion – only to get it right. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South has got up and raised the point and asked me to give my position on it. I gave the position as it happened, as it came up.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, with respect I submit that procedures of other Parliaments would have heard Honourable Members as to the matter of amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not precluded that, because the Honourable Member for Christ Church South was given the opportunity to make that point. I have not excluded anybody. All I am merely saying is that the amendments came to me in an order I thought presentable and conformed with what amendments are. That is all I said. I think the matter seems to be clearly understood.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have really had the opportunity of reading this now, but it is not in any way paginated and I will draw Your Honour's attention to 3. Having regard to the terms of the 4th and 5th recitals, it is my submission that Your Honour should look at and reconsider your ruling as those matters raise matters totally outside the scope of the terms of the main motion and cannot legitimately be held to be amendments. That ought to be the subject of a different motion, a different debate. Having been called in here to debate the policies, the performance of tourism as a key sector leading the recovery of the economy, are we going to have a debate on how you are going to have recovery of the economy where you have 30 to 35% of the people, despite the recovery of tourism unemployed? That has nothing to do with the original motion.

In my opinion, Sir, that is a brand new motion. If they want to indulge in some self-congratulation on the performance of the economy, they must make a ministerial statement or bring a motion on that, but do not try to hang that on to a debate which deals with a central issue as to the exercise of power by a Prime Minister in a country. That is the issue. That is not in contradiction. That does not contradict, it is not an amendment. An amendment, as I understand it, in accordance with all rules of procedure, must relate to a contradiction. We have not alleged or said that tourism, as a result of the performance of the Prime Minister in his appointment, placing his man and his woman there, that tourism has deteriorated. So therefore we have not raised the issue of the performance of tourism.
11.50 a.m.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; I am not going to listen to anybody who confesses to being battle weary because when you are battle weary your judgment is not good.

So that the position is, and this is an important point, and I am asking you to rule on it in the light of the new observations, Sir.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to be heard on the matter because I came in here to debate a

motion that was limited to the credibility, authority and prestige of the office of Prime Minister. That is the substantive paragraph in this Motion. I came in here as well to debate a motion which therefore asked the House to show no confidence in him for very limited reasons which are set out in this Motion.

The effect of an amendment must therefore be within the terms and confines, in my humble submission. On the basis of what I have read in May's and other parliamentary journals and written authorities, it must be within the confines of that. We are discussing the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister's office insofar as it raises those fundamental issues.

No persons have raised the question of the policies and programmes of the Government. Now this final amendment to the amended Resolution raises the issues of the policies and programmes of the Government and therefore makes the Motion not a motion as against the Prime Minister but a motion as against the Government as a whole. If it goes outside of those terms, in my humble submission to this Honourable House, it is not a proper amendment, with due respect, Mr. Speaker. It is not in those terms a proper amendment because we can range wide over any particular issue at all related to the Government's behaviour including, whom they sleep with or don't sleep with, if you want to get that far, Sir. You can get as wide as that.

If we are to confine the motion – and I am very serious, Sir. I am not being frivolous. I am using that deliberately in order that Your Honour may focus on the point I am making in this submission. The point is that this is a motion in relation to the Prime Minister in his office of being Prime Minister. It cannot be and it was not a motion concerning the policies and programmes in the ill-performance of the Government therefore raising the question of a motion against the Government as a whole. I submit I have seen Your Honour rule before in instances where the amendment goes outside of the confines to introduce new matters that are not within the motion that that amendment should not be allowed. I humbly submit here that this final amendment and particularly the paragraphs that I have highlighted should not in those circumstances be admitted as an amendment motion and that it should be disallowed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES; I want to suggest a way forward, Sir. I would like to suggest that on page 3 the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs be withdrawn because we can be on this back and forward all day. I am on a point of privilege, Sir. The 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs and on the following page the very final operative clause be also withdrawn. These are the ones they objected to. So that the debate can continue, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The third operative clause of the original. All the words of that operative clause be deleted in order that we can continue. Of the amendment we are taking out paragraphs **3, 4** and 5 on page **3** and we are also taking out the final operative clause in order that the debate might continue.

In other words, Sir, the amendment would be that the third operative clause of the substantive motion be deleted.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the point I am making all the time. Once the amendments have been put, they have been put and seconded, and the Government side suggested that they want to change it. Now, in that circumstance what I propose to do at this point in time is to suspend for a few minutes. I will suspend for a few minutes so that we could get this matter straightened up.

The underlying principle to an amendment must always be whatever you think how relevant it is to the main motion. That is the main consideration to it. Relevancy does not confine itself to one area or another. Nonetheless, the Honourable Member said I was broadening the debate. I was always prepared to broaden the debate to a point where Members would have had ample room. If they confine themselves then I will stay with Standing Orders that say that no Member shall go outside the scope and terms of any Resolution...

SUSPENSION

Mr. SPEAKER: I will suspend the House for 15 minutes. If there are no objections this House is suspended. 11.59 a.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. I hope now after that suspension we would have all agreed to move on. It seems as if I can call on the next speaker. Who will be the next speaker? The Honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a sad and serious day quite without parallel in the life of our assembly. Ever since our model democracy was founded in 1951 there has been no attempt to censure a Prime Minister. This is the first time, not for a Member of the House of Assembly or a Minister of the Government, but the effective head of Government, be he Premier or Prime Minister, an attempt is being made by the House of Assembly to censure him, to impeach him as it were.

No attempt should be made or allowed to trivialise this matter or to introduce any deflections or any red

herrings. The contribution of the Honourable Attorney General with respect to Prime Ministerial power I regard as no more than a red hemng. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister's own description of the power and authority of the Prime Minister today ***vis-a-vis*** his Cabinet is accurate. But having said that and that he appoints his Ministers, that is not the end of the matter.

The Prime Minister still, notwithstanding his enormous power, cannot act outside the four walls of the Constitution, nor can he act outside of the laws and regulations in force in this country for the time being. I think that is the point we need to make as a launching point that notwithstanding his enormous powers he is accountable at the end of the day. He cannot act outside of the four walls of the Constitution, nor can he act outside of the four walls of the laws and regulations in force in the country at any time. We can put paid to the argument of the Attorney General with respect to his power. He is not a dictator. He is accountable and he cannot act outside of the law. Once we accept that we begin to appreciate the point and force of the charges made against the Prime Minister.

In the face of the red herrings, Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to restate broadly the nature of the impeachment which we are attempting against the Prime Minister. We are charging that by his behaviour and action in relation to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority, he conducted himself in a manner which lamed the smooth functioning of the Authority itself and tended to undermine its integrity. Further, that he acted in a manner which diminished the authority, dignity and prestige of the office of Prime Minister. That is the first feature of this impeachment.

Secondly, Sir, we are charging that in his television address to the nation on May 18, 1994, he misrepresented the position of the three Members of the Cabinet who resigned on the so-called Arthur issue, and that he imputed to them actions and positions which cannot be borne out by the record, and that that has given rise to a perception that he did not speak the truth but rather that by his behaviour he has robbed the office of Prime Minister of its credibility.

Now, I think that for the purposes of the .record it must be stated that even though this Resolution is specific in focus and narrowly drawn, it has its appeal and power only if seen in the context of the behaviour of the Prime Minister ever since he assumed office. This Resolution does not stand by itself. It has special force and special appeal in this country today because it is seen as the last straw on the part of the Prime Minister. It does not stand by itself. The consistent charge against the Prime Minister ever since he assumed office as Prime Minister is that he does not consult even though he claims to be the chief practitioner of consensus Government. The consistent charge notwithstanding his public position is that he does not consult and that his style of Government is aloof and distant and that he is neither comradely nor warm.

A former Minister of Finance has resigned claiming that he has a tendency to make appointments in relation to matters which fall outside of his Ministry, the Ministries of others and the Departments of others without consulting. There is the charge too that he does not sufficiently communicate and that in his handling of the International Monetary Fund negotiations he has been inept, and that he more than anyone else has been responsible for many of the woes and much of the suffering which our people and our country now endure.

The political and economic situation in the country in the last three years in particular has gone from one plateau of crisis to another. There is a feeling abroad that it cannot continue and that something has to give and that the moment of giving is now, and so there is that coincidence of time. The coincidence of this occasion with the immediate circumstances of the Resolution. Unless we appreciate the harmony of occasion and the motivation of the Resolution and the immediate circumstances surrounding the Resolution, unless we appreciate that, we do not begin to understand how is it that in a political party, and this is so in all political parties, that exerts such iron discipline on its members, that it is nothing peculiar to the Democratic Labour Party or to the Barbados Labour Party for that matter. It is the very nature of political parties. They tend to exert iron discipline on their members. But notwithstanding all of that, we have a situation where members of the Democratic Labour Party in Parliament today will support this Resolution. That will only be understood and can only be understood if we appreciate the coincidence of the occasion of the Resolution with the background circumstances related to the performance of the Prime Minister.

12.45 p.m.

In my view the most serious of the charges is that the Prime Minister called an individual who became interested in the job following a search. I am refemng to Cecil Miller. He became interested in the job of the Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Tourism following a search that was led by BIMAP to find the best man for the job. That search led to Miller. Following that search the Board entered into discussions with him with a view to his taking up the job as Chief Executive Officer.

There is so much in tourism and in the country to consume the attention of the Prime Minister and I will refer to some specific challenges facing tourism in a moment

that could do with Prime Ministerial attention. But rather than divert his energy to those major matters to which I will refer the Prime Minister called Mr. Miller last January 28 and suggested to him that he ought to write a letter and indicate that he had no further interest in the matter. Having done that within the same day he was to call a senior member of the staff of his employer Caribbean Development Bank. We do not know precisely who that person was. We can only assume that some form of pressure was exerted on that person to ask Mr. Miller to withdraw his interest, indicate that he had no further interest in the matter. On the next day, on January 29, at a cocktail party the Prime Minister sought him out and enquired whether he had as yet written that letter and withdrew his interest.

This is not fascist Italy or Nazi Germany. This is an independent and democratic country and we value our traditions of democracy in this country. That a Prime Minister could so abuse his power as to frustrate the legitimate career ambitions of a fellow citizen as to deprive the authority of the country of the man that was perceived as the best man for the job as to undermine the smooth functioning of the Board that he had a duty to protect the Board's integrity, the Authority's integrity.

A Prime Minister as head of Government has a duty to protect the integrity of the parastatal organizations in the country and to do everything to support the smooth functioning. When he could do all of that, Mr. Speaker, I think we must agree that his behaviour is on the one hand disgraceful and on the other hand inexcusable. It is homble behaviour however viewed. The Prime Minister stands condemned in the country and must stand condemned in Parliament. As Prime Minister, you just do not behave like that. You must have a sense of proportion and balance about you. You must understand that there are limits to your power however great you think it is and indeed it is great. You must operate within the 4 walls of the Constitution. You must operate too within the 4 walls of the statute on the book in the country and you must respect the rules and regulations enforced.

The Prime Minister, in one breath undermines the authority of the Barbados Tourism Authority. He frustrated that young man. He robbed the country of the best man, as he was perceived by the search party and by the Tourism Authority. They are serious charges indeed.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is important. It employs, depending on how you count between 15 000 to 20 000 people in this country. It earns us in excess of $1 billion. It is the fastest and the most reliable earner of foreign exchange and properly managed it has the largest capacity for growth. Its affairs need to be handled in a professional and businesslike manner. Ever since Mrs. Nehaul went on pre-retirement leave in the summer of 1982 the job of the Chief Executive Officer was vacant. It may be argued that the delay was, in part, occasioned by the fact that institutional changes, rearrangements were being made and that the Barbados Tourism Authority was succeeding the Barbados Board of Tourism. I make no excuses for the delay.

The point is that our tourism sector has been slipping. Since 1989, for example, which is the high point for visitor arrivals from the United States we have lost some 60 000 visitors from the United States of America. All of this talk about we are doing well, where like the boy who used to come 4th in class out of 30, he slipped back to the 25th position and now that he has gone to 22nd position in class his parents are boasting that he is doing very, very well. He used to be 4th in class. He slipped to the 25th position. The fact that he is in the 22nd position now cannot mean that he is doing very, very well. What about all of that lost ground that we cannot reclaim? That is the point. We must not deceive the people and delude them about what is happening in tourism. It is an unprofitable sector. That is the reason why we are not attracting, in any appreciable numbers, new investment.

We have challenges of making sure that we add to the number of our tourist attractions particularly in eco-tourism and in heritage tourism. We have to make sure that we convert some 15% or 20% of our cruise ship packages coming to Barbados into long stay visitors. We need to find money, Mr. Speaker, to refurbish and modernize our tourism plant. Many of our competitors have relatively new facilities whether we are dealing with St. Lucia or Mexico or Jamaica or the Dominican Republic. We have to make sure that Barbadians as a whole appreciate the role that each and every one of us has got to play in the future of tourism and that, in particular, those who work in the industry are better trained if we are to become more competitive and if we are to offer improved services.

Sir, some of the basic challenges facing the industry is that the industry is suffocating under the weight of the indirect taxation imposed by the Prime Minister and there were several opportunities for the Prime Minister to make strategic and meaningful and helpful interventions in the tourism sector. Not frustrate the poor, undermine its integrity, confuse the young man who had a contribution to make. They would not be areas in which he should be making his intervention. He should have been taking the lead in addressing some of these challenges which I have identified. Rather than that, he was content to abuse the Prime Minister's authority and dignity of the office by capsizing luckless Cecil Miller. It is a temble thing for a Prime Minister using the weight to the prestige of that office to descend upon you like that twice within one

day, twice within 24 hours and to call your employers too to add to the pressure. That is inexcusable behaviour and we in this House ought to condemn it, as the country is condemning it.

12.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the role of parastatals for a moment, all' within the confines of the motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the Honourable Member recognises what I have said. You have placed the Resolution in a very narrow area. While I was willing to broaden it, you narrowed it.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I will walk the narrow path, Mr. Speaker. Thanks very much indeed.

We are dealing with the Barbados Tourism Authority, which is a parastatal, and I want to make the point that those parastatals that are involved in the productive sectors have key roles to play in trying to create growth and create jobs in this country. Having established them and given them a Constitution, we in Government – and the Prime Minister more than anybody else – must not then lame the integrity and undermine the smooth functioning of those parastatals. That is precisely what he did when he interfered in the way he did at the Barbados Tourism Authority.

Every man in the street knows the importance of the office of Prime Minister. He knows its prestige and he knows its authority. He knows too, Mr. Speaker, that the day you cannot trust your Prime Minister, the day you cannot believe in his words and in his actions, that the office of Prime Minister has ceased to function. He knows that the foundation stone of the office is a thing called credibility, and amidst all the political play the intelligent citizen, the average man in the street, knows when you give for the political play between the parties, at the end of the day you still must be able to believe and trust your Prime Minister.

One of the particulars of this bill of impeachment before this House today is that the Prime Minister robbed that office of its credibility. He destroyed the foundation stone on which the office rests, to the point that nobody believes him and it is part of what the Americans call the logjam in this country. where nothing is happening and nothing can happen unless the Prime Minister is removed, because nobody any longer believes in his words and his actions.

A very serious thing has happened, because the former Honourable Minister of Tourism, the Member for St. Michael West Central, made it clear in his public account of this matter that he always told Miss Lynch and Tony Arthur, "once you are recommended by the Board, your Minister will support your appointment and take the next step of carrying it to the Cabinet." No one has suggested that he is not a man of the truth, or that he would have called them there and told them other than what he honestly believed. This is a club and we have to know one another in here, and we know that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central is not a hypocritical or deceptive man and that once he told them that he meant that, and there has been no account to contradict that. That has been his position in relation to these two characters in this drama, as it were.

The Honourable Member for St. James South took a principled position, and his position was "this is nothing that falls within my immediate portfolio, but I am a member of the Cabinet and I have a general interest in all that goes on. What I saw happening around me was not consistent with the principle of collective responsibility." He was not concerned with the issue of Tony Arthur, it could be any other person by name. He had no position on Arthur as to whether he was suitable or not suitable, whether he was competent or not competent, his position was one of principle as to how the appointment should have been made, regardless of the person to whom the appointment would be going.

I have recited that background, Mr. Speaker, to make the submission that it was a horrible distortion of what took place for the Prime Minister to have told the nation that the honourable gentlemen to whom I have referred were diametrically opposed to Arthur. Not compromisingly opposed, not opposed in the sense of having reservations, but diametrically opposed. It is a horrible distortion and a Prime Minister as leader of men has a duty to represent them accurately and honestly to the best of his ability. He has a duty too to be just to them and he has a duty to tell the public the truth and nothing but the truth, not about his personal business, but on matters of public interest. The charge here is that the Prime Minister did not tell the country the truth and that he was neither just nor reasonable in relation to his colleagues when he so publicly distorted their position in relation to the Arthur issue.

The same thing can be said for the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, who held the position of Minister of Tourism for four or five months. It would appear as though, if he had to make the choice, it would not have been Arthur, but he too was prepared to go along with his Board and he said that even if he had reservations on the Arthur appointment he would have supported it. So there is no basis in fact for the Prime Minister to have claimed as he did that his Ministers were diametrically opposed to the appointment of Arthur.

But the matter did not end there and does not end there. It has to do with the fact that the country must be in a position to believe the Prime Minister, and when you have three of his most senior and loyal Ministers – this is the point – almost the core of his Cabinet coming out and saying that the Prime Minister was not speaking the truth and that there is no documentary or other support, nor can there be, for the position he has represented to the nation, it is a serious thing indeed. The perception in the country is that Judgement Day has come for the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, the Right Honourable Prime Minister, that he cannot continue to go the way he has gone; that he must be brought to account and that he must be brought to check. That is why notwithstanding the cynicism and the apathy out there about the political process nothing has focussed the attention of the people and commanded their interest like this matter in the last 8 years. They feel something has to give and that the Prime Minister has got to go and that is what this impeachment is about.
1.05 p.m.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that seen in the context of the totality of his whole stewardship because the Resolution is about more than the issues mentioned therein. The people's sentiments are right in that we need a new leader and that we need a new beginning and that this Resolution should succeed.

SUSPENSION

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that the Sitting be suspended until 2 p.m. today.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker suspended the House accordingly.
1.07 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. If there are no Honourable Members wanting to speak...

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will speak. We brought the original motion here and we are not afraid to speak on this side.

Mr. Speaker, what is described as liberal democracy has been a hallmark of the institution of Government in the English speaking Caribbean for the most part, I would say, since the disturbances of the 1930s. There are obvious exceptions to that from time to time but not long-lived ones. Certainly, Sir, since Independence generally we have had in this country free and fair elections at regular intervals. We have had civil and political rights guaranteed and we have had what is described as responsible Government. We have also had what I call political inclusion and by that I mean that we have had universal suffrage and we have a non proscription of parties. Those are the freedoms that I know of as a girl and a woman.

Barbados is such a democratic place that I often tell people in Barbados we have leaders without parties. We have parties without leaders. Every computation you can think of we have. Right now there is a multiplicity of leaders walking about without parties. When you compare Barbados to other British former colonies over the years you will see that others have not feared as well in terms of the democratic process as we have. If you look at Nigeria or Uganda, those countries became independent roughly about the same time that Barbados and Jamaica became independent. You will see what the difference was. Those countries have been plagued by coups, both civil and military, by civil wars and the comparison could go on.

The democratic process of which we like to boast in this Parliament of some 350 years plus now is underpinned by certain institutions such as Parliament. This is one of the major institutions which underpins democracy, the judiciary, the trade union movement and the Civil Service. In fact, I often say that you can always tell very easily the difference between certain Latin countries and ourselves. The difference between their style of democracy and ours can be marked out very clearly by looking at those institutions. Where those institutions are strong and free, you will observe that democracy strives and where they are not democracy tends to be unstable and short-lived, often under constant threat of bribery, corruption and dictatorship. I regret to say, Sir, that there are unhealthy signs that some of those institutions have now become obsolete and are weakening in Barbados. Parliamentary democracy in this country is in need of much reform.

At the time of Independence, most of the countries of the English speaking Caribbean, including Barbados, did what could only be called some tinkering with the system as most of us put written Constitutions in place. Some countries in the Caribbean have moved from a bicameral to a unicameral parliamentary assembly. Some have become Republics within the Commonwealth. At least one has moved to an electoral system of proportional representation. But everywhere, and particularly in this Barbados Parliament – and I have complained about it before, most recently in the debate on the Appropriation Bill just gone – there is an unhappy, fusing, blurring, however you may choose to put it, between the legislative and the executive.

We are being governed in this country by Prime Ministerial tyranny. I have used that phrase in here before. That is the mode of governance where sometimes not

even the Cabinet is aware of decisions made, where sometimes so-called advisers, gurus, consultants...

Aside.

Miss B. A. MILLER:... anti pimps too, yes, outside of Cabinet will have more influence with a Prime Minister. It is a perfectly parliamentary word, Sir. I am not going outside the bounds today.

Mr. SPEAKER: You need not worry about that.

Miss B. A. MILLER: I know you are not worried about it, Sir. People like that have more influence with the Prime Minister than the Cabinet. We live in a time when the back bench does not know what the front bench does, where the Opposition sometimes is better informed than the back bench. That is the nature and style of governance in Barbados today. The parliamentary process is on trial in the Barbados Hopse of Assembly today.

I heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central speak about the great power that a Prime Minister has, and he is correct. Power that a Prime Minister has is tremendous, awesome, but a Prime Minister must also remember that the greater the power such as that that a Prime Minister has, the greater is the responsibility to temper the use of that power.

The Honourable Member for St. Joseph made the point earlier that today's motion is part of a cumulative effect. From time to time we have pointed out in here - I remember at the time of another No-Confidence Motion in December of last year making the point that if a Prime Minister will abuse his power as a Prime Minister, to usurp the role and function of a statutory board, well then every Minister in the Cabinet will feel that he and she can do it too. It is a poor example to set. It is a wrong model. It is not an easy thing to get up in here because we are all colleagues but respect will beget respect. It is not an easy thing for us to get up in here, and certainly not easy for me to get up in here to support a motion, as I will, and must, because it is more than a man who is on trial. The process, as I said, is on trial. It is not an easy thing to say that a Prime Minister has lied. That is what we are debating in here today. It has been said before and I have no doubt it will be said again by others that this is unprecedented in our Parliament. This is history in the making. As I said earlier, Sir, this institution is in great danger. Some will say that everywhere in the world now parliamentarians are lower than pond water. We are now compared to used car salesmen and we are partly responsible for the kind of low ebb, the kind of disrespect, into which this parliamentary process in Barbados has fallen.

2.15 p.m.

In recent years people have been saying there is no point about the House of Assembly anymore. It is not an important place to say anything. I am relieved that today there is a clear understanding of the power that resides in this House of Assembly and that a Prime Minister above all others should conduct himself in a way that would according to our Motion undermine the authority, the creditability and the prestige of the office of Prime Minister is no small thing.

There are so many particulars in which the Right Honourable Prime Minister has failed to speak the whole truth to Barbadians. Half-truths can be sometimes even more damaging than outright lies. Now this is narrowly drawn. I want to draw attention by way of an illustration to something that the Prime Minister said in his speech of May 18. Among other things that he said in that televised event was that tourism was doing well and that the Chief Executive Officer was the best man for the job in his judgment and words to that effect.

Just to show you how the whole truth is not spoken. It is true to say that in the month of April in Barbados there was an increase in the number of tourist arrivals in this country. We had cricket. The arrival from the United Kingdom shot up 72% over the year before, 1993. So you would not be surprised at that. There will not be any cricket in 1994. Oh, the Australians are coming, I hear.

What I am saying is this. On that occasion the Prime Minister did not go out of his way to point out to Barbadians that this sector which is the largest foreign exchange earner, the key sector in Barbados, was showing that in the month of April this year, this same month when they had the Global Conference, when Bajan Yankees were coming back here in droves for the so-called Global Conference, when Bermudians were coming in here that arrivals from North America were down 17.5%. So the whole truth was not told. The whole truth is being told now.

For the fourth year in succession arrivals from our major markets were down and the Chief Executive Officer who is found to be the best man for the job helped to preside over that. Every major initiative he took in those years have bombed yet he is "the best man for the job". That is an example of not telling the whole truth.

You don't have to believe me. You just have to look at the figures. Look at the figures and let them tell you. Let the Minister of Tourism who is the Prime Minister explain to us why it is that the arrivals out of North America are down.

The point I am making is that the Prime Minister will not speak the whole truth or any part thereof. That is the point I am making. We will come to that shortly.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the way in which this whole matter was brought about is reprehensible and we have to make sure that there is not room for this to happen again. My understanding of it is that the then Director of the Board of Tourism goes on retirement leave. Somebody is put to act in that job and then his substantive post is filled by another. Now, you have to draw a certain conclusion from that.

When you fill a man's substantive post, you are saying to him that he cannot go back there. That is the first thing you are saying to him. Either that he is going to go somewhere else in the Civil Service or that he will go home. So that is the first thing that you have to note. Again it has been spoken in here more than once already today that attempts are made then to place this man in the post of Director or Chief Executive Officer, whatever we may choose to call it. The Prime Minister seeks to impose his will that a particular person should be appointed to that post.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of another quote "No-confidence vote" motion in here the point was made and it is going to be made several times in here today. There are rules in Barbados. There are regulations. There is a Civil Service which has its own regulations. Legislation which will give certain powers to Ministers always make it clear where the boundaries of that power reside.

Do you know what is happening, Sir? Everywhere outside of Barbados, everything that goes wrong now people are saying, "Well, the kite pop. It is a free for all. People *can* do what they like." I watched television last night and I watched the news and then a little bit after the news when I was expecting to see the late news I saw a message saying that CBC regrets that the CBC late news would not be telecast as scheduled. Then my phone got hot.

Where are we in this country now that we are operating by ministerial dictatorship and prime ministerial dictatorship? In another country when that happens you would assume that the Defense Force has taken over the television station. But in Barbados now we assume that a prime ministerial order... The management of the CBC... Barbados was hot with it last night. Was there a ministerial or prime ministerial order to the effect that there would be no late night news. Even now people are asking that question.

Asides.

Miss B. A. MILLER: I am saying that the Prime Minister is the Minister of CBC as well. That falls into his portfolio as well and there is a history.

You didn't want to get up and talk just now. You want to talk now when...

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit any interruptions. Continue, please.

2.25 p.m.

Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I am saying is that there is a widespread understanding in this country that people do not have to obey the rules anymore, that because you are a Prime Minister or a Minister you can do every and anything. This is not something that Barbadians are accustomed to. This is not something that Barbadians are disposed to tolerate because that is the thin edge of the wedge.

If you start where you could phone up a man and tell a man that he must withdraw an application and you can give a directive to a Board and tell them that they must do what you want, it will get worse and worse. The next step from that will be that they will dictate to us when we can go, when we *can* come, when we *can* speak. All of the basic freedoms that this Constitution of Barbados guarantees to us will be under threat. It always starts like that. You only need to start with one man or one woman, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not right. It is wrong that the Prime Minister should abuse his power in this way. It sets a poor example not only at the level of Government. Everywhere else in the society once that example is set people will feel that they *can* now flout authority in whatever form and in whatever fashion but the real danger of it , Sir, and I go back to the parliamentary process. At the level of the Board - and I am following the Resolution - we are told that one Minister after another brought certain matters to the Cabinet. That is a courtesy. Generally speaking, if a Board makes a recommendation to a Minister and the minister has no difficulty and no objection to the recommendation the Minister can accept whatever it is that the Board has recommended and go forward with it without reference to the Cabinet. But there is a custom and a courtesy in this country that important appointments such as the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer, of any of the statutory corporations are brought to the Cabinet whether the Minister is in agreement with the Board or not.

The Minister, in this case, is in agreement with the Board and goes, as a courtesy, to the Cabinet and then the matter is reversed at the Cabinet. We have it in the public domain that some Honourable Members on the other side made the point to the Prime Minister at the time that he could not do what he was seeking to do. But he would not be told. And this partly goes to a large insecurity on

the part of the Prime Minister, a man who has to keep beating his breast and telling you, "I am the Prime Minister. I am the head. I am the boss. I am the school teacher. I am the great educator and you have to do what I say." That speaks a level of insecurity that could fill up this whole Chamber.

When a Prime Minister has constantly to be reminding his parliamentary colleagues, his Cabinet that he is the Prime Minister and that he is the boss, it speaks to the fact and I am sure that there are professional people out there who would not necessarily want to contradict that it speaks to the fact that there is a massive insecurity.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Attorney-General in his contribution earlier this morning suggested that the Opposition was going out of its way to try to destabilize the Government The Opposition does not have to go out of its way to try to destabilize the Government. The Government is doing everything to bring itself down without any help from the Opposition.

He made it seem as though something was wrong, that Members who sat on the Government side would want to support this Resolution. He made it appear as though there was something inherently wrong with that. That is the nature of our political system.

The Barbados Labour Party displaced the Democratic Labour Party as the Government in 1976 because some people who were supporters of the Democratic Labour Party saw fit, at that time, to vote for the Barbados Labour Party. That is going to happen whether the next General Election is called in 1994, in 1995 or in 1996, that is going to happen again. There are too many parallels to be drawn between that time and this time. Too many that are unhappy memories.

There are those out there who are saying that the Prime Minister... In my submission, Sir, he is not only a lame duck Prime Minister, he is a dead duck Prime Minister in the water. Dead in the water. He will not recover from this. It will be down hill all the way. He has not only damaged himself he has sought to damage the institution that supports him, as a Prime Minister. He must not think that any one man can bring down the Democratic Labour Party...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has 3 minutes more.

Miss B. A. MILLER: ...any more than any one man could bring down the Barbados Labour Party. He must not think that.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is for the Members on the other side to put their house in order, not only in terms of the parliamentary party. They have a difficulty after today in terms of the political party. But that is their problem. I would have thought that a man of the experience of the Honourable Attorney-General would know better than even at this stage to seek to mislead right thinking Barbadians into believing that there could be something inherently wrong in what the Opposition is doing. That aspect of the democratic process that is ours, exclusively ours as the Opposition to protect we are doing that. Imagine what it would be like in this country if there were no Opposition to do what we are doing today.

I will have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this Resolution which condemns the actions and the statements of the Prime Minister in the matter and the manner of the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority. I have no confidence in him and it will not be difficult to support that aspect or that leg of the Resolution either, and certainly the final resolve – "that the appointment of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister ought to be revoked – I would support heartily. Let me be clear on this, Sir, in this connection the vote that is going to be taken today is a larger problem, as I have said, and we are not expected to be able to complete that entire task today, but we are not at liberty to abstain from taking action which will help to put the democratic process back on the firm foundation on which we found it when we came into this Chamber.

1 thank you, Sir.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. W. W. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise, with a heavy heart, to make a few comments in this debate. Indeed, when my mother died some five months ago I was diminished and I never thought that I would ever feel as badly as that over a period of, say, three weeks or so, as I really do now. I would say that this has been a very trying period for the past three to five months, and indeed even going back further. If you are talking about trials and tribulations, I would say for about six, seven or eight months.

Sir, I am not here on condemnation, but I would like to say that I am here for righteousness, truth and life. I feel that as a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ I wish to affirm my loyalty first of all to Almighty God. Most people do not do that, they are loyal to man, and in some cases first to party. As a Barbadian elected servant of the people in this Honourable Chamber, my second loyalty is to the people of this nation. As a member of the Democratic Labour Party and its elected representative for the constituency of St. Michael West Central, I am proud to say that I have always been loyal to the Democratic

Labour Party, its philosophy and to its leadership. One has to remember that loyalty is one of the greatest virtues of mankind.

Sir, most people have been enamoured about what is going on. While I am hurting some people seem to be very happy. As a country things have been so volatile at times, as far as the gossip on the call-in programmes is concerned, that we in Barbados have forgotten that on 1st June, 1987 the great Sir Errol Walton Barrow died. We do not seem to remember that, it just passes away. It is like life. What is it? A vapour that is there in the morning and then disappears in the evening. What is man that we are so mindful of him? That is the position I find, Sir.

I wish to state to you, Sir, that when I joined the Democratic Labour Party in 1981 and served as Opposition Senator, along with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, I was not particularly keen at that stage to join in politics. For one, when I lost, my mother said the Lord knows best. I could not understand that. I blamed the Member for St. Michael West for that, because it was he who had encouraged me, when I had told the Prime Minister that I was not running. He came to me and said: "The constituency is a little hard, but I will help." When I won in 1986 and again in 1991 my mother cried. I could not understand that at all. She is no longer here to tell me why she did, but I think she knew all along. From 1986 to the 25th day of February, 1994 I served this country as a Minister of the Government in three Ministries. During that time I assisted in articulating the philosophy of the party and the formulation and execution of its policies, its programmes and its projects. Of course, this was with particular emphasis on the Ministries under my purview. I have done so not only in good times, but also when the political weather was stormy. For example, when the economic stabilisation programme was introduced, and the people were calling for the removal of the Government; secondly, when the structural adjustment programme was formulated, and it generated heated national debate about the economic path which Barbados would pursue. All that time my loyalty to the Prime Minister was unswerving.

I remember the time when the paparazzi jumped on the backs of the poor people of this country, who were legitimately striking for what they thought was just and they wanted to pull down the Government. I just wish to say that I was there and I was as loyal as anybody else, more loyal to the Prime Minister in that period of 1991 and into 1992, that had I served my God as much as I served him, the angels up there would have jumped many feet in the air. They would have sung a song of praise. I just wish to tell you that, Sir. I mean loyalty, neck on the block, anything, not blindly, but with confidence. Real loyalty, loyalty that is akin to the marriage vows. For better or for worse, then. That is so.

I feel that there is a time when enough is enough. With a heavy heart, but I feel so, when one must draw that line of demarcation between loyalty to God and principle, and loyalty to man.

Sir, as I said, there is no one who could feel like the way I feel now; but that is the way. I know that God is my strength, my refuge too. As I came through the gates this morning and some people whom I have known over the years as friends and well wishers, and I noted the attitude towards me or as I reflect on the phone calls I have been getting, harassment of my family, as I reflect on that, Sir, I have to wonder is it really worth it.

2.45 p.m.

Sir, I did not resign from the Cabinet because I was diametrically opposed to Mr. Arthur or I felt so strongly about his appointment that I resigned. That is not so, Sir. I will state now that I did not support the idea of someone who has not been recommended to me to be CEO. You have to be recommended to me if I am the Minister because the Law clearly states, section 9, that the Board appoints and the Minister approves.

For the eight years that I have been a Minister, there has been a convention that anytime anyone is appointed to a Board, whether a Director or Chief Executive Officer or however designated it comes before Cabinet. There is good old fashioned commonsense in that, Sir, because when we all look together at a situation you will be able to find out exactly if you are doing the right thing. Therefore I never really questioned the idea of an appointment going to Cabinet. I believe that it must be said and I have said it at all times.

I am not now out here being accused of being diametrically opposed to someone when I know that is not particularly the case, because I have stated from the beginning that I resigned because I had fundamental differences with the Prime Minister. I had fundamental differences with his management style.

I said in here only 2 or 3 weeks ago that I am not a political scientist but I will tell you something. I have studied people's behaviour in political systems and I know that some people are frightened to say what they really mean and others are so frustrated that they don't talk at all. I am not like that, Sir. I say it eyeball to eyeball to anybody. I hear so much about a Prime Minister has so much power. That is true. I am not denying that you don't have power but God does not give you power to do what you want to do. He gives you power to do what he wants you to do. That is a fact.

Therefore Sir, 1 had to know that those things that people are saying are not really true.

I feel, Sir, that if there is consensus government and I am a Minister, I feel that I should have at least some sort of say. If not, you are disrespecting my views. My charges were that the Prime Minister had disrespected the views of the Cabinet Ministers and he eroded their self respect and held them up to public ridicule. I said that. I do not know how people in Barbados want me to say that 3 weeks ago and today want me to come now and change overnight, Sir. I cannot do that. I said so and that is how it is.

Now, let us have some counselling. Let us have some remedial work done. Let us have, as I have been calling for so long, some healing, We want to get together as a Party. That is what I was saying. No one has listened to me but everyone is talking about loyalty to the Party as if there is the slightest notion that I have ever been disloyal.

I say, Sir, that if a Minister is told that he is supposed to be moved, that is the prerogative of the Prime Minister and I agree with that. I feel that I would like to speak on a few areas so that I can enlighten people and I can illuminate the dark corners of their minds. If you hear one Prime Minister say something in public and then you hear another ex-Minister say something else in public, the people out there get confused, and in the final analysis the only persons that will lose will be the politicians themselves.

I talked in here glowingly not at the fact but glowingly from the point of view of exhortation, when I said that 6 youngsters were interviewed only 3 months ago in Barbados and when they were asked about politicians, they could not care less about any of us. Hansard will report, Sir, that I said that I was striking a chord for politicians. At that time Sir, I was not aware that today we would be in a matter of crisis. But there are people who are always in crisis. Every country has been in a crisis. Every family has been in a crisis and every individual has been in a crisis at some time. The point is that when you come into a crisis, you have to make decisions to know what to do.

Sir, I would like to explore another myth that I have heard bandied about. In fact, I have heard it said on the call-in programmes and from the people on these talk shows, that we were so inefficient at the Board of Tourism that the Prime Minister had to jump in and intervene because we would not make a decision. Here today, no less a knowledgeable person than the Member for St. Joseph said that he was not making a case of it, but the time was a little long. He didn't know why it was long. Maybe it was the changeover. I am saying to you, Sir, that in October 1992 the Prime Minister wrote me a letter or wrote the Chairman of the Board and copied to me. I would like to think he wrote me, Sir, because I don't think he should write the Chairman and then copy to me. After all, I was the Minister. You see, that is the thing I stand for. I shall pass that and I shall say this.

The Prime Minister had asked that we should look at delaying the appointment of the Director. Sir, that was the day before the Board was going to make a final selection. That was October, 1992. So we had to postpone it until the new Board was selected. That new Board was selected on March 15, the Ides of March, Budget Day, 1993.

So I just wish to say that the Prime Minister's view was that the job would change in nature and scope and I agreed to this 100%. The job was changing in nature and scope and therefore we would hold over until then. Why then criticise my Ministry and the Board for any apparent discretion? We were on track and I did not mind delaying.

I just thought that I would say so, that people would understand that the Board was not delinquent. I wish to say, Sir, that the problem began with... The BTA Act was enacted in 1993 by Parliament and published in the *Official Gazette* on February 8. It was proclaimed on March 15, 1993. Sir, let me tell you where my problem started. I have to move fast.

My problem started with that Board. I was going to South Africa and I felt that as a Minister, I needed to tell the Prime Minister what I was doing. I was going away so I told them that I was going to select the Board, and have it to Cabinet on March 11 and I would proclaim it on the 15th. My problem with the Board, and I must be honest with this, is that the Board that I really wanted I did not get. I want to make that clear. So, here is this, you don't have your Chairman, you don't have your Deputy Chairman and in the final analysis another month down the road, you don't get the CEO that the same very Board appointed and I said, that is foolishness so I will resign. I should have done that at that stage, August 26, 1993.

But the Prime Minister changed the Ministries and I felt that if the Prime Minister felt that there was a problem with me, and he was changing Ministries, it was okay with me I would go and work for the betterment of the people of Barbados, for the betterment of my Party and the betterment of my constituents. That reshuffle was no problem, Sir, so I went on and I worked for another six months. I just wish to say though that I was flabbergasted at other things that I did not think were right and I said so in no uncertain terms. If you are telling me that that is something I must not do, I am saying that I do not agree with that.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Board recommended a Mr. Hudson Husbands. The problem was that the Board had four short-listed people. The Chairman of the Board wrote me and said that they wanted to have an executive search and that was predicated on the fact that the four people, including Mr. Arthur, did not meet the requirements. Sir, if you are a Minister and the Board comes and tells you that, and I knew that the people in the Board had

spoken to the Prime Minister, he did not tell me, but I knew that they had spoken to him so who am I, if they had spoken to him, and he did not tell me that he was committed to Mr. Arthur. He did not tell me that he wanted Mr. Arthur. In my seven years I did not know that. Between October and March I did not know that. Sir, it is unfair, to say the least, if you could expect me to know that; so I went with the choice of the Board.

Sir, I did not get it and I was going to resign on those issues that I mentioned. Subsequent to that, my successor had similar problems, that is, the Board recommends or appoints, the Minister approves and presto, some technicality – I do not even know what they are saying. They said he did not assume office and the amendment said it was not completed. But, Sir, it was not completed, just like that.

What I am saying, Sir, is, my successor will speak for himself. I do not wish to pre-empt him but I will speak for me. BIMAP again, made another executive search. They recommended someone. It was approved and then nothing happened. My position was that when the Prime Minister became Minister of Tourism, and he revoked the Board on a Tuesday, the Board picked the CEO on the Wednesday, it went to Cabinet on the Thursday to note and I say, Sir, that I had no problem. There is no criminality according to section 9 of the Act. If the Board has nominated or appointed and then the Minister has approved, that is okay with me, if that is what has happened. In fact, it was a curious paradox that you could not accept an appointment in the Cabinet, as I had to do, and everybody else had to do, but to go for noting was strange to me. The methodology was strange and I did not like that.

But, Sir, let me say what is most alarming. Whatever anybody may have said, Mr. Arthur had gone into the job. Whatever anybody had said the Ministers had resigned, and they had not spoken. In their silence they were condemned as men, toothless, or whatever else you may want to say. They were condemned as they did not speak out. My whole loyalty to the Democratic Labour Party would compel me not to say anything. I said absolutely nothing. I resigned so that was it. I did not complain. I resigned and went home. Mr. Arthur went into the job and was working. Tourism figures were going up and everything was nice.

The whole of Barbados felt that the Prime Minister had done the right thing – they did not know the facts – but he had jumped in, he put the lid on and that is what people in authority should do and it looked all right. So whether we believed it was wrong or knew it was wrong, the point is that the wonderful people of Barbados felt that eyerything was all right, and so let it be. The party is there. Then lo and behold, with everything going well, the Prime Minister is in the driver's seat. Everything is right. The Ministers are down there. They have said nothing. We were silent but we really did not mind.

The Prime Minister then went on a broadcast, which he had promised this country for three months that he would tell them about plotters, schemers and all that sort of thing. Well, Sir, that did not apply to me so I really did not bother about that. I will say this that when the Prime Minister went on the television to an expectant audience and said that we, the ex-Ministers were diametrically opposed, and had resigned because we did not particularly like the appointment, I said then that could not be really true. I would have to defend my honour.

Sir, I believe in my credibility. I believe in my integrity. I have walked up and down this country, London, New York, Hong Kong, wherever I wanted to be, and could hold my head up high. That is all I have left. I do not have anything else but that is good enough for me, integrity and my credibility. That is what I want. When that is dashed unnecessarily so, because this situation was dead, and not only dead but it was buried. That is a fact. I believe that if you are on the ground and somebody comes and puts his feet on your head and does that, it is not only premeditated, it is bad. Sir, that was my position, so I defended myself. I have said to the people of Barbados what has happened.

Now, Sir, the Barbados Labour Party has taken up the comments of the three Ministers and they have come with a Resolution. How could you tell the people of Barbados that this is a fact, this is what happened and then because the Barbados Labour Party brought it, then it is no longer a fact? Is that what people are telling me? I do not understand the logic. Therefore, I have to be very upset about this. I think that my principled stance in this is one where I felt I was badly done by, and I said nothing. I went to the party and told them, we need some reconciliation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Three minutes more.

Mr. W. W. HALL: I will get to that, Sir. I said to the party, we need some healing. As the Bible says, if you humble yourself and seek my face and turn from your wicked ways then I will heal the land. We want healing. I have been to South Africa and seen Mr. Mandela. He had been in jail for 27 years. When I talked to him for four hours I could not understand how one man could have passive resistance to such an extent that he has been able to bring the whole of Africa into one unity programme. He has been able to get Mr. Buthelezi from the Zulus up in Natal to sit in a Cabinet. You could imagine that, Sir? A miracle. He has been able to get Mr. DeKlerk whose National Party put him jail and he has been able to

come and say "I believe in peaceful co-existence." Sir, if that could happen in far off Africa, what about Barbados? What about us?

Sir, no one has said anything to me for three months. I have pleaded to the Democratic Labour Party, let us get some healing. That is all I have been saying and nobody has listened. Maybe we had trips overseas and were busy. Maybe that was the situation but home drums beat first. Look after the things at your doorstep and then you can always look after America, England, Australia, India, China and wherever you had to go. Look after the home things, and that is what we should do.

Sir, I am not in any way being unreasonable. I am hurting because I cannot understand why people are so vicious towards you in terms of what you feel. I feel that way. The reason why I wanted to come together and close ranks is that Government is not a fungus that cannot thrive in the sunshine. You have to open up yourself to the people. You have to be acceptable to the people. You have to be reachable to the people. I am saying that is why I wanted this healing. I wanted this healing because I feel that the Democratic Labour Party is a great party, the greatest. But there is no point seeing it going down the drain like that. I therefore wanted to make sure that we should get some healing. Sir, not only in this question did the last Board of the Barbados Board of Tourism under Chairman, Cleveland Mayers not recommend Mr. Arthur. The BTA Board did not recommend him. As far as I understand the second one did not recommend him. I did not support him.
3.05 p.m.

The funny thing is that the day before the Prime Minister came out with this allegation, Mr. Arthur and I were shaking hands on the front page of the national newspaper. The newspapers mocked me by saying "But Wes, who would have thought this? You do not have a job and I got the job now." That is what I was brought to, and ridiculed. One of my charges was brought to ridicule and make me a laughing stock of the people. I am not accustomed being in that position.

Sir, could I just have the 2 minutes for some water? Sir, one more minute. Mr. Arthur was the...

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to say what you are attempting to do now would have to have the permission of the House and if there is no objection the 2 minutes will be granted.

Mr. W. W. HALL: Sir, people are saying that Mr. Arthur had no job. When we came in here with the Tourism Act the Member for St. Joseph was the one who had to tell us that the power of the Minister was going to the Board. It was inadvertently left out. Also you have a CEO. You were wrong. It is not a CEO and a Deputy CEO. It is a CEO and Deputy. The IDC has 6 Deputy CEOs, only 2 can act. Therefore all we needed to do was to come in here and put an "s" on to officer and make it 2 because the present Deputy CEO is not skilled in marketing and therefore cannot take Mr. Arthur's job as the marketing man.

Therefore for all of these things I feel that I – I wish I had 3 hours to talk – cannot see how, if all that has happened here in this Resolution, is that all the things we have gone through, are now being articulated, it does not matter who it is, by the BLP or whoever. I am here to say it is true and I will vote for it. It is as simple as that. That is what I am saying that we have to recognize when wrong is wrong. I am saying it is like a vision.

I feel the time has come when spirit filled people will walk in the halls of power. I wish to say that this is not a vote against the DLP. Far from it. It is not a vote against the Government. I will tell you why. It is a vote for integrity. It is a vote for credibility. It is a vote against unrighteousness. It is a vote against principalities and powers. It is against spiritual wickedness in high places. That is exactly what it is. I wish to say that these must be said because they are the things that I have seen. I wish to let everybody in Barbados know. People are out there believing that if you have integrity, if you are going to have a principal stand that you are against the world. I am not against the world. I have been as loyal to the Democratic Labour Party as anybody.

If you are telling me that you are going to have an election, if the vote is lost, it means that you have not changed from those styles. Therefore, Sir, it means that we have to learn to live with challenges and we have to understand that when we have had to deal with challenges in the past, we have done it. This is a country that is mature enough, that in 1985 and 1986 after two of the great tragic losses we were good enough to come out above water.

I feel, in all honesty, that I have been treated in a very unfair manner. I can only say to you, I hold no malice, no acrimony. I am just like Daniel. 1 do not mind what happens out there. Daniel was a man that when the Babylonian Empire was conquered by the Persians, Darius put him in jail. What do you think they put him in jail for? I, as a little boy thought that he had killed 500 men. He was put in jail because he prayed 3 times a day. He was put in with lions because he prayed. But do you know what happened to the lions? All the lions out there the same thing would happen to them in 1994, 1996 if we do not understand that the principal stand is the stand that the people of Barbados must take.

I am not telling anybody what to do but I am saying this is how I live and this is my position. I am not here for the whims and fancies of the Barbados Labour Party. I am not on their agenda. It seems that everybody has an agenda. I have only one agenda to live happily in the Lord's grace. That is what I am going to do.

I hope that one of these days every one of us can say that as a promise.

Thank you very much for letting me indulge in this debate and I sincerely hope that the people of Barbados will judge me and my way of life, my standards, not by what I talk or by what I read, but by the way I live.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in May 1971, I received a call from Sir Frank Walcott on behalf of the late Errol Walton Barrow inviting me to contest a seat in St. Lucy. This was at a time when changes were taking place in the political arrangement of Barbados, when we were moving from double Member to single Member constituencies. Two senior members of the Democratic Labour Party, Sir Cameron Tudor and Sir Theodore Brancker could not agree among themselves which one of them would be the candidate.

As a result they were high minded enough to decide that neither of them would run but would vacate their position to allow another person to emerge as the candidate for the constituency. As a result that is how I got into politics. From the time of my entry into elective politics and into the political arena the record would show that I have been a solid and dedicated foot soldier of the Democratic Labour Party. No one can question this. I was with the Party through thick and thin.

I think it is also a matter of record that I have been one of the staunchest supporters of my friend, the Prime Minister of Barbados. In 1991, during the tough and early stages of the implementation of the IMF programme when difficulties were being experienced with the manufacturers of this country and when, on occasion, there was a threat of the manufacturers taking action which would have put the Government in an embarrassing position even although I was not Minister of Trade, the Prime Minister called to me for help to get the situation resolved. Indeed, Sir, I was able to use my influence to get a meeting convened at Ilaro Court where we were able to negotiate a settlement with the manufacturers that gave the Government a breathing space until we were able to reach the Budget of the following year.
3.15 p.m.

In December, 1991 during the period when certain elements in the business community were not only attacking the Democratic Labour Party but were attacking the Prime Minister of this country in a very personal manner, I recall that at the opening of a housing project in St. Philip I took the opportunity to, as it were, go after the persons who I considered to be attacking the Prime Minister unfairly and accused them of attempting economic sabotage of this country. I did this in defence of my party and in defence of my Prime Minister. This was a time when few people within the Democratic Labour Party thought it fit to come out and speak publicly, or were afraid to do that. I did it. I put my head on the line.

My record of fighting for the Democratic Labour Party in the House of Assembly during 1971 to 1981, and in the Senate between 1981 and 1986, is one that the public can judge. Whatever I have done in my political career, the 23 years I have been in politics, it was always in the interest of the Democratic Labour Party. Whatever I do today, howsoever I vote today, it will be in the interest of the Democratic Labour Party.

On assuming the office of Minister of Tourism, International Transport and Culture in September 1993 I inherited a situation of an impasse over the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer for the Barbados Tourism Authority and I publicly stated that I would make every effort to ensure that an appointment would have been made by the end of 1993, and I did. I spoke on many occasions to the Chairman, to the Deputy Chairman, to members of the Board, and I tried to encourage them and to coax them, and to be frank with you I tried all that I had within me to encourage them to support the appointment of Mr. Tony Arthur.

It is interesting, Sir, and I digress here for a minute, to note that one of the members of the present Board, who was on the Board at the time I became Minister, when I approached him to suggest to him, and indeed to encourage him to support Mr. Arthur as the CEO, indicated to me in no uncertain terms that it would be the worst appointment that would ever be made in that position. I must confess that I was so taken aback that I said to myself this seemed to be really a very difficult situation. I had not been aware that there were so many negatives in this particular matter. But, of course, I would say he is now a member of the same Board which has appointed Mr. Arthur. I leave that there in the public.

Sir, I tried, and it is really hurtful to hear the Prime Minister making the comment, on 18th May, 1994 to the effect that the three Members who resigned over the issue were diametrically opposed to the appointment of Mr. Arthur. 1 indicated to the Prime Minister, on January 26, 1994 that I would write to him setting out my views on this particular matter and on my position, for the record. I was deliberate in making the point that I was doing it

for the record, because I had anticipated that something like this would have happened and I needed something to which I could refer. So on 27th January, 1994 I penned the Prime Minister this letter which I will now read and make a document of this Honourable Chamber.

Aside.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: It is not confidential. I deliberately refused to put "Confidential" on it, because I knew that it would have come to this point.

Aside.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: I do not want to hear "Read it out, Lyn." This is my business and I am dealing with this. I am not seeking support from any quarter in here, this is a personal matter and I am dealing with it in a personal manner.

"Dear Prime Minister,

In our discussions at the end of today's Cabinet Meeting,.,."

We were not in Cabinet, therefore this is no Cabinet secret.

"... you expressed your displeasure at the fact that the Tourism Authority had refused to accept your directions, as Acting Minister of Tourism, to appoint a Chief Executive Officer through internal promotion. As a result, you stated that you would take over temporarily the Ministry of Tourism and have the appointment of Mr. Tony Arthur as the Chief Executive Officer confirmed. After this was done, you would return the portfolio to me.

I indicated that I would be unable in the circumstances to accept that position and 1 therefore wanted to be relieved of the responsibility for Tourism immediately.

Prime Minister, I consider it necessary for me to make a number of points on this issue.

When I assumed the portfolio of Tourism in September 1993, I spoke to Mr. Arthur and told him that I would consider him for the post. I enquired from him whether he had an alternative position in the event that difficulties were encountered."

After all, I have been schooled in the Trade Union Movement and recognise that you could never box yourself into a corner.

"He stated that in those circumstances, he would prefer to go to North America as Regional Director since his children were at an age where he could benefit from the allowances which would accompany such a posting. This discussion took place in Aruba.

I had a meeting with the Chairman and the then Deputy Chairman and discussed the matter."

3.25 p.m.

"They agreed to take the matter to the Authority for its reconsideration. Later, it was communicated to me by the Chairman that the Authority did not consider Mr. Arthur as a suitable person for the job.

You will recall that when you asked me to take over responsibility for Tourism, I intimated that I would wish to make some changes on the Authority and the Advisory Council."

[And I took the opportunity to do so.]

"The newly structured Authority interviewed candidates including Mr. Arthur, and after deliberate consideration, agreed to recommend someone other than Mr. Arthur.

As this was during the time you were recuperating and knowing your preference for Mr. Arthur, I delayed responding positively to the Authority's recommendations since I felt that decency required me to discuss the matter with you. This I did at your invitation at the last meeting of the House of Assembly for 1993. I indicated to you that the Authority had made a recommendation other than Mr. Arthur for the position of Chief Executive Officer and that I would be obliged to act in accordance with the law. As you are aware, Section 9(1) of the Barbados Tourism Authority Act, 1993-1 states:"

[and I quote:]

"The Authority shall, with the approval of the Minister, appoint a Chief Executive Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer."

You indicated to me at that meeting that Mr. Arthur had your full support as in your opinion he was the best qualified person for the job as Chief Executive Officer. I cautioned that if you persisted with this it would lead to problems and that I felt very uncomfortable about it. We agreed that I would think about it again.

On Monday January 3,1994, I sought a meeting with you to discuss the matter. The meeting was held at Ilaro Court at 2 p.m. I again drew to your attention

Section 9(1) of the Act and my understanding of its meaning. I further drew your attention to section 12 of the same Act which states:

[and I quote:]

"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."

[Now that may be a matter of interpretation.]

I pointed out that the appointment of a Chief Executive Officer for the Authority could not be considered, in my opinion, as "policy" and that in any event, Section 9(1) dealt specifically with the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer. I pointed out then that in the circumstances, I would be unable to direct the Authority.

At this point I reminded you that I was due to attend a Board meeting of the Caribbean Tourism Organisation in the British Virgin Islands and I was seeking your permission to take a few days off. I wrote you to this effect on Tuesday, 4th January 1994 and in that letter stated that the International Transport Division had arranged a series of meetings for me to meet with airlines in North America to get them interested in flying to Barbados, As a result, I sought your permission to be away from Barbados from the 17th to 26th January, 1994."

[I just wish to point out that a number of things happened during that time. I was not here and I was not privy to it and therefore I cannot indicate. I am only expressing what happened to me.]

> "I should point out that I called Mr. Arthur in Fort Lauderdale on Saturday night, January 1, 1994 and indicated to him that the Authority had not recommended him for the position of Chief Executive Officer. I intimated that I was about to concur in the recommendations of the Authority and reminded him of our discussion in Aruba. I enquired whether he was still interested in being posted overseas. He indicated that he would get back to me the following day (Sunday, 2nd January). Up to 27th January, Mr. Arthur has not responded to me."

[I am his Minister.]

> "Prime Minister, I have no quarrel with your taking over Tourism. You will then be free to have Mr. Arthur appointed Chief Executive Officer. I would only caution... "

[and this is advisory. Not opposition, advisory. I would only caution because as a Minister I feel that I ought to be in a position that I could advise the Prime Minister]

> "... that based on my personal experience in the few months that I was Minister of Tourism and the considered opinion expressed to me from across the industry at home and abroad, I think that it would be a grave mistake and I would be less than honest if I did not say this to you. I have no intention of reciting my experiences with Mr. Arthur and other senior members of the staff of the Authority I can only sincerely and honestly, for the good of our country and the industry, wish you well in your efforts.
>
> In 1984 a former Prime Minister described the actions of the then Director of Tourism as more devastating than a hurricane. It is my considered opinion that we may be in danger of an event that will do more damage to our tourist industry than the recent earthquakes in California have done to that state."

[That was my opinion.]

> "Prime Minister, as you know, I am a loyal and dedicated member of the Democratic Labour Party who as the record will show left no stone unturned in ensuring that our Party regained office in 1986. This was at a time when the then senior members of the Party could not take on the Barbados Labour Party."

[That is again a matter of fact.]

> "I recall that many occasions in the 1976-81 period Branford Taitt and 1 were the only opposition members in Parliament. We were attacked and ridiculed by members of the Barbados Labour Party but we stood our ground. It is a matter of public record that during my stint in the Senate (1981-86), along with Wes Hall, I assisted immensely in creating the atmosphere for a Democratic Labour Party victory.
>
> I am therefore disappointed that my advice on a matter to you as a friend, as a colleague and as Prime Minister has been ignored. You should be aware that I have no interest in misleading you. In the meantime, as we agreed at today's meeting, I will continue to hold responsibility for the portfolio of International Transport and Culture."

I resigned as I said from the Cabinet on 26th February, 1994 and stated that I did so because I felt that I could be of no further use in Cabinet since I did not feel that in the circumstances I could make a positive contribution. That is my right. I paid the price. I felt that I was no longer of use and I resigned.

As far as I was concerned this matter was dead. I returned to the Barbados Workers' Union, or made arrangements at that time to return to the Barbados Workers' Union from which I was given leave. I took a month's leave off because I needed to get some rest and get my thoughts together. I no longer had any interest in this particular matter because as far as I was concerned the matter was settled and it was dead and buried.

To be frank with you, Sir, I was pleased - when I said I had no interest in the matters surrounding the appointment of the CEO because that was settled and dead - and still am to see the very positive developments which are taking place in tourism and the fact that the plans which have been laid down over the years of which I feel a part are coming to fruition and that tourism is growing. Certainly not in all the areas; but no one can deny that tourism is growing and making a positive contribution towards the development of this country and I feel that we will see even better growth and a greater contribution in this particular area.

I do not intend to get into any controversy but the Honourable Member for St. Joseph in his speech is riding his own hobby horse indicating that there is no new investment in tourism in Barbados. That certainly is not true. The evidence is there that there is a lot of new investment taking place. There are a lot of hotels in Barbados which are spending a lot of money refurbishing and expanding and there are other ancillary projects related to tourism which are taking place. This must go on the record.

Because I have a particular situation it does not mean that one has to agree with some of the foolishness that falls out of the mouths of Honourable Members. It is utter foolishness. The point is that when therefore on the 18th May the Prime Minister in a national broadcast stated that I was diametrically opposed to the appointment of Mr. Arthur I was really dumbfounded.

3.35 p.m.

I think that the record is there, as I have pointed out. My efforts to get Mr. Arthur appointed were very, very clear. I indicated that if the Barbados Tourism Authority had made a recommendation to me of Mr. Arthur, I would have gone along with it even although I might have had some reservations because I felt that would have been the proper thing to do. So do not come and say that I was diametrically opposed to Mr. Arthur when I even went to the point in order to try and get him appointed taking a public tongue lashing in my efforts when I changed the Board and did a number of things in order to make sure, hopefully, that things would have gone right for him. So I do not think it is fair to me in this particular area.

I just wanted to make this point. We have now reached this point and I thought it was necessary for me to put my position on record. Maybe this might be the last speech I am making in here. It may very well be. All I am saying is that whatever I say and do in this matter is in the interest of the Democratic Labour Party.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I consider that I am on trial in this matter although my name has not been specifically mentioned in that regard in the Resolution. However, it does appear to me that looking at the wording of the Resolution that it was brought because of responses which the three ex-Ministers made to the television broadcast of the Honourable Prime Minister on May 18 so that the statement made by me, refuting the one made by the Honourable Prime Minister in which he said that I was diametrically opposed to the appointment of Mr. Tony Arthur as the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority means that either he has spoken an untruth or that I have spoken an untruth.

This brings into question, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, my own integrity and reputation. It could cause irreparable damage to my reputation. I am about to re-enter practice and I have to be very careful with my reputation so I have to defend the statement which I made - "I categorically deny that I was diametrically or otherwise opposed to the appointment of Mr. Arthur." I said diametrically or otherwise. In other words, I was never opposed to Mr. Arthur at all far less diametrically and I will deal with that later. It has taken me 55 years to build my reputation and I would say in all modesty I feel I have a reasonably good reputation in this country. I feel so.

I need by way of introduction to say a few things about myself for the record which people might not know. 1 returned here from Bermuda where I was practising in July 1973 and accepted a post of Magistrate. That suited me because on the one hand I was able to make a living and do something I loved dearly, that is community work. I love that dearly. Politics was something I had always argued I would never enter but one does not have complete control of one's destiny and so about 1979180 just by chance I was the Coroner in a case in which a man met his death and I had to preside over that enquiry. The Prime Minister at the time thought that I had given the wrong decision. That is okay. But he went on a political platform in Fairchild Street Bus Stand and aired his views. He thought that he was castigating me and I thought that he was attacking the judiciary which, incidentally, as you would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, is one of the fundamental principles of our Government, that is, the separation of powers. I thought that was wrong. I resigned and entered politics in an effort to change that. The point I am making is that I resigned from a reasonably good job, happy, in 1981 on a point of principle.

This Resolution today has brought me here because of a point of principle as well and I have to speak on it. What are the facts? You have heard from my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, and the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. Briefly, because some people have asked me, how did you get involved in this?

Now, the matter surrounding the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority attracted the attention of Cabinet for at least nine months. I believe this was so because the Honourable Prime Minister seemed not to be able to accept or understand the provision of the Act relating to the procedure for making the appointment.

At this point, let me commend my Cabinet colleagues for the patience and tolerance exhibited during those trying months. Nobody outside the walls of Cabinet knew, there was not a whisper that we were having a problem. That is what Cabinet is all about, confidentiality. Nobody knew that for nine months we were having a serious problem over this matter and I commend my Cabinet colleagues for that.

Eventually, my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, who was the Minister of Tourism was replaced by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. The Board which was appointed in March of 1993 had some changes made to it by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in September of 1993, as he said because he wanted to know members of the Board. If you are a Minister of Government and you have a Board you must know the members of the Board so he wanted to know some although he too had a rough time when he wanted to appoint the Board. But, in February, he too was relieved of the Ministry. I believe at that point the Prime Minister took responsibility for the Ministry.

The Prime Minister then revoked the members of the Board and appointed a new Board without coming to Cabinet for discussion or approval. That was wrong to me. If I am going to be responsible for something, I must have a say in it. According to our practices in our Cabinet all the appointments and revocations of a Board have to come to Cabinet. It is common sense. Sometimes a name is put up and you would realise that he is on two or three Boards, or he is very busy so you pass it around. You ask questions. Is there competence in this area? Or somebody would say he is better for this or for that. It is common sense. Common sense is common sense anyhow. So I was annoyed. It was wrong. The Prime Minister brought it for notice and as far as I was concerned, again he exhibited a high degree of disrespect for his Cabinet colleagues.

3.45 p.m.

Let me say this, a former Member when he was a relatively inexperienced Cabinet Minister terminated the appointment of a Deputy Chairman. He paid the price for it. We took him across the coals, never, ever let it happen again. I cannot blow hot and cold. If there is a principle for one Member the principle has to apply for all Members. It is a good principle.

I guess somebody said the Prime Minister has all of this power. I do not know what power he had because you cannot get power unless I give it to you. I have a fundamental difference with this so-called power because power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is the problem. The new Board appointed the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority. But this is fundamental as well. This was not before the Prime Minister had called, and I believe the Member for St. Joseph mentioned it and I have to repeat it because I was in a strange position , Mr. Speaker. Mr. Arthur lives in my constituency and Mr. Miller lives in my constituency. You have to defend both of them. But I am going to defend right, not wrong.

The Prime Minister called up Mr. Miller and asked him to withdraw. These are the facts. I went to our General Council and I said that this is a very dangerous thing. This is something which is going to cause severe problems, please listen to me. But instead I was derided. People said I want locking up that I am a clown. Mr. Speaker, I begged. It has come to this now. I do not want to disclose these things but they have to be disclosed. If this is the only forum in which I have to speak I am going to speak.

The Prime Minister called Mr. Miller's employers and asked him to withdraw. Is that right? Are you going to tell me that is right? Soon the Prime Minister will be appointing the maids. I am not for that. As a politician I would send somebody for an interview and I tell them straight I can get an interview for you, I cannot get the job, Because when politicians get jobs for people they cannot fire them. They always tell you that the politician sent me. Not me. That is one of the reasons I resigned because I heard of that. I said if that is true I am going to have no part of it and I resigned.

The Right Honourable Prime Minister up to today has not denied those allegations. I honestly believe them to be true. If they are true the Prime Minister should do the right and honourable thing and resign. We all make mistakes. We all do silly things. But I believe as a man when we do something foolish or silly we should get up and say "I have done something foolish. Flog me if you want to flog me. Do what you want to do with me but I am honest."

On Saturday the 27th February, 1994 I was still Minister of Education and the Prime Minister issued a press release, among other things he said that he was changing the Ministry of Education to the Ministry

of Education and Culture and that the Member for Christ Church East was assigned to the Ministry of Education as Minister of State. I mention this because I honestly believe it is most impolite to bring somebody in my Ministry and to change the name of my Ministry without telling me a thing. I do not operate in that way and I do not expect anybody to operate in that way with me.

At that point in time I felt it was right for me to resign and I resigned because I know my temperament. A lot of people might think I am fairly cool. I am not as cool as people think I am. I wrote this letter and I want to make this letter a document of the House. It is a copy of the original which I sent to the Prime Minister. I am reading this to show you what I said.

"The Right Honourable L. Erskine Sandiford, M.P.
Prime Minister,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,
ST. MICHAEL.

Dear Prime Minister,"

It is dated the 4th March, 1994.

> "This is to inform you that I have decided to resign from the Cabinet with immediate effect. I have found your method in appointing a Chief Executive Officer to the Barbados Tourism Authority unacceptable. It does not conform to the principles of collective responsibility as I understand it. Other people might understand it otherwise but that is my understanding. Therefore there is a fundamental difference between you and me."

End of letter. I do not write long letters because lawyers know how to write letters.

On Sunday March 6, 1994 I gave an interview to the *Voice of Barbados* because I felt people might not have understood. I was not Minister of Tourism. I felt therefore I should tell the people why I resigned. I was very restrained in what I had to say. I did not say too much, I said that my resignation was due to the method the Prime Minister used in appointing the Chief Executive Officer of the BTA. I was at pains to point out that it had nothing to do with Mr. Arthur per *se*.

I also stated, in my interview, that I felt that the Party could deal with it. I believe that it was on March 7, 1994 that the General Council met. The Prime Minister was sick and it was agreed that the matter should only be discussed in his presence. When the meeting was convened the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central spoke. He spoke of a healing, we need to heal, he said. I said that I felt it was a very serious matter, a matter which could split the Party and therefore I wanted to go to the elected Members and that whatever the elected Members agreed upon, even if it varied with my views I would have accepted it. Because I live in a democracy and if I come with 12 people and 11 say, "We are going this way, I would have to go along." This is now 10 weeks. The Prime Minister has not convened that meeting yet.

The Prime Minister is Chairman of the Party and sometimes some of the most outrageous things are said about you at the council meeting. He would sit and say nothing. He has allowed it to go on. I did not want to discuss anything there. But in the interim the Christ Church zone held a meeting and at that meeting the Prime Minister spoke about schemers and plotters juxtaposed to having spoken about the 3 ex-Ministers. People wanted to overthrow the Government. He said he would address the country. People started asking me if I wanted to destabilize the Government, if I was a plotter and a schemer. That was their understanding of it, whether or not their understanding was correct. We were pinpointed.

You might want to know, Mr. Speaker, what efforts did we make to have this matter resolved. I spoke about going to the General Council. The 3 of us discussed the thing among ourselves. We said this thing is getting out of proportion, what can we do? A meeting was convened with the 3 ex-Ministers and intermediaries who informed the Prime Minister of the meeting and with the intention of reporting back to him. We attended the meeting, which lasted about five or six hours. We explained to the people, "we are going to tell you everything that happened, from beginning to end." The persons were shocked. We have not heard anything since about that. We had another meeting at the house of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central. This time we tried to get the intermediaries and ourselves to see if we could do something about it. "Help us, please help us. This thing is bad."
3.55 p.m.

Some people were saying that we met at Kingsland. I want to state for the record I did not even know where Kingsland was until I heard that we had a meeting at Kingsland. We never ever met at Kingsland. I think it is in Christ Church, but we never met there. But the Global Conference was upon us and people were busy. I wrote to the Deputy Prime Minister and said: "We have a problem. Please help me. See if you can get the fellows together so we can get this thing resolved." Unfortunately the Deputy Prime Minister took sick and had to leave the country. So things were dying down. We said nothing. We were being accused, ridiculed, everything. We said nothing. We were out of Cabinet lying low, and when I thought things were over and I was about to go to work on 1st June, lo and behold on the 18th May up comes the Prime Minister,

like an accident looking for somewhere to happen, saying that we were diametrically opposed to the appointment of Mr. Arthur. He said that if our views had prevailed, then he would have to resign. I cannot understand that yet. Somebody will explain that to me later, because if you are in a group and you are the Chairman of the group but the views of the others do not agree with yours, why must you resign? I cannot fathom that one, that is above my level of intellect. Probably a Barbados Scholar will explain that to me.

I could not even believe what I was seeing and hearing. It is strange. Sometimes you hear a word and you think you know it. I thought I knew what "diametrically" meant, but I started to doubt myself, because the English language is changing so rapidly these days I had to go to two dictionaries. Of course I was not wrong, but I had started to doubt myself. Sometimes you are in a situation where people say things and you do not feel that you know what is going on, so I went to two dictionaries. I knew he could not have said so from what I had written or what I had said on VOB, so I believe that he came to the conclusion by what we had said in Cabinet, because I had no discussion with the Prime Minister about it. I thought that if he was breaching the rule of confidentiality, then he would have to live by the consequences of his error, That is why I said, and I want to repeat here, that every single Minister told him that he could not change the recommendation of the Board.

I knew too, and this really hurt me, because on one occasion if I am the one person who expressed it about Mr. Arthur, I said: "Listen, I do not know Mr. Arthur's competence." I remember those words ringing in my head, not that somebody could have guessed. I said I did not know Mr. Arthur's competence, and there it is, I was diametrically opposed to him. And so I quickly denied the statement.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, before the television broadcast on Wednesday, 18th May, I was prepared to forget the whole thing, because it appeared to me that it was tearing the party apart, and if I could keep silent and allow the party to continue I was happy. But my integrity and honesty were being threatened at this stage and I felt I had to defend myself.

I know that the Member for St. Lucy was most concerned. I take him exercising every morning and we discussed this thing. He said he was going to try to get a meeting of elected members, but before he could do that a meeting was arranged by the Prime Minister. I was not invited. I do not think it was deliberate, but I did not get an invitation. As I understand it, the meeting was for the Executive Committee of the party, the General Council and the parliamentarians. But I will say this now. In any event I would not have attended the meeting, because the arrangement was that the elected members would have met.

Again, the Prime Minister, with some papers in his hands, "he has the facts", he has the documents on which he arrived at his conclusion. You could understand three humble Members of Parliament and the Prime Minister, who do you believe? That Is why this is so important to me. I found this rather disgusting and misleading to those present, because as I said before I knew that nothing I had written to the Prime Minister could have given him the impression that I was opposed to Mr. Arthur. I wrote one letter to the Prime Minister and I had one interview.

This whole episode, Mr. Speaker, has caused me much anguish, pain and suffering. I have not worked for three months because of this. I never thought that this could have taken a toll on me like this. I have been a very ardent supporter of the Prime Minister. I was even called one of the northern Mafia. We used to make all the decisions for the party, I was called one of them, but there is one thing I am very sure of today, whatever the outcome of this Resolution, after this the Prime Minister will not lead me again. I am sure of that. As the sun will rise tomorrow morning, I am telling you I am sure of that today. After this he will not lead me, whatever the outcome of this.

We have spoken of the Prime Minister's method, and again I want to demonstrate to you what I mean. The Prime Minister came on the television when this motion was put and he said if in the unlikely event that this no-confidence motion goes against him, he is not going to ask the opinion of anybody - not the Deputy Prime Minister, not the Attorney General, not the Minister of Foreign Affairs - they do not matter at all, I am going straight to the Governor-General, and strange enough, "I am going to lead the party", so all the puppets on the string will follow him. He is going to lead the party, they have no say in who is to be elected leader. Can you imagine that? He is not going to lead me! He said that the three ex-Ministers must vote against the motion.

I believe that there is an amount of arrogance in everybody, but arrogance must come with some finesse. When arrogance is naked, raw, crude, it is destructive. It is designed to destroy.

4.05 p.m.

I believe the Prime Minister is talking about not voting. I believe that every Member in here can remember when the Barbados Labour Party Government tried to increase the salaries of parliamentarians the Democratic Labour Party was diametrically opposed to it. Who voted for it? One man: the Prime Minister. Selfish! I am saying that is the hallmark of him. Very selfish!

Mr. Speaker, since the Rime Minister has taken over this Party 6 Ministers of Government have left it. In other words, 6 out of 13. Call it 50%. Two are no longer connected to the Party. Four backbenchers have left this Party altogether so that since the 1986 election 10 people or half of those have left the Prime Minister showing their dissatisfaction with him and the way he is doing things.

I can find no fault with the Democratic Labour Party itself. The problem is with the Prime Minister and I will be honest and say that. Are we going to allow one person to destroy a great Party? If this democracy must live it suggests to me that we must have 2 vibrant parties. I do not want to see the demise of the Barbados Labour Party. I believe in democracy and I say this too. One of the unfortunate things that happened in this country was when the Democratic Labour Party won 24 out of 27 seats in 1986. Can we allow one person to destroy this great country which our forefathers have sweated and toiled and shed their blood for? Can we allow one person to destroy a democracy? The answer can be decided today.

Let me say this. I am no constitutional expert, but I believe that if this Chamber revokes the appointment of the Prime Minister that he only has a holding position. I believe so. I might be wrong. It has not been tested yet, so 1 can give my opinion too. If it is revoked it is like when a company is changing the chairman you hand over the books. You have time to hand them over. That is my view.

If the Party is to live we have to change. I am telling you we in here know who we want to lead us. We have decided. We know who we want to lead us.

What are the lessons to be learnt from this? The lessons to be learnt from this are mainly for my Party. The Leader of the Party and the political leader must be in separate and distinct hands. There must be a mechanism to change the political leader when we believe so. I would suggest that when two-thirds of the elected parliamentarians determine that we don't want X to lead us that we change it. We would not have been in here today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my parents (deceased) were from the 1950s the most vociferous and ardent supporters of this Party, and my family continue to be. I must do what I consider to be just, fair and honourable. Not for me, but for my country. I do not like doing this and actually I hate doing it, especially in public; but I have tried my utmost and there is no alternative I can see. This has to be done today I have to demonstrate loud and clear that country comes before Party. Today I must demonstrate to my two sons and more so to my grandson that I am a man of principle. I alone have to live with my conscience and, quite frankly, considering all 1 have said today either to vote against the motion or to abstain would make me a hypocrite.

This is not a vote for the Barbados Labour Party. This is not a vote against the Democratic Labour Party. This is a vote to save the Democratic Labour Party and this country. This is what the vote is all about. I don't want the BLP's to come and say Keith Simmons voted for the Barbados Labour Party to overthrow the Democratic Labour Party. I am voting to save my Party and my Country.

I will therefore support the Resolution of No-confidence against a person 1 knew for at least 35-40 years. That hurts me. In so doing, let me say this. I am prepared for the consequences of my action. Whatever they want to do, I am prepared. Let everybody know that. I am prepared for the consequences of my action. I want to thank you.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to begin this afternoon by saying and quoting a line from that great hymn that you hear fairly often at funerals – "It is well with my Soul."

Two years ago and a bit, Mr. Speaker, I decided to resign from the Cabinet of Barbados. I did not own any supermarket. I did not own any minibuses. I did not own anything. The only thing I had, Mr. Speaker, was a little believability and a little integrity. That is all I had. Nothing else.

I warned this country at that time that what I saw being passed as management was anything but management. Mr. Speaker, what hurt me most of all at the time that I resigned from the Cabinet was that persons in the Democratic Labour Party who knew of my commitment to that Party all my entire life went around Barbados saying that the white people paid me. Now anyone who knows Harold Blackman would know that I cannot take any money from anybody because I have to 'buse anybody when I am ready, so I cannot take money from anybody because if I take money I cannot tell you what I have to tell you. So it could not be me.

People in my Party, people who knew me for years, were saying that. Mr. Speaker what has happened recently with the Barbados Tourism Authority is just a culmination of what has been going on for years. Mr. Speaker, let me start by telling you this. I have to congratulate the three Ministers who resigned recently because those fellows stuck it out two years longer than I could. So they had a good stomach.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened and the biggest problem with the Democratic Labour Party and what hurts me is this. You keep hearing people today saying that we are trying to destroy the Party. For two years If I wanted to destroy the Democratic Labour Party or even try to

destroy the Democratic Labour Party I would have set up a platform somewhere and spoken what I had to speak and everything would fall into place. I did not do that. The four Ministers who now sit on the Back Bench have been loyal Members of the Democratic Labour Party, some for 15, some for 20. I was supporting this Party from the 50s when other people were at Mona, when other people were at the London School of Economics, when other people were nowhere in Barbados, I was up and down this country supporting this Party. But what happened? When I resigned from the Cabinet in 1992, one would have thought that persons who had the ear of the Prime Minister, the General Council and the Executive Council, would have said to the Prime Minister, "Look, if Blackie who like this party so much could do that, something has to be wrong,'
4.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is Blackie?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Your humble servant, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The Honourable Harold Blackman. I am only saying what people, the General and the Executive Council should have said.

Mr. Speaker, if he did that, something has to be wrong. Why do you not sit down and discuss it. But, no. What happened? The majority of the people at General Council and Executive Council would tell the Prime Minister, "Man, do not mind him. Go ahead. We are behind you". You have seen right up until last week they were coming out every night. They are 100% behind the Prime Minister. Now, Mr. Prime Minister, try and settle your differences with your parliamentary group or with your Cabinet colleagues. No. Skipper I am 100% behind you. Do not mind them.

In fact, one gentleman two Friday nights ago said they should thank the three Ministers who resigned for their services, wish them bye bye, get them out of the party and let the party move on. Those three Ministers were the same three Ministers who after that statement was made were called left, right, and centre telling them they should not vote against the Prime Minister. This is what was happening in the party.

The Honourable Prime Minister has consistently decided that he was going to listen to persons who tell him what he wanted to hear, not what was true and honest for this country. I told him that on the day I resigned, I am not bringing out any secrets. I told him to his face. I said what happen to you is that you want to listen to people who tell you what you want to hear. You do not want anybody to tell you what is the truth and that is why this party has found itself in this trouble. That is the reason.

A Prime Minister has to listen to people. You have to listen especially when people are coming to you in an honest and straightforward manner. You do not only want to listen to people who tell you what you want to hear. If a person comes to you and tells you, "Look, you cannot do that because that would cause such and such a thing", and you ignore that person, but the other person comes to you and says "Man do it, Skipper, we behind you". You know that is wrong but that is what you wanted to hear so you go ahead and do it,

Mr. Speaker. I am not surprised about what happened with this BTA affair because you have a system where the Chairman of a Cabinet, or a Prime Minister, believes he can come and say, "I have done this", not "I am going to do it" because I am going to do it could still put something in the future and give you a word to say. But you have a situation where a Chairman could come to you and say, "I have done this. I have appointed such and such a person as Ambassador to the United States. I have appointed such and such a person High Commissioner to London. I have this. I have that"; no discussion at all, absolutely none. After all, the decision in the final analysis will still be made by the Chairman but, at least, give the other people who are sitting down with you the feeling that they should be heard. This has gone on for years.

You turn up a day and you hear "Gentlemen, I want you to meet the new Cab. Sec.", no discussion at all. I am not bringing out any secrets because my view about Cabinet is that matters which were discussed at Cabinet you should not bring out. If they were not discussed at Cabinet you cannot be bringing out anything. That is my position. This is what they say. If it was discussed you cannot bring it out. If it is not discussed you are not bringing out anything. You just get people turning up and saying "I have done this".

I am saying that I also congratulate the persons in the front bench, not the two who have just gone over because they will soon learn. I have to congratulate the others who have sat in their whipping all of this time. They have a stomach, a real stomach. I am being honest. People have to understand that if you can remain in situations like this for that length of time, you have to be long-suffering and patient. Maybe they are long-sufferingand patient because they are hoping that sooner or later something will have to give.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. What has completely turned me off now from the present Chairman of the party was the statement that if he loses a vote of

no-confidence, he will go to the Governor-General without checking with anyone and advise her to dissolve Parliament. When I heard that, I said to myself that if he calls a meeting again, he will have to have our Lord with him for me to turn up to that meeting because what that statement said to me was that if the Honourable Prime Minister is no longer Prime Minister, no other person in this party, including those who are long-suffering and patient, can never be Prime Minister, that he will prefer to hand it over to my comrade, the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

The point I am trying to make is that here it is you have a party with senior people, respectable people, but a leader of the party that I have spent my entire life defending is going to say that if he is no longer Prime Minister, because that is it, all fall down, all. Whether you support me or not, I am sorry fellows. If it is not me, nobody else. Now, I cannot reconcile that to any person or to what I always considered to be statesman-like behaviour because if I am to believe that the Governor-General appoints as Prime Minister the person who can command the majority of his colleagues in Parliament, in my view, when you have lost that majority of your colleagues in Parliament, no man is bigger than a party. No man should think that he is bigger than a party.

Miss Thatcher found herself in a similar situation. It was not even as bad as what was happening in Barbados because she would have run again. She could have contested that ballot again and she probably would have won but when she saw so many people voting against her in the first ballot she said, "Look fellows, there are too many in my Cabinet that are up against me. I am finished with that" and stepped out. She did not say that she was going to destroy her party by going to the Governor-General.

I will say this, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon. If the Right Honourable Prime Minister were to lose a Vote of No-Confidence, in this situation that is happening in Barbados today, he would have by that one stroke, destroyed the Democratic Labour Party by going to the polls. The Honourable Prime Minister knows it. But, once again, he is following the advice of persons who are telling him what he wants to hear. I do not have to call the names here. I will call the names on a political platform very shortly.

4.25 p.m.

Anybody who is thinking about their Party and who really love their Party, how can you tell me if one man has lost the support of the majority of his colleagues that that one man should send that Party to oblivion? If he does that, the Right Honourable Member would go down in history of Barbados as the worst Minister of Finance this country has had and the person who has destroyed everything that Errol Barrow had spent his life and death trying to build up in this country.

I want to see if he is willing to go down in the history of this country with that record. I want to see that because this Party is bigger than the Prime Minister. I am willing to go anywhere and defend this Party, because I was defending this Party for the past 40 years, not yesterday. I will go anywhere and defend it but not as long as the Right Honourable Member remains the Prime Minister and Chairman of this Party. Whenever the Right Honourable Member decides to leave or call an election, once he is not at the head of this Party, I will do my best for him. But if the Right Honourable Member calls an election and I am saying it here now for you to hear, Mr. Speaker, and leads the Party he will lead it without me. He can send him and 5 more up in St. Philip, I will not be running. But I am willing to defend the Party. I would go out there in the hustings for the Democratic Labour Party once a change is made. This is nothing to do with Party.

What is happening now is that people are calling and saying that if you vote with the Barbados Labour Party, you are voting against your Party. That is crazy. I am hoping for what is right and whether it was brought by any Party what is right is right. I will tell you the reason why I am going to do it.

Since no one seems to be willing to support a measure brought by someone in this Party – because the excuse you always got was that you cannot bring a motion against your own Prime Minister. That would look very bad. Since that was being said for a long time, now that a Motion is brought and the motion faithfully represents what was said there is no way that I am going to vote against this Motion because it represents the truth faithfully. I believe that by voting for this measure I am doing the world of good for the Democratic Labour Party and this country. It has nothing to do with my selling out any Party. It is a matter of principle. Are you going to go down the road all the time with a person's management style which, every year or every 2 years, 3 people have to resign.

If this is allowed to continue, maybe in another 2 or 3 months another 2 or 3 will come in the backbench. But there is nobody else to carry forward. That is the only thing. If this is allowed to continue, this is what will happen. In another 2 or 3 months 2 or 3 more will come behind and then you will have everybody behind here sitting down. A stop has to be put to it. I never thought when I started to support this Party back in the late 1950s, I never imagined that this great Democratic Labour Party could come to this sorry state.

Only last month or whenever the Budget was I started my speech by saying that Barbados needs these 2 Parties. I said it is very important to the democracy that we have practised in this country because we had 2 stable and powerful Parties. That is what I said. How could I imagine in my wildest dreams that the Democratic Labour Party, a great, great Party that I spent my entire life defending could come to this sorry mess? That is what we have come to. A state where one cannot even recognize that this is the Great Democratic Labour Party.

With the necessary change this Party can continue and there are thousands of Democratic Labour Party supporters who have been turned off from this Party because of the management style of the Right Honourable Prime Minister who would return to this Party. I live in a constituency which I consider to be probably the greatest and staunchest supporters of the Democratic Labour Party and there are hundreds in that constituency who are telling me, "If you all do not remove him, we are never going to vote Dems again." I mean people who have been voting Dems – there are very few people in St. Philip that I do not know and I mean north, south, east or west St. Philip. It does not matter. That is what they are saying. These are people who have never supported any other Party but the Democratic Labour Party.

But again, the Prime Minister decides to listen to what he wants to hear. There are people in this Party telling the Prime Minister, "Go ahead and call an election" although they know that if the Prime Minister calls an election the Party would be wiped out. But they will not take the blame. He will go down in history with the blame.

Yesterday they were going around at persons asking persons is they would run for the Party if the Prime Minister calls an election. Not only that. They are saying that he would easily find 20 people to run. I say, yes, you could find 80 because he can go out and run it. The idea is running people who can win. that is the thing, not running people. Because you would always find people would run.

This is the advice. The advice is bad advice that he is being given. I believe that the situation has gone too far. The situation could have been corrected months ago if the people who had the ear of the Prime Minister would tell him, "Your problem is with your Parliamentary group. You have no problem with the Executive. We love you. You have no problem with the General Council. We love you. Your problem is with the Parliamentary group. Try and settle your differences with them. Try and get them back to what it should be. But no one decided to tell him that. All of them said to him, "Go ahead, Mr. Prime Minister, I am behind you." Every time a report comes out from General Council all you see is that we are 100% behind you. That is nothing to do with the Parliamentary group. In fact, up to last Friday at the General Council the 4 of us behind here were being attacked. I mean real lashes, real licks were put in us. These are 4 people who have supported the Democratic Labour Party, who have been Members of Parliament for the last nearly 15 years, who have supported this Party for the past 35, 40, 45 years. And you are getting people in the general group getting on as though we are Johnnys-come-lately. We are serious, serious people in this party and people do not understand it. It is time something is done.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste anymore time. My position is absolutely clear. What has happened with the BTA is just a culmination of what has been happening for a long, long time and it has to stop. We have to stop it, because the management style of the person who is running this country is wrong. If you are Prime Minister you have to discuss, you have to listen, you have to take advice. Those are the things that are necessary and those are the things that are lacking.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this Resolution without any sort of reservation, because it is necessary for the democracy of this country. It is necessary, I believe, to bring this Democratic Labour Party to its senses, and that is what I want, because, as I said, I am willing to support this party as long as certain necessary changes are made. If they are not made, I am sorry, but I will have to take my exit or they will put me out. That is my position.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of this sitting until 5.00 p.m. today.

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

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

4.40 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed.

Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. Omitted, all the voyage of their lives is bound in shallows and in misery. On such a full tide, are we now

afloat? I would wish to make one slight adjustment in the words of that stanza and instead of saying "in the affairs of men" let us say "in the affairs of a nation", and then to say that there is a tide in the affairs of a nation which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that it is because we are on such a tide that this exercise must be seen by us as being a very healthy one, although there are several aspects of it which are sad and saddening, because nobody who belongs to a parliamentary system should want to see an exercise in which we are brought to a position where a parliamentary colleague is brought to this level of public debate and public scrutiny based on his or her public behaviour. But the very fact that it is taking place ought to be salutary for every one of us who is here and ought also to be salutary for those persons who intend to be politicians or parliamentarians in the future, because what it speaks to is a recognition by us in Parliament that the constituency which we serve is not satisfied only with form but is satisfied and cart only be satisfied if there is true accountability on the parts of the guardians whom they place in positions of responsibility, and that they will only be satisfied if there is transparency by us in what we do and the general well-being of the country. It would be instructive for us, whatever side of this Chamber we might belong to, and whatever political view we may hold on to, if we bear in mind that increasingly we have a more perceptive nation – that is to say, the people of Barbados – increasingly we have a nation of people who are much more demanding in terms of the quality of leadership and the quality of representation, and we must be prepared in the service we render to ensure that, whatever our points of view, we endeavour always to serve at the best level of our capabilities.

Indeed, Sir, it is because of that kind of commitment that I would wish to have you indulge me just for a little while so that I can compliment the excellent work that is done by members of my fan club who, even at the level of public meetings, have been making some comments about my travel arrangements. From time to time persons on both sides of this House have been singled out by international agencies because, if we have nothing else, we are able at the level of Barbadian representatives so to represent the interest of our country and the interest of our constituents that we get singled out for higher office wherever we go to serve. Many of us in that regard have been called upon from time to time to travel, and those of us who travel at the international level know that travel arrangements are made by internationals, not at the whims and fancies of individuals, but that they are made sometimes months in advance. For example, my recent absence from this country was arranged since February of this year, but so committed was I to making sure that I recognise the fullness of the tide that is before us, that I was prepared to travel all night to get back here this morning at 5 o'clock and to take part in this debate. Not because I wish to make a long speech, because I think the speeches have been made by the four Ministers who have resigned from Cabinet, but rather because I wish for the records to make a statement nonetheless regarding the significance which attaches to this particular matter so far as I am concerned.

It is my considered view, Mr. Speaker, that this debate today strikes to the very heart of democracy. It strikes to the very heart of democracy at a time when we in this country, and indeed we in small democratic societies like this country, speak very much about the relevance and the importance of consultation, of full discussion, of the sharing of information and of efforts to involve more people in decision making. In that context, it is important for us to recognise that democracy has to be served even where sometimes there may be pain to be suffered by individuals. My concern is not to do with the appointment of a person and the rightfulness or wrongfulness of that appointment. My concern has much more to do with the performance, the methodology, and it has to do with what that says about this delicate plant called democracy. It has to do with their being contradictions within that arrangement at the same time that we will recognise that in a country like ours we have to be very careful to nourish, to groom and to endeavour to make sure that this delicate plant, democracy, is able to grow and to flourish and to become a firm and strong tree.

5.10 p.m.

Every time we do something which subtracts from that nourishment which sets back our efforts to have consultation and discussion. Every time that we do that, Mr. Speaker, then we are removing the people who should be at the centre of our thinking and bringing to the margin of our consideration. That is something that I believe that we ought not to be encouraging at this time.

My role in this exercise is a role that relates to my conscience and does not speak to any party statement. Indeed, if it were not for the fact that we had had four other speeches just before myself I would be inclined to say that other persons may easily have got up here tonight or this afternoon and may have made statements but then committed themselves to party leadership and party direction. In my own case, I do not believe that I have or even that I would have wanted to have that liberty. In fact I made that decision some 15 months ago.

My departure from the Democratic Labour Party in March 1993 signalled the fact that I wanted to be in a position on occasions like this to speak directly to the conscience of the matter and not be under any whip or guidance from party leadership. I would like to put that within the historical context as I recognise as lying before us.

In 1987 when the late Errol Walton Barrow was replaced by the current Prime Minister I recall that at a party conference I said to the Prime Minister that I was going to give him critical support. I said this in the presence of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Attorney General and several other persons, some of whom are no longer with the Party. On being questioned as to what I meant by that I indicated that where the Prime Minister was right I would give him the fullest support that I was able to, that where in my view he was wrong I would first of all endeavour quietly and privately to speak to him regarding what I thought were errors and only if I realised that he was not prepared to listen to private consultation would I express my public disagreement with him.

I have endeavoured to live up to that particular situation, even though in 1991 – I think it was the 31st August – the Prime Minister did make it clear to me and, I believe, to others, in a public pronouncement on television when we were in the middle of discussing a means by which we thought we could address the matter of the difficulties in the public sector, when the Prime Minister indicated that he was no trade unionist, he was a Prime Minister. I realised that that was his prerogative and I merely wish to say now in 1994 that I am no party member. I happen merely to be the prime servant of a labour movement. The same way that he was able to make his decisions governed by Prime Ministerial position and status at that time I will make my position made from my prime trade union position governed by what I consider to be the conscience of the working class people of this country in 1994.

Governed by those considerations I have to reject the efforts to bypass established form when those forms are set up to deal with matters like the appointment of Chief Executive Officers and when furthermore that is only an indication of the kind of style that there is in management.

I am going to be concerned by the Prime Minister's action in uprooting one Board coming out of the dissension to establish a Chief Executive Officer and planting another one, I am equally concerned about his removal of the trade union official who served on that Board and replacing him with another trade unionist. In 1984 when the trade union official was removed, the Barbados Workers' Union made a public outcry about it and the Democratic Labour Party supported the Barbados Workers' Union. In 1994, I had written to the Prime Minister indicating the strength of my objection. I have not made a public outcry for reasons which I do not wish to go into at this time.

The facts however remain the same that if a Prime Minister of a country recognises the need for consultation then it cannot be consultation at the whims and fancies of any one of the social partners but it has to be consultation which meets with the needs of the society as a whole. I am not one of those people nor is my organisation one to take lightly the statement that is made regarding the commitment of the Government to what it appears to call the automatic rights to appointment and promotion from within.

I know it is very popular for people to speak to this subject and to suggest that whatever the circumstances that people who are within an institution should be promoted to fill jobs at the senior level, whether they are able to perform the task or otherwise. We in the Barbados Workers' Union have said very early that we do not subscribe blindly to such a view, although we believe in the efficacy of promotion and of filling positions from within. We believe that if people are going to be given positions by promotion from within that there must be an established and satisfactory competence that is shown in all the circumstances.

I do not say that to suggest that the person under discussion today is not competent. I do not know and I would wish to trust in the integrity of the persons who made the decisions. I would merely wish to say that people would have made those decisions based on their conscience and those decisions must be the decisions they have made and I respect them.

What I would concern myself with is that the manner by which the Government and indeed the manner by which the Prime Minister approached this has left very much to be desired. It brings me back to the position I was speaking to a moment or two ago when I said I spoke to the Prime Minister in 1987 and told him I would give him critical support. But I went on beyond that to say to him and the same persons who were present, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Attorney General and some others. I said to him I am going to take a position for the labour movement because in my view you are not going to lose this Government. You are going to throw it away. And long after you have thrown away this Government I am going to have a trade union to run. That was in June 1987. I still remain of the view, although I did not myself know that those words were prophetic. I do not believe that I should belabour the subject because it is clear to me that these words have today shown that they have established what the score is.

I cannot support the amendment to the Resolution because it is my view that the Resolution as it stands speaks to the heart of the matter. It speaks to the concerns that we have to save Barbados' parliamentary system. It speaks to our need to save democracy, as we understand it, and to ensure that everybody else who comes afterwards does not find himself or herself in a situation where there is the possibility for any similar problems of the kind we have experienced.

5.20 p.m.

Though people will have a lot of division coming out of this and there are going to be difficulties in this divide that is out'there in the street, I think we need to say to the public at large when they speak to us, as in fact they have spoken to me and they have said "do the right thing", we have to be able to say to them "Yes, we are doing the right things because we are being governed by our conscience".

Mr. Speaker, I am being governed by my conscience and my conscience advises me to support the Resolution.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is easily one of the most difficult speeches to make in this Parliament. I was one of those persons who had a motion of no-confidence tabled in this Parliament against me and I knew that the opportunity was taken on that occasion to make some of the most sweeping and vicious statements. The only thing on looking back on it today is that I am able to stand up in this Parliament and speak and the mover of that motion is somewhere in America, cannot show his face because if he comes back to Barbados God knows where he would be and I am still able to walk in Barbados with my head high because, as I said on that occasion, I had nothing to hide, that my hands were clean. Therefore, that debate, although it was painful, is not as painful as this one because this is a debate where, on this occasion, the debate is joined by colleagues on this side, some of whom I go back with many years.

Mr. Speaker, when I offered myself in 1975 to the Democratic Labour Party, I remembered I was interviewed and I said on that occasion that it was a very difficult decision to make because the moment one enters political life, you open your family and self to all kinds of accusations in things you have worked for over all the years before you got into political life and all of a sudden people start to see them only after you have got into political life. Therefore it was one that you had to be careful about.

The last time in 1986 when I offered myself then under the leadership of Mr. E. W. Barrow, and then more recently under the present leadership of Lloyd Erskine Sandiford, I offered myself as a member of the Democratic Labour Party to the people of St. Philip North. I say that, Mr. Speaker, to say that when I went to the people of St. Philip North, I went under two conditions (1) as a member of the Democratic Labour Party and (2) as is known in the politics of Barbados where leadership is very important, they knew in 1991 when I offered myself last that I was offering myself under the leadership of Lloyd Erskine Sandiford and the people in St. Philip North endorsed my candidature again. Therefore, I speak for the people of St. Philip North. I have not had the opportunity to go back to my people of St. Philip North to consult with them. I am not going to speak on this motion otherwise than as a loyal member of the Democratic Labour Party who had gone in 1991 under Lloyd Erskine Sandiford and was therefore asked to come to this Parliament.

I am not going to be long, Mr. Speaker. I had on the occasion before I started, some of you would have noticed that I passed to my colleague, Wes Hall, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, a note. I passed that note to my colleague for the following reason that I tried on numerous occasions to get him – Wes and myself go back from Combermere School – and I told him in the note that I felt I must let him know that when I speak what I was going to say in the debate would be in the interest of our continual friendship and in the interest of our relationship with the people of Barbados.

I will tell you why I passed him that note. Those of us who know the configuration of Cabinet will know that I, on numerous occasions, discussed the matter. Let me start by saying that I have never worked with Mr. Arthur. Let me start by saying that I know nothing of Mr. Arthur's ability. Let me start by saying then, therefore, that at the beginning I did not have any views on the matter.

Unfortunately, I am fortunate in a way that I am not going to disclose what happened in Cabinet. All I am going to say is that if I was placed in the position of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, I might have been in the same position today. I will tell you why. The whole debate broke out around the words "diametrically opposed". This is all we are here discussing. The word "diametrically" opposed is what started the debate. I am saying that it is a matter of perception. The most I can say on this occasion is that I was persuaded, and I believe the persuasion was genuine, that Mr. Arthur was not the most fitting person for it. I believe the person who persuaded me so really felt deep inside that was the position. Therefore, if I had a perception of the whole thing, I could have been led to believe that there was some opposition to the appointment of Mr. Arthur. That is an honest opinion. All I am saying is that one has to examine this matter very, very carefully.

My colleagues on the Back Bench spoke with conviction. They have obviously been hurt and they were crying out for someone to reach out to them. Let me say that the machinery of the party, and like them too, Mr. Speaker, I cannot disclose party matters here, but sometimes in the effort to support leadership some of our members are their worst best enemies. Some of them are the worst enemies to the party in that they do not understand the mechanism of party politics and that whatever you do the machinery must be there for people to be able to vent their feelings so we could have internal views.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have reached this stage where some of my colleagues believe that this is the only place they could air them. It is extremely unfortunate that my colleagues reached the conclusion that this was the only place that they could have poured their hearts out. It could be, as a member of this party for a long time, I must carry some of the blame. I have said that of all of those sitting down on this side, I was a member of this Democratic Labour Party from when I joined in 1957, therefore you can understand the agony I am going through. I am going through real agony because what is going to happen is that whatever are the true convictions of my colleagues on the Back Bench, their convictions are going to lead to a situation where the Democratic Labour Party that we all have been members of and worked so hard for is going to be at the crossroads. That is the most I am going to say.

5.30 p.m.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Peter made a statement that the Prime Minister's Statement on March 14, 1993 on page 3076 would be the noose by which this Prime Minister must be hung. That brings me to something that I often wondered. There are many of us in this Chamber who cannot come to grips with capital punishment. Do you know why we cannot come to grips with capital punishment? It is because in the odd chance that we have ended the life of an innocent person, when we discover that we have ended the life of that person, it is too late. I say that to come to the point, Mr. Speaker, we are all asking for reconciliation. We all searched our individual souls and many of us believe that we are doing what is right.

There are many of them that lay pretence to being closer to God than I am. Some of them are in continued communication with God. I have no doubt that God would guide them. I try in my way, Mr. Speaker. But there is also a part that they would know as well in that same book which states very clearly, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." That is significant. It is significant because most of the colleagues who spoke ended up with one statement that they are supporters and lovers of the Democratic Labour Party. I think it is the common trend that went through the speeches here today. Some of them are looking towards the salvation of the Democratic Labour Party by the route of purging. They feel it must be purged of its present leadership in order for the Democratic Labour Party to survive.

I want to believe and I believe that that might be the general conclusion which they have reached. I think too that I am entitled to a conclusion like all of my colleagues. I am afraid that that is not the conclusion. If we are searching for a reconciliation, if we realize the machinery is not there, it is not too late for the machinery to be put in place. But it would certainly be too late, Mr. Speaker, if after we have voted here, in the quiet of the night, when we examine our individual consciences very, very deeply that we realize that there could have been the perception of being opposed was not an outrageous perception according to the actions and maybe the words of some of us.

Mr. Speaker, as I said it is very unfortunate in a way that Cabinet secrecy demands that you cannot say what has happened in that Chamber. I am not going to break it. All I am going to say, in closing, is that the people of Barbados have given the Democratic Labour Party a mandate for 5 years under the present leadership. In my opinion there is nothing that has been done by that present Leader and I know what I am talking about. I examined him closely today. There were 3 charges laid, the manner of the appointment and a lot of it, as the corrected Resolution shows were inaccurate statements. It is not frivolous to say here we are in this Parliament and we are going to bring down judgement on a person for supposedly not speaking the truth. The same Resolution that is to bring down the person for not speaking the truth is riddled with inaccuracies. It is a strange thing,

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain this House any longer. I am certain that you can glean, from my contribution that it is not my intention, and I am not going to support the Resolution.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing in this Honourable House, a struggle for the Ark of the Covenant, the Holy Grail of our social, economic and political system. Today the Prime Ministership of our country is at test. I have no doubt that eyes will be cast on that Grail and that Covenant both from within this Party and outside of it. It is the biggest prize in the firmament of politics. I have no doubt from the drift of the discussions that there will be champagne parties tonight in the Heights and the Terraces and other places, In the homes of those working class people who have been reviled by those persons who put them there, there will be a lot of tears and the gnashing of teeth by working class people tonight.

Sometimes in these periods of crisis I go back to my foundations. That is not always the Bible. I cannot tell anybody that I am always going to the Bible for my answers. I go to people like Laskey who lived through the turbulent First and Second World War and the periods in between. He wrote a book about "Liberty and the Individual". He talked about what happens to people in times of intense crisis; what happens to people in periods like 1991 in Barbados and afterwards where there was severe economic contraction. Laskey, looking at the rise of Nazism and other social forces in that period recognized that that type of period can cause severe difficulties in any country. It can cause trauma in the body politic. It

can cause trauma in the minds of individuals. I see a lot of that happening today. It causes fear and fear leads to doubt, mistrust, suspicion, exaggerations of actions. It leads to a fracturing of relationships and individualism comes to the fore. Groups disintegrate. Teams break up and every man fights for himself. People would get up and give testimonies. I have seen this.

All they are telling you is what they should do because of their duty. Any time a man gets up and boasts that he has done his duty, it bothers me. If I have to get up here and tell you that I have always supported the Democratic Labour Party, I would be ashamed to do that because that is what you expect me to do. If I tell you that I support my Prime Minister it should not be otherwise, except my Prime Minister is found to be wrong and proven to be wrong, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that I do not have any cause to give full and unqualified support.

In these circumstances people take up ideologies and slogans to support their own positions and they sometimes dress them in clothes that strain to the circumstances and they seek opportunities for conflict and join in the battle for the Ark of the Covenant, the Holy Grail. That is always the underlying thrust but they use opportunities and circumstances to join in that conflict. The debate here today is about the apparent proximate cause of why we are here, that a Prime Minister is supposed to have said – that is the proximate cause, not the real cause – that certain of my colleagues and his colleagues were "diametrically opposed" to the appointment of Mr. Anthony Arthur, as the Chief Executive Officer for the Barbados Tourism Authority. There was no No-Confidence debate when the Ministers resigned which was the big thing but there is a No-Confidence debate because of a discussion about diametrically opposed. That is why I say you seek the occasion and dress it up into something more than it really is, because I do not really want to examine whether the persons were "diametrically opposed" or not. I think that is going to come out. That will come out, but that is only seeking the proximate cause.

5.40 p.m.

Let us look at the issue, the Prime Minister's description that the Ministers were diametrically opposed. Immediately the Press and everybody else said the Prime Minister is a liar, he has to be a liar. I challenge 90% of the people of this country of Barbados, including the Press, that they do not know the facts of the situation. I challenge them to say that in this country of Barbados we are passing judgements on mature things, important things, and we do not know the facts. I am challenging this country that if it thinks it can move forward through rumours and gossip to bring down people in high estate and institutions, that is very serious business. Rumours and gossip murdered Desdemona. Rumours and gossip got between Iago and Othello. Those are lessons for those who studied the writings of great men.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am saying to you that the facts of this matter will not come out in this Chamber. You had better believe it. Every person who speaks inside here has an axe to grind in this issue. I too, yes. All of us. The facts of the matter would better come out if you had an objective tribunal that would look at the information available and decide whether or not the Prime Minister was wrong when he said that persons were diametrically opposed, because they would be able to read the documents, they would be able to investigate people as far as their Cabinet secrecy would allow them to say certain things, and we would know whether there are facts or not. I am afraid that we are not in that frame of mind in this country. All the talk about truth in here, whose truth? Even these persons who spoke here, I challenge them that they gave you the facts as they wanted you to hear them, not all the facts. You had better believe that. There is no half truth, quarter truth or threequarter truth. You are either truthful, in other words let the facts flow and let decisions be made, or do not get involved in talking about integrity and those sorts of things. Let us understand where we are at. I am not attacking anybody, but in their own minds they will know whether I am telling the truth or not about their actions, not about the truth of the situation.

There is a tight veil over information in our country. People hold on to information because they do not want to hurt one another. Some people are more prone to hold that information because they do not want to hurt others; others do not mind talking as much as they like. It is a personality thing. It is a thing about character too. I do not believe we will hear all the truth in here, but judgements are going to be made. Judgements were made before that incident. Judgements, as you can hear from the speakers themselves. Some of them came with heat in their breast from three and four years ago. This is only the occasion, but hear them how they speak. They are now spewing out things that were in their consciences and in their brains and minds years ago, but this is only the proximate cause and this is the occasion.

Let me say to you that in this debate we are talking about the Prime Minister and we are talking about three attributes. The attribute of power, the attribute of authority, the attribute of responsibility. Let us look at the three of those things in relation to the Prime Minister. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central has given you the constitutional power that resides in the prime ministership in our country. It is a very powerful position and one has always to be careful in the exercise of

power. But I wish to ask anybody, in terms of the exercise of that power, what is the most important thing. That power should be exercised for the good of this country and for the betterment of the people of this country without fear or favour of any special interest groups, and if you are suggesting that in his actions, in this case when the Prime Minister wielded his power, that he wielded that power in the disinterest of Barbadians in general, I am going to challenge that, I am going to speak to it. If the Prime Minister used his power in a way that is against the best interest of this country, when everybody was saying that you must have a man in charge of the Tourist Board, the tourism sector is too important, you cannot allow it to drift for a very long time, exercise your power. That is what people were saying. Make sure somebody is there,

Now authority is slightly different. The Prime Minister also has authority that derives from law, but there is another authority, and this is where the problem comes from. His authority can come from his personality, and perhaps because there are differences in our views of a personality and how it should be - because we always confuse personality with character - I tell this Chamber here that most of us in this country have a particular image in our minds, partly through brain washing for years, about the kind of personality that should lead us. To me the dominant image is of a tall, white or brown skinned type, with a fairly straight nose, that articulates in an Oxonian or a Cambridge manner, and who is fairly aggressive. That is the image in most people's minds about a leader in this country, and because some people fall away from that image, that perception that has been built into your minds, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will find that he has some image problems out there on the street, because he does not fit that image. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South, our Prime Minister, has never fit that image and from the start he was under attack, because he does not fit that image which has been created through a lot of years of brain washing of the people in this Chamber, and outside it too. We analyse these things very carefully, we know that is a fact. I know what I am talking about, I have good evidence from social psychologists. Fanon and a number of them. So the kind of authority that can come from personality and image was never always there for the Prime Minister.

Now I come to responsibility. The Prime Minister has ultimate responsibility for what goes wrong and what goes well in this country. That is why the vote of no-confidence is against him, not against any Minister now. This is where the buck stops, right here in that seat, whoever is there. If things do not go well, he will take the blame. If they go well, nobody wants to credit him. It is always somebody else or something else, but when there is blame the responsibility is going to fall there. So I ask you, in case of the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority, there were two - as events have expressed themselves to me - and this is a perception I have, I may be wrong - there were two competing ideologies. (The first ideology would be that the appointment to that position should come from outside the Authority.) The second aspect of that ideology is that the person should not be Barbadian, preferably. I have heard that expressed more than once, so don't question my authority. I will tell you where I heard that from. I heard it on television programmes; I heard it being espoused by former presidents of the Hotel Association; I heard that, If you didn't hear it, then that is your business.

5.50 p.m.

I heard that ideology expressed. One, that the person should not be from here. It was preferable that the person be from outside. h was also said that the person should not be from the public sector at all. It should be a private sector type of person. It was said that that person should be given any amount of money. It does not matter. Let them go out there and do some good work but pay them anything they ask for. It has also been a part of that ideology that the person should be able to socialise and smile and so on.

I am now putting that ideology together in retrospect, looking at all that has been said and that form of ideology that apparently exercised the mind of the first Board, from what I am reading. When my good friend, the Honourable Member for St, Lucy, said that a particular member of the Board was diametrically opposed to Arthur and did not vote for him, I spoke to that person too. The person said to me that as a member of the first Board this was the reigning ideology and he was convinced along the lines that that was how it should be, that all persons on that Board said that the person should be an outsider, should not be from the public sector and all sorts of things.

The person said to me that when they heard the new Board, of which I am a member, articulating a different philosophy he was convinced that we were right and she previous ideological position was wrong. But you will hear further about that. I know the power of persuasion that people have on others. I know that if a man comes and tells you - you don't know Mr. Arthur - and he comes and tells you he is no good and you hear five people saying so and you have to make a judgment since you don't get an opportunity to talk to Mr. Arthur, you are going to be persuaded by the view that is put on you.

If you are a member of a Board and there is a predominant view... Remember in that Board everybody did not support that view. There are some from the start who did not support it. I want you to be very clear. But

you have to understand the composition of the Board. You have to understand who comprised the Board. The persons involved should be giving you these facts so that you can make objective judgments.

The second prevailing view which, as I understand it, the second ideology, is that the appointment should come from inside the Authority, that the person could be a public servant – there is nothing wrong with that – and that the person would have to be paid according to comparable positions in the public sector. The Barbados Tourism Authority is just another parastatal organisation and therefore in rewarding the Chief Officer you could not have any special regime for him or her, for that matter.

The ideology in this second view is that the emphasis should not be on the ability to smile and go to cocktail parties but on that person's capacity to plan programmes for the Tourism Authority, to develop strategic plans and put them in action, to create a team at the Tourism Authority to deliver the goods for this country.

Now when you are faced with those two conflicting ideologies, because they are not the same, you may come to different results. My understanding is that the Honourable Wes Hall, my very good friend, who did a tremendous job at the Ministry of Tourism, a yeoman job, would have been to some extent constrained by the ideology of his Board. He need not have shared that ideology. But he felt constrained that if the Board said, "This is what I want" to some extent he had to go along with them.

In my view, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy tried in a way to blend between these two ideologies that seemed to have been clashing. Remember, he was not making the decision by himself. He was making a decision with a Board. He did not get the Board he wanted. He got a Board that was a composite Board. Nor did Wes have the Board he wanted. We all have to understand what is happening here, the problem about Boards, because I am going to deal with that issue too, the relation between a Board and a Minister and a relationship between a Minister and a Prime Minister. Let's understand these are the major issues we are talking about here.

They did not have the Boards they wanted and therefore they had to do a certain amount of dancing around to satisfy the end. They did not have total liberty in exercising their judgments. Now if the Prime Minister of this country is of the view that the second ideology is the one that should hold in terms of appointment to that position and let us assume that that Prime Minister is confronted by an ideological position that is totally foreign to what he wants, and he had the ultimate responsibility for turning around this country, for controlling the economy and the Tourism Board through that, what should the Prime Minister do?

If you were Prime Minister, what would you do? Walk away or tell all those Boards that he accepted their ideology which is completely different from his and surrender his position. He has the power. He has the authority. He has the responsibility for this country and what should he do? I ask any of you here who exercise authority. All of this talk about discussions and so on, you all know in your conscience and your heart that there are times when you have to make some lonely decisions without consulting anybody. I challenge all of you to say that you all take into your confidence all of your close associates each time you are making a decision.

I will say to you that the Prime Minister was constrained to act. There are certain things on which there can be no middle road. There are certain things that are not negotiable. If you have a particular ideology that says this is the kind of appointment I want and there is another group out there, you have to act in keeping with your position.

I am telling you the first persons I heard articulating the first ideology about the outside person and give them all the money, that group was coming from the Hotel Association and from the distributive retail sector. I am not calling anybody's name but they went public early and told this country that Arthur was no good. Read the newspapers. Go back and see who were making those comments early before even we as parliamentarians got involved in the discussion.

There were people bold enough to go out there and tell Barbados long before there was any opportunity for Boards to decide that this man was no good. Who gave them that power? Who gave them that authority? What responsibility do they have to this economy and this polity to be making those kinds of judgments? Those are the ones that should be put over the bar of public opinion and condemned, not the Prime Minister, for doing what his power, his authority led him to do and what is his responsibility. That is my position.

Now, I want to deal with a detail. It has come to my notice from reading and from hearing that a Board recommended a certain Board member, a member of the Board, for the position of CEO and that there was agreement that he would get some $30 000 additional from the TDC and that that was carried to the Prime Minister and to the Cabinet. I have strong views about that. You all are talking all sorts of things in here about responsibility and taking action. Let me ask you a question about that.

If that had ever gone through, if a Minister had carried that to Cabinet, Cabinet had agreed and the Prime Minister had agreed and you didn't roast the Democratic Labour Party and tell them, "go you are corrupt", then I would have been the most surprised man in the world.

The Prime Minister is being castigated from stopping that action. Tell me what you are saying because I understand that the Prime Minister did not accept that. I don't know the details. I am only talking about what I hear. Somebody who knows the details will fill in and tell the truth. As I said, I dare anybody to challenge that that is what happened. A group of businessmen in this country were able to top up a salary of a public servant by $30 000 and the person who would have been a public servant said he would take it and the Prime Minister rejected that and now he is being castigated for rejecting it and they are saying he stepped in and used his power.

In the case of - I am hearing a lot about executive searches. I am hearing about a lot of other people being nominated and none of them couldn't find an acting CEO to come up with. All of these searches going on, but the man who has been doing the job, who has been there for 20 years, none of these searches can find the man and give him a shot even if he is knocked down afterwards.

Now if I were a Minister and somebody did not bring that name to me, I would ask them why not. Bring all the rest that you went and searched for, but I would ask you why not. At least put him up, even if he gets knocked back down. I would have to be satisfied that he was on that.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, for the record, on a point of order or elucidation, whatever. This may be my last debate in here. The Chairman of the Barbados Tourism Authority indicated to me and this was also conveyed to me by the Deputy Chairman that both Mr. Arthur and Mr. Miller were interviewed by the Board on the occasion when BIMAP which was requested to do an executive search which is a legitimate way of attempting to deal with a matter like this. There is nothing underhand about that. They were both interviewed. As a result of the interview they came up with a person other than Mr. Arthur. I want the record to be very clear about this.

Thank you, Sir.

6.00 p.m.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the Honourable Member for St. Lucy for making that statement and putting it into the records because there are some people out there in the public domain who might have been of the opinion that at no time was Mr. Arthur's name put forward so the Ministers did not have to look at it. I am grateful because I know my colleague would put the truth in the record. The truth is that Mr. Arthur has been considered. I want that to be understood very clearly.

Now, however Mr. Miller moved, I do not know. I heard he was called and asked to demit. I hear so. But I also heard that Mr. Miller was called and asked to come forward too, so I do not know. As I said, I am not part of these things. But if Mr. Miller moved out and there were two people up, the obvious thing to me then is that the one that was left back would have to go in. I cannot see any problem with that. If two are found to be all right and one goes, it seems to me that logically, you could not then toss out that one and go and look for another one.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: I am not dealing with personalities. I want to be very clear. I am not dealing with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. His point has been made very clear. I am talking about when my chance came to make a decision. It has nothing to do with the Honourable Member for St. Lucy operating at the time in the way that he had to operate. I just want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker. I just want to crystalize what I am saying.

The proximate cause of us being here trying to pull down a Prime Minister is that he is supposed to have told lies and I do not believe that is true. I believe the Prime Minister had enough reason to believe that what he was saying had the germ of truth in it. There is the question of whether people were opposed to the man's appointment. You are hearing that people cannot be opposed and, in fact, the real problem is that their Boards did not nominate the man and therefore they did not have to make the choice.

I do not believe that is the reason for what is happening here. I want you to understand that very clearly. I do not believe that is the real reason and we might not even discuss the real reason. Let me say that for the purposes of this debate, a lot broke out because of two conflicting idealogies. I am still of the opinion that there are certain people in this country who did not want Mr. Arthur for particular reasons. I want to be clear about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Three minutes more.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Thank you very much, Sir. In three minutes I can do what I have to do.

There are certain interest groups in this country who were able to influence certain boards to shut the door in Mr. Arthur's face. It was to the embarrassment of good people like the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central who was put in a very invidious and difficult position by a board that was adopting a philosophy that was different from the philosophy of the Democratic

Labour Party and the philosophy of our Honourable leader, the Prime Minister. That Board put him in that particular difficulty. That is my view still that he was constrained by the Board. The Board had a philosophy that was strange to what the Democratic Labour Party would support and strange to what the Honourable leader would support because we would always have gone for the man inside who worked hard. We would not have gone for any outside person and given him any $30 000 extra and that sort of thing. That is foreign to the Democratic Labour Party and foreign to the Prime Minister and foreign to all of his Cabinet members. But that Board sought to put the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central in that position.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy tried a thing and he said he was not opposed to Mr. Arthur but he ran into a Board that was not his Board and he tried to make a compromise. He would not go for a private sector person. He tried to see if he could get a public sector individual, not to top up any money because he would not be any part of that, and that did not get through either. The other Board said "No", not that either, and you found a Prime Minister having to deal with a Board that did not understand its own relationship to Ministers and to a Prime Minister.

Aside.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: So you understand what happened. Nowadays you appoint Boards and then the Boards turn around and think that they appoint you. That is part of the problem. That is where the problem is that a Prime Minister will appoint a Minister and there is that relationship. Then a Minister appoints a Board and the Board turns around and feels, "Oh, yes. You appoint me here, well I am calling the shots now. You go back and tell the man that put you there this is what I want to do". This is what is happening with Boards in this country and you are talking about abuse of power with the Prime Minister? You really think so? You have to understand who is abusing the power in this country. The Boards that feel that when they get there they can then decide all of the policies for the same Minister who put them there and the policy for the party. In many cases they are not even faithful party people either.

Mr. SPEAKER: Time.

Mr. R. L. MORRIS: Those are some of the things you have to understand

I thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot think that there has ever been a debate that I am less inclined to participate in than this particular debate. I accept the quotation which the Honourable Member for St. Peter used at the beginning of his presentation in which he said that this is a matter on which it is difficult to speak and impossible to remain silent.

I want to start by beginning on that note and saying that I agree with him 100% because I was sent here by the people of St. John, not to put my personal position on issues, not even to put simply a parochial position, not simply on occasion to put a national position, or simply to put a party position, but to seek to distill from all of the competing interests which we as representatives serve, because some people forget that, and to put an interpretation in events which happened in this country and on the policies pursued by Government. I want to reiterate this because there are some people in this Chamber today, whose IQ, not when they are listening, but when they are writing, seem to reach rock bottom. I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot recognise them, nor can you, but I hope that they are listening very carefully to what I have to say.

Parliamentarians are elected for a multiplicity of reasons. We are not just elected because people like us as individuals. That is important. Integrity, credibility and a high level of morality those are important issues and, therefore, from time to time one gets consumed with the importance of those kinds of things, as did the Leader of the Opposition recently. Those things are irrelevant. People's personal business and the lifestyles they live are irrelevant. What they do in terms of performing in this Chamber when called upon to represent the interest of those they serve is what is important.

Then some people get mixed up and they start to talk about party line and yardfowls. I maintain that both of the political parties in this House, and I would go as far as to say, and the pretenders to the throne on the outside, are all parties which have the national interest at heart. If anybody in here can dispute that point then they have no right being in this Chamber. It would be foolish of us to continue to allow people to believe that there is some wide gulf between the policies which we as parliamentarians sitting in our party caucuses with political parties which have mass membership of more than 10 000 people each, are not representative of a national position. Those who say that people come in here to tow a party line simply do not understand that there is a symbiotic relationship between the party and Barbados as a whole.

The last point I want to make relates to the role or impact of views of our constituents in our performance in this Chamber. That is important because since we cannot gauge with any accuracy how our constituents feel on any given issue, it is almost impossible for people to come

in here and say they are representing a constituency view unless it is a parochial problem like lack of water, lack of roads, or some individual issue which they can locate in their constituency. When I look at this particular issue it is not an issue on which there is any conscience vote.
6.10 p.m.

I am not dictated by any conscience vote in supporting it. I am also taking into consideration all of the perspectives which have put me in this Chamber. The people of St. John and there is nobody on the outside of this Chamber who can believe or would wish to believe or would be silly enough to believe that I would support any Resolution brought by the Barbados Labour Party which is self-serving and which has, at its heart essentially a lust for power – which of course never dies in politicians so that is not such a bad thing – and the smell of political blood.

I am not supporting the Resolution and those who do not wish to hear contrary viewpoints can leave now and wait until their argument is being put. I am not supporting it. Though I must say that viewpoints have been expressed in here which are essentially pertinent viewpoints about the style of management of this country's affairs, concerns about the way in which the Prime Minister handles issues relating to his Ministers and these kinds of things and those are issues which, in my view, Mr. Speaker, have no right being dealt with in this context. But they are before the House and perhaps there is a good reason for they being here and, in due course as Parliamentarians, we have to understand what this debate is about.

But since the Members on that side are making a bed for other people to lie down in, I hope that in years to come, if I am a Member of this Chamber, that I do not have to participate in any exercise in which somebody else is trying to make the same bed for somebody else to lie down in. That is very important because there are only certain ways in which you can govern a country. If a Prime Minister, assuming he is not despotic and a dictator and assuming that he has the national interest at heart has to look over his shoulder every 10 minutes to determine whether he can in fact generate the level of support that is necessary to carry out the Party's policies, then he would safely have a situation of anarchy in this country.

This exercise is a good lesson for us about the way in which the Barbados model is functioning and whether it is in fact in our best interest. I sat down in this Chamber in 1991 and a Member of this Party who had moved himself to the Back Bench, not at my request, gave the impression to the public of this country that I was a supine, spineless person who never expressed my views, who allow the Prime Minister to do as he liked and he did not only refer to me, he often referred, in his accusations – he said all but one Member – that all of us were spineless individuals. I was about to get on my feet because I had spoken already and was told, no, sit down, you do not let secrets out of Cabinet. That is one secret that I am not holding.

Anybody who accuses me again of being spineless and supine is going to have to listen carefully to my response to that allegation. I will use whatever facts I need in support of the allegation. I have never had any difficulty in relation to my portfolio, which is a large portfolio in the Ministry of Finance, in functioning with the Prime Minister. Any time I have a difficulty in functioning with him or with the Democratic Labour Party, I will make an exit from politics by way of resigning my seat.

I believe that the majority of persons who elected me did not elect me simply because of who I am but they elected me because they felt that I was one of those persons along with all of us here who could implement a programme and therefore if I failed to subscribe to that programme, it meant that the relationship between us had come to an end. Some people would cross the Floor and some people would resign their seat. That is not necessarily what is happening in this particular case because as I have said the issue seems to be a more localized issue that relates to the style of leadership and is something that would have to be solved. I give my views in here, in Cabinet and in the Councils of the Democratic Labour Party and there is nobody who could make that accusation, in my view, about any Member of this side.

We are not dogs doing tricks for money or harlots waiting to be paid to expose ourselves to the public. That is another problem that there are lots of people who believe that, as politicians, that we are up for sale and we have no morality and that anything passes, anything goes. Even if these 4 men who have spoken in here are wrong for what they have said, and I am not passing judgement on them, at least they have shown in this particular debate that we are not harlots and dogs doing tricks for money. As to the substance of their charges, that is something that they will have to resolve at another level because I am not attempting to resolve them in this particular debate.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael Central quoted from Shakespeare. The last time we had a debate like this somebody quoted from Macbeth. I cannot remember which book the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central quoted from.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Julius Caesar. I can quote from Hamlet, "To thine own self be true. And it must follow as the night the day thou canst now then be false to any man." That is the most important thing. Therefore

I gave to those Honourable Members the credit that they believe that what they have said is right but I also give to the Prime Minister the credit that I believe that he believes that what he is saying in this particular matter is right. They do not understand each other's respective positions. That is clear. If that happens ...

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I cannot quote from Shakespeare now but I can quote for the television if that happens, as the Prime Minister once said, "something has to give" and something gave. It is not as trivial as that because in the midst of this debate people are forgetting that in 1991 this Government was being reviled. We had been through worse than this and this is why it hurts me so much and why this is an exercise that I detest having to be involved in.

Thousands of people were on the streets but we had to stick to our guns. We have been under a barrage of criticisms from some of the most mindless people in this country on the radio stations, in columns, in editorials. We have been under assault externally by some of the positions which the international institutions have taken against this Government and things they have written. They are now saying that Barbados is a success story. But the people who quote the institutions to say we were wrong have forgotten what the institutions are now saying about Barbados. They are dishonest clowns. That is the level of public debate which this country sunk to in 1991 in which people were being led by that kind of opinion making throughout Barbados. People were on the streets, the Government was reviled, Members of Cabinet including myself seldom left their home. The whole of Crop Over 1991 I remained in St. Philip. I was not spineless. That is not what I was. I felt badly because of what the country was going through the wrenching economic problems and in a situation like that, that is a time for reflection. You were joyous at the wrong moment, because when you were spending $40 million in CARIFESTA you should have been home hiding; licking out the taxpayers' money you should have been home quiet, but instead of that you are walking around smiling. 6.20. p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not expect the Honourable Member to go down that line.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1991 we went through a difficult time and that this administration has made so much progress, that this economy, even though the issue of unemployment remains a major issue, has by and large been characterised by all quarters, except the Honourable Member for St. Peter, who is...

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to draw to the Honourable Member's attention that for some reason that aspect was not accepted in the Resolution nor the amendment.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. That this economy – in particular I want to deal with the issue of investment in the tourism sector – has been turned around so successfully, and that in the tourism sector, contrary to what the Honourable Member for St. Joseph said in misleading this House, misrepresenting the facts, there are major investments taking place in tourism, some of which Honourable Members on that side themselves are involved in – golf courses, major refurbishment of Heywoods Hotel, nearly $20 million in new investment now in Sandals to add 130 rooms in addition to those existing. Sandy Lane added nine holes in golf and carried major refurbishment, nearly every major hotel in this country, and the small ones, particularly those in the south, Mango Bay in Holetown – major tourism investment not seen in Barbados for a long time is being undertaken, and the Honourable Member as usual, as he does with agriculture, can pooh pooh all of that and tell you that nothing is happening in this country.

This is 1994. All of those investment? are going to produce jobs in the tourism sector, which is why I am in this House. I am not in this House to get in any imbroglio with anybody over their understanding of the word "diametrically" or their viewpoints about the appointment of anybody. If the people in St. John sent me to do that, they can send somebody else, because I do not do that kind of thing well.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: They can, if they prefer that kind of debate, but I know better than that. Maybe you do not, that is why you are carrying out this exercise in here today and are so misguided about your role as a parliamentarian. But I have no illusions or delusions about my role as a parliamentarian. My job is to continue to ensure that those policies which are going to bring economic advancement to this country, particularly policies in the tourism sector which are going to be advantageous to investors, both domestic and international, are carried out. I want to focus on that, and I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that after all we have been through, after all of the difficult economic and social problems, to come to this sorry past in this particular debate is something that I just cannot understand. I cannot work it out by any process, so if I am battle wary or weary, it is because I really do not think that my time should be spent in seeking to resolve those kinds of difficulties. I would hope that there is a solution which transcends the difficulties of interpretation and goes to much higher level.

You have three outstanding party members – I am only speaking to the more recent departures, because I am not a hypocrite, so all the other things you may say, the supine and so on, the word "hypocrite" cannot come out of their mouths – but the three members who recently left the Cabinet are outstanding members of this Democratic Labour Party, and so is the Prime Minister. They are all persons who have given committed service to this country in several fields of endeavour and therefore I would like to see all of them continue to serve the people of Barbados at the highest level wherever possible. That is something we should be looking towards, and instead of people fomenting the dissention and using this as an opportunity to make a bed which they themselves are eventually going to have to lie down in, and they like they cannot work that out, somebody is going to try another back door manoeuvre...

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I do not want to warn him, you see, because I do not want to pretend to be more experienced than he is. Everybody talks about when they got into politics, but the Honourable Member for St. Peter was in Jamaica when I got into politics. I do not know where you were, but I know he was in Jamaica. You were now getting into the House, I think. There were major fights in the Lower Green Bus Stand. I was present with my school bag on my shoulder trying to get home when you were interrupting the City of Bridgetown. Anyway, I appreciate your presence, as you know.

I really wish, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that there was a solution which could bring all of these persons back to the kind of service which the public of Barbados would anticipate is necessary and desirable, because you cannot have this kind of factionalism serving in the best interest of this country, particularly when there is so much we have to achieve. I do not think anybody on this side needs to be lectured on anything, everything has been thrown at us so far. Corruption has been thrown at us, lack of morality, people have said that we have personal agendas, that we prefer to draw ministerial salary than to return to our professions, which the public of Barbados does not seem to realise are more lucrative. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South should tell them. It has also has been said that we are the worst class, last class citizens of this country who are unable to take principled positions, but I am no less principled in taking the position I have taken than anybody else in here. I am taking this position because I do not understand. That is a valid reason. I have not lost my principles and I know that tomorrow I will read about Attila the Hun, Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin and all of them that they would like to compare me to, because I have said that my party's interest and the national interest are coincident. I would also say that your party's interest and the national interest are by and large coincident. It is just that the system of democracy we practise is such that we cannot rule together, but even when we cannot rule together we co-operate in here. Not enough members of the public come to see that there is a level of national co-operation which obtains in this House, when people of integrity can discuss matters dispassionately, so everybody rushes down in here to see political blood flowing in the streets. That is what I am sent to this House to defend. As I said, I could as well then stay home, if this is what the level of the political debate has to come to, and this exercise, this gladiatorial contest in which people are being pilloried and punched on both sides is what the exercise is about, then it is not worth it. I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that one does not need to lecture anybody on this side about the principles of morality, of commitment, and whether we are taking a stand which is in the best interest of the country or not.

I consider this debate, as I have said, to be a monumental tragedy, an exercise in which the Democratic Labour Party as a party has nothing to gain from the exercise, in which the Barbados Labour Party, and particularly its leader, have nothing to gain from this exercise, in fact everything to lose in the future, whenever that misfortune should befall Barbados again, and that the people of Barbados really have nothing to gain in a situation in which this country is coming out of a major economic recession when the fortunes of this country are being turned around by policies which make sense and which. Mr. Speaker, you said I cannot enunciate here, and I wish I had the opportunity, but between the co-operation of the trade union movement, the Government and the private sector, initiatives which are about to turn this country around and we are being sidetracked by an exercise which is of no virtue and has no national relevance, in my view.

6.30 p.m.

All kinds of people are wasting their energy reading up the Constitution and giving all kinds of fulminations and wrong information, mixing up the public about what Government is about, most of whom could not save a deposit, even if they ran for a major political party and most of whom could not cross the threshold of this Parliament, but who nevertheless arrogate to themselves greater principles and integrity than anybody in this Chamber.

I am concerned about that. I have put my position as clearly as I think I cm put it. I hope that the Honourable Members will be able to resolve these differences. I want to make the clear position that I was not sent here to this Chamber to participate in these exercises and I hope this will be the first and the last that I have to face in my involvement in polities, If this is the route we have to

go, then there will not be that kind of place for persons like myself. I will not be supporting the Barbados Labour Party on this or any other Resolution which they bring to this House which is subversive of the national interest, which is subversive of the Democratic Labour Party and which is generally subversive of the interests of the people of Barbados. And that is what this particular exercise is about and I condemn it once again as another political sham by the Opposition and in particular by the Leader of the Opposition, calculated to cause disunity, national disruption, to stop the progress which this country has made, to embarrass every single Member of this Government, including those who are going to take whatever position they take later on in the debate, calculated to bring down the institutions in this country, calculated to subvert what I consider to be orderly government, all of those things, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. SPEAKER: Did you say subvert Mr. Speaker? I want to be clear if you said "subvert Mr. Speaker".

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No. I said "subvert" the Government. I didn't say "subvert Mr. Speaker". Mr. Speaker, Sir, you could never be subverted, not on a matter like this. I know that you and I are ad *idem* about what this particular exercise is about.

I am going on to say that I have worked out in my mind that this is an exercise which is intended to do all of those things. Because of that I cannot support it. It is an exercise intended to pit political foes against each other on the outside of this Chamber. It is an exercise which is aimed at slowing the economic progress which is being made. It is an exercise to distract the national debate from issues of substance to trivia, gossip and rumour, all of those things. That is what this debate is about.

Though some are trying to pretend that they are on a high road, I know that at the end of the day that they are like the pond water which the Honourable Member for the City spoke of. Their minds in this particular debate are motivated by motives which I consider not to be in the best interest of this country.

With those few words, I want to make it clear I will not be supporting the Resolution and I take my seat on that note with the hope, Mr. Speaker that the Resolution of this particular conflict will be speedy and that the interest of Barbados will be served at the end of the day.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I join this debate with reluctance and for that reason, Sir, I will be very brief. I cannot think of a debate that I would want less to be in quite honestly than this one and that is so for perhaps two principal reasons.

One. This debate is about impugning the integrity of someone who has been our colleague for many years, someone that you have known well for close to 40 years, and the second reason is that I do not believe that a person of the stature of a Prime Minister ought to be the subject of a Resolution of this kind unless for really very grave (and I will develop that later on) reasons more fundamental in my opinion than those that have been advanced here today. That is my opinion, Sir. We have got to be able to treat institutions with greater dignity and greater respect than I believe that we have been treating those institutions over the past several years, particularly over the past 4-8 years.

I said the Prime Minister was my colleague for many years. That is so. He joined the Cabinet when I was already a Member of the Cabinet in 1967. We sojourned through the Senate. We have sojourned through the House of Assembly. We entered the House of Assembly at the same time for the first time. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West also came into the House on that particular occasion and the Member for St. Lucy as well also joined the House on that occasion as well.

I have been a ministerial colleague of the Prime Minister from 1967 until now, except for the period when we did not control the Government. I am speaking for myself and from my own observations and my own assessment of a person and a person's character I cannot say that I have ever found him to be lacking in integrity. That is my opinion, Mr. Speaker.

The argument advanced here to show lack of integrity are set out in the preamble to this Resolution. My contention is that because a person's statements do not always accord one hundred percent precision with what the facts are it does not necessarily mean that that person is telling lies. I can give an example right here in this very Resolution. I can say the Honourable Member for St. Peter is telling lies when he says here in a preamble that the Board in August 1993 appointed the Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the then Minister, contrary to the provisions of the Act, the appointee did not assume office. This does not accord with the facts. I cannot say the Honourable Member is telling lies.

This is not me. In the first place the Board decided in July 1993 but the approval of the Minister has never been communicated to the Board. It is July 1993. But because that does not accord with the fact I cannot say the Honourable Member is telling lies, that he has no integrity, Mr. Speaker, because it is said again that the Prime Minister revoked the appointments of the Board when in fact it was done by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. How can we do this, Mr. Speaker?

I have to be fair and this applies when it is said that the Prime Minister revoked all the appointments of all the directors. There are inaccuracies in here but inaccuracies do not mean that whoever is responsible for it is lying. I want to make this statement right now. I am going to speak for myself. On the several occasions when an appointment was discussed in relation to the filling of that appointment to the Barbados Tourism Authority from the information I had, I did not then feel that the present Chief Executive Officer was the most suitable candidate for that position on that particular occasion. Maybe even now. If the Prime Minister were to come and say that I was diametrically opposed to that I cannot say that that would not be telling the truth. That is for me. I expressed my opinion in his hearing, at his residence, in his office and that has been my opinion. I am not removing from that. I am not withdrawing one word of what my impression was about that particular set of circumstances at that time. It may even continue right now. So we have to be careful how we attempt to impugn the character of people and at the same time use those set of circumstances to say that you are going to bring a Resolution for the revocation of the position of a Prime Minister.
6.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, where do we stand on these particular issues? I cannot agree with that. I cannot in my conscience support that. I said just now, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think we are treating our institutions well enough. We have an office of Prime Minister. Let us respect the office of Prime Minister but I am not sure that this is precisely what we are doing.

A Prime Minister, in my view, should only be removed from office in this way if he has been taking bribes or if he has committed some criminal offence. What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is, it should be a matter of a very grave nature, something akin to what one would expect – the removal of judges cannot be done in a light way. It has to be somewhat akin to that then. To remove a judge from the High Court, he can only be removed for misbehavior. Someone would have to bring a resolution detailing that misbehavior of that particular High Court judge. My view is, Sir, that the removal of someone from the office of the Prime Minister, that person should only be removed for reasons similar to what one would bring against a High Court judge.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, that too. I said akin to what would be brought against a High Court judge. If a High Court judge goes off, although he has not misbehaved, at the same time he cannot function properly.

Aside.

Hon. P. M. **GREAVES:** Bob Hawke? This is different. They never had a resolution in Parliament against them. They did not. That is my view. I am expressing my view, Mr. Speaker, because there are mechanisms for the removal of a Prime Minister. The people remove them when they are not operating in their interest. It happens often. Mr. Barrow was removed, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South was removed and if we happen to live long enough, the time will come when that particular Prime Minister will be removed too. That is the essence of democracy and that is what I believe in. But I do not believe in this particular way of handling any particular matter.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I said I would speak briefly. I will stop here because this Resolution cannot, with the reasons I have advanced here this afternoon, get my support.

Hon. B. M. **TAITT:** Mr. Speaker, we have heard this debate so far since this morning. As I get up to participate and state my position, I am minded that in one of the newspapers today there was a listing. As I looked at the categories, it had attending, speaking, voting. *On* the question of attending at my name they had a question mark. Well, Sir, you know that it has been said that if it is one place I like to be it is in Parliament. But they had a question mark as to whether I would attend. *On* the question of speaking there was another question mark. Well, Honourable Members on that side, at least, have said that if it can be spoken on I usually will get a word in. But the newspapers had two question marks. But on the question of voting, Sir, they said that I would vote. It is remarkable. They were not able to contact me but they knew that I would vote.

Let me establish at the outset that I am going to vote against the Resolution.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. **TAITT:** Sir, you notice that you did not hear the Honourable Member for the City at all. Every Member spoke and you did not hear the Honourable Member for the City. As soon as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West gets up the Honourable Member for the City comes to life. The Honourable Member for the City knows that I will defend the Democratic Labour Party because I do not have to spend a lot of time outlining my position in terms of the Democratic Labour Party. It is one of the worst kept secrets that I have given, as one of my colleagues said, my soul to the Democratic Labour Party.

I was very moved when I heard the Honourable Member for St. John articulating today the symbiotic relationship between the party and the country. There are many persons in this country, I call them opinion

makers, who have become self-opinionated but who fortunately have the privilege of expressing their opinion in such a manner as to influence others on an almost weekly basis. They make the most outrageous statements, some of them slanderous, defamatory, and they get away with it even if on a short-term basis, and they influence the community into a certain shark-feeding pattern. That shark-feeding pattern as it applies to politicians, is something that anyone who has been in politics for as long as say, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, will recognise that it goes from season to season, in and out.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: As the Honourable Member is saying, Sir, this is the in-season on the politicians and this is probably as it should be. As Barbados is identified as a place desirable to live, it is proper that we should be able in our Parliament, and outside, especially outside to have a discussion about the governance of this country in a manner that assists the rest of the country to understand that we live in a democracy. Mr. Speaker, there is no one Member on this side who is not my friend. There is not a single Member on this side who is not my friend, as Your Honour has been my friend. Now that the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central is on that side I have to say there is at least one Member of that side who is my friend, at least one. The Honourable Member for the City and I have a symbiotic relationship which in the words of the Honourable Member for St. John is not the business of this House. The Honourable Member for the City would not deny that, Sir.

6.50 p.m.

It is important that we understand the position of my colleagues who are sitting behind here. My colleagues who sit behind here are not straw persons. These are persons who have made and are making a significant contribution to the development of this country. They feel therefore, and correctly so, that they have a right to be taken seriously in any matter to which they put their hands, their heads and their minds. They are *bona fide* members of the Democratic Labour Party and they have a right to feel aggrieved if the machinery of the Democratic Labour Party has not worked, as they perceive it, in a manner that is suitable to them.

I regret – and here I part company with them – that for whatever reason they felt able and they felt it necessary to assist some of the blood suckers in this country into believing that the Democratic Labour Party had a blood lust and they were spilling the blood, certainly the political blood, all over the Floor of the House of Assembly. But I understand it, because for the last few weeks in particular, I was in Belize and I came back and found that my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and – not that side of the Chamber – were at loggerheads and difference of opinion on the issue of what took place in a particular set of circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, it is well accepted that any two persons who observe the same set of facts will have two different versions of those facts. It is well understood that the use of language creates problems among the best learned people in the world. Witness the fact that even in the highest courts you have the same set of facts put before that highest court and three judges would come down on one side and two on the other.

It is not a mortal sin for two people to misunderstand a statement. If the Prime Minister says that the Honourable Members were diametrically opposed to anything and the Honourable Members feel that they were not diametrically opposed, &at starts a feud. I took the trouble of examining "diametrically opposed. I could not understand it. I honestly could not understand what the war was all about. As I think the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central said, that was the crux of the cause.

These Honourable Members have been angry with this Honourable Member, Sir. Do you know what upsets me? There are people in this country who believe that we do not have the right to get angry at all. But in the Church they get angry with one another, weekly. Why cannot we in the political party get angry sometimes? But the Fourth Estate, bless it, in pursuit of its legitimate cause to sell papers will promote, with or without cause, the smallest possibility of a real feud. This had all of the makings of a proper feud. "Sandi". The mere mention of "Sandi" brings gristles in the throats of a number of people who are the opinion makers in Barbados. They say "Sandi lied to the people". "Sandi and the Dems tell more lies than were ever told to the people of this country for all the generations before." The Honourable Member knows about lies, Sir, so if she says it is true, she knows what I am saying is true.

They said that the Democratic Labour Party took the people to damnation and they were led blindly by the white haired, "can't dress" Sandi. They said all manner of things and then they started looking around and said "let us deal with them, the Dems, in the Fourth Estate". The working press in this country is, generally speaking, Sir, a good press. Barbados, generally speaking, has literate newspapers. But there are some people who write whose contribution or whose major attribute is to make sure they know as little about what they are writing as possible and to write in as deep a manner as is possible.

I have read an article, for example, that 86% of it was quoting from other newspaper articles. But that passes, in Barbados, as deep comment. I have no problem with that. I read everything. I read the Lockhorns. I read the

comic strips. I read the news and I even read the Barbados Labour Party column because in that there is a measure of potential earnings. I read Cou Cou.

The ordinary people this night, in their homes, are shaking. There are thousands of people in this country who are wondering what is going to happen because to take one Editorial, "Judgement Day" is upon us – the Apocalypse. That is what we have today. The people of Barbados are out there wondering, telephones humming, "Have you heard anything yet, have they voted yet?" Mr. Speaker, the number of old women who called me – I know they are old, Sir, because I know them. The young people tell me all kinds of things – to say "God go with you today, I hope you all do the right thing." You know what I am speaking about because I know there is not an Honourable Member in here, certainly on this side, and I believe on that side who did not have calls, because today has been built into a climax. They say it is the most important debate since Independence. What utter rubbish. It is an important debate but in this House, since I have been here and I have been here for a very long time and plan to stay for just as long – unless you call elections *too* soon – I have been in here in debates. I have seen a debate when the Honourable Member for Christ Church West brought down to this House legislation – the 1981 Administrative Justice Act. I saw not a single one of the persons who write. But that legislation was mammoth legislation, because it gave the ordinary people in this country an opportunity to question the Government. It said, among other things, that when a public functionary makes a decision in this country they have to give reasons in 14 days or else. That is monumental legislation. That is the most far-reaching legislation in the world. I did not read that it was "Judgement Day". You did not read anything like that, Sir, because those important matters which have transformed this country, by the two main political parties in this country, into the quality that we have get almost no notice. What gets noticed is when we are biting out each other's throats. "Taitt is a thief!" That is headlined. Hear them in the highways and byways! "You hear how much money Taitt cah way?"
7.00 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member asked me *sotto voce* if *I* am still debating it. Yes. That is why we cannot broadcast these debates, Sir, because there are people who put information out knowing it not to be true, but they know it can do political damage. The Opposition has a legitimate quest to get the Government at all costs. I would make bold to say that what I know of the Honourable Members over there – and some of them have been around for a long time, some too long – they are unlikely to try to get the Government by illegitimate means. I would say that for them. They are going to try every possible political means to bring this Government down, especially the three who are over there now. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South is a past master at old tactics and how to bring down the Government. You will notice that they are not speaking today, Sir. As far as they are concerned, the runs have been knocked off, so they have achieved their objectives, because they feel that the Democratic Labour Party has some dull choppers chopping up one another and the blood is running down the well of Parliament. Sir, it is not quite so, because they have attacked not only the Prime Minister, they have attacked the party, and those of us who are committed to the Democratic Labour Party are not going to be moved by a couple of dull choppers. You have to take our heads and cut them completely off. You have to cut off our political heads for ever. You cannot come in here and merely attack the Prime Minister by saying his management style is bad. All the Prime Ministers of Barbados have had bad management styles. Everybody now forgets that the late Errol Barrow got up in here and made decisions on the Floor of the House and then told his Cabinet. Everybody, except them, forgets that Tom Adams made many decisions of which they were totally unaware. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West left the Cabinet because of matters.... I am not going to bring up the dead. The Honourable Member told me he left the Cabinet. I accused him in here of being fired and he told me no, it is not true, he left. Now he is telling me he did not leave. Well, he got fired then.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the Honourable Member must not misrepresent the position. I would like to get the record straight. The position is that I served in the Cabinet of Barbados for five years. There was a dissolution of Parliament and I was not back in the Cabinet.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: A man of such distinction, one of the finest lawyers, was able to be left out of the Cabinet. Let us leave that, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is saying they had so much talent that he could afford to be left out. He told me he asked to stand down. I am not discussing him now, Sir, I am discussing the management style.

Sir, I have disagreed with the Prime Minister on more than one occasion. The Prime Minister will tell you that. One of the things I can tell you that Your Honour will not hear, or anybody else in here or outside will not hear ever, is what I said or what any of my colleagues said in Cabinet. You cannot hear that from me, Sir. Let me say I have disagreed with the Prime Minister on numerous occasions. Anybody who believes that that is supine,

then I am supine. That is no problem, Sir. Anybody who believes I have no testicles, check it. I do not have a problem. That is what they say, that we on the Front Bench are supine, we have no testicles. We do not have any women over here, so I will assume that they mean everybody. And a number of other things, insulting, disgusting things they say about us.

I do not have to come here tonight, Sir, and lay out a record of my service. I have been functioning for the people of Barbados for over 35 years and my record is there. If I have to come and spell it out in a debate like this, I have a problem. So if there is anyone who knows me who believes that I have no spine, write some more editorials. I say so. It may even be true. What I will say is this, that this Prime Minister has the foibles which other great leaders of Barbados and elsewhere have had, and people are to tell him from time to time that he is not right. I have known him for over 25 years. I first met him when I was functioning in New York and he was in the Cabinet then. I am not going to go into great detail. Suffice it to say that I still consider it acceptable for me to remain in his Cabinet, and I will continue to give him my advice. He will take that of it which he wants and that which he does not want he will discard. If I ever reach the point where he and I have a difference of opinion that is sufficient for me to leave, I shall leave. So there is no mystery about it.

The Democratic Labour Party is something I have defended from the time I started functioning as a part of it. I respect my colleagues, both over here and behind there, for their views. I wish that I could bring to them the understanding that I have, that what action happens here today will not only affect us and/or the Prime Minister, the action will affect a large number of people across Barbados who have put their trust in the Democratic Labour Party's Government, led by us, based on how we have approached them before, during and since. I bleed for those people, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I speak for them, not only the ones in my constituency but across Barbados, because they come from far and wide to have discussions and counsel from me. So I bleed for them that the Prime Minister, who has the authority. . . and one of the misrepresentations that has been put out – I advise all those who still are in any doubt to read the article that was written by Jeff Cumberbatch which, in my humble view, is the right articulation of the law regarding the constitutional position of the Governor-General. There is no discretion. When the position is reached when the Prime Minister, acting either outside of or within the context of a debate in here, advises the Governor-General to dissolve, the dissolution is automatic. That is my opinion and I share it with Jeff Cumberbatch. I see Ramsayhoye, he of great Privy Council fame, has also said that. I am saying, therefore, that my regret is that the Prime Minister felt it necessary and/or desirable to make that dissolution statement. That is my regret, but lest anybody should believe that that is something unusual, anyone who reads this paper here, the *London Times,* need only go back – you could pick up any copy of this over the last 6 months and you will see that Prime Minister Major on more than one occasion has threatened that he is going to call a general election. Of course, there is not much of that sort of thing that is carried in our local newspapers – because of space, I believe.

7.10 p.m.

The threat of a Prime Minister to call an election is a legitimate weapon of a Prime Minister. It is the only weapon he has. He has to choose carefully when he is going to threaten, because he has to get some people to run with him. A Prime Minister who is going to call elections must also be able to garner enough people to win a majority and so if the Prime Minister threatens to call an election, I think he must have worked out that he has enough people. I look at them, Sir, and they look to me like they can handle it, especially with the old tired ones over there.

Mr. Speaker, that is only one aspect of it. I share the view expressed by my colleague who just sat down that the Constitution was not intended in this business of calling what the Honourable Member for St. Joseph called the impeachment. That is use of a word. This House has no authority to impeach anybody. Impeachment forms part of the constitutional arrangements of the North American system, but the Honourable Member for St. Joseph would use the word "impeach" because he knows that there is a relationship between how people will hear "impeach" and what they saw Nixon had and they would see this as some kind of trial.

This is no court. It is always being suggested that this is the highest court in the land. This is no court. This is a political chamber. It does not have the power that the Parliament in England has to send people to prison. It is a good thing, too, otherwise Tom Adams would have locked up so many people. If this had the power to send people to prison, the Barbados Labour Party the last time they had the Government, would have locked up all of us. The present Leader of the NDP should confirm that he was on the lock up list by Tom Adams.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Ask the security forces if they didn't send to say that we brought the man in here who snatched Tom Adam's speech.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Too far wide of the mark.

Asides.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I was more man than you. I am not going to get into a row with the Honourable Member about who was more man. The Honourable Member did not have any lot of standing up time with Tom Adams.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not permitting that kind of argument.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say to you that the Honourable Member sitting in his seat is making asides. Asides are not part of what this debate is about. I am asking the Honourable Member to ignore those asides and proceed.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I will try to ignore them, Sir. The point I am making, Sir, is that this Parliament is not a Court. This Parliament is a political chamber and political issues are to be discussed in here. It is proper if the Honourable Members on that side feel that they can get a political victory by bringing a No-Confidence motion, and if other Honourable Members feel they want to support it, that is proper; but I think it is wrong to mislead the people of this country to give them the impression that this is some massive trial in which somebody is being impeached.

What is happening is that there is a Motion of No-Confidence against the Prime Minister. There are three charges. One, that he misused his office. The Honourable Members have not produced any evidence. The Honourable Members have said - and this is the only charge as far as I am concerned that is sufficiently serious to warrant examination - that the Prime Minister telephoned somebody. The Honourable Members over there know that in a court of law they would never have gone saying that anybody telephoned anybody and offered it as evidence.

I have no doubt that the Prime Minister would be able to respond to that. They say the Prime Minister called up and used his tremendous powers to persuade somebody to withdraw from applying for a position. I have no doubt the Prime Minister will respond to that.

The Honourable Member said that the third thing was - I don't want to misquote them, Sir - the drastic misuse and abuse of the powers of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister only occupies a critical position... Oh, and he put the credibility of the office of Prime Minister on the line. Credibility is based, according to the Honourable Member, on the Prime Minister saying that they were diametrically opposed and the others saying they were not diametrically opposed and they all set out their position.

Diametrically, Sir, means on the opposite side of. It is like a diameter, one on one end and one on the other. I think that the Prime Minister can deal with whether he perceived they were diametrically opposed or not, and I think the Honourable Members have already put their position. The Honourable Members have indicated what their position was as Ministers. There is a misunderstanding however in the Law.

Now, I have to make my position clear. I always thought and my colleagues know that I always thought that the Tourism Authority legislation was foolishness because all it sought to do was to remove power from the people through the political process and give it to some other people who do not have to face the people for polls.

I am saying that the system we have requires politicians to be in charge of policy because politicians are accountable to the people. There is no one in Barbados who can be appointed to a Board by a politician who is accountable to anybody but the Cabinet or the Parliament. But all of us politicians are accountable to the people.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Let me finish it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Complete your sentence.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The people of this country elect politicians and therefore the politicians should have the power to make the decisions and when they don't make the right decisions the people will remove them. The Tourism Authority created most of the difficulty we have because in the old system the Minister used to be involved in the decision making, but in the new system the Minister is supposed to approve, and appointment is not complete until the Minister has approved. The old convention of bringing it to the Cabinet was in the system.

Perhaps if the Honourable Members over here felt as I did, the question would not have arisen because they would have made the appointment as in the end the Prime Minister made the appointment and there would have been no question about if the Cabinet had approved or not. The Cabinet has no locus in the whole matter. It is for the Minister to decide. I am not going to get involved in trying to defend a matter that is not defendable, Thank you, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe I would be failing in my duty if I did not make a contribution in this debate. I have been around here for many, many years and I regard this Resolution and this debate today as a debate which raises profound issues about our system of government.

I resent therefore the puerile charges by the Honourable Member for St. John that this Resolution is a Resolution that has been inspired by some kind of shammed behaviour on the part of the Opposition. It is a great pity that a person who is a relative noviciate in here should seek so early in his career to display such total and absolute irresponsibility and ignorance about the fundamental matter of accountability of the executive to Parliament.

7.20 p.m.

We have sat here and seen the most scathing indictment of the Prime Minister, not from this side but from that side. The consequence of that must be that we are here in Barbados in a position in which we are being governed by a political party which is in disarray. Anyone with a knowledge of our system of Government would recognise immediately that the people of Barbados are the ones who will suffer from the incapacity of the political machinery to function effectively. If we had any doubt about that, we only have to listen to the words of the same Honourable Member for St. John for he is on record as having said publicly that the turmoil is such that he is battle weary and he holds an important post of Minister of Finance.

We have others who have said that this disarray, this profound disagreement and lack of confidence in the Prime Minister is such that they are forced against their conscience to do something that they would never have thought they had to do. Now, I just ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider this. Obviously the wounds that have been inflicted by the conduct of the Prime Minister on his own party are so great and so grievous that they have been forced to be in that position. That is a very serious matter, Sir, an exceedingly serious matter.

Everyone knows that there must be checks and balances upon the utilization of power. I would hate to think that any Prime Minister in Barbados would be so misguided as to believe that because he has been vested with the office of Prime Minister that he can use the power derived from that office to ride roughshod over the views and opinions of everyone. That is the basis of the accusation that the Honourable Members from his own party have made in here today. This is not the Opposition creating these facts. They are the members of the Democratic Labour Party creating these facts. They are telling us how they feel about the way in which the Prime Minister carries out his office as Prime Minister and how he exercises his power.

Sir, they also told us that within the councils of the party they had no relief, that despite all of their efforts they were unable to find any mechanism within the party to vent their legitimate grievances. Now, if ever Parliament was the proper forum for them to come in these circumstances, it cannot be doubted that this is the proper forum. This is a Resolution brought in the right place at the right time by the right people. It is the function of the Opposition where they see that the Government is in total disarray...

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I want to remind the Honourable Member who does not have the courage to get up on his feet that he himself at the Ivy has on more than one occasion complained about the conduct of the Prime Minister. The Honourable Member is like a small fish. You throw a little bait at him and he snaps at it except this bait happens to be the currency of the realm.

Now, Sir, the position is that we wish to emphasize that we cannot stand idly by and not bring these matters to the attention of Parliament.

Now, Sir, 1 want to deal in some detail with the proposed amendments because in truth and in fact, there is no great challenge to the substance of the preamble and the grounds as set out in the Resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Peter. There is absolutely no doubt that the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority was carried out in such a manner as to be the major cause of the dissention within the ranks of the Government and that is a political matter. There cannot be any doubt 'about that because it is quite legitimate for the Honourable Members who held the posts of Minister of Tourism to feel that the manner in which they were treated was very dissimilar to the manner in which the Prime Minister treated the appointment.

All of them said that they regarded it as part' of the convention for them to take to Cabinet for the approval of Cabinet their approval of the recommendation of the Board. But, as one of the Honourable Members was at pains to point out, that when it came to the point when the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Tourism, was informing Cabinet that the form and substance of what took place, was that he took it for noting.

7.30 p.m.

In other words, they are saying, quite clearly, that in this area of activity the pattern of behaviour that was exhibited by the Prime Minister was totally different from what he expected of them. That is a serious matter. You are dealing with the heart of the mechanisms of how the Cabinet Government is to operate.

If the Prime Minister finds himself in the position in which his colleagues, as is evidenced by his speeches, feel so strongly about the matter, not only that they have resigned but also, judging from their speeches, the wounds they have are so deep that they are prepared on the Floor of this House to stand up and be counted.

It is no use the Honourable Member for St. Michael West saying that the problem in this matter is a difference of verbiage. That is not a question of verbiage. That is not a question of disagreement between one position and another position, as some Members here are trying to point out. This is a deep-seated matter. The Honourable Members as men have been at pains to point out that they are prepared to let this matter pass. But the Right Honourable Prime Minister challenged their integrity by going before the nation using such expressions as to indicate to the nation that they were rebellious and diametrically opposed to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer. In other words they openly said to themselves, having regard to that broadcast, as far as I am concerned, either I am a liar or the Prime Minister is a liar. That is exactly what they said. That is the gist and the pith of what they said.

The Prime Minister, by his speech, forced his own members to be in that invidious position. What is an Opposition to do in those circumstances? We would be redundant, useless, irrelevant if we did not seize upon that opportunity to bring before the public and Parliament the serious situation in which the governing party finds itself.

How can you have a Prime Minister operating in the office of Prime Minister when his own members are saying that he is a liar. That is the problem. That is the crux of what we have to deal with. He had full opportunity, within the Councils of his Party to say "I disagree with that."

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to caution the Honourable Member never, at any point, did I hear the Honourable Member use that term.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: What term, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: A liar. That the Prime Minister is a liar in his speeches. I have never heard that term used in here.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The words that the Honourable Members over there use give me the distinct and absolute impression that they are saying that it was either he was a liar or they were liars. As a point of fact, the Honourable Member for St. James South said that he was forced to be in a position to protect his reputation because he felt, after he heard it that the people would get the impression that either he was a liar or the Prime Minister was a liar. What are we talking about?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not my interpretation because the Rules of the House do not suggest that a Member can call another Member that. No matter how you put it, you are saying to them that that is what they say.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am making it abundantly clear, in my capacity as a Parliamentarian, that this Resolution and the speeches that are made indicate abundantly clear that one of the issues that we have in this country is whether we have a Prime Minister who, independent of his own Members, has conducted himself in such a way that they say that he is accusing them either of being a liar or he is a liar. That is what I say.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have...

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The point is that you said in your opinion but you did not say that they said that. I am accepting what you say.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I say this is the way we see this thing, Sir. This a No-Confidence Motion and I sat in here and I listened to the Honourable Members on the Government side the backbenchers say that they were left with the distinct impression, having heard the broadcast, that the Prime Minister was saying that they were liars and they felt that they had to do something. They tried to use the vehicle of the machinery of the Party and they could not make use of it. This is not a trivial matter. It is a very, very serious matter. We must look at it in that light. Barbados is not the only country in the world. This debate is taking place against the background of the scrutiny of our colleagues in CARICOM, in the Commonwealth and indeed, since we are part of the machinery of world institutions against that background too. It is a grave charge to make and I made it publicly, not only in this House. Despite the fact that that was made publicly, with all the gravity, no attempt was made, as I understand it, by the Prime Minister and his colleagues to try and to calm down the situation.

We are in here now and we are the but of abuse for doing our duty, in this matter. I want to make it clear, Sir, my study of Constitutional History, constitutional law indicates very clear to me that the greatest check against an autocrat, against a dictator is a virile and active public opinion. Prime Ministers and others must understand that they have to be able to get along with their colleagues. They have sometimes to give way to the view of their colleagues. I served in a Cabinet for 10 years and, obviously you have occasions in which the Prime Minister would want to have his own way. But I will tell you this, there was never an occasion in which the Prime Minister could behave in the manner in which the Honourable Prime Minister behaved in. Never, never, never.

Let us look at the precedents and you will see discussion. You argue it out and when you cannot deal with it on a political level, you take it over to Roebuck Street and you go there and see if you can get the notional Executive trying to come up with a consensus. It must be something very deep-seated that this issue has arisen over such a thing as an appointment to a post.

Why is it – only the Prime Minister can tell us, that he felt it so vitally necessary to have his will in this? I do not understand it. A Board is to go because of this insistence and his own will. That leads me to the view that he really is autocratic because he believes that if he does not get his own way all of the time, then something is wrong with him. Because big men sometimes know when to back back. You back back on this occasion because you know there will be other occasions when more important matters will arise and you will want your own way. That is something the Prime Minister must tell us. What is the magic about this whole situation, about this appointment that he must place his own political future in the Democratic Labour Party in jeopardy? Do not let anybody fool you. The Honourable Members on the other side are deeply worried about this Resolution. There are Members of their own Party of long standing who say that they are going to vote for the Resolution and against the amendment. They are going to vote for the Resolution against the amendment.
7.40 p.m.

Now, Sir, I just want to illustrate this point about the value in a democracy of the power of public opinion and the vibes that your colleagues have that you must take into account. Mrs. Thatcher. Everybody who has studied her period of time as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will recall that she was a lady that had built up a reputation for wanting to have her own way all the time, for battling to get her own way and for dominating and domineering her colleagues and her Cabinet colleagues. The Prime Minister said he is a big student of political science and history. I have no doubt about that. He should recall that even she in the end had to give way, for when her Deputy resigned and made the statements that he made about her style and about her manner of dealing with her colleagues, the other colleagues told her that she should save herself from disgrace and not allow a vote to come in Parliament.

I happen to know that the Prime Minister has received such advice from his own colleagues here, because they know how the Honourable Members over there stray, but the Prime Minister is again demonstrating to us that as far as he is concerned he must have his way all of the time, to the point that he will carry his party and himself to the brinkofdestruction.

There is a little phrase in the book "The Foundations of Law – Constitutional and Administrative Law" by S. A. deSmith. It belongs to my friend, but I am sure he would not mind making it a document of the House. The page is 176 on The Executive. They are discussing the question of the power of the Prime Minister and they say this:

> "Disquisitions on the sovereignty of the Prime Minister bear some resemblance to discussions of the sovereignty of Parliament. Parliament in its wisdom might pass any number of appalling Acts without stepping beyond the limits of its constitutional authority, but somehow it does not regularly perpetrate gross abuses of its formal omnipotence. If a Prime Minister..."

and this is the point,

> "... were to behave in a preposterous manner..."

listen to this,

> "... he would lose credit among his senior colleagues (who would resign if he had not already dismissed them), in the country and in his party;"

Listen.

> "such a combination will be fatal to anyone but the most reckless autocrat, and a reckless autocrat who will neither resign nor mend his ways may have to be dealt with by unconventional and even extra-legal means."

So, you see, the learned authors of this book did envisage that it would be possible in a country to have people who would act in a reckless manner, and who would be so reckless that he would neither resign nor mend his ways and he would have to be dealt with by unconventional and even extra-legal means.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with this matter in a conventional manner. I do not want to be forced, I do not want the public to be forced into a position where they want to force us to use extra-legal means. In other words, if this Parliament does not summon the will to exercise its undoubted powers to put a brake upon the autocrat that we have, then, Mr. Speaker, you will be forcing the public to say we excuse you if you use extra-legal means. God forbid, Sir. As we said, he has given no evidence so far that he wants to mend his ways. Maybe when the Honourable Member comes to speak he will get in here and say to his colleagues that he is sorry, that he wants to mend his ways, but it will be a matter for them if they believe him. They have told us that they have uied their level best to give him that opportunity before and he was adamant that he would neither resign nor mend his ways. He is prepared to do something else. He is prepared

to threaten them that he would call an election. What is more, Sir, he is even prepared to take them to the law courts.

Well, Sir, again in this same book, page 178:

> "Again, it is sometimes said that the power of the Prime Minister (acquired since the First World War) to advise a dissolution of Parliament without the prior concurrence of his colleagues places in his hands an enormously potent weapon to subdue restiveness or crush rebellion within the ranks. Here analogies with nuclear weapons are relevant. They can be used, ..."

listen to this,

> "... but the result is likely to be suicidal;..."

political scientists have already predicted that.

> "... hence threats to. use them may not always be taken seriously. For a Prime Minister overtly to remind fractious or openly rebellious colleagues or party backbenchers that he might feel obliged to request a dissolution, the disloyal being denied official party support at the ensuing General Election, is seldom a wise move."

As Mr. Wilson was made to appreciate in 1967 and 1969.

> "If the threat is carried out, the electorate may well turn away from a party in disarray and put the Opposition in office; a penal dissolution is apt to prove a boomerang and everybody knows this."

You see, Sir, when you study our system of government you will understand the importance of what the Opposition is doing here today. We cannot sweep this serious matter under the carpet. It is too grave a matter and that is why, in conclusion, I condemn all of those who sit there and make speeches to the effect that as far as they are concerned the office of Prime Minister is such that among its attributes he can do as he likes with his colleagues. Only some of his colleagues, not all of his colleagues. Thank God in this country we have been able to produce some that will let him know that there is a limit to his power. Thank you, Sir.

7.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, recently while addressing a group of journalists at a press conference at Ilaro Court, I indicated that within the general scheme of political life in Barbados, the concept and reality of a no-confidence motion constituted a very serious matter. I said then that such an issue, however styled, and in spite of whatever whimsical grounds it may be predicated on, cannot be viewed lightly. I said so, principally because whenever this Honourable House is called upon to sit in judgment of any of its members or the Government, particularly for their deeds and/or misdeeds, it highlights the role of this institution as a body second only in importance to the general electorate of Barbados in the assessment and determination of certain matters.

More than 35 years ago, I took a conscious decision that I would dedicate my life and my time to the service of the common man and woman in this country whose resources helped to give me my education. I was in no doubt, having emerged from among poor people in this small community and knowing of the struggles which we all had to endure, that my particular mission would be service to the masses through service in the public sector.

So my political career began some 28 years ago, and for 27 of those years I have had the privilege of serving continuously as a member of the Parliament of Barbados. During that time, Sir, I have observed scrupulously the Rules of the Chamber, and have been very respectful to the presiding officers, and I have sought to conduct myself at all times within the framework of the Standing Orders of the Chamber. Motions of censure or no-confidence have been brought against other members in my time, but none against me. This is a novel experience for me, and I ask myself what have I done to deserve this most extreme form of treatment by some of the members of this Assembly.

I have always, as far as may be humanly possible, sought to implement my vision and the vision of my Government through pursuit of the qualities of considerateness, even-handedness, fairness, sincerity, honesty, integrity and truth. I reaffirm those qualities and values now since they are integral and are so essential for good governance, for trust, for confidence and for leadership, management and motivation.

Mr. Speaker, in all of my 28 years of public political life and service, indeed up until now, no man, woman, or opposition leader for that matter, has been able to substantiate against me any charge of corruption, of lying, of being unethical, or of any of the contemporary political accusations that we all seem so eager to daub political leaders with.

I have always been, and no doubt will always be a poor, civil, polite, humble, honest and fair person, loyal to the laws of Barbados and dedicated to the cause of the poor, the underprivileged and the disadvantaged in this country. My character has been my bulwark, my word has been my bond. I have never had to use lies as a prop or defence for my actions or for the positions I have taken.

Nor, Sir, does power fascinate me. I believe that power and its extensions of authority and influence are instruments to be used to advance the cause of people in

a country. Prime Ministerial government, as a concept, simply recognises the shift that has evolved out of the 19th century concept of liberal government. That is a fact no realist can ignore.

Mr. Speaker, the internal hatred which my opponents have allowed to build up in their minds and hearts against me have now led them, against all common sense and against all sense of fairness and equity to create out of their own imaginings a tinselled stage from which to nakedly and unabashedly accuse me of lying to the people of Barbados. So frustrated are they that they have not been able to destroy me in other ways and bring down this Democratic Labour Party Government, that they have turned to the sour note of trying to strip me naked of my integrity and standing in this community so that the people of Barbados would lose heart and faith in me and the Democratic Labour Party.

Let me tell you, Sir, how I see this Motion of No-Confidence. A motion of No-Confidence cannot but have serious consequences for a Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is "the prime minister" in his government. Any successful motion of no-confidence in the Prime Minister means a successful motion of no-confidence in the Democratic Labour Party Government. There is no separation of the flock on this issue. My Government, like all the preceding governments of Barbados since the introduction of the ministerial system of government, is inextricably linked to the Cabinet, to parliament and to the country by the doctrine of collective responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have never shied away from answering charges and allegations against me, if I know precisely what they are. My shoulders are broad, and I am never afraid to accept responsibility for what I do. But I want to know what I am supposed to have done wrong. What are the particulars, nature and gravity of the wrongs I have committed that would merit any censure, and that would merit this gravest of censures, namely that my appointment as Prime Minister should be revoked? Tell me, what have I done to merit all of that? Have I committed some high crime? Am I a drunkard? No! Have I incited some riot or affray? No! Have I committed grievous bodily harm, assault or battery? No! Have I committed the offence of seeking to impede the apprehension or prosecution of someone who has committed an arrestable offence? No! Have I committed perjury or contempt of court? No! Have I committed treason, terrorism, sedition or arson? No!

Mr. Speaker, I have done none of these things, nor are they triable in this court of Parliament but rather in the law courts of this land. What is it, I ask again, could I have done that I should be brought in this manner before my colleagues and peers for trial? Why have these proceedings been instituted against me as though I am a common criminal? And why, contrary to the maxims of justice, some people have already tried and condemned me as guilty even without a trial?

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that history will be kinder to me than the histrionics and polemics which my opponents have brought to bear on this issue, as God is my guide and judge, and my constituents of St. Michael South and the people of Barbados, my supporters, my shield and buckler.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am faced with a Resolution which seeks to invite this Honourable House to express through votes that it has no confidence in me as Prime Minister and that my appointment as Prime Minister should be revoked. As I see it, Sir, this Resolution represents nothing but an opportunistic attempt by the Leader of the Opposition and the Barbados Labour Party to exploit differences of opinion and position between me and some Members of my Government so that they may benefit at our expense. But, let me, Mr. Speaker, get down to this whimsical, opportunistic Resolution which is riddled with inaccuracies, and on the basis of these alone it ought to be dismissed.

In the first instance, the Resolution at paragraph 1 of the second page states as follows and I quote:

> "AND WHEREAS the Board in August, 1993 appointed a Chief Executive Officer with the approval of the then Minister responsible for Tourism, the Honourable Member for the Constituency of St. Michael West Central, and, contrary to the provisions of the Act, the appointee did not assume office:"

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that the Board of the Barbados Tourism Authority did not appoint a Chief Executive Officer of the Barbados Tourism Authority with the approval of the Minister! This simply did not happen! No one was appointed by the Board! How could that have been when, in fact, the process never reached the stage where the proposed candidate was officially informed, or where any contract of service with the Board was ever signed? How then, I ask, can anyone, least of all me, be charged with preventing any appointee from assuming office? Now, we know who is committed to fact and who is committed to fiction?

8.00 p.m.

How could the proposed candidate have been prevented from assuming office, as the Resolution claims, when the individual's services were never officially employed through instrument of contract, as the Act provides? So the charge by the Opposition that through my actions I directly or indirectly prevented an appointed

Chief Executive Officer from assuming office is a blatant untruth and should be dismissed for what it is.

Secondly, Sir, there are even more inaccuracies and baseless misstatements of fact. The Resolution states, and I quote again:

> "AND WHEREAS the appointments of several directors of the Board were thereafter simultaneously revoked by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, as temporary Minister responsible for Tourism, before the end of their period of appointment, and other persons were appointed to the Board."

Let me set the record straight. I never appointed or revoked any directors of the first two Boards of the BTA. I never did it either as Prime Minister or as acting Minister of Tourism. In fact, Sir, the first Board of the Barbados Tourism Authority was appointed by the then Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, after consultation. After the Honourable Member assumed responsibility for a new portfolio in the Cabinet reshuffle of September 1993, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy assumed responsibility for the Ministry of Tourism. He, after consultation, revoked the appointment of some, not all, of the members of the original Board, and in their place appointed fresh Directors to join those remaining.

How on earth can a serious Opposition party, indeed, how can any serious Opposition leader who claims to be so interested in truth, really expect to distort the record so blatantly, and then be taken seriously? It is a frightening thing, Sir, when an Opposition leader can be so willing to bring such a Resolution, riddled as it is with misstatements and inaccuracies, before this Honourable Chamber in his name. We really must, in fact, question his commitment to accuracy and fair play. It is simply not true to state that I, as any acting or temporary Minister of Tourism, did the things I am accused of doing. It is just not true!

Again, Sir, it is not true that the Board, properly constituted by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy when he was Minister responsible for Tourism, appointed any person to be Chief Executive Officer of the BTA, as this Resolution goes on to indicate. Mr. Cecil Miller was never officially appointed. As I understand it, and again the member can correct me if I am wrong, his name was recommended by the Board for appointment and the Minister accepted the recommendation, but the process was never completed. No instructions were given for the gentleman to be officially appointed! So that candidate was not appointed! He could not have assumed office! Officially he had no contract.

So all of these allegations are false. They are based on whimsical, inaccurate and unsubstantiated evidence. They are baseless. Now we know who is committed to the truth. Now we know who is telling the truth and who is telling lies.

But what is it that I am really being accused of, and what is the basis of the accusation? The unreliable Resolution goes on to say that in my address to the nation on May 18, 1994, I said that the three Honourable Ministers who resigned over the issue were diametrically opposed to the appointment of the present Chief Executive Officer of the BTA, and by so doing I falsely imputed actions to the former Ministers which, as the Resolution says, were "contrary to the proven records of the Barbados Tourism Authority in relation to the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer".

In other words, Mr. Speaker, that part of the Resolution is basically saying that through a statement which I made, I either told untruths or sought deliberately to mislead, in relation to the process. At the outset, let me say that it has never been my style or my intention to impute improper motives to any member of Government, especially any of my Ministers present or former. You, Mr. Speaker, would not allow me to impute any improper motive to any Honourable Member in this Chamber, since that would be against the Standing Orders. But from time to time I may respond to statements made on specific issues, where I hold an alternate view.

Let me say that those persons out there who are banking on me to indulge in any assault on former Ministers of my Cabinet will be sadly mistaken. There will clearly not be an agreement on all issues. There has to be give and take and accommodation of positions. But where it is impossible to agree with the Prime Minister or with other members of the Cabinet, then one may choose to resign. There is no mystery about it.

I hold nothing personal against any member who chooses such a course. It is true that I am saddened that the ex-Ministers felt constrained to resign from the Cabinet. I recognise the contribution which they, particularly the former Ministers, have made to the management of this country during one of its toughest socio-economic periods. I commend their efforts. I do not think that because of their disagreement with me on this issue, or I had better put it the other way, my disagreement with them, that their efforts should be discounted.

The fact is, Sir, that on the issue of the appointment of a CEO at the Authority, I had a difference of opinion with my three former Ministers. But, Sir, my opposition was mainly focussed on the actions of the two Boards of Directors. I felt that in the circumstances these Boards were not acting fairly or even-handedly. If I had any real difference with my Ministers on this issue, it was based

on my perception that they unduly limited their role in the appointment process.

During September, 1992, the Establishments Committee of the Board of Tourism considered 16 applicants for the post of Director of Tourism and recommended that the following four persons should be interviewed for the position.

(1) Mr. Anthony Arthur
(2) Mr. Carl Hinkson
(3) Mr. Cecil Miller
(4) Mrs. Faith Marshall-Harris.

The interviews never took place because of Government's decision to restructure the entire Board of Tourism and establish, in its place, a new Tourism and Travel Authority and Advisory Council, with the position of Director to be styled Chief Executive Officer with new responsibilities being assigned.
8.10 p.m.

After the establishment of the Barbados Tourism Authority, on March 15, 1993, the position of CEO which was created through the new Act, was advertised almost immediately. In this case 10 applications were received. The Chairman decided that the Establishments Committee of the Board should interview all of the applicants, and those interviews were held on May 28, and May 29, 1993. Of these interviews 4 persons were identified as potential candidates for the post; and based on the Committee's views and assessments the following persons finished in this order:

At number one was Mr. Harry Fisher, a sixty-three year old retired ex-patriate who had worked in the travel industry in Barbados for some time as Manager of Pan American Airways.

The person who placed second was Dr. Harry Eastmond, an Attorney-at-Law by profession and a trained social scientist by qualification.

In third place was Mr. Anthony Arthur, the then Acting CEO and long-standing employee of 27 years whose training was directly related to tourism management, marketing and related areas.

Fourth was Mr. Carl Hinkson, a former Acting Deputy Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, an economist by training who had been seconded to the Tourism Investment Corporation.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, there was objection to Mr. Fisher on grounds of age, I believe, in the full Board. Thereafter the Establishments Committee recommended to the full Board that it should undertake an executive search to find a possible candidate for the position of CEO of the necessary calibre so as to provide the results envisaged by the Board. None of the candidates, apparently, appeared to be suitable to the Authority.

The Authority then requested the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity (BIMAP) to undertake an executive search to find a candidate who met with the Board's view of what was suitable. Coming out of that search the Board, acting on the advice of BIMAP, recommended to the Minister that Mr. Hudson Husbands, who had not originally applied for the position and who, at the time, sat as Director of the same, be appointed as Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to understand what is in fact happening here. Mr. Hudson Husbands was a Director of the Board which determined, in its wisdom, that none of the candidates who were short-listed were suitable. That Board accepted the advice of BIMAP and recommended one of its fellow Directors, Mr. Husbands who, in fact, was still an active member of the Board. A most questionable situation!

In addition, the Executive Director of BIMAP advised the Authority that if Mr. Hudson Husbands were appointed CEO, it might be necessary for him to be given direct assistance in the areas of managing changes in the organizational structure and human resources of the Authority. A Management Committee comprising the Chairman, one Board member, the Chief Executive Officer and one senior member of staff with skills in Human Resources Management would be desirable or necessary.

You tell me, Sir, how could I, as Prime Minister and Minister responsible for the Civil Service, and with a role to play in major appointments at the highest level, not have a position on this matter! I felt then, and I feel now, that when a vacancy occurs in any organization, and there is a suitably qualified, experienced and motivated candidate within the organization, all things being equal, internal promotion rather than external appointment should be employed in the interest of staff morale and institutional building.

I felt that in Mr. Anthony Arthur, the acting CEO, the organization had a well-qualified, experienced and motivated candidate. He met the prescribed qualifications. He possessed the appropriate skills, knowledge and expertise. He had risen in a career going back to 1971 to the position of Deputy Chief Executive Officer. He had responded in a very professional way and imaginatively to the request for the development of a special marketing programme to energize the tourism sector with its spill-over into the rest of the economy.

It is standard public sector recruitment policy that preference is given to the principle of internal promotion, all things being equal. My view was obviously not shared by some body, such as the Tourism Authority as previously constituted. That body did two things at least. One was that they never recommended Mr. Anthony Arthur for the position; and secondly that they, on more than one occasion, went outside of the organization in search of a prospective CEO.

Against that background, and by the actions committed and omitted, I feel fully justified in concluding that some body was not in favour of the appointment of Mr. Arthur. But it goes further, Sir. After Mr. Husbands was identified as the candidate for the job by the Board, Mr. Husbands was approached by the Executive Director of BIMAP, Mr. Rudy Gibbons to see whether he was interested in the position.

Mr. Husbands in turn indicated that he was prepared to accept the job, but only if the total emoluments provided for the post were increased beyond the advertised level, which I believe was something like $70 000, an S2 position. He said that he was prepared to accept emoluments of something like $11 000 a month or some $132 000 a year for the duration of the contract. If he had been given this money, he would have been the highest paid public officer in Barbados, higher than the Prime Minister, the Chief Justice, the Leader of the Opposition, all Permanent Secretaries, all Chief Executive Officers of all statutory institutions of Barbados, and higher even than the very Minister of Tourism whose approval his appointment would have required.

Mr. Speaker, I thought this was untidy, unprecedented and unwarranted. Here it is that this Board had an excellent opportunity to consider a long-standing employee of the Authority who, mind you, was more eminently qualified and experienced for that position than Mr. Husbands himself.

Mr. W. W. HALL: Sir, on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the Right Honourable Prime Minister. It is not true to say that Mr. Husbands was offered $132 000 a year. The man was offered $30 000 a year over the $70 000. That is $100 000 a year.

While the Prime Minister is at it, he should be able to say that when that was said to be creating a precedent and I informed Mr. Husbands that that was the situation, he decided to accept the same $70 000 as advertised.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no difference here. I did not say that Mr. Husbands was offered that. I said that Mr. Husbands when approached by Mr. Gibbons said what he wanted. I said that is what he wanted. He is truthful and I am truthful. We are brothers on this. You are right, but I am also right. When approached, he said what emoluments he was prepared to accept. I did not say that was what was actually offered to him, he said what he was prepared to accept.
8.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue after that interruption. Here it is that this Board had an excellent opportunity to consider a long standing employee of the Authority who, mind you, was more eminently qualified and experienced for that position than Mr. Husbands himself or any of the other candidates, and he is overlooked in favour of nominating another who is not prepared, originally at least, to accept the terms and conditions which went with the contract! The Board, as I understand it, approached a private sector organisation, the Tourism Development Corporation, and invited that body to advance an additional....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I stop the Honourable Member at this point? The time allowance is 30 minutes. If the House wants the Honourable Member to continue, I have no objection of accepting the House's agreement. Is it the opinion of the House that the Honourable Member can continue? It is suggested that 15 minutes more be given.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am indeed grateful to you and the Honourable Members of the House for the indulgence. Fifteen minutes is a first refresher!

The Board, as I understand it, approached a private sector organisation, the Tourism Development Corporation, and invited that body to advance an additional sum of $30 000 to top up the salary of the proposed candidate, Mr. Husbands.

In the meantime, I wrote to the Minister in response to the situation, indicating why I thought the Board's insistence on having Mr. Husbands, despite the superiority of Mr. Arthur in terms of experience and qualifications, was inappropriate. The Minister replied disagreeing with me and stressing the claims of Mr. Husbands.

I asked myself why would the Board go to such extremes to the extent where they would ignore someone who was eminently qualified, deem that person unsuitable without properly saying why, to get someone who first promised only to accept the job if the salary was increased, and secondly, who they themselves acknowledged had certain shortcomings. I could not understand the logic then.

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I felt, given all that the Board had done and was prepared to do, that it was not giving Mr. Arthur a fair break. I felt that the Board was deliberately ignoring or overlooking the officer's

contribution to the Authority and his potential for further and higher service. In those circumstances I felt I had no choice but to oppose the recommendation of the Board. Of course, this meant that I would also find myself in opposition to the then Minister, who indicated to me that he accepted the recommendation of the Board. His argument was that under the law the Board had executed its responsibility, and that he approved of the recommendation which they made. I respect that position. The Board found a candidate and they recommended that candidate, who met with the approval of the Minister. On the other hand, I felt that in the general circumstances the Board, which is really there to give effect to general Government policy in the management of the Authority, had in fact not acted appropriately in the circumstances and was not being fair and even-handed in the handling of the situation. My objection was not primarily geared against the Minister. I honestly felt, though, Sir, that the Minister should have taken a more positive stand in relation to the Board, not only within the framework of the responsibilities which he perceived.

Let me now deal directly with the allegation that I lied when I said that the Ministers were diametrically opposed to the appointment of Mr. Arthur. I had reasonable grounds for coming to that conclusion. In a letter of August 20.4993, the Member for St. Michael West Central made the following point to me, that Mr. Arthur had good qualifications and long service, but it was his view that he was not suitable for the position of Chief Executive Officer. That was his position. Am I wrong in coming to a conclusion that he was opposed? He was opposed, and the word I used was "diametrically". And as the Member for St. Michael West pointed out to me, that is just a word.

Sir, let me pass on. I repeat, I had good reason for coming to the conclusion that I came to in both instances. I knew how the then Ministers felt about these situations, and I was therefore justified in coming to the conclusion to which I came. I will leave that matter at that particular point.

In spite of the foregoing, objection is taken to my formulation on the basis that the Honourable Members have said that they were not diametrically opposed to the appointment. I will modify my particular formulation of that. They have said so, they are Honourable Members, and I accept their particular statement. These is no big thing about that as far as I am concerned. That is where that matter rests, but be assured, Sir, I had good grounds for coming to my conclusion. But let me move on, Mr. Speaker.

8.30 p.m.

I reshuffled the Cabinet in August 1993, and eight Ministers were either assigned to new portfolios or given additional ones. A new Minister of Tourism was appointed. Shortly after that, Sir, there was the question of finding a candidate for the post.

The Board re-opened the process, this time interviewing two candidates, Mr. Arthur, the acting CEO, and Mr. Cecil Miller who was an economist by training and who was employed at the Caribbean Development Bank. Again, as I was informed, Mr. Miller did not apply for the position of Chief Executive Officer but rather the new Board invited BIMAP to do another executive search for a suitable candidate to fill the position. BIMAP did conduct the search and indicated to the Chairman of the BTA that Mr. Cecil Miller should be considered far appointment.

The assessment among other things says, and I quote:

> "Mr. Miller is familiar with the functions and culture of the Barbados Tourism Authority. However, he has never had the opportunity of managing an organisation, especially one with operations in more than three countries."

It goes on to say, and I quote:

> "There is also no evidence that he has developed and managed the implementation of any specific marketing programme for tourism organisations. These tasks will pose a serious challenge to the skills of Mr. Miller."

Against that background, the Board decided that Mr. Miller was a more suitable candidate for the post of CEO than Mr. Arthur. The Board then recommended Mr. Miller for approval by the Minister who in turn accepted the recommendation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I felt that the Board was clearly not exercising appropriate judgment. In the meantime, Sir, the Board had gone ahead and filled the substantive post held by Mr. Arthur. What that meant was that if he were not appointed as Chief Executive Officer he would have been left there in the cold with some special arrangement having to be made. My position was that it was not fair and that it would not have been sensible to proceed down that path.

Sir, the Minister in question, like the previous Minister, felt that if the Board had made a recommendation and he had no objection to the recommendation, then the issue was settled. I felt that the Ministers could have been more engaged than that in relation to the Board. That is my judgment, and I am entitled to my own judgment on these matters just as others are open to their own judgment.

Today, Sir, I face the consequences of the actions that I have taken. I tell you Sir, in Barbados anyone who tries to effect change will encounter serious criticisms. That is my lot. I think I can safely say that the same obtains for all of my Ministers on this side. People in Barbados like to talk about change, but anyone attempting to effect change encounters serious problems. However, if I see something which 1 believe in my judgment is not going right, then I consider I have a solemn responsibility to act in accordance with what I believe is right and just,

I do not hold myself up as being perfect or overly righteous. I am human and I do err and can go wrong. I am but a mere mortal. But I must exercise my judgment, however flawed it may be, or however right it may be in the circumstances. I have never been of the mind, Sir, to pull down anybody to advance my cause or that of anyone else. I have nothing against either Mr. Hudson Husbands or Mr. Cecil Miller, and I wish them well in their careers.

Let me say that I did call Mr. Cecil Miller when it was suggested to me that the former Board of Directors of the BTA might perhaps be willing to review their position on Mr. Arthur's appointment and therefore carry out my instructions relating to internal promotion. I called Mr. Miller and told him of the policy direction I had given for filling the post by internal promotion. I told him that my position was not any adverse judgment on him but I would not be able to give my approval to his appointment if the matter came to me. I asked him if in the circumstances he would withdraw his application. He told me... I am being truthful to this Honourable Chamber, Sir. That is it.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying that that is the position I took.

He told me that he did not realise that there were difficulties surrounding the appointment until recently, and in the circumstances he had already informed the Bank President that he was proposing to withdraw his name from consideration in pursuit of other career interests.

In other words, he was saying that he had already given consideration to the matter and had already told his boss, the President of the Bank, that he was withdrawing his application. This position was later confirmed to me by the Bank President. There was no big mystery about the matter. But, I ask, Sir, is this really a matter that would necessitate a No-Confidence Motion and a call for the resignation of a Prime Minister? What I did, I did to prevent a major injustice being done to a hard-working public officer. There was no injustice done to Mr. Miller. I could not stop him from keeping his name in consideration. There is no way that I could have done that. He simply indicated to me the course he had already determined upon. He was not being prevented from working, as was suggested.

Let me recount, Sir, the immediate events surrounding the appointment of the Chief Executive Officer. On February 10, 1994 I advised the Cabinet that I proposed to revoke the appointment of the Board of Directors of the BTA. Accordingly, with effect from February 22, 1994 the appointments were revoked and a new Board appointed from that day. On Wednesday, February 23, the new Board approved the appointment of Mr. Arthur as CEO. On Thursday, February 24, the Cabinet noted the revocation and the appointment of the Board of Directors.

The Cabinet on that day also noted that I proposed to approve the appointment of Mr. Arthur as recommended by the directors of the BTA. The Member for St. James South was not at the Cabinet meeting. Perhaps he was taking one day at a time!

Sir, we all have contributions to make. If I have directly or indirectly injured the reputation of anyone, either on this side who has been involved in this issue, or on that side, or anywhere, I apologise for that; but that was never my intention, and it will never be. At the same time, however, I believe that all Honourable Members of this House, indeed, all Barbadians, if they examine the delicate issues involved in this process carefully and with a clear mind, will form the conclusion that neither did I break any law nor did I act unreasonably or capriciously in the circumstances.

8.40 p.m.

So what is left of the Resolution, Sir? I was falsely accused of doing certain things. I pointed out that I did not do them. I was accused of lying and I have refuted that charge. The allegations concerning the Miller affair just do not stand up to scrutiny. What system of justice are we pursuing in this country? How can I be hung, drawn and quartered by this process? Today it may be me. Who is to stop someone from bringing a vote of No-Confidence tomorrow in the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else on such flimsy grounds?

They talk about my management style. They did not tell you, or do not tell you, that this Resolution also had problems with management style! I do not know how widely it was discussed. Perhaps many were kept out of the loop, but that is management style. They know of my management style. Nobody knows of their management style. I go no further or deeper into that.

I fail to see, Sir, how a man or woman can be sentenced to death when the charge does not even merit a sentence of reprimand and discharge. In other words,

Sir, if the motion of No-Confidence in me is passed, it will, perhaps, for the first time be that a Prime Minister was ever censured in this country, not on a fundamental matter of policy, or on a serious charge of corruption and vice, but rather really on what amounts to a difference of opinion between different individuals with different personalities. Is this the kind of politics we want in this country? I rest my case, Mr. Speaker.

The question that the words to be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the afirmative the House dividing as follows:-

Noes: Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Hon. D. W. BOWEN, Hon. J. O. TUDOR, Hon. T. C. ESTWICK, Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE and Mr. R. L. MORRIS - 12.

Ayes: Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. W. W. HALL, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. L. R. TULL, Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. G. W. PAYNE, Mr. R. C. EASTMOND and Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN - 14.

Mr. SPEAKER: Fourteen Honourable Members voted "Aye" and 12 Honourable Members voted "No" therefore the amendment has been defeated. We come to the main Resolution now.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Rt. Hon. *L.* E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. B. M. TAITT, Hon. M. A. KING, Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. C. V. WALKER, Hon. D. W. BOWEN, Hon. J. O. TUDOR, Hon. T. C. ESTWICK, Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE and Mr. R. L. MORRIS - 12.

Ayes: Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, 'Mr. W. W. HALL, Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. L. R. TULL, Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, Mr. G. W. PAYNE and Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN - 14.

Mr. SPEAKER: Fourteen Honourable Members voted "Aye", 12 Honourable Members voted "No". The Resolution has been carried but not in accordance with Section 66.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated both last week and today, that today would have been reserved solely for the debate of this particular motion. There is no Government Business which has been set for today. I do not know if Honourable Members have other Private Members' matters they would want to attend to at this time. I rather suspect not.

I move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, June 28, 1994 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, June 28, 1994 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 4943

Confiation of Minutes of 31st May, 1994.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES 4944

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION THAT THIS HOUSE HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER AND THAT HIS APPOINTMENT OUGHT TO BE REVOKED 4944

Mr. O. S. Arthur, 4944; Hon. M. A. King, 4949; Hon. H. B. St. John, 4953, 4955,4996; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4953, 4992; Mr. H. deB. Forde, 4954; Mr. Speaker, 4955; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, 4956; Miss B. A. Miller, 4960; Mr. W. W. Hall, 4963; Mr. E. E. Greaves, 4968, 4986; Mr. N. K. Simmons, 4971; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 4975; Mr. C. LeR. Trotman, 4978; Hon. W. O. Franklin, 4981; Mr. R. L. Moms, 4982; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 4987; Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4991; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 5000.

SUSPENSIONS 4956,4960,4978

ADJOURNMENT 5007

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 5007.

SPEAKERS M THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter)
BLACKMAN, Mr. H. A. (St. Philip South)
CHELTENHAM, Dr. R. L. (St. Joseph)
FORDE, Mr. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
FRANKLIN, Hon. W. O. (St. Philip North)
GREAVES, Mr. E. E. (St. Lucy)
GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)
HALL, Mr. W. W. St. Michael West Central)
KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
MILLER, Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
MORRIS, Mr. R. L. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church South)
SIMMONS, Mr. N. K. (St. James South)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John)
TROTMAN, Mr. C. LeR. (St. Michael Central)