

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 18, 1994

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

PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT (Speaker)
His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.),

J.P.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. B. M. TATTT, B.A. (Hons.), MP.A., LL.B.

(Hons.)

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, and Minister for the Civil Service)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M. (Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.)

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

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and International Business) (Leader of the House)

Mr. J. O. TUDOR, JP.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE, (Minister of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., LL.B. (Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.CP. (Edin.)

Mr. D. CARTER

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, (Minister of Labour, Community Development and Sports)

Mr. G. A. CLARKE, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

Mr. F. J. STUART

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. H. F. LASHLEY

Mr. R. St.C. TOPPIN

Mr. D. StE. KELLMAN

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON (Minister of Health)

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs and Culture)

Prayers were led by Rev. Ivan Harewood. Mr.

SPEAKER: This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, October 5, 1994.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of the meeting of this Honourable House of Assembly on Wednesday, October 5, 1994, have been circulated and subject to any observations by any members I would wish to move that these Minutes be now taken as read and stand confirmed.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to report to this Honourable House the Accounts and Statements for the months of March, April, May and June, 1994 prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: The Message from Her Excellency the Governor-General is as follows:-

"Her Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that she will be absent from the country during the period October 13 to November 12, 1994, on private visits to the United States of America, Europe and Costa Rica

Under the provisions of Section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, the Chief Justice, the Honourable Sir Denys Williams, KCMG, GCM, will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of Her Excellency's absence."

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

1. The Representation of the People (Expenses) (Amendment) Regulations, 1994.
2. The Duties, Taxes, and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 2) Order, 1994.
3. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 4) Order, 1994.
4. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 5) Order, 1994.
5. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 6) Order, 1994.
6. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 7) Order, 1994.
7. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 8) Order, 1994.
8. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1994.
9. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 10) Order, 1994.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

1. A Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 250 000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal

of Government to supplement the Estimates 1994/95 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1994/95, No. 1 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

2. The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

1. A Resolution to take notice of the Throne Speech delivered by Her Excellency the Governor-General on October 5, 1994.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER the following Bill was read a first time:

1. *The Supplementary Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1994.*

On the motion of Hon. Miss B A. MILLER seconded by Hon. DA.C. SIMMONS, the following Bill was read a first time:

1. *The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.*

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to make a policy Statement on the granting of public service vehicle permits.

The approval of a large number of permits for the operation of public service vehicles by the former Minister of Public Works in the dying days of the last administration is indeed one of grave concern. It has severe implications for the public transport system and threatens the efficient functioning of the Transport Board.

The Road Traffic Act, Cap. 295 provides for the revision and consolidation of the law relating to road traffic. Section 104 of the said Act deals with the issue of permits for the operation of public service vehicles. It states, inter alia, that notwithstanding anything contained in the Act, the Licensing Authority may issue a permit authorising the use of a motor vehicle as a public service vehicle and may, at any time, review its decision to issue or refuse a permit or it may revoke any permit it has issued.

Section 2 (2) states that a reference to the Licensing Authority is a reference to such person or authority as the Minister appoints by Order to be the Licensing Authority. For the purposes of Section 104 of the Road Traffic Act, Cap. 295, the Chief Technical Officer is the Licensing Authority.

Since the commencement of the Act on June 1, 1981, all applications for the issue of permits have routinely been submitted by the Chief Licensing Officer acting on behalf of the "Licensing Authority" via the Permanent Secretary to the Minister for his approval.

It should also be noted that the same procedure obtains in the case of requests for the transfer of permits. The Solicitor General has advised that in accordance with Section 29(7) of the Road Traffic Regulations, 1984, the transfer of permits can only be effected subject to the approval of the Minister in writing.

Section 29(7) provides as follows:

"A permit granted under this Regulation is

- (a) renewable annually;
- (b) transferred to another person subject to the approval of the Minister in writing on payment to the Licensing Authority of the fee prescribed by virtue of any order made under Section 104(3) of the Act¹¹

On assuming office as Minister of Public Works, Transport and Housing, I requested the Permanent Secretary to submit a report on the issue of permits to operate public service vehicles during the period January 1 to September 6, 1994. This was against a background of speculation and rumour in the media and elsewhere concerning the scandalous and irregular granting of permits and a subsequent transfer, during the previous administration. 12.30 p.m.

The report has now been submitted and reveals an alarming number of permits - 384 - were approved by the former Minister in the six (6) weeks prior to the 6th September 1994. This amount is more than double those granted during the previous four (4) year period.

It has also been discovered that the vast majority of permits approved by the Minister during the relevant period did not conform with the regular procedure described above. It appears that those applicants made direct application to the Minister who in some instances seemed to have issued approvals on his letter head without reference to any formal

application. In some instances as many as five (5) permits were issued to one person and for their affiliates. Of particular concern, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that a large number of approvals were signed and dated by the former Minister but the date the applicants signed the application forms is subsequent to the date of the execution by the former Minister. In the absence of a full investigation of the unusual circumstances surrounding these executions it would be difficult to avoid reasonable speculation thereof.

I am informed that the former Minister had been advised and was aware of the policy of the Ministry to freeze the number of permits in the ground transport sub-sector with particular reference to taxis, omnibuses, maxi taxis, minibuses and route taxis, pending the findings of the Barbados Public Transport Study which had recommended a significant reduction in the existing fleet.

Mr. Speaker, if all 384 of these public sector vehicles in particular 106 taxis, 187 maxi taxis, 29 minibuses and 21 route taxis are allowed to operate it would throw the existing public transportation system, already bursting at its seams, into chaos. In addition to severe problems with parking, both in the bus terminals and the taxi stands, it would also affect the operations of the Transport Board which in the absence of a substantial government subsidy would be forced to reduce or curtail its operations and lead to further layoffs.

Worst still, Mr. Speaker, is a problem presently associated with the complement of maxi-taxis and private vehicles illegally plying the route-taxi territory. During the 1992/93 fiscal year, 263 additional maxi-taxi permits were added to the route taxi fleet purportedly to stabilise this problem. However, Mr. Speaker, another 184 remained in the system up to the 1st August, 1994, and there can be no justification for the additional 187 new maxi-taxi approvals. If the precedent of 1992-93 is repeated it will only serve to exacerbate the existing situation.

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I have requested in accordance with section 104 of the Road Traffic Act Cap 295, the Licensing Authority to review the decisions to issue permits in respect of the period 1st August 1994 to the present and to refuse to issue any such permits for the operation of public service vehicles.

No further applications for the issue of public service vehicles will be accepted by the Licensing Authority.

No further transfers will be effected by the Licensing Authority.

I will be ordering an inquiry into the granting of permits by the Licencing Authority during the relevant period and any subsequent transfers of the said permits.

During the next few weeks, Mr. Speaker, the Licencing Authority will be closely monitoring the ownership of all public sector vehicles and all permits and transfers which are found to contravene the existing Road Traffic Act CAP 295 will be revoked forthwith.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, remains committed to its mandate as set out in our 1994 Manifesto to establish an independent Transport Authority to regulate the entire ground transport system.

I thank you.

CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with much regret that I rise to pay tribute to the late Sir Cuthbert Edwy T'ahna, Knight of St Andrew, Commander of the British Empire, who passed away during the period when this Honourable Chamber was prorogued.

Your Honour, will no doubt recall the record of this distinguished Barbadian whose name is, to put it mildly, a household word in the parish of Christ Church and whose reputation as a contributor to the public life of Barbados has gone not only to the length and breadth of this country but indeed throughout the Caribbean and beyond.

Sir Edwy Talma served in this Honourable Chamber from 1944 to 1948. In those days you will recall, Sir, that persons like Sir Edwy Talma would have to have had tremendous fortitude to be able to rise to the level of representative in this august Chamber.

After a period of absence he was back in 1951 when, for the first time, all of the people who were over a certain age were eligible to participate in the political life, the democratic process of electing a representative. And from 1951 to 1976 he served with distinction as a member of this Honourable House, representing first the parish of Christ Church and then subsequently the constituency of Christ Church East. At his funeral one of his colleagues - one of those persons who had served with him spoke in sufficiently glowing terms as not to warrant here a repetition of the details of his service. But one of the things which was outstanding in that eulogy and in the minds of all who came to know Sir Edwy Talma was the reference to his tremendous humility and his capacity to communicate directly with the ordinary masses of this country.

12.40 p.m.

I came to know him, Sir, in 1971 when I came back to Barbados to participate in the Government as a Minister. He was at that time the Leader of the House. I served in the Other Mace but one could not sit in the Cabinet and not be aware of the distinction and the capacity which the man had to cut straight through to the quick of an issue, so to speak, and to remove an issue from the realm of intellectual discourse to that of its relative importance to the masses.

He was involved with all of the political parties that were in existence up to his time in some form or another. Like all of the people who sought to represent the masses during that time, he started with the Progressive League and the Barbados Labour Party. As I understand it, Sir, he was a fearless fighter in his earlier days. Certainly that would become evident from time to time as persons either regaled him of his exploits in earlier days or he told persons about various and sundry issues in which he had participated.

Sir Edwy had another side to him. He was one of those persons who understood the Law Courts better, I am told, than many who had in fact qualified to practise in the Law Courts in the normal way. They said that he was in fact a conveyancer of the highest order. I recall the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, who is in his chair now, speaking at a different time in this House and discussing the quality of Sir Edwy's work as he practised. Indeed, Sir Edwy was one of those few persons who became an attorney-at-law under the so-called "Grandfather Clause" when the matter was brought into this Honourable Chamber. Whether he was functioning as a defender of the poor in the courts through his ability to draft or whether he was silently admonishing colleagues who may have been going in a direction he did not wish them to go, because he had a great capacity as well to listen and he did it quite well, or whether he was adamantly holding to a position even when all around were taking the opposite position - one got the impression of a man who was not afraid to fight for the cause which he believed in.

I believe that his nick-name of "Rommel" was not easily arrived at and I have no doubt there are others here who will be able to speak to that with much more accuracy than I can. Suffice it to say that those of us who came into the Chamber subsequent to his long sojourn here learnt quite a lot and quite easily from observing him at work. As a Leader of the House, he enjoyed the confidence of both sides of the House right up to the end. There was especially in those days a clear understanding that a man's word was his bond and I recall vividly the number of times when the discussion between Honourable Members on both sides of the House would come to a conclusion with a quiet word behind the Speaker's Chair. I have no doubt, Sir, that at least two Honourable Members on that side who served with him will have more to say.

It is the custom in this House, Sir, for us to pay homage to those who have served this country well from this Chamber. In that context, having served with him as a Minister from 1971 and having been aware that he was a Minister from 1954 to 1956 and then from 1961 to 1976 culminating in the position as Deputy Prime Minister, I have the honour to propose the usual Resolution to mark the passing of this great man.

Let me in concluding remind Honourable Members that during one of the major crises of this country, that is to say the oil crisis, it was Sir Edwy Talma acting as Prime Minister who took this country through that first and most difficult crisis which we had in the 1970's. It is, therefore, with great humility and some pride that I take the honour bestowed on me by my colleagues on both sides to allow me to have the first word in offering tribute to the memory and service of a great Barbadian, a Knight of Saint Andrew, a Command of the British Empire, Sir Cuthbert Edwy Talma.

I received a letter from his son who is an officer in the British Army who asked that should this opportunity arise that I should say to this Honourable House and to Barbados that the Talma family were and will remain forever grateful to the people of Barbados and to the Government of Barbados for the manner in which they dealt with him in the end. I commend the usual Resolution to this Honourable House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Hon. H. B. SL JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my friend in paying tribute to the late Cuthbert Edwy Talma. I had the distinction of sharing with him in the period 1966-71 representation of Christ Church when it was one constituency. The name Talma is a household word in Christ Church. 12.50 p.m.

Few people, however, know that the late Sir Cuthbert was not actually born in Barbados, he was born in Grenada, and it is a tribute to the contribution that the family made to Barbados, and to Christ Church in particular, that he was able to overcome any insularity which was in existence in politics in Barbados.

As has been said, he started his career at an early stage with the Barbados Progressive League, and indeed it is said that he gave up the opportunity to pursue a university career in agriculture because of his conviction that it was necessary for him to render service to the progressive forces at that period of time in our history. That sacrifice is indicative of the fact that for Sir Cuthbert service was the most important thing in his life. It has been said of him that as a politician his only ambition was

periodically to change his 2000 Vauxhall car and that once he got a new car every seven or eight years he was satisfied with whatever salary or perquisites of office bestowed upon elected Members of Parliament

He is well remembered in Christ Church for his outstanding contribution to the improvement in the fishing industry. He was one of those that pioneered the use of motorised boats as opposed to sail boats, particularly after the disastrous hurricane that Barbados had in 1955. In addition to that, he served as a very distinguished Minister of Agriculture, and indeed his record of service as a Minister was one of which he could be justly proud.

He loved Parliament and he loved all politicians. As has been said, he had the distinction of being a member of all the political parties that were formed in Barbados during his period of time. He was by no means a doctrinaire person. To him being part and parcel of the decision making process to improve the social and economic conditions of Barbadians was the important thing.

He also, of course, never took Christ Church for granted. I well recall when he was defeated - and with the exception of my honourable friend for Christ Church West, it appears that all politicians who attempt to persuade the electorate of Christ Church that they should be elected periodically fall out of favour - he himself took his defeat with grace and he reminded them, as he was fond of saying, that he would be back. When he did come back in 1951 he was returned with a resounding majority.

He also as an opponent was a very generous person. The story is told that in 1971 when he had to deal with such a formidable opponent as the Honourable Member now for St. Joseph that the first time he recognised him was on the night of the count in SL Christopher's School. He asked one of his supporters who was that young man over there and when they told him that it was the opponent he went up to him and told him: "Young man, your turn will come next time".

After his retirement he continued to drive around Christ Church to meet his old friends. In his last days he was fondly spoken of by a few who in particular assisted him in his period of difficulty. He was, I am told, particularly grateful to his friend, the former Honourable Member for St. Philip, Mr. Reynold Weekes, who periodically spoke to him on the phone.

I, Sir, should like to join with the Honourable Member in paying tribute to this very distinguished and outstanding legislator.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I would not wish this occasion to pass without a very short intervention. I have had the honour of knowing the late Sir Edwy Talma from the time I was a schoolboy growing up in the

household of the late Madam Elise Ifill and her husband, Mr. Cotirney Ifill. Sir Edwy was a very close Mend of my adoptive parents. He paid frequent visits to our home. Even more important, he gave tremendous assistance to the charitable and community Work in which my adoptive mother was involved. He would support that work by his presence, by his ideas and also with financial assistance. I certainly cannot recall an occasion during the festive Christmas season (when it was usual for our household to entertain the poor and particularly persons in what was then known as almshouses) that Sir Edwy did not attend and lend his support.

In those days people of different political persuasions found it possible to meet socially and converse not only about social matters but about current affairs and controversial political issues. It was usual to find political opponents exchanging friendly banter. I recall political stalwarts such as Sir Edwy (at one stage a member of the Labour Party, at another in close association with the Congress Party, then finally with the Democratic Labour Party) the late Mr. Fred Goddard, Mr. Darrel Garner and Mr. Wynter Crawford. They would all meet at our house and seriously debate the topics of the day. As a youngster I was able to listen to their conversations and would often marvel at their strong commitment to serving the people of Barbados.

Sir Edwy was certainly a defender of the poor. He looked after their interests, often to the exclusion of his own financial stability. He certainly looked after the fisherfolk of Christ Church and assisted them in every way that he could.

When I entered the House for the first time in 1971, he quickly befriended me and although we were on opposite political sides, he was always free in his advice. When on occasions I made an error, either procedurally or substantively, he, together with the late Mr. Burton Hinds and Captain George Fergusson, would hold me outside of the Hall of this Chamber and reprimand me with their words and then encourage me to continue the fight. 1.00 p.m.

Those were not easy days, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I had my baptism of fire in this House, with the likes of the late Rt. Honourable Mr. Errol Barrow, Mr. Patsy Springer and Sir Frank Walcott. Very often I would find myself as a young speaker sandwiched between them. There was then always the danger of losing my cool and, as a result, the argument. But Sir Edwy would always have a word of encouragement for me, even when I fell down in some of my arguments. I have always appreciated that. Despite the fact that he was then a Member of the Democratic Labour Party, he found time to encourage me and to advise me on how I should conduct myself in public affairs. Sir Edwy was also a

constituent of mine and although at that period of his political life his politics were Democratic Labour Party, yet he found time to encourage me in the running of my own constituency.

We have lost a great Barbadian who devoted his lifetime to the people of Barbados, to the people of Christ Church in particular and to the poor in general. He rose from being an ordinary member to become a Deputy Prime Minister of this country and to act from time to time in the role of Prime Minister. I believe that his was a life of public service and dedication and that in the process he gained pleasure and satisfaction but he hardly gained financial reward of any great measure.

In his last few years, I was privileged, together with the former Honourable Member for St. Michael North who himself became a Deputy Prime Minister and a few other persons to be frequently in contact with Sir Edwy and to render assistance. If there is one lesson to be learnt from that period of his life it is that ex-parliamentarians do need the support and the assistance of those of us who are currently in public life. They sometimes feel that they are forgotten and no longer remembered although they have given a lifetime of service. But we were able from time to time to converse with Sir Edwy in his latter years and I certainly continued to find him a source of encouragement, knowledge and support

I express on behalf of my family and myself my deep condolence at his passing and regret that Barbados has lost one of its great patriarchs.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the words spoken by colleagues on both sides of this Chamber and to express my own condolence and that of my family on the passing of Sir Edwy Talma.

I believe that I have served longest with him on the executive branch of Government taking into account the present composition of this Honourable Assembly, as I was a member of the Cabinet during the period 1967 to 1976 when he himself served in a senior capacity rising to the level of Deputy Prime Minister. I, too, would like to pay tribute to an outstanding public official who has given the best years of his life to this task, sometimes, thankless task of political representation. There are those who misguidedly believe that politicians are able to enrich themselves out of politics. That certainly is not true, certainly not in a Barbadian context; and I think that we should take into account that with few resources, Sir Edwy was able to do much for the people of his constituency, and for the people of Barbados, in order to ensure that that hyphen between decision-making and the ordinary lives and the common

task of the people of Barbados are kept at a level that would continue to enhance the quality of life of all Barbadians. He made an outstanding contribution and I have learnt a lot from him.

There is much to say for the quiet style in politics. He was not someone given to shouting and thumping, except on the political platform when he was using his particular style to get across to his constituents; but as my colleague indicated, he would always listen and always make that pertinent intervention which would tend to set a line of argument on a different path, and certainly would indicate very distinctly where he was coming from.

Perhaps another aspect of his political style was one of flexibility. He was able to manoeuvre himself in difficult circumstances in order to try to arrive at a solution that would be best in the circumstances.

I think it is very appropriate, Sir, that we should on all sides of this Chamber, and in all walks of life in Barbados, pay a generous tribute to someone who has served, and served well, in the public affairs of this country. I am therefore very happy to be associated with the motion which has been moved, and seconded, and supported.

My deepest condolences to the late Sir Edwy's family.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it would be somewhat remiss of me if I allowed this occasion to pass without joining in the tribute for someone who has been a friend of mine for many years and from whom I have benefited considerably in terms of being able to take a broader view of events in the political life of Barbados and in my own political life. 1.10p.m.

One of the things that always struck me about Sir Edwy, Sir, is the fact that he enjoyed living. He enjoyed people and he had a remarkable generosity of spirit to all, even those whom he perceived as being opposed to him at any given point in time.

But I think that his success in political life in Barbados relates very much to the fact that he was an extremely good judge of people and a good judge of events and it was very difficult for anyone to get past him very easily.

Another aspect of him, which I thought contributed so much to his success in politics, was the way in which he related to ordinary people. Perhaps the most unusual political meeting that I have ever attended, I think it must have been some time in the 1971 General Election,

somewhere in the Sayes Court/Silver Sands area and as often happened, his equipment did not work, there was a large crowd there - I myself was not involved in active politics at that point in time - then all of a sudden this figure got up on a small truck and just repeated the words "Rommel, Rommel, Rommel" and the whole crowd burst out in the fondest and warmest acclamation you could think about and that was the end of the political meeting. That was reflected in the votes in a very short period of time. Now, that was something that was so significant I just could not understand how anyone could have ever got that kind of reaction from a crowd. Quite clearly, he had done his homework in the area and he understood them and they understood him.

I also had the opportunity, Sir, to observe him functioning as a Minister of the Crown. He certainly brought two things to my mind which I can remember very well. First of all, he was always very dignified. He always maintained an appropriate relationship between himself and the staff in his Ministry. I think he recognised very clearly what the function of a Minister was very much in the area of policies and he was able to see issues very rapidly. He did not confuse himself with a whole lot of administrative detail and was able to find solutions to major issues. That is why when you look back at the history of Barbados you will find that in almost every Ministry where he served that during that period there were very substantial improvements in the area for which he held responsibility. He understood quite clearly what the function of a Minister was and I know that was very much an important factor in his success.

He never worried about money. I think that is quite important for us when we look back at politicians of that era who made enormous sacrifices. He could have joined a wealthy professional class and he probably could have lived well and made a fortune in Barbados but he chose otherwise. It is important to remember that the pleasure that he got came from service and not from seeking to make money because if you are interested in money then politics is not the place for it. I am quite sure that he would have given anyone that kind of advice because in politics it is a matter of spending money rather than making money.

I have heard several lawyers comment on his capacity, and his excellence as a conveyancer. I cannot speak of that in any detail but, certainly, I have heard many other barristers of the day comment on his competence in that area.

But I believe, Sir, that one of the shortcomings of the whole political process in this country is the failure to recognise the contribution of such persons while

they are still alive and then we go no further than that. Once they have passed to the great beyond, we tend to satisfy ourselves merely by passing the appropriate resolution in this Honourable House and conveying it to the person's relatives. I really feel that we need to be doing more to ensure that future generations of Barbadians clearly understand the kinds of contributions that many politicians of that particular era have made to this country.

It was an extremely difficult period. It required a lot of courage. It required a lot of sacrifice. It is a lot easier today to get involved in the political process. Those who got involved at that time in the history of Barbados would have been making major sacrifices and required a lot of courage especially those people who had an alternative in life and he was one of those that had an alternative.

So, Sir, while I associate myself very gladly with this attribute, I would sincerely hope that the Government of the day would give appropriate consideration to what should be done in relation to persons like Sir Edwy and many others of that generation. It is important to remember that there were not only Prime Ministers but there were also many other people who made contributions and in these days of heritage tourism and pronouncements on factors relating to heritage, and so much of the talk about culture in relation to education and so on, I believe that the time has come when we should pay appropriate tribute and make sure that the life and work that they did should be an inspiration to the Barbadians of the future.

I thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Honourable Chair supports the sentiments expressed by members. I am sure that these sentiments have been a reflection of the true feelings of all members here. This House will support this Resolution with acclaim. I now ask you to stand for a minute's silence in tribute to the late former Honourable Member. 1.20 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to secpnd that

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

ORDER NO. I - SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (NO. 5) BILL, 1994.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the matter for the consideration of Parliament is the approval of a

supplementary appropriation bill to grant the amount of \$19 857 286 out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of the country during the Financial Year 1994/95.

In introducing this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that I have a responsibility to set this second reading debate within the context of Government's financial policy and also to set it against a background of the state of the public finances as they now exist and as they are likely to evolve for the rest of the financial year.

Now, Sir, I should begin by making the observation that experience, particularly recent experience, has shown that the careful management of a country's fiscal affairs and in particular the fiscal affairs of small open economies, such as we are, are among some of the most crucial aspects of overall economic and financial management. The experience particularly in the financial year 1989/90 and 1990/91 shows that lack of concern for fiscal prudence and the practice of bad financial management can commit a country to overall economic and financial ruin. And as a result I need to state categorically at the outset that this administration is resolutely and is unrelentingly practising sound and prudent economic and financial policies. And among those will be the containment of our fiscal deficit to levels that are regarded as prudent.

In that respect let me be explicit to say that the concept of a manageable fiscal deficit is one that will take into account the impact of the deficit on the state of the country's reserves and the impact of the deficit of the liquidity position of the domestic banking system. It will also bear some relationship to Government's capacity to access financing on the international capital markets, a consideration that becomes all the more pertinent given the nature of Government's existing and projected relationships with its traditional international lenders, namely the international lending institutions.

In arriving at a determination of what represents an appropriate fiscal position, Mr. Speaker, we will also have to look at the composition of Government expenditure and the composition of Government's revenues and we shall hear more of these matters in due course.

The extent to which a deficit is manageable also depends upon liquidity positions, the extent of the reserves, the Government's capacity to access financing, particularly to support its capital programmes, and the relative emphasis of Government's expenditure as will be defined from time to time.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I have already articulated a strong position on this matter - that Government's fiscal deficits as defined recently under the strictures of

IMF conditionalities do not bear a sensible long term relationship with the requirements of the Barbadian society. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion that a Government of Barbados had an opportunity to state what it would have regarded as a reasonable deficit, the then Minister of Finance, the now Honourable Member *for* St. Michael South, did in fact state a deficit that was larger than that we have eventually come to accept from, the International Monetary Fund. But we are going to get into matters of appropriate deficit in due course, Sir. I just want this House to understand clearly that this administration is resolutely committed to the practice of sound, proven economic policies. I want the House therefore to understand that our commitment to the practice of sound and prudent economic policies, set the appropriate backdrop against which these supplementaries will have to be considered.

I do also feel that we have a responsibility at the outset of this Parliament to make a determination of the financial language with which we will speak in this House. This may seem like a small point But to me it is a major point; and I am sure I am going to enjoy some support from some elements on the other side because we have before us the option of presenting our public accounts either by reference of the methodologies used by the International Monetary Fund or by reference to the methodology used by the Accountant General of Barbados.

Now we are a country governed by law. We have a Financial Administration and Audit Act which at section 18(2) requires and prescribes that the Accountant General should make regular reports to this House and it also details the manner in which our financial accounts should be presented to Parliament

The Estimates of Expenditure that are laid in this Parliament are prepared in accordance with the methodology as prescribed by the Financial Administration and Audit Act section 18(2) and followed by the Accountant General. Indeed, Sir, the monthly statement of accounts presented to Parliament also follow the Accountant General's report. But from time to time the House has been given statements of financial accounts based upon IMF methodology which differ fundamentally from those of the Accountant General.

I favour the presentation of accounts to this House following the Accountant General report not only because I want to stay within the four corners of the law, but because if Members of the House have before them only documents prepared by the Accountant General following the methodology specified in law, it is possible for them to follow the arguments in relation to management of our affairs by reference to the documents before the House.

Month by month, Members of this Parliament will see the Accountant General's Report But the methodologies used by the International Monetary Fund and which have been the subject of the presentations by the previous Minister of Finance follow the IMF reports. The House can therefore very often get confused, as indeed the public will get confused, if we are not sure which reports we are using at any one point in time. I therefore in the course of my presentation, Mr. Speaker, Sir, will be using concepts such as revenues and expenditures and deficits following the prescriptions of the Accountant General since those are the documents which Members will have to access. Only people working within the Ministry of Finance have access to the information generated upon the basis of IMF methodology. I do not feel you should confuse the House by moving from one set of accounts to the other without all Members having access to a common set of financial information.

I want at the outset, Sir, of this session of Parliament to say that I shall be using accounts prepared in accordance with the methodologies of the Accountant General as submitted to this House in the monthly statement of accounts prepared by the Accountant General and following the methodologies as set out in the Estimates that from time to time are laid in this Parliament That therefore, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the financial position against which this supplementary is being presented to the House, Sir. 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1994 the then Minister of Finance caused Estimates to be laid in Parliament showing total Estimated Current Revenue for the year at \$1 222 200 000. Current Expenditure was set at \$1 099 494 954 with a projected Current Account Deficit of \$72.3 million. The Estimates then also showed Capital Expenditures projected for the financial year at \$172 million with an overall balance of \$249 million. If we were to use the IMF methodology to take out amortization, airport expenses and a whole range of other things and add in expenses, we would have reached a different balance and which the then Minister said was in the nature of \$38.7 million.

It is important that the House understands that in March when these accounts were brought to Parliament they were brought in the context of a situation where the economy was to grow in this year by 2.7 per cent. It was pointed out to Government, Mr. Speaker, as the records of the House will show, that Government's Revenue Estimate which showed only an increase of \$9 million or 0.3 per cent over the corresponding figure for the previous financial year was an unrealistically low revenue estimate in circumstances where Government was projecting the economy was going to grow by 3 per cent. To put that in a nutshell, Sir, the Government brought Estimates to this House this year projecting that its overall revenue would grow by 0.3 per cent in the context of a situation

where the overall economy was intended to grow by 3 per cent. The records of Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker, that it was forcibly brought to Government's attention at page 4429 that its Revenue Estimates bore no relationship whatsoever with its projection to the growth of the economy.

The fact of the matter is that the revenue projected for the whole financial year has been better than as set out in the Estimates but in line with what would have been reasonable Estimates of Revenue had the Government used a sensible basis for the determination of the relationship between the rate of growth of the economy and the rate of growth of Government's resources. As a result, Sir, actual revenue up to the end of August 1994 is set at \$380.8 million and for the overall financial year it is anticipated...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I will pass this around for you. It is a long time that you have not received any figures from a Minister of Finance.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was about to make the point that it is now projected that Government's revenues for the financial year in full should be in the vicinity of \$1 047 000 000, a bit more than what was anticipated at the start of the year. It is anticipated that Government's Current Expenditures at the end of August stood at \$428 million and for the full financial year amount to \$1 128 000 000, a bit more than what was set out at the start of the financial year. Government's Capital Expenditures which were projected to amount to \$172 million for the full financial year only amounted to \$48.7 million at the end of August. It is anticipated that for the full financial year Government's Capital Expenditures will amount to no more than \$121 million. There has been some slowness in the execution of Government's Capital Programme.

Again, Sir, the former Minister from his seat demonstrates that it is all business as usual. We discussed this in March and it was pointed out to the Minister then that a lot of Government's financing was in the nature of pre-investment and pre-feasibility studies financed under the financial mechanism supporting Government's stabilization programme. In circumstances where Government's Capital Programme was largely in the nature of pre-investment study you could not expect a large amount of capital activity. In point of fact, Sir, the records of Parliament will show that there was reference made to

the possibility of fiscal contraction during the course of the financial year.

So that, Sir, it is projected that we could end up with an overall fiscal deficit of \$202 million as compared to the \$249 million that was the initial estimate at the start of the financial year. But the House will have to understand that a large part of the difference is that Government's revenue is now likely to be greater than was forecast before and that it is likely that on trend, Government's Capital Expenditure is likely to be \$50 million less than what was voted for by Parliament and those are the factors that count

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you were to translate that into IMF's terms, you would have a deficit that is very small, therefore, this is every reason for the House to agree to this Supplementary Appropriation Bill which is in a very prudent manner bringing to Parliament a request to vote sums to supplement the provisions of the Estimates to be able to allow the Government to carry out obligations not of this new administration but obligations that had been previously entered into.

Mr. Speaker, I really must set these Estimates within some context of priority. We have received to date in the Ministry of Finance's requests for over \$66 million in supplementary expenditures. The House will therefore have to understand that this Bill before Parliament is seeking the House's approval to grant \$19 million out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of the country is but the first tranche in a series of supplementary provisions that the Government will be bringing to Parliament. We have received to date requests for over \$66 million in supplementary expenditures of which this \$19 million is a part. I am saying therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we are setting priorities. The Estimates before the House reflect a number of priorities. They reflect our commitment to honour inescapables arising out of actions which were not foreseen at the time of the preparation of the original Estimates and you could not have a higher purpose for a supplementary than to have to honour the meeting of financial commitments which were not perceived when the initial budget was prepared. 1.40 p.m.

Among such unforeseen, Sir, obviously was the election. I speak charitably because I have no way of knowing for sure that it did not then reside in the then Minister of Economic Affairs' mind to hold elections this year. I am thankful that he did, and he seems to want to agree with me that it might have been in his mind. But to all intents and purposes and from the point of view of public financing, the Minister of Finance would not have been in a position to know if the then Minister of Economic Affairs wanted to have called an election in this financial year, and therefore he did not make any

provision for it. As a result, therefore, Mr. Speaker, these supplementaries reflect the financing of just over \$1 million to pay for the elections.

The supplementaries also reflect our commitment to begin to work down in a phased way some fairly substantial arrears that have been accumulated by Governments of Barbados over a number of years, arrears which have been a source of considerable grievance to persons affected by Government's financial decisions. In particular, Sir, there is a record of the accumulation of Government commitments in regard to land acquisitions that go back some distance and for which the amount is fairly substantial. We will in the course of the debate, if necessary, state what the amount is, but we believe that the Government should begin on a phased basis to work down the arrears that have been accumulated in relation to things like land acquisitions, which are a source of grievance to the population whose assets have been acquired by Government without compensation in a reasonable time period. These estimates reflect our commitment to begin that process and, as I said, Sir, we are going to be doing it on a phased basis, because the House would agree that it would be beyond the limits of prudence for this administration, although we should recognise the obligation, to in one swift moment try to correct all the deficiencies that have existed over a considerable period.

The Bill before Parliament makes provision for amounts to be granted to reduce arrears principally in the area of arrears to the University of the West Indies and arrears in relation to land acquisition. The supplementaries also prioritise our providing through Parliament additional funds to meet personnel expenses such as the payment of increments and the restoration of the 8% where such have not been provided for in the original estimates. I want to say that this administration is treating these two things as a priority. We believe that to the extent that the Government, including the previous administration, because there is just one Government of Barbados, has given a commitment that the increments and the 8% should be restored, that those policy commitments should be reflected in the statement of public finances. There are instances in which Government Departments' initial estimates in March did not reflect fully amounts required to pay for increments nor to fully restore the 8%. As a result we feel that the first order of business should be to honour those commitments and our first supplementary is treating as a priority the topping up of all those Ministries' votes where the provisions for increments and the restoration of the 8% have been financially deficient. We feel that the Government of Barbados has a responsibility to honour its word and it is not enough for Ministers of Finance simply to say that the increments are being restored without that commitment being reflected in actual allocation of resources.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these supplementary provisions also reflect to some extent some minor changes in policies. One such is the policy, which it has been agreed, that there should have been an increase in the car loan limits. We are bound by the policy and to that extent a supplementary provision is being made for it. The supplementary provisions also make provision for Government Departments to be able to finance the purchase of critical supplies and equipment without which Departments simply could not function, and we are treating this as a priority. For example, there is no point in any Government of Barbados spending large sums on the Capital side to put in exquisite facilities at Hometown but not providing the financing to be able to furnish the facilities on the spot. If the estimates as prepared were left to be carried through for the full financial year, we would have the very astonishing situation where a Government would have spent money to build a new facility but no provisions would have been made, properly so, to equip nor furnish it. Therefore we are making provision in these estimates for the Departments so affected to be able to purchase supplies and equipment without which Departments could not function. There are a few instances in which that is the case, and our sense of priorities requires us to provide for them.

We are also through these estimates, Sir, making provision to pay for services where the provision was inadequate. I speak, Mr. Speaker, in particular to the provision for services such as maintenance and utilities at Sherbourne for which there was no financial provision.

These supplementary provisions do not, except in one instance, represent any of the new programmes of the new administration, and I want that to be understood.

The \$19 million we are here voting, as I said, is the first tranche of a series that will be brought to Parliament and they reflect our commitment to honour obligations that we have inherited from the previous administration. But it is our judgment that it is absolutely necessary that the Rural Development Programme, which forms an integral part of our party's Manifesto, should be put into operation at the earliest opportunity. As a result the House will see that there is a financial provision in the amount of \$200 000 to enable us to start preparatory works to establish a fully functional rural development programme. These funds will be used to support plans and the drafting of plans to give the rural development programme full life and meaning. We do not subscribe to the view that the transformation of the rural society of Barbados only entails engaging the services of Booker Tate Management Services to manage the sugar industry of Barbados. We believe that there must be a holistic approach not only to the management of our agricultural resources, Sir, but that holistic approach must involve setting agricultural

redevelopment in Barbados within the context of overall rural development. We feel so fundamentally. *Unhappily*, while the past Administration has spent vast sums of money on the sugar industry and its management, vast sums studying the problems of the sugar industry, it has not spent a penny on any concept or any programme for broadbased rural development. 1.50 p.m.

Even at this early stage of this Administration, we want to begin to locate agricultural redevelopment, the redevelopment of the sugar industry within the context of a sound rural society. There is a lot of important preparatory work that must be done between now and the Budget next year for us to be able to concretise the nature of the rural development programme that we will give effect to. Therefore, our Administration is advancing \$200 000 to support workshops and other seminars and other productive intellectual activity that will allow us in the quickest possible order to have in place a rural development programme to support and sustain and save rural Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recognise, there are a large number of important areas of potential public expenditure that we have not been able to bring to Parliament by way of supplementary. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that there is no supplementary for the Ministry of Health.

I want to say at the outset of this session of Parliament that the practice of Government Departments expending funds without the authority of Parliament is a practice that is unlawful and that it must stop. It is unlawful and it must stop, Sir.

The practice also of Government Departments flouting the financial rules, and month to month and quarter to quarter expending funds beyond the limits that the Ministry of Finance in the issue of warrants says reconcile with Government's cash flow position is a substantial breach of the financial rules of this country; and it must stop.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, going to preside over the financial affairs of the Ministry of Finance in circumstances where the Ministries feel that the right of Parliament to vote expenditure is a right they can arrogate to themselves. I am also, Sir, not going to preside over a Ministry of Finance in which Ministries also feel that when the Ministry of Finance issues a warrant saying that this is the limit that you can spend within the context of a month or a quarter that Ministries can ignore Government's cash flow and go ahead to do their own thing.

We have found in certain Ministries the entrenchment of what one can only call very disturbing trends that

represent financial disorder. Departments have gone ahead, Mr. Speaker, and spent funds before such funds have been appropriated by this Parliament and it is unlawful; and it must stop. Although the request has been put to us, Cabinet has decided that we would want to examine these circumstances more closely before we offend the sensibilities of Parliament by bringing in requests to support expenditure that was unlawful by nature.

I want to single out particularly the Ministry of Health as one of those offending Ministries where we are totally unhappy with the lack of financial good sense that has prevailed. We want the House to know that the Ministry of Health's request was among the \$66 million that has been put to the Ministry of Finance. But we could not treat it as a priority to be brought today because some of the financial practices that have obtained have not been within the four boundaries of prudence nor propriety. And I strongly 'want the relevant public officer who is charged with the responsibility of so doing to begin to surcharge people who do not respect the financial rules.

I believe in the words of Voltaire - if you remember Voltaire's words in *Candide* when the officer, a British General was being shot - that it is often necessary to shoot a general in order to encourage the others.

The House must understand that Parliament must be restored to a position of supremacy where the management of public finances are concerned. Although the previous Minister of Finance can treat this as a light and frivolous matter, we have had too many instances in the past where Government Departments have spent in advance of approval by Parliament. It is an offence to the rights and privileges of this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and at the outset of this Session, I am letting all Ministries know that it must stop.

The Ministry of Health, among others, are not here today because the financial practice has been bad. Equally, Mr. Speaker, we have had to defer consideration of supplementary requests from the Ministry of Public Works where not only has the financial practice been bad, but the administrative practice has been bad and the exercise of ministerial indiscretion has reached a level that staggers the imagination. The Ministry of Public Works' request for supplementary resources are being evaluated with the closest scrutiny because we are totally dissatisfied with what has passed for administrative practice and financial practice in that Ministry, and we are also aghast at the level of ministerial indiscretion that has been allowed to obtain in the discharge of a very important part of ministerial discretion in that Ministry.

There are some policy matters that have to be resolved in relation to the size of the subsidy to go to

the Transport Board. As you know, Mr. Speaker, a lot of Government's former economic policies were constructed under the auspices of its undertakings with the International Monetary Fund. Some of these undertakings had to do with the fact that institutions such as the Transport Board and the National Housing Corporation were not to be given any subvention on budget. The reality of the matter is that those institutions have been left to flounder and that they are now seeking to have subventions on budget and we have to take a policy decision first of all as regards the desirability of having them financed again on budget.

There is no subvention in Estimates before Parliament from March for support of the National Housing Corporation. But the Government of Barbados has a responsibility to determine if it is going to give a subsidy for Housing and the level of that subsidy and, before we are committing ourselves to a number, the Cabinet is thinking through the policy in relation to the support for Housing on budget and the support for the Transport Board on budget. Requests have been received for subventions to those institutions. In order for us to bring those to this Parliament it will require a policy change from what was the basis of the policy used in the formulation of the initial Estimates and we are giving considerations to them.

The House must also be told that the Estimates have been prepared against the background of some relief granted by Government to the manufacturing and agricultural sectors in the form of the waiver of duties on inputs used by agriculture and manufacturing. I want the House to be assured that contrary to the nonsensical propaganda that has been put out by an aspirant to these Chambers who now is regaling the public day by day in a newfound occupation, that is the chief financial articulator on the call-in programmes, that contrary to the nonsensical propaganda that he is putting out, the matter of the cost of relief to manufacturing and agriculture has been gone into with great care. We are satisfied that the \$5.3 million that is being granted as relief for the rest of the financial year can be accommodated within the limits of the policy parameters which are set out. But I want to say, Sir, that even if it was more than \$5.3 million, even if it was \$10 million or \$15 million, we believe that the creation of conditions that are equal for Barbadian manufacturers to be able to compete with those from the rest of the Caribbean is such an important matter that no Budget, no set of Estimates, should ever be prepared in this country that includes a provision for the taxes on inputs used by that sector.

We have removed them, Sir, as a matter of policy and it is left to Mr. Whatever His Name Is... He may want to spend his time titillating his own intellectual fascination as to whether it is \$5 million or \$10 million. We will get on with the business of governing the country. We are

standing on our policy despite all of the criticism that the voices, and is now being voiced by his arch apostle on the other side who is equally annoyed... 2.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Honourable Member be heard in silence, please. Let there be order, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, you must not spare me because the voice I am hearing sounds like the voice of Paula and I never listen to the voice of Paula, Mr. Speaker.

But, Sir, we are very clear in our minds that it is the correct thing to do.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: There he goes again. He is now calling Mr. Mascoll's words trivial. He should have recognised that in the midst of the campaign when we were telling him that the 5-4-3 was also trivial.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to be able to speak in the conditions of silence as has been the right in this Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we have order in this House, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am hearing from my side that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to emasculate the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want it to be known that our determination as to what represents reasonable estimates to bring to this House now, and what represents our judgment as to what will be reasonable requests for supplementary provision for the future, takes into account our commitment to give effect to the reasonable pledge that relief should be granted to manufacturers.

There is a remonstrance on the other side that they want a suspension. I am prepared for the House to be suspended and I will come back to matters if that is the wish on the other side but, Mr. Speaker, I am not yet through.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the lateness of the hour...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No. The Honourable Prime Minister has not concluded. Even though he has not concluded his presentation and has given away in this respect, in view of the lateness of the hour I would wish to move, Sir, that the sitting be suspended until 3.10 p.m.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 3:10 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. The Honourable Member for St Peter.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I really have said enough to set the parameters within which the second reading of this Bill should proceed. I just want to establish that the Government will be bringing to the House in due course requests for other supplementary provisions and those supplementary provisions, as I hinted, arise out of the need to support the programmes that were conceived by the previous administration, or to expand them. They have very little to do with the implementation of the programme as set out in this party's Manifesto. I therefore want it to be understood that the \$66 million in supplementaries that we have been evaluating have nothing fundamentally to do with the programme of the Barbados Labour Party Government but arise from commitments, some of them very last minute commitments, of the previous Administration.

I give the House the assurance, Sir, that we will be scrupulous and careful in our evaluation of these supplementaries. We will make sure that Government expenditure is kept within the limits of sensible fiscal bounds, that every effort will be made to manage expenditures in relation to cash flow considerations, and that the fiscal position should not cause a disturbance in the management of the country's economic and financial affairs.

I believe also that the House should be seized of the fact that there are a number of outstanding issues that properly have to be resolved in relation to the financial administration of some Government Departments where a greater sense of propriety needs to be observed and where proper financial accounting must again become the norm.

In due course, Sir, other supplementaries will come to Parliament and I will be using the opportunities on those

occasions to outline other aspects of Government's policies which are now in the stage of initial deliberation. I will be using the opportunity subsequently to touch on other aspects of Government's policies which are in the initial stage of consideration not the least being the restructure of Government's relationships with the multilateral lending institutions.

With those remarks, Sir, I do beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, we have been treated during the course of this morning's debate and the early afternoon debate to what, in the history of Barbados, when it is written, would rightly, without any polemical attribution, be the very first speech delivered as Minister of Finance to this House by the Honourable Member for St. Peter. Had I delivered myself of such a speech as my first speech, I believe that I would have left this Chamber in a sense of great disappointment. I think we all expected much more coming from the Minister of Finance who has certainly so much experience and for whom others testify to his ability as an economist, than to be treated to such a convoluted presentation which neither sought properly, and in a cogent logical way, to set out for the benefit of the public of Barbados what is the state of the nation's finances. 3.20 p.m.

Nor did it seek in any logical way to set out what in fact are the priorities of the new Government, nor did it seek in any logical way to demonstrate that this is a new era of financial management and fiscal prudence and all of the catch-phrases which now form the new language of the financial affairs of our country. In fact, so convoluted was this speech that the Honourable Member began by telling us that he feels that the financial language in this country must change and he poured, and rightly so, opprobrium on those persons who regaled this House only with the formulae and the methodology of the International Monetary Fund. However, it was quite interesting to note that just before he got to the priorities of the Barbados Labour Party that he then located the basis for this supplementary on what he described in these words "on IMF terms there is scope on that basis for this supplementary". So the very language which he asks this House to disabuse itself of, the very methodology which he asked the House to ignore, forms the basis for him to say in this debate that there is scope for this supplementary.

There have been occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Ministers of Finance have had to put the fiscal position in Barbados, both on an Accountant General basis and on an IMF basis, and there was a

clear reason for that and memories seem to be very short because there was also the accusation that previous Governments had never put before the House the actual IMF targets which it was required to meet and therefore the only sensible way in which one could present to this Chamber the information that was necessary, not only by law, in other words on an Accountant General basis under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, but also so that one could understand whether the Government was meeting its targets and obligations with respect to the programme which it had entered into with the international institutions was, in fact, to put before the House the methodology on an IMF basis.

There seem to be some people, and certainly it often falls from the mouths of economists who like these convoluted arguments and obfuscation and smoke screens and so on, to give the impression that there is some mystique about giving information on an IMF basis. So when we came to the House of Assembly during the course of this year, Mr. Speaker, for a Bill to provide for \$24 million to the end of March 1994 it was not necessary then for the Minister of Finance to provide any information on an IMF basis because we had ended the IMF Programme and therefore the Minister of Finance had by then resorted to providing the information on an Accountant General basis and that was the tradition which was followed thereafter right up to and including during the Budget presented in March 1994.

Nobody needs to fool us about their brilliance about economics that netting out amortisation is a big issue. If you know you have netted it out and the Accountant General's basis means it must be put back in you can put it back in. It is figures you are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, there is no mystique about netting out the revenues from the Post Office or taking out the revenue earned from the operations of the Airport. We are past that stage, Mr. Speaker, and always in our presentations to this House, particularly when we are under programmes with the International Monetary Fund I think it is incumbent on any Minister of Finance to set out the targets and also to set out before the House the basis on which those targets are measured. If not, it is not just for the benefit of people in this Chamber who may very well understand and many of whom may not, but it is also for the benefit of the public of Barbados whom we serve as parliamentarians.

It is very important for me to say that because as I say, Mr. Speaker, the impression is being given by the Honourable Prime Minister, and as I say, he is very right to give it, that there would be something wrong with a Minister of Finance coming here when it is not necessary, and confusing the House about providing figures on an IMF basis. Therefore that approach was abandoned shortly after we came out of the IMF programme and was only

used to describe our performance under the targets which existed. The Honourable Member for St. Peter knows that. He knows much better than that and must not feel that he is Columbus and he has discovered some new "econoeeze" and language of economics by which I must abide, or anybody on this side must abide with. We will use the language we think the people understand in explaining the economic issues in this country and in that regard we can opt to use any particular approach.

In that regard I wish to also say that the Honourable Minister of Finance has followed a very noble tradition in introducing this particular major supplementary Bill by attempting to give a background, even though incomplete, to the fiscal position and there are some questions I wish to ask him that will demonstrate that it is incomplete which I hope he may be able to answer in the course of his response, or somebody else may be able to answer.

On the issue of management of fiscal affairs and this so called lack of concern for fiscal prudence between 1989 and 1991 that battle is long past. However, the glowing story which he can tell about the Barbados economy now to this House, by implication, also speaks to the fiscal prudence and the concern which the Democratic Labour Party administration demonstrated in the period 1991 to 1994 which makes it possible for the kinds of achievements to which he wishes to aspire as he looks at the other supplementaries which come before him to be attained during this fiscal year. That is a very important consideration.

I do not expect the Honourable Prime Minister to put my case for me. I do not give gratuitous advice to opponents and I certainly do not expect them to give it to me even though there are some who seem to feel that it is their obligation to do so. I will defend the record of the Democratic Labour Party even in the face of such gratuitous advice from the type of quarter it may come. And in that regard I believe there is nobody in Barbados who would doubt that the glowing picture which the Prime Minister is able to paint in this Chamber today is an indication of that level of fiscal prudence which the Democratic Labour Party is responsible for and I commend his statement that his administration will practise sound fiscal policies. It is not anything that I can argue with. I wish however, that his lecture to his respective Ministers on how they should spend Government's money or how not to spend it is something that this House does not need to be treated to. We expect you to surcharge public officers who go out of their remit. That is what the law says you are to do, so announcing it in here as if it is some major discovery or development which is so significant to the development of this country since the past two months is something that we will not accept. Do the job you are paid to do and make sure that the public officers do the job

that they are paid to do. It is only when Ministers seek to step outside of their remit and take action which they think they have power to take, some of which I heard about earlier in this sitting, but the courts will deal with those kinds of things in due course. When Ministers feel that they are now announcing that they have responsibility for doing things which the law does not even give them the slightest right to do then we will have problems. So you can make sure, by whatever means you have at your disposal, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of these debates that irrelevant matters like that can be excised. We expect the Minister of Finance to exercise fiscal prudence and that is why we are over here, to ensure that you do it

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You came and found an economy in good shape. Continue to exercise that fiscal prudence, continue to manage the resources of this country efficiently, continue to put the interest of the people first. Continue those things. That is what our charge is as an Opposition, to ensure that you continue. So do not make any announcements about surcharging public officers. If they are wrong, surcharge them but there are lessons you will learn. You only have to go a little way down to that end. As I said you delivered your first speech as Minister of Finance in here and you are now sinking your teeth into these things but there are some things you will never sink your teeth into. And if you feel that it is as easy as making an announcement on the floor of this House... 3.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member address the Chair?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: If the Honourable Prime Minister feels that it is as easy as just to simply make a statement in this Chamber, there is not a Minister of Finance in Barbados who has not said on the floor of this House that he proposes to surcharge some public officer or written it on a file. But in this respect you are unique. The Honourable Member for St. Peter is probably the only Minister of Finance who has said that in his first speech to this House as Minister of Finance. It usually comes after great frustration. But I understand it. I wish you luck and I hope not only does that occur, Mr. Speaker, but that the reforms which we proposed to change the Financial Administration and Audit Act which have not gone very far yet.. So I am not taking any credit for anything, but I heard it referred to in the course of the Government's Programme from the Throne Speech that those reforms are being implemented and that that legislation is being amended without delay. The Government will have the cooperation of the Opposition in meaningful amendments to the Financial Administration and Audit Act to ensure transparency. This will ensure that in respect of the

allocation of resources and how they are spent, that in Barbados we are efficient and honourable.

I believe that is a very important matter and I was waiting with baited breath to hear the Honourable Minister of Finance say what he thinks of the performance of these Ministries and to tell us how soon that this will be done because no matter how I tried to track that matter down, it was a very elusive file. Every two months somebody made a suggestion about a reform but in fact the reforms were going no further. However, the Tax Administration Programme which was so bitterly criticized by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, you are implementing it. The Throne Speech said that it will be fully implemented. I am very glad to hear that. The Tax Administration Programme funded by the Inter-American Development Bank to a tune of \$18 million which will upgrade and reform the entire revenue collecting apparatus in Barbados, in my view, will have a significant impact in that area and will also assist in getting those reforms done in the Financial Administration and Audit Act. But people were quick to criticize that I have no criticisms of it. I think that it is money well spent and it is something that will receive the fullest support of the Opposition.

On the question of deficit, again I wish to say that you are a free agent The Honourable Member for St Peter as the Minister of Finance is a free agent. He is an even freer agent than I was. Yes, I accept that because I believe the position which I took was correct and that certainly there was no cause at the time when the Estimates came to the House for this kind of optimism, and strangely enough, the Honourable Member for St. Peter concurred in that viewpoint. There was no cause for substantial optimism about the performance of the Barbadian economy. In fact, as I said in the weeks leading up to the election campaign, the economy has performed beyond our expectation. Because we certainly did not expect that there would have been this level of performance. I certainly did not expect the build-up of reserves in the way that they have built up and certainly in a sustainable way in my view. Therefore, the Honourable Member for St Peter has to acknowledge to this Chamber that neither he nor, I with all of his economic wisdom - nor anybody else in the Ministry of Finance nor anywhere else in Barbados, none of the columnists in the newspapers, nobody else who was analyzing the financial affairs of this country - would come to the conclusion that there was any reason to be as optimistic as to expect the way in which the economy of Barbados has been performing. I believe at the end of the day the performance will be better than was projected.

That is my view. You know that too. You do not have to hide it. The issue then would be who is to take credit for it not the level of performance. That is what will be the issue but you can take the credit

Mr. Speaker, you are free to call on the Minister of Finance to determine which of those elements should have greatest impact on the decision in relation to the deficit as a percentage of GDP. That is something the Minister of Finance has to determine in his own discretion and he has to stand by those policies which he opts to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to discuss some of the issues relating to the slowness of the Capital Works Programme which the Honourable Member for St. Peter put before this Chamber once again as if he was a Solomon come to judgment. This is something which the Government has grappled with for a long time. Even the Minister of Finance's Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Economic Affairs recently in an address given at the delightful Sherbourne Centre, Two Mile Hill, St. Michael, which he pointed out was unfinished, set about to describe why it is that project execution in Barbados is so problematic. It is nothing new that anybody has found. It is a major problem. All of the apparatus which the Labour Party set up in the 1980's had no impact on it. Subsequent administrative changes still had no impact on it and we all know that it is a major problem that needs to be addressed. Perhaps it needs to be addressed by more flexibility and that is one of the things which the reform of the Financial Administration and Audit Act should consider because a lot of it may have implications which are essentially way outside of the Minister and may be matters which fall almost entirely within the purview of the Public Service and the various project units and so on which are responsible for those projects. It is something which the Government will have an opportunity to examine, but it is not something which could be attributed to any lack of determination by the Democratic Labour Party administration when it was in office. 3.40 p.m.

In fact, one of the criticisms which was levelled at the Democratic Labour Party was the speed with which it sought to complete some of the Capital Works programmes which were earmarked in the 1994-95 Estimates. Notwithstanding the slowness, however, and I forgot to bring a copy of the last Budget that was presented to this House, but there are a number of projects that we expect to be commenced in this fiscal year. I hope that money is not being diverted from those projects, all of which are worthy projects, to other areas of expenditure, whether Capital or otherwise. For example, the St. John Polyclinic on which construction is due to recommence in December...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, anyway, we will wait and see. You can say "not now" from your chair but I will be here in December, I am not going anywhere. I know that provision was made for the resumption of that project and I anticipate that certainly with all the photographs which have been splashed all over the Press and the comments which have been made, that that project will be resumed.

I know also that part of the World Bank road programme - I do not remember what it is called, but I notice they are doing roads in part of the rural area. I have noticed it in Society Hill, in Massiah Street, St. John...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: These are projects we negotiated. Do you not expect we will do them in areas which have been neglected by the Labour Party in the period up to 1986? Therefore I would expect that those projects would continue apace notwithstanding any realignments which are being made to accommodate nearly \$60 million in supplementaries. I will get to that point shortly. There are a number of other Capital Works projects which were in the pipeline on which we anticipate that work will continue with haste over the coming months.

The Honourable Prime Minister has also indicated that he has had requests for \$60 million in supplementaries. I cannot think that within my tenure as Minister of Finance or as Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance that there was any year in which we did not get requests for supplementaries amounting to that. Perhaps we have adopted a different approach after 1992, and I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter is aware of that. If a Ministry felt that it had to switch its priorities because of maybe the way in which its budget was structured, and maybe not careful enough attention was paid at the time of the preparation of the Estimates, we permitted them to make those shifts but on the understanding that they would have to realise savings in another area so that the overall picture would not change substantially. I know there was a lot of resentment to this approach and I am not commending it to the Honourable Minister of Finance unless he has a will of steel and great resilience to the supplications of his colleagues, but it was an approach that was used, so nobody had to come to the Minister of Finance begging for anything. The position was that you could have it so long as you could find savings in another area, because the point is that a Ministry must have the right to make decisions about what is a priority, particularly where the budget is constrained. Contrary to any impression that might be given in here today by the Minister of Finance, erroneously so, he does not have as much flexibility nor would anybody else have had that level of flexibility over the medium term. As much

as in all the speeches he said the long term is already here, I am talking about the new medium term which he has to face. The Honourable Member for St. Peter knows what I am talking about, that the financial picture is not as rosy.

I do not give gratuitous advice and I am not giving him any advice, Mr. Speaker, but I would nevertheless recommend that there is nothing wrong with Ministries in the course of the fiscal year making decisions about changes in the structure of their expenditure, so long as Government in determining the level of our overall expenditure that should be allocated to various disciplines and sectors has made a wise decision. So if we say that Health should have an allocation in this range, then I think the Ministry should have the right to change its priorities and restructure the composition of its expenditure.

I would like to know how the Minister of Finance proposes to deal with these supplementaries of \$60 million, whether he expects that most of them will be dealt with by way of realising commensurate savings, or whether he proposes some other kind of financing mechanism, increased taxation or whatever other methodology he wishes to use. I think he should enlighten the House, because it would be useful. To that extent I would also like to know whether with respect to any of this \$19 million, for which the impression may have been given, correctly so, that these may be commitments which had been undertaken by a previous administration, whether the savings were found. Not because I can discipline anybody or say anything to those who ran up the additional expenditure, but because Ministries were supposed to be functioning on that basis and therefore it should not have been difficult for the Minister of Finance to accommodate this level of expenditure. In fact, it should have been very easy for him, because I know that I approved of no supplementaries as Minister of Finance and I know that instead of that where there were urgent requirements that the Contingencies vote, which went to its upper limit, had been utilised to meet any additional expenditure that was required up to the time of the election.

Those who in the *past* - I saw some of them around here today, although I am not permitted to see them - have criticised Governments for ballooning expenditure just before elections and all of the other virtuous criticisms which they have put before Government have now had the opportunity to see what it is like to see a Minister of Finance and a Government totally financially bound and gagged from July to September, unable to undertake...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point being that the Honourable Minister of Finance must let the House know that there was an unusual occurrence, a very lengthy period

of time for which the House of Assembly did not meet and for which Ministries were therefore likely to undertake very necessary expenditure without the approval of Parliament. That is the point. I have heard all of these debates in here, I know that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South is going to vote against this Bill. Do you know why I know that Honourable Member is going to vote against it? Because a couple of months ago I brought to this House a Bill to clear arrears in respect of about 12 Statutory Corporations, arrears that had been built up for in excess of 12 years, spanning all Governments, to the tune of \$67 million and a supplementary in the Contingencies vote and when we got to dealing with the Transport Board and some of those other items, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South nearly blew the roof off this Chamber and said he would never ever support any Bill ever again brought to this House in which the expenditure had been incurred prior to the House giving approval for that expenditure. So I am adopting that approach too and I know that if there are two people in this Chamber who are *ad idem*... But I will only vote 'no' if the Honourable Member for Christ Church South votes 'no' on it. The Honourable Member for St. Peter said these are expenditures that were incurred before the House gave approval. 3.50 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I could identify them if you want me to. I know because...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member please address the Chair.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I apologise. The Honourable Member for St. Peter knows that I know that there are sums of money in here for which approval is now being sought for expenditure already undertaken. Why do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Peter is talking about surcharging people? It would be illogical for him to come to this Chamber with that argument, breathing fire on the public officers of Barbados, although wrongly so on this occasion, because I think that there was an unusual occurrence in the past three months, a long period in which the House could not meet to do these things. So it is understandable.

This is not the occasion to breathe fire on public officers. This is the occasion to praise them and to thank them for their forbearance and to say that we are very happy that the increments are being restored and that even though there may be a minor error in respect to some Ministry that provision has nevertheless been made by the previous Government for the restoration of increments

to ensure that the morale in the Public Service, which others said had been so devastated in the past three years, would be restored. I will wait to see the benefits of that restoration undo: the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South will dictate my vote in this debate because I am ready to join with him in his principled position, and sometimes he adopts those positions. Sometimes he does adopt them and I am willing to join with him in any principled position he takes on this occasion. In that regard, I think that I should identify an item of expenditure which has already been undertaken and then see what position he will adopt with respect to that I will, before the day is finished and we will proceed from there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Honourable Minister of Finance about the savings, both with respect to this Supplementary and how much he expects to realise with respect to the pending supplementary, assuming that he approves all of those supplementaries, even though I have need to doubt that he will.

Let us deal with the question of arrears. The impression, Mr. Speaker, should not be given by anybody least of all the Honourable Member for St. Peter that there is any major scenario of arrears building up with respect to Government obligations anywhere.

Point No. 1. Land Acquisition. When we met in Estimates Committee the position was very clearly taken that, in any event, the Ministry responsible had about \$10 million - I think that was the figure they gave. A global figure of \$10 million - in arrears for payments which will be made tomorrow. I mean "public service tomorrow" and "legal tomorrow" as distinct from normal "tomorrow" for the average citizen. So we put in a figure on the understanding that it was possible that an additional \$3 million would be made available during the course of the fiscal year depending on the performance of the economy.

The Honourable Minister of Finance has come with \$2 million and perhaps that is all they can spend between now and next March. But there was always the concept that we would have a pretty flexible arrangement and if there was another source of financing we would seek to clear more of those arrears.

The University of the West Indies. I can only describe that as an accounting fiction. I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows what has been happening with the University. We have been trying to find a way to get the University to function financially in a prudent manner, to be more accountable for the resources which it has available to it and, in an effort to do so during the course

of the fiscal year, we had to be constantly meeting with the university officials to review the expenditure. This clearance of arrears, as I understand it, is in respect to tax, PA YE deductions, probably payments to Inland Revenue which in any event were probably netted out of the \$29 million when that provision was made for the University in the Estimates. So it is not a major issue. It is not new arrears which were not foreseen.

I see something else in the addendum about payment of economic costs. That to my mind has to be erroneous. I don't know what the source of it is. Perhaps somebody could explain that to me because the idea of continuing to pay the economic costs until such time as that matter was up for review, which was sometime way down the road, contrary to what the Honourable Member for St. George South believes or heard or saw, that until such time, the Government was required to meet the obligations of the economic costs of Barbadian students at the institution. Therefore whether we pay it now or pay it later, bearing in mind that the University's financial year straddles the Government's fiscal year, it would have been something we had to pay.

There is no major financial impropriety. There is no poor accounting. There is no attribution to anybody of lack of performance with respect to these arrears because these would have been anticipated and the way in which the financial system and the arrangements for payment of these cross arrears and arrears to Government institutions was being dealt with it was likely that a supplementary would have come or was foreseen. I think the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows that.

I dealt with the restoration of increments. It is now my great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to stand on this side and to ask the Honourable Member for St. Peter who has made a few trips to Washington enough to get the information which he needs and who has made public statements to the people of Barbados to tell me whether he is going to get the money from the World Bank and the IADB and to what extent will your inability to get those funds compromise your financial requirements over the whole of the fiscal year, because I know that is a big issue. If you have not investigated that yet, I will have to accuse you of dereliction of duty.

There was never an occasion in this House when any financial matter came up that the Honourable Member for St. Peter did not place at the forefront of his discussion of Government's financial requirements about the fiction of the Estimates, the dishonesty of the Estimates, all the other things highlighted in yellow on that page and elsewhere. Everytime that he came to this Chamber the Honourable Member for St. Peter gave the impression that the Government was concealing from the people of Barbados

the true position in relation to its discussions with the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and that we had made provision under financing for sources of finance from those institutions which will not be forthcoming. Now, if it is not forthcoming, and if he does not anticipate that it will be, then it is dereliction of duty on his part to have led off a debate in this Chamber, as convoluted as it was, with all of the other failings which it has in it, without at least telling the public, the people of Barbados, and scolding the previous administration for those errors which he said it perpetrated in introducing the Estimates earlier in the fiscal year.

I am waiting to hear what the position is. As far as I am concerned, the Honourable Member for St. Peter has said elsewhere that the country could proceed without the IMF and then he said he is not making any rash decisions and maybe he will have to dippy-doodle with them for a while but he had to have an ongoing... He is not really sure what he said and that is why I am not surprised that he is not saying anything in here today. Worst still, is that he will now hide behind something he said previously, but I am not interested in that. I want to hear what the position is now. You could as well shut those debates because you are the Minister of Finance now, not me. 4.00 p.m.

When you put it to me I answered you based on what was happening in Barbados at that point in time and you must now tell the public of Barbados whether the investment sector loan is still on, whether you have accepted that Barbados has been graduated from the World Bank and that the Structural Adjustment Loan which we said was not on is still not on, whether the programme of enhanced surveillance with the International Monetary Fund has any future in the context of your financial arrangements, and what, therefore, is the true position. That should have been your first order of business.

The second order of business, because I am getting to your priorities now, should have been to do what you promised you would do on the platforms, so since you did not do it I am going to do it for you. I am going to start with rural development. I am going to have to make it a document of the House because I know it will never be laid. I wish to quote from this Manifesto which was supposed to be laid but I will make it a document of the House to make that irrelevant.

Imagine we come to this Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member for St. Peter laid, together with the Honourable Member for the City, nine documents, and the thing that he said would be his first order of business before he did anything else in this country, he was going to take this document entitled "The

Barbados Labour Party 1994 Manifesto** and lay it - not make it a document of the House. I am going to make it a document of the House because I cannot lay anything, so once it is there whatever you do after that is irrelevant. I do not want anybody to forget what you said you would do and it is my job to make sure that you do it, so I am going to make this a document of the House. I regret very much that you did not do that as your first order of business, nor Job No. 2, but just like Job No. 1 we scotched that. We reached Job No. 2.1 am waiting now to do Job No. 3 for you. Job No. 2 was victimisation. Job No. 3 was devaluation so we want to get to Job No. 4. We are going to let you do all, 1, 2, 3 and 4.

I want to see what was said. I never read it. I must confess to having not read it, but I want to read now the part relating to Rural Development, page 29.1 can sit down and let you read it if you wish, but this is a very interesting thing because I have listened to the Honourable Member for St. Peter. There is nothing that has hurt the Barbados Labour Party Administration, and the Honourable Member for Christ Church South in particular more than the fact that the Democratic Labour Party undertook...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South came to this Chamber every single week about Booker Tate and now to think that folly could fall from the mouth of the Honourable Prime Minister. I understand the Honourable Member for Christ Church South as the biggest bluffer in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John you will have to withdraw the word "bluffer".

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I withdraw. I did not know that bluffing was unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, but if you say it is, I withdraw it. He is the biggest dippy-doodler. That is unparliamentary now?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John, could we have this debate being conducted along the lines of parliamentary procedure and standards, please?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that as well then. Let me find an epithet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue, please.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John, have you concluded your speech or are you going to continue with all asides, please?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to say on this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, could we get on with the business of the House, please?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am going to deal *seriatim* with all of the issues.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, could we get on with the business of the House, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Let me make the position clear that I thought it would be monumental folly, Mr. Speaker, for any Honourable Member of this House to suggest that the sum total of rural development undertaken by the Democratic Labour Party was to bring Booker Tate to Barbados and that there was no holistic development of rural Barbados. It is misleading and it is wrong for anybody to give that impression.

The Tenantry Road Programme in this country for which \$56 million was borrowed from...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: We have 7 tenantry roads in St. John, a lot in St. Philip South, a lot in St. Philip North, a lot in St. Peter. That Tenantry Road Programme which saw the installation of water mains, street lights, drainage and roads was a project undertaken by the Democratic Labour Party. The commencement of the construction of polyclinics, particularly the one in St. John, the work which was done *on* Pavilion in St. Philip North, Blades Hill, King George V, I cannot remember all of them...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: St. George had already been taken care of, together with that Industrial Park at Six Roads in St. Philip. We can list a very proud record. The Democratic Labour Party record...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. I really did not want to get into this. Between February 26, 1976 and September 2, 1976, the only semblance of an industrial park at Six Cross Roads was a piece of open land on which the Honourable Member for St. Michael South West drove a piece of heavy equipment about July 1976. Any industrial development there...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am correcting the misleading impression, the clear error in what the

Honourable Member for St. John said. The only industrial buildings that were built began under the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order is taken.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, we were on rural development. I was only talking about the Democratic Labour Party record but that is not necessary. According to the Trinidadians "I overs that". I am moving now to what you in your Manifesto promised. 4.10 p.m.

Listen to the flowery language which you have all but forgotten. Page 29.

"The rural communities of Barbados have been the bedrock of our stability and progress."

I represent a rural constituency so I agree with that 100 or 101%.

"But many districts in rural Barbados have not kept pace with modern development due in major part to the dislocations and loss of employment resulting from the indiscriminate fragmentation of prime agricultural land."

These promises are set out as follows:

"We will create a Rural Enterprises Fund to assist in financing of new projects aimed at generating new business and jobs in rural Barbados".

That is not ready yet.

"Rehabilitate the Scotland district and convert it into an economically and socially vibrant region of Barbados. Thus we will reclaim and stabilise one-seventh of Barbados at present threatened by erosion and simultaneously modernise the roads, water, light and housing in rural Barbados."

That is not ready yet.

"Ensure that every household is provided with running water, water-borne toilets and electricity".

Not ready. And \$200 000 cannot do any of that. You know what the \$200 000 is being spent on, Mr. Speaker? You see, what galls me is that we were dealing with the international business and financial services sector in the Budget and the Estimates and the Honourable Member for St. Peter chastised the then administration for providing \$400 000 for the work of that unit which he is now incorporating almost into an entire Ministry. He said

it was not enough. Now, not a cent had ever been provided before that - exclusively for that. That was the first time the unit was getting its own budget. We provided the funds \$400 000 for a unit, dealing in what you would say a very small area in which the accountants in Barbados are largely involved in the promotion and now the Honourable Member for St Peter, the major plank of their policies, and when you look at what is being provided now for funds to start a project in this New Rural Development, the very handsome sum of \$200 000. Even the Barbados Agricultural Society would probably have to shut down its doors tomorrow if it were only able to raise \$200 000 in any given year. How can you even consider coming to this House with a new programme to modernise rural Barbados, to create one Barbados, to rehabilitate the Scotland District and do all of these things and then tell us about seminars and so on. The people of St John know what they want and if you want a list by next week I will give you that list. So let us get some dollars in this vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: When the former representative was asked by the Labour Party what they wanted done in St John, he said the people of St John did not want anything and for 10 years between 1976 and 1986 the people in St John turned their back on the Labour Party as they did in recent times. But I am adopting a different strategy. If you want to know about rural development in St John I will provide you with the list. The Honourable Member for St Philip South will provide you with a list and the Honourable Member for St Lucy will provide you with a list of projects which we anticipate should be executed with immediate effect and \$200 000 cannot do it.

I enjoy, Mr. Speaker, hearing the Honourable Member for St Peter. He never loses his ability to create this facade of new-engineering this and doing this, that and the other and when it comes to putting his money where his mouth has been for the past seven or eight years, he comes to this House, unbelievably so, to bring to the people of Barbados a new rural development project and the vote contains \$200 000. It could not even build 4 chattel houses in the Scotland District in Barbados or put up 12 gabions by a bridge in Bath, St John. If that is how you are going to treat your projects, take some more time, sit down with your officials, get your act together and then come to the House with ideas that make sense but this kind of joke business, Mr. Speaker, cannot wash in 1994. It is unbelievable. Then the Honourable Member for St Thomas will tell the public, they cannot deal with everything in a few weeks and I accept that. But do not half deal with it. Do not give the impression that you are dealing with something by providing a little \$200 000 which is going to transform rural Barbados and do all of these things and

when the time comes you are going to have four seminars somewhere in the country which is so beautiful and then the people in those areas never benefit from those important things.

I have made this a document of the House. I hope the Clerk is aware of that because I know that it would never have been made a document by any Member on that side doing it on behalf of the people of Barbados so they can have access to it for posterity.

So the Honourable Member for St. Peter comes to this House and says that vast sums are being spent on the sugar industry in Barbados by the previous Government. The Honourable Member has a right to stop that.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well stop it. That is your affair. You have the Government now and if you do not want to commit resources to the sugar industry in this country feel free not to do it but I learned the lesson because I was on that side of the divide at one time.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have to because I realise that rural Barbados still depends, together with the ecology of Barbados, and there are a number of other factors in this country which make it imperative in the short term, particularly because we have quotas which we have to meet with the EEC and with the US and so on that we need at least to produce that minimum amount of sugar that we can have access to that foreign exchange that people in the rural areas can still find jobs and there is some rural prosperity in Barbados.

If you are saying you wish to abandon that and that that makes no contribution whatsoever to rural development then you simply do not understand what you are telling this House and it could only take a convoluted argument by somebody who has not taken time to read the files and to understand what modern Barbados is about, to come to an argument in this House which essentially says that all that the Democratic Labour Party has done is brought Booker Tate to Barbados which is also not true and that in addition to that we have not undertaken any holistic approach to rural development. That is trivia, Mr. Speaker. And I am not giving any gratuitous advice. I said it at the beginning and I am still not giving it but I expect the Honourable Member for St Peter to rise to the occasion when he is called upon to do so. The fact that he could not get up there today is nothing to do with me. I have absolutely no fear about excoriating him publicly for the stances that he has taken in this debate.

I probably would not have done so, had he not acted to launch that vituperative broadside on a very worthy holder of a first class honours degree in this country who only wishes to serve this country like him. But if in the course of his first speech as Minister of Finance he sees it as his duty to pick on a young, bright Barbadian, a product of our institutions who rose to the top of academic pursuits at the university and try to belittle him to this Parliament that something has to be wrong. The Honourable Member for St Peter must have a better concept of his role in public life. There is something called graciousness in victory. You do not get graciousness in defeat I am going to give as much graciousness as I can but you have something called graciousness in victory and it is uncalled for for any Prime Minister of this country to engage in that sort of debate in this Chamber. So it will be met with a response from me whenever it is done. And any attack on the Democratic Labour Party record from any quarter, I make that position clear, will find my response because I do not advise others on how to conduct their affairs. I do not expect anybody to advise me how to conduct mine because I am not loitering anywhere waiting for anything.

Now, I believe that in dealing with that issue of rural development the Honourable Prime Minister has a duty to put before this Chamber a vision of rural Barbados. I hope the Honourable Member for St. James North, who is charged with that responsibility, will at the appropriate time do so, because it is very, very important that the people of Barbados living in the rural sector understand the extent to which this new Rural Development Programme is going to bring them into the economic main stream, is going to create jobs and is going to transform rural Barbados. I can confess that under successive administrations in this country that more attention has been paid to the infrastructure in St. Michael and other parts of urban Barbados than in the rural sector. If you are going to address that imbalance by a serious programme which you articulate to this House including the St. John Development Plan, you will have my full support. I think you could ignore that introduction which the Honourable Member for St. Peter gave and rise to the occasion on an appropriate day and let this Chamber know what is in store for us in terms of rural development in Barbados. 4.20 p.m.

We have had some presentation in here about ministerial indiscretions in the Ministry of Public Works. I know the Honourable Members over there always want to get excited about these kinds of things and perhaps they should. You see it as your duty so parade it as much as you can, because nobody over here is hiding. You can call as many Commissions of Enquiries as you want. You can investigate every facet of your Ministry and every decision taken by the Minister of Finance. But I want you in

particular, since that is what you are doing and since the Honourable Member for St. Peter is encouraging his Ministers to do, to check the position of the Ministry of Finance on the Transport Board and not come in this Chamber trying to give the impression that the Transport Board was left to founder because that simply is not true. If the Transport Board could tell the Honourable Member for St Peter now what its financial position is and it reduces it to writing it, you could take that and throw it in the nearest stuff bin. Any Government or any Minister of Finance that has asked the Transport Board for information on the level of the subsidy that it requires and on its operations, when that information comes in I believe all of them respectively - I cannot speak for all. I apologize for the lacuna in my knowledge which extends to the period of 1986 to 1987 because I did not check that period. But I have no reason to doubt that he was equally as prudent as other Ministers of Finance. The Transport Board will tell you that they need \$1 million today and four weeks later when you check with Inland Revenue and when you check with National Insurance, Mobil, and all around Barbados, you will discover that the Transport Board has already run up about \$5 million in debt. Yet, they are telling you that on their projections, which cannot stand up to any scrutiny whatsoever, that they only need \$1 million.

So my approach, Mr. Speaker, was essentially to make provision for a token amount and the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows that because he raised it in the course of the Estimates Debate and he raised it subsequently. We made provision for a token amount for the precise reason that we did not feel confident about the kind of financial information which the Transport Board was making available to those people who had to make those decisions. There are even people who came from outside of Barbados who are experienced in these matters who have been unable to set what is an appropriate figure for a subsidy on-budget to the Transport Board.

Sir, to give the impression that the Transport Board was left to founder is wrong, erroneous and it is something of which the Honourable Member for St Peter knows better. Because he has already had an answer to that during the course of the Estimates Debate where we indicated that it was token provision and that as a result of that during the course of the fiscal year we would have to determine what is an appropriate level of subsidy for the Transport Board. That was always the position. I only suggest that when you are reading the files, if you choose to read them, rather than come to this House to give the impression that you are a Daniel come to judgment or Columbus, that all you need to do is check the files and you will see the terse remarks from the Ministry of Finance and the responses and non-responses from the Transport Board on that matter. If you can unravel it, you will earn the undying

credit of the people of Barbados because men who are alleged to have greater intelligence than you have tried to do it before and have not succeeded. That financial mess only got near to being cleared up when the threat of privatization was hanging over the head of the Transport Board. When that threat of privatization was hanging over the Transport Board, they rushed to clean up their act and to ensure that their performance was much improved. So you have inherited a Transport Board which, in that sense, is probably easier to manage. But even in the face of that, the Transport Board is not going to be able to give you accurate and timely information on the level of subsidy that it requires. So I leave that matter to you.

I want to deal finally, Mr. Speaker, because I know how these things happen, with provision for not a large amount or at least I do not think it was. There was a provision here for the increased loan. You know that I do not ever run. You know I am going to sit down and look you in the eye. So you can say what you want because I do not owe anybody and I am not reading these reports on a daily basis to see who I have to watch. You can say what you want.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed please.
4.30p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Loans and Advances. Provision is required to meet the cost arising from the increase in car loans limit available to Parliamentarians, as well as to provide for new loans, and the amount is \$260 000. The Cabinet of Barbados took a decision some months ago, Mr. Speaker, that the loan limit for Parliamentarians should be increased from \$20 000 to \$35 000, but what is important to be said in respect of this matter is that directions were also given from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of the Civil Service that arrangements should be made for Public Officers' car loan limits to be increased to \$35 000 as well. So I am not raising it out of anything, I am raising it to make the point that it is not only parliamentary car loans that will be increased but that the decision of the Cabinet extended to Public Officers, because with the cost of motor vehicles in Barbados as it is today it was almost for Public Officers *or* Parliamentarians to get a motor car with a loan of \$20 000. It would mean that you would have to get two loans. In any event, there was only one application outstanding at the time. This \$260 000 increase should reflect the legitimate claims of the new Members of Parliament on both sides of the House to the increased car loans, which is not a problem and is something I think is supportable.

I want to make that point, Mr. Speaker, because I have been inundated with calls from members of the Press on this matter. Whenever you demit office in this country there are people who seem to feel that you leave a trail of

suspicion behind you, and therefore when other people add, by flippant remarks, comments to that, that trail of suspicion intensifies. Let me make the point clear, that car loans were increased for Parliamentarians from \$20 000 to \$35 000, that directions were to go to the Ministry of the Civil Service to amend the relevant legislation and we did not even make it an election issue. Throughout the entire election we did not even tell Public Officers that we had agreed to increase their car loans to \$35 000, because that is the kind of trivia of the past, the old order.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, you understand why the trail of suspicion needs to be opened up? If any Honourable Member wishes to comment on it, get up and say so, because in the *Advocate* newspaper they are on the verge of carrying such a story, so if it is true that I told the Honourable Member for the City, which I deny, it means she went and told somebody else and they are now getting back to me, so it is the last thing I will ever tell her, if it is true I told her. Mr. Speaker, I learned a good lesson from the Honourable Member for the City today. She was head of the transition team. I thought I was discussing things in confidence but I learned my lesson on these matters now. It will not happen again, it will be in writing in future, it will not be any flippant discussion.

The final point, Mr. Speaker, relates to the waiver of imposts in the manufacturing/agricultural sector. I believe that is something for which the Government should be commended. It was an initiative which I was not able to undertake because the conditions were not appropriate at that time to grant such a waiver. I commended the Minister on it but he did not see the commendation, he only saw the negatives, and went on to make the point that in my view, contrary to popular opinion...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we have order across the House, please? Could we hear the Honourable Member for St. John in silence, please?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: A waiver of those imposts, \$5.3 million. It was also regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Peter did not see it as a duty to bring that matter to the attention of the House in a fuller way in the course of his presentation. The reason why I say that is because during the course of his tenure as Shadow Minister of Finance he always took the viewpoint that the House of Assembly should be the centre of economic debate in Barbados. While I agree with him

that if he can give a tax concession without coming to the House he should do so, I also feel that at the first opportunity - and today was the appropriate one that he came to this House - that he should explain in greater detail, not with reference to what somebody said on the radio, but out of information and courtesy to this House the nature of the concessions, what impact he expected that it would have, what changes would be made in respect of the composition of Government's revenue and so on in respect of those concessions.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member *for* St. John. Is that an aside or is that pan of your presentation?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am moving on to...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, Sir, I am moving on to the issue of these imposts for which the concession was given. All I am saying is that the first opportunity that presented itself the Minister of Finance, in keeping with his own proclamations from this very seat time after time about the scant respect which he alleged the previous administration paid to Parliament; about the fact that economic issues were not forming the centre of debate in the House; about how some big economic committee should be set up, a select committee to look into finance; all of these things, and he comes to deliver a major presentation for a \$19 million supplementary and did not see it that as a matter of courtesy to this House as Minister of Finance; as a matter of duty as Minister of Finance that he should say to this House, as I said, the nature of the concession, the way in which it would impact on the overall finances and matters of that sort. So we get a side glance at it with reference to somebody who calls in on the radio every day to say what the value of the concessions was.

There was never an occasion when the then Government brought any concession which the Honourable Member for St. Peter did not doubt the figures which were given for that particular concession. When we reduced fuel prices it was a pittance. It may have amounted to more than the \$5 million, but that was a pittance. When we took half of those duties off the agricultural sector in the last Budget, joke, that was not enough, so we gave \$5 million more and that was a major breakthrough which would totally revitalise the manufacturing sector. If that alone could revitalise the manufacturing sector in Barbados and I used to wear a hat I would eat it! 4.40 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter himself, by his own words, must stand condemned because time and time again he has agreed in this Chamber that the removal of all of those imports would not have any major impact on the manufacturing sector unless in addition to that certain other things were put in place.

Furthermore, he also knew that the Government was contemplating introducing a Value Added Tax which when it was introduced those very same imposts would be removed in a matter of months. All would have been removed. Yet in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, he had the opportunity to clarify those issues to ensure that the kinds of standards which he demands of others he as a new Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St Peter, himself would observe.

If there is any disenchantment with politics in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows about that disenchantment because he always speaks about it, then he himself now has to stand condemned for contributing to that disenchantment by failing in his first presentation to this House to rise to those very noble standards to which he constantly in his gratuitous advice to Members on the other side when they were in Government gave as he sat here, about the financial mess in this country and all of the other tilings that he said. I have lived to witness it, but I am not going to be cynical. I am still much too young to be cynical. Those who want to feel that that is not a big thing, that is their business but I think it is a major issue.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing because the Honourable Member for St. Peter rightly came to office with a fund of goodwill which over time he is going to whittle down by acts of this sort. So I hope that the Commission of Social Justice will meet soon and that they will tell him the standards of political propriety which we expect in this Chamber as a result of the changes wrought on September 6th because...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member *for* St John, could you confine your remarks please to the Bill that is being discussed.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the financial propriety to which I refer is this. When the Honourable Member for St. Peter comes to this Chamber he must set out very clearly all the elements of the fiscal position, particularly supplementaries of this *sort*, and he must also tell us about those things which he said would impact on his decision in relation to the level and size of the deficit and he must tell us at the earliest time not wait on supplementaries, the Minister of Finance should be sitting all like now and reconfiguring his budget to

reflect these new priorities and this change in outlook and this change with respect to what constitutes an appropriate deficit for Barbados.

We want to hear that soon instead of all the cosmetic changes which you have been undertaking. Get to the substance of your portfolio! That is not gratuitous. That is what I demand as a citizen. Get the facts straight. I represent people when I come in here and when I speak, I speak on their behalf. I don't come with personal gratuitous advice. I don't give it I am making a demand of the Minister of Finance on behalf of the people whom I represent and the members and supporters of the Democratic Labour Party and the rest of Barbados, particularly those who are going to vote 'No' with me on this Bill. Particularly those who want these standards of propriety to return to public debate.

I am not going to relent because I have every single word that you have uttered ringing through my ears for the past four years. All the sanctimonious advice which issued from this seat and other seats in here about the level of debate and the standard of financial prudence and performance which are necessary.

The Minister of Finance; if he is going to undertake those major initiatives, must bring them before this Chamber and if he does not do so then we will do as we have done in the past few days. No honeymoon. We will give our own views with respect to those matters. It is very important That is our job as an Opposition.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be voting as a party against this Bill unless the Honourable Member for Christ Church South... If he votes against it, then I will join with him on the basis of his previous perspective with which I agree. If he votes against it, I will vote against it as well. Other than that, as a party we are not going to be opposing this particular Bill. We understand the problems and the exigencies which have made this necessary. We are very happy to have had the opportunity to lay as a document of the House the Barbados Labour Party's 1994 manifesto and we will be ensuring that every opportunity that arises we will be going -through that document with a fine toothed comb to ensure that the lofty language and ideals which according to them it proclaims are upheld and implemented in this country.

In that regard, in particular, my job is to ensure that - the Minister of Finance does not come to this House and fall short of the standards which he said he required of others. I will be seeking to ensure that in these debates that he does his job, not to the best of his ability but to the standard which the citizens of Barbados require of their representatives and of a Minister of Finance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this matter rather briefly and make a few comments on this Supplementary Appropriation Bill. First of all, let me say this. It is rather a shock to me to find that by October of any fiscal year that you are already looking at \$60 million in supplementaries. That is the harsh reality that we have to face. I do not recall any situation where within 6 months of a beginning of a financial year one is looking at \$60 million of known supplementaries to come before Parliament before the end of the financial year. One can be quite sure that if that is the amount that is known at this time of the year that there will be several million dollars more coming up between now and the end of March next year. That is the first point I would like to make.

If we are to get this debate back to the substance of the Appropriation Bill and deal with the core of the matter and the comments on the matters in the Schedule, I will get on to that Schedule and that will be the focus of my contribution. I am particularly interested in this whole business of returning to constitutionality and legality in the management of the financial affairs of Barbados.

For many a year, particularly in 1989/90 period I spoke in this Honourable Chamber on many occasions on the question of lawlessness in the management of this country's financial affairs and even today I still remain fully seized of the view that had there been respect for the laws of Barbados that this country's economy would not have suffered half the damage that it suffered over the past 5 years and there would be considerably less suffering today in this country. I think that one very important lesson that we have learnt is that you cannot just decide on the parameters on which we are going to run this nation's financial affairs. There are laws in place and those laws have been put there as a result probably of centuries of experience of people down the years. 4.50 p.m.

We just cannot decide when we feel like to function in any kind of cavalier manner in relation to the Laws of Barbados. I would hope that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of this country is serious indeed about the restoration of lawfulness in relation to the financial affairs of Barbados. He did not address this matter. He spoke about the fiscal position and the financing of the fiscal deficit and I hope that somewhere along the line I would hear a commitment from him that he would not be printing any money in this country during his tenure as Minister of Finance. I will get back to that very shortly because I believe we have the same view of the damage that kind of activity does not only to the foreign reserves of Barbados but also to a whole lot of other aspects of Government finance.

Now, Sir, one, of course, would always have appreciated a more comprehensive financial statement and perhaps it might have been in the Minister of Finance's best interest to have come with a more detailed financial statement. I had indicated in a Point of Issue Programme that I would like to see a comprehensive financial statement before this Honourable House as soon as possible because listening to all kinds of presentations in recent years there have been periods when we have had a budget without any financial statement in it at all and I think this kind of thing needs to be corrected. We need to get Government's finances back on track and we need to get it back on track strictly within the four walls of the Laws of this country otherwise we are going to have more and more difficulties.

Now, Sir, I have a strange feeling that unless that whole question of legality is addressed, that we are going to end up with more and more problems in Barbados. There can be no question whatsoever that there is only one lawful basis of accounting for public expenditure and revenue in this country and the only lawful basis is the lawful basis as set out in the Laws of Barbados under the Financial Administration and Audit Act wherein you will find a financial year clearly defined. It also sets out very clearly the roles of the Accountant General and the Auditor General, what should happen to monies received and what should happen to monies expended. Where, Sir, and I think there are only one or two exception to this, there is a provision for some element of financial flows outside that accounting arrangement, for example, in dealing with roll-overs from Treasury Bills and so on below the line, there is clear legislation and clear authority for that kind of accounting. Therefore, Sir, I hope I will never see anything coming before this Honourable House again where we are asked to take any action in terms of raising revenue or approving expenditure which does not fall within the four walls of the Financial Administration and Audit Act

In that context, I would sincerely hope that, in the not too distant future, if things improve that we will see a return to the situation where there is a lower legal limit on borrowing from the Central Bank of this country because I think that where it stands now you can lawfully - there is a question of legality, illegality being made legal, and the limit set at a level which, in fact can create problems in terms of our reserves and so on, but these things need to be dealt with and need to be dealt with decisively upfront and at a very early stage.

Now, on this whole business of other forms of presentation of the financial activities of Barbados, I think the record should be set clear. The way how this thing developed in Barbados is that when the Central Bank came into being, they started reporting Government's fiscal position on the basis of the calendar year and not the fiscal

year as defined in the Laws of Barbados under the Financial Administration and Audit Act. That is okay for the Central Bank. The Central Bank does not come under that. That is a "private" business in a sense as to how they set out their accounts. They can choose any month of the year and they could choose any method of presentation. That has nothing to do with the Laws of Barbados and nothing to do with the kinds of parameters we must use when we come into this House.

The other thing too, I think it is time that the IMF should be told that they cannot come in here and subvert the Laws of Barbados. They cannot come in here and force anybody to bring any financial statement before this House that does not conform with the Laws of this country. I think it is highly ridiculous for anyone to allow themselves to bow to any kind of pressure saying that an International Monetary Fund requires this kind of presentation. We have to recognise that this is an independent country and as an independent country it is for the IMF to work back from our accounts to do their business. It is not for us to have our systems perverted by introducing into this Parliament any kind of accounting based on any IMF formulation.

These things are very important for the progress of the country, important for legality and important for the self-image of this Parliament and the self-image of the country, this whole concept of altering and shifting around and trying to get around the Laws in relation to these matters to satisfy the IMF or any other international agency.

While I am on the IMF, I would strongly advise the Minister of Finance that his best bet is to forget the IMF as soon as possible. Try and get Barbados in a situation where it does not need any World Bank financing, or if it needs any IDB financing let me tell you something. When the country is being properly run, when you have free access to these international financial markets they run behind you to lend you money. The same IDB will be running behind you because it is important to their image to know that they are lending in Barbados. I do not perceive it as any major problem if you cannot borrow money from the IDB or the World Bank or the IMF. You only need the IMF, if you need them at all, if you are in trouble. If you can demonstrate to the international financial community, especially with the present levels of liquidity in the international system, a credible economic programme, I do not think you should have any major difficulty in securing financing. The problem is, of course, that if you find yourself in trouble then you would need the umbrella of these organisations in order to access other financial markets.

I do not think that the question of \$60 million is something that should be sneezed at I certainly welcome to some extent some attempt being made to put

that expenditure in some kind of philosophical context in terms of what the objectives of Government would be down the road. 5.00 p.m.

I am particularly interested in things like Sherbourne. And let me tell you something. It is about time we begin to call a spade a spade. This country has gone through, almost 20 years of a whole lot of capital projects which have not only diverted a lot of resources from the productive areas of the economy but have ended up as liabilities against Government's current revenue in order to keep them going and they also form a significant pan of the public debt of this country and I believe and I hope that we would not see any more Sherbournes in Barbados for the next 20 years, the next 50 years, not that kind of wasteful expenditure. We have to call a spade a spade in the interest of this country. We have a responsibility to ourselves and whether it is Central Bank Building or whether it is Sherbourne we have to understand that that kind of thing must never happen again. Not when we have 30 000 people or whatever they have out there unemployed in Barbados and when we need to be putting our resources into the productive sectors of this country.

This business of measuring the performance of a Government by the number of high profile capital projects that they have put up in five year period... I heard the Member for the City, for example, like to taunt people about how many capital projects they have. I think at one stage I heard her say it is only an arch or something like this. But that is not the point. The point is that we need to be spending our money now in very critical areas, like getting the police stations repaired getting our schools organised and make sure that we have a five/ten year period where this country is free from that wastage in capital spending, and I believe that you will find that things will settle down in such a way that your deficit will be under control, there will be less demand for foreign borrowing or local borrowing and that the financial affairs of this country would be improved and more employment would be generated on a continuous basis by having a large number of these small projects going in different parts of the country, in different areas, with a large number of small contractors involved in it and you will be able to come out boldly and say this is the position of Parliament, that Parliament has come to the view that they do not wish any more of these high prestige projects, except perhaps in some critical areas of the environment or whatever is critically necessary at a particular point in time.

I am also very interested in this whole business of what is happening in the agricultural sector and I believe that as Minister of Finance you have a responsibility to let this country know exactly what is happening in respect of the sugar industry. Our position in the National Democratic Party is absolutely clear. We have always been very

unhappy with the fact that so many millions of dollars would have been spent on lawyers, accountants and all kinds of people over the past year or so and when you look at production of sugar in Barbados every thing was down the year before and up by a couple thousand tonnes last year. I would really like to know how much money has been spent in that process between Booker Tate, the Barbados Agricultural Management Corporation and the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust How much money has been wasted on Lawyers, the Receivers, Accounts, whilst at the same time people like myself have to go up and down this country trying to fight to get the workers their severance pay?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Does the amount also include the severance payments as an expenditure so far as well.

The point is this. I will guarantee you that they would probably have spent or committed to spend as much money as would have provided for two years satisfactory subsidy for the sugar industry.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You check it out I do not know where you were in 1985 but I am quite sure that since 1985...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not know, Sir, where the Honourable Member for Christ Church South was in 1985 but I am sure that if that same amount of money had gone into helping to support the price of sugar out there that you would have had a lot more sugar produced today.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, that was 1983, not 1985.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.
5.10 p.m.

On the question of health, I think that a lot of money is wasted in the area of health and for many years I have been asking for a detailed enquiry into what is happening in the Drug Service. I sincerely hope that we will try to save some money over the next six months, but there should be a thorough investigation of matters within the Drug Service of this country. This is nothing new. I have been asking for an investigation in this House since 1989 and I know what I am talking about I do not ask foolish questions.

On the question of the manufacturing sector, the Honourable Minister of Finance is quite right in that it was a desirable thing to remove those taxes. But I believe that more has to be done as well. I think that we should not estimate the damage done by taxation to the manufacturing sector of Barbados. The people who will benefit from this are the ones who have managed to survive over the past few years. In the meantime, there are hundreds of small manufacturers who would have been driven out of business in this country because of the high level of taxation. So that the first impact that this is going to have now is probably to save a few more businesses from going under and then in due course probably help people to upgrade their machinery and to improve their stocks and so on. It will be sometime before this converts into jobs. It is not going to happen overnight. But I think that the Minister is going to have to face the reality and the reality is this. The Barbados dollar is tied to the U.S. dollar two to one. In most of the other Caribbean countries, the exchange rate is far more favourable to their manufacturers in respect of their exports. The reality is that our manufacturers still will not be facing an even playing field in respect of the domestic market. I do not know any place where you have been able to develop a satisfactory export manufacturing sector unless you have a strong domestic manufacturing sector. I am not talking about enclaves and so on. Every country that has become a strong export manufacturing country always has to have a strong domestic sector.

Therefore, I believe that the Minister of Finance is going to have to face the harsh reality sooner or later and he is going to have to take additional steps to make sure that a larger share of our market is available to our manufacturers. I will tell you this too. You hear all this business about trade liberalization and all of this kind of thing, reorganization and sending home 30 or 40 per cent of staff in companies, that sort of thing is working in North America where they are sending home people in an economy that has 5.9 per cent unemployment. That kind of thing is not relevant to this kind of society and a few people have become extremely wealthy in Barbados and doing very well over the past 3 or 4 years. I am upset to see what is happening to the middle classes in this country and what is happening to the poor people. We are recreating in Barbados the kind of society that our fathers fought against and a flight which have resulted in people like us being in this House of Assembly today. I am being serious about it.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Let me tell you something. We have to get really serious about these things. We have put in this country a financial regime which has resulted in the progressive impoverishment of the middle classes of this country. It has made it impossible for any person even to think of becoming middle class and, our people who have

put 90 per cent of their savings in this country in the form of real estate or whatever now see it disappearing overnight, and this kind of nonsense has to stop. I will be shouting and they will be hearing me down to the bottom of Broad Street because changes have to come about in this House of Assembly. Halls Road and Swan Street, too, will hear me.

Let me tell you something. This is a serious responsibility that this Parliament has right now before it to make serious reverses in the direction in which things have been going in this country. If there is a single contribution that I will be making in here on a continual basis, it will be to make sure that there is a restoration of a stake in this country for people like me and you and our children and grandchildren.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: As far as the foreign reserves are concerned, I am not quite sure of the foreign reserves because we have not had any details on those. I do not know how they net out. I do not know what kind of demands or arrears or whatever is involved. If the net position of the foreign reserves is as satisfactory as they appear to be... now listen to me very carefully as they appear to be... because if you have a good net position, I do not see any reason why you want any IMF about here at all. They should have been gone since September 7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is all right, Sir. A half hour is quite enough. I am going to sit down right now.

We have to re-assert our independence in the management of our country. We have to let these international organizations know that they are not going to come in here and reorder things in Barbados and restore relationships in this country that we have fought against since the 1930's as black people in this country. We have to let them understand that very clearly. Make no mistake about it. If it means that they must go and we will fight our way in the world, then we will fight our way in the world. Do not allow yourself ever to be making compromises in terms of legality, on how the domestic resources of Barbados should be allocated or anything like that on the basis of any IMF or any posturing of the World Bank or IDB for financing. It is the wrong thinking for any progressive society.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to wind up this debate and to respond to the points and issues raised by the two speakers. The Member for St John gave a speech that was truly reminiscent of the speeches that he gave on the campaign trail which will go down in history as having been characterized by the biggest bluff ever in the history of Barbados, a series of speeches that had at the centre a deliberate lie about a secret deal cut with the International Monetary Fund. What we have this evening is a continuation of that pattern from the Member of St. John.

Sir, I want first to deal with what he might regard as the only thing of significance that he has done which is to make the Barbados Labour Party's manifesto a document of the House. Now the Member for St John takes a fascination in the affairs of the Barbados Labour Party that one must almost assume is genetic. The way in which he is concerned with who should lead this party and what its policies should be, Sir, can from time to time cause one to feel that either his father or his grandfather must have left him political shares in the Barbados Labour Party. I say that against the background of the fact that there is a Resolution which has been laid before this House in the name of the Member for Christ Church West that draws attention to the Throne Speech and the determination of the Government to implement the provisions including the provisions as said by the Governor-General in that Throne Speech to make the manifesto a working document of the House.

Mr. Speaker, he wants to tell the Barbados Labour Party how to run the Barbados Labour Party when he cannot run his own party's affairs. I just want, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the public record and less any feeling that there is any disengagement of this party from making that manifesto a document of the House, it is going to be done during the process of that debate of the Throne Speech that is going to come next week.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heard the Member in silence. I want my right, Sir.

The point raised by the Member for St. John was to draw reference to the Rural Development Plan and our voting funds to start something where rural development is concerned. Now the Member would want us to vote \$10 million for rural development when there is no staff in place at the Ministry of Agriculture to do the programme. There is no staff in place. There are six more months before the end of the financial year. I have brought a Resolution, the purpose of which is to try to staff the programme who will then develop the programme out of which will come the specifics of the Rural Development Programme. But the Member for St. John wants us to put

the programme in place before there is staff. We can now better understand, Mr. Speaker, why the Sherbourne...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Peter must not mislead this House. The items which he spoke of were seminars and that sort of thing. He said nothing about staff. In fact, I would be very surprised if I were to discover based on this supplementary that he was about to employ staff *under* that particular allocation. I think he should check very carefully on what he has come to the House and asked for. 5.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John, no point of order. I understand that "seminar" involves people and training.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, we have to start somewhere with putting a rural development unit in place. We had to sit down and discuss the programmes and we are going to make a start this financial year so that when we come to the Budget of next year the planning work would have been done and the financing that this House is going to be called upon in March to vote to support a rural development programme will not be based upon a knee-jerk reaction to it, but upon a systematic study of the programme between now and March. This is the kind of approach to planning that that former Government could never understand. And that is why we have Sherbourne, because they set out not knowing where they were going and they have now given us, because they did not plan it, a building with its back side exposed. That is the kind of problem we are trying to avoid in relation to the rural development programme. We are putting funds here so that the planning can take place such that by next March we can start executing programmes, but we cannot start executing programmes until we have a unit in place.

Now, Sir, the Member for St. John also criticised my granting waivers to the manufacturers. All I want to say to him is that if he had spent his time granting the waivers to manufacturers, rather than doing what he was doing...

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

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, he also made reference to the fact of my speaking about car loans. I made reference to car loans without saying I was speaking about car loans for Parliamentarians, but I know what he was trying to get at. The only time that this Leader of the Opposition has called me on any matter...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I am going to get into it The only time this Leader of the Opposition has called me on any matter since September 6 was to bring to my attention the fact that there were complications in relation to the importation into this country of a car by the former Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is the only occasion on which he has called me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since it has come to this. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, for the simple reason that in the course of my communication with him on matters relating to defence and security I have called him or returned his call on a number of occasions from a number of venues. However, I wish to make this point very clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this pan of your point of order?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, because he is saying the only occasion on which I called him, but I wish to go further than that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you have already explained your point of order. You have made it clear that the Honourable Member for St Peter did call you on another occasion and I believe that is what is your point of order. Could we continue, please?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am really sick and tired of this Member for St. John challenging me all the while to produce facts, as he did in the election campaign when he challenged me to produce facts about some secret deal. It was the most scurrilous thing ever done in the history of Barbados' politics, because he knew it was a lie. I am saying that I was very careful in discussing the car loans to avoid any discussion about car loans to Parliamentarians, but he made sure that he dragged it into the debate because he took the initiative to call me to draw to my attention complications that I knew nothing about.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. As I recall it, Sir, I was the last Minister of Foreign Affairs. As I recall it, I have imported a car. As I recall it, I had dealings with the former Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member said there were complications, and the language in this country is very strange. Could the Honourable Member please establish that there were no complications relating to any irregularity concerning the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the importation of the car? Could the Honourable Member please check that out?

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: I did not get any duty free. I want it pellucidly clear that there was absolutely no irregularity

in the importation of the car. The innuendos have been going around for months and I want the Minister of Finance from the plenitude of information he has to establish that there were no irregularities. It is my car that I imported and paid for with my money.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West I believe you are talking about...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! Let me make a ruling on this point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West used the word "irregularity". From my understanding of the meaning of the word "irregularity" it does not mean the same thing as what the Honourable Member for St Peter said about complications. They have two different meanings altogether and I do not see why the word "irregularity" should be used there to have an explanation of the word "complications". Could we continue, please?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was careful to give a speech that was very simple.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It seems to me that you misunderstood my point of order, so let me put it to you again, Sir. The use of the word "complications", while it might be pellucidly clear to Your Honour, has some other meanings to persons who have predilections to hear things that may not have been said. Therefore, anyone who says that the importation of a car, when they are discussing duty free, suggested that there were complications, leaves...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have ruled and the Honourable Member is challenging...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Since the Honourable Member who spoke...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West. I have ruled that it was no point of order. Could we continue, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not hear the ruling, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I gave a very simple speech. I said that I wanted to operate Government's fiscal policy with reference to...

Asides.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am pleading for your protection, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Peter is on the Floor. Could we have some order, please? 5.30 p.m.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I gave a very simple speech. I made it very clear that I want to have manageable fiscal deficits and the size of the deficit will have to vary upon the basis of the reserve position of the country's liquidity position and its capacity to borrow. That is as clear a statement as you can have, yet I am being castigated for not having stated a policy.

Sir, I set out as fully as I could the parameters that inform the Administration that went before about the Estimates that it prepared in March. I cited the numbers. I said what the numbers were intended to be for the full year. I also went on to say where we were at the end of August and where we were likely to be on trend for the rest of the financial year. That is as full a statement of the country's financial affairs as you can have.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I also went to the extent of saying that there were two different methodologies that had been used in this House before to present fiscal accounts; that I would be prepared to stay within the Law and use the Accountant General's Report, and the Financial Statement that I presented was in the context of that approach. I think I indicated to Parliament that we had received \$66 million in requests for supplementaries and we had to find a way of prioritising their coming to the House. I outlined the criteria that we had taken account of in bringing this \$19 million on the basis of what we thought were priorities within that \$66 million. Those \$66 million are not the BLP priorities. They are what we have inherited. But we had to find a way of determining what proportion of that \$66 million we could accommodate now, what proportion has to be brought at some other time, and all I have spoken to is the priorities we have applied in trying to find a rational way of meeting requirements for \$66 million in supplementary expenditures arising before us.

Some of the supplementaries which we have not brought to Parliament pertain to Sherbourne. Mr. Speaker, we have to evaluate them carefully for a very good reason because the former Minister of Finance speaks in terms of financial systems and so on but most of the expenditure on Sherbourne has been hitherto under the contingency vote. That is a fact. One of the biggest capital programmes ever undertaken in this country has had the financing for it provided by way of a contingency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said that any expenditure on Sherbourne should be on the basis of a projected approach to such a capital...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order. That is a grossly misleading statement. If it is true that the

Sherbourne project cost is certainly in excess of \$10 million most of the financing for it could not have come out of a contingency vote which itself had less than that in it. That is financial madness and it would be stupidity of anybody to repeat that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that all part of your point of order?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, you will look in vain in the Estimates of Expenditure of this country to show the true reflection of what has been spent on Sherbourne because a lot of it has been spent through what has been called the Contingencies Vote of the Ministry of Finance. I am going to change that, Mr. Speaker. I am going to make sure that never again must any major expenditure on any major capital project be treated as a contingency.

Sherbourne was not a contingency and it was clearly a misuse of any contingency vote for even one penny to be spent on a capital project under something called a Contingencies Vote. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we are evaluating what was spent on Sherbourne with reference to considerations like those and it could not have been part of the priority therefore before this Parliament today. Sherbourne was met by contingencies and that is one of the reasons why it is where it is today.

Now, Sir, the member for St John gave vent to a number of statements which I must clear up, Sir. In giving a picture of the state of Government's revenues, I was deliberate in making the point that the fact that Government's revenues are now projected to be higher than they were as stated in the Estimates has nothing whatsoever to do with any glowing state of the economy as the former Minister would want us to believe. It has to do with what was in fact discussed in the Estimates Debate this year when the revenue estimates were brought in the first instance. We pointed out to the Minister of Finance that in circumstances where you are projecting the economy to grow by 3% for a full financial year it was financial nonsense to expect Government's revenues to grow only by 0.3%. Those things are part and parcel of the records of Parliament. All I am trying to tell the House is that rather than grow at the rate of 0.3% as that former Minister of Finance's Estimates say they were supposed to grow at, they are now growing at a rate commensurate with the growth rate upon which the Government itself forecast the revenues.

The former Minister of Finance and the Member for St. John is deluding himself if he wants to read into my statement on the state of the revenues any inference about any glowing performance of the economy. In an economy that is starting to grow at the rate of 3%, it is

nonsense for any Minister of Finance to accept any revenue projections which says that Government's revenue will grow by only 0.3%. That is the basis upon which this year's Estimates were cast and it explains in large part the difference between the revenue as conceived and the revenue that is now being realised.

Sir, the member for St. John also spoke and asked for clarification about Government's capital programmes. Again, Sir, this is something that was discussed this year and last year and the year before and which I must now address because I have been pressed on the other side to make clear statements about our relationship with the multilateral lending institutions.

Let me give the background. In the course of the last three years, Government has been unable to give effect to its capital development programme because the DLP's capital development programme was predicated on the assumption that the Government of Barbados of the day would have had access to multilateral financing from the World Bank and the IADB to carry out the programme. But the Government had not agreed on policy matters with those institutions to trigger the financing. The same thing was reflected in this year's Estimates.

This year's Estimates was based on the assumption that the Government would be able to carry out \$172 million in capital works, most of the financing of which would come from the IADB and the World Bank. But there were many policy differences between the Government and the IADB and the World Bank that stopped the Government from being able to access those funds. Therefore, Sir, we said from the very start that in the absence of any agreement between the DLP Administration and the World Bank and the IADB it was a fraudulent financial exercise to continue to put in the Estimates of Expenditure the presumption of continued access to financing from those institutions.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member must not have that in the record. It means that I would have been party to a fraudulent financial exercise and it imputes improper motives to me as the then Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member knows that that is contrary to the Rules and that it is also untrue to say so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter. I would like you to say what you want to say without using those terminologies, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I would then better read what I said on page 4427 of this year's Estimates.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order and I should like your ruling on the matter. I have said that the comments which are made by the Honourable Member impute improper motives to me as Minister of Finance at that time in that he is alleging that I would have participated in a fraudulent financial exercise. Only one person can bring Estimates to this House. He knows that, and in that regard, therefore, I am asking that you rule on that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. Peter. Would you like to rephrase your statement please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "fraudulent" but I want to read into the record what I said. "These Estimates are based again on the same precept, that the Government this year is going to rely largely on access to funding from multilateral institutions, in the case of IADB by as much as \$73 million, to finance the Government's deficit." 5.40 p.m.

In the absence of a very clear statement of the Minister of Finance in relation to the present status of Government's negotiations with those institutions, Sir, we have no *prima facie* basis from which to say that these estimates are different from those of the two previous years which had at their core reliance on those institutions for the financing of Government's deficits.

For the last three years, Mr. Speaker, this House, as I said in a budget debate, was carried through a sham. The Government had major policy differences between itself and the international institutions but yet it was writing into the Estimates of Expenditure large scale financing from those institutions. That is the reason why the capital programme in those three years could not fly because the financing could not be made available for the capital projects in the absence of an agreement between the Government of Barbados and the institutions.

Now, what is the present state, Mr. Speaker? We have made it abundantly clear that all of the niggling foolishness that has stood between the Government of Barbados and the multilateral institutions is not worthy of any serious discussion between a sovereign government and any institution. The former Democratic Labour Party Government committed itself by way of policies to have the International Monetary Fund come to Barbados to tell them that somebody living in one room in Fernihurst should pay X amount of rent, somebody living in another room adjacent, the same square feet, should pay a different rent. When they could not give effect to that foolishness, the relationship between the Government and the IMF broke down. As a result the Government could not access further IMF funds.

The IADB made it a condition of access to its financing that the Government should honour its pledges with the former institutions. So a whole relationship between the Government of Barbados and the institutions collapsed on the basis of whether differential rents should be charged the same Barbadian citizens renting the same units of space in the National Housing Corporation and matters of that character.

In January of this year, Mr. Speaker, when the then Government tried to increase the rents the then Opposition brought it to Government's attention that it would have been in breach of the Incomes and Prices Protocol and it withdrew the bid to increase the rents. But it had already given its words to the institutions just as it had given its word to the institutions that it was not going to restore the 8% pay cut. The reason why the former Government of Barbados could not access funds from those institutions is precisely because the institutions held that the Government of Barbados was not willing or prepared to keep its words on policies no matter how ridiculous those policies were where we are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I give you the assurance that I am not, and this Government is not going to found any relationship with any institution on any matter having to do with the level of rents in Barbados. It is not the IMF business. The IMF relationships with sovereign governments are governed by its Articles of Association. Its Article 4 Association allows it to discuss with member countries matters pertaining to its exchange rates, but the IMF does not have any power to come into anybody's country and say what the level of water rates should be, what bus fares should be and we are not going to have any relationships with the multilateral institutions based upon any determination by those institutions about water rates in this country, bus fares or anything of the kind and they have been told that.

Mr. Speaker, what the previous administration did not say was that not only is U.S. \$30 million in IADB financing hanging a relationship with the IADB, but U.S. \$240 million of project funds over the course of the next three years hang upon the Government of Barbados having a working relationship with the Inter-American Development Bank. The public discussion of this matter proceeded in terms of confusion and disagreement over access of the ISL which was set at first at \$60 million but was subsequently reduced to \$30 million. But what was not properly explained is that in addition a lot of the project financing, as I said, amounted to U.S. \$240 million over the course of the next three years hangs on there being a structured relationship. Now, Sir, the reality is that Barbados has graduated and will graduate from access to World Bank financing. We are not going to accept World Bank dictates about exchange rates.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with officials of the Inter-American Development Bank and I have made it clear that any relationship between a Government and the institution cannot be based upon niggling foolishness like water rates, or whether National Housing rents should be charged, whether, as I said, people living adjacent to each other in Fernihurst should be charged different rates because some IMF official has gone to Fernihurst and has determined that some people should not be living in Fernihurst, as is the case because that is what happened, but it has to be based upon fundamentals and the fundamentals have to be sound.

We have a macro-economic programme that has as its core a sound fiscal position, an export-driven development strategy, a strategy that addresses the question of the human resources of this country. If we put to institutions sound, macro-economic programmes as the basis upon which we access project funds and the institutions are not prepared to deal with those fundamentals but want to go back to the question as to whether Miss Jones living in Fernihurst in Room 15 should be charged \$5 per week and Miss Smith living in the next room should be charged \$6 a week then there is no basis whatsoever for a relationship. And that is our position on the matter. They understand that as clearly as crystal because that is precisely what I have told them.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Now, Sir, the truth of the matter is that the relationship came to be bogged down, as the Honourable Members on the other side should be honest enough to say, in a lot of niggling foolishness arising out of a sense of bad faith.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the Honourable Member in silence, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am giving the House the assurance that nothing has happened over the course of the last two years under that former Minister of Finance because, as I said, he could not access additional funding from the institutions because the relationship came to be bogged down over foolishness that he himself in his private conversation lambasted his predecessor in the Ministry of Finance for having agreed to...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: He himself will tell you that it was wrong on the part of the former Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, to have agreed not to have given back the 8% but then went

and turned his back on what he had agreed. He will tell you that in private conversation because those are all of the kinds of things...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St Peter who has a fascination with private business...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, it is a point of order because...

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order, please?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am making it, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House because my position on the 8% was made clear in this Chamber and it was a contrary position to the position...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John, your point of order must relate to what has been said by the Honourable Member for St. Peter, not your position, please. Could we continue, please. No point of order.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this administration is just a month old and we have within a month started to grapple with fundamental issues. We have not asked for any breathing space, Sir. 5.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Members on the other side want a clarification immediately of a relationship that they have mismanaged for 3 years and I just want to let them know that the discussion and deliberations on the relationship, Sir, are proceeding on the basis of different fundamentals now that we have spoken and said clearly to the institutions they know what our position is. I must also say...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the Member for St. Peter in silence, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: You know, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. John should be ashamed to open his mouth on any economic issues in this country after he went on public record, as a leader of a party, to say that I have cut a secret deal with the institutions in Washington. To this day he cannot say anything about this secret deal. And I am going to strangle him with it. Mr. Speaker, it was a dishonest act

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St Peter, could we proceed with the business of the House, please?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, for as long as I am in politics, Sir, I give him the assurance...

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir, I am a little concerned at this moment I thought I heard the Honourable Member saying he is going to strangle the Honourable Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St Peter, would you withdraw the word "strangle". He does not want you to strangle him.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I withdraw it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, Members on the other side, and more particularly the Honourable Member for St. John, had the audacity to challenge me to speak about our relationship with the international agencies. He should be ashamed for having contributed, Sir, so massively to the defeat of his party by leading the people of this country to feel that he had something hanging over my head in relation to some secret deal that I was supposed to have cut with the multilateral institution, Sir. It is one of the most scurrilous and shameful things done in the whole annals of Barbadian history for a leader of an institution to keep challenging that if within 24 hours I did not talk about a secret deal he was going to...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Peter, could we focus please on your reply to this Bill? Please let us proceed.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I am replying. I have said all that to make the basic point that it does not therefore fall properly from the mouth of the Member for St John to ask anybody in this country about any relationship that they have with the International Monetary Fund or anybody else after what he has done over the course of the last 3 months.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we hear the Honourable Member for St. Peter in silence, please?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I want publicly to thank him for it because I know the extent to which it contributed massively to the loss of confidence and good faith by the public of Barbados in the party that he led, and it shows what happens when a leader could put himself in that form of disgrace.

Sir, he spoke in terms of the timing of these supplementaries and he said that he was bound and gagged between July and September and therefore prevented from bringing these supplementaries in good order. I think that point has already been dealt with by the Member for St Michael South Central who has had to bring to his attention that it is not customary for us to have

\$60 million in supplementaries before the House even in October, and that it would be quite extraordinary for a Minister of Finance to ask the House in March to approve Estimates but yet come to the House between July and September to supplement the Estimates that he just asked the House to approve. But it is indicative of the level of folly that obviously emanates from the mind of the Member for St. John.

Sir, as I said I have put as simply as I can the parameters within which these supplementaries have been conceived. I have given the House the benefit of Government's projected financial position for the whole year, where we are, where we were at the end of August, where we are likely to be without supplementaries. I have told the House what is the extent of the supplementaries that we are trying to manage, Sir. I have told the House what I am trying to do by way of criteria to determine which should come to the House and which should not come to the House. I have also explained to the House, Mr. Speaker, what are my concerns in relation to restoring a sense of propriety to the administration of public affairs. I have alerted the House to the fact that there are supplementaries that we have to look at that involve Government Departments - and I am not casting any aspersions on the Minister - spending in advance of approval by Parliament

I have served notice, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I have taken a very dim view of that and other irregularities. I give the House the assurance in particular that practices such as the spending of large sums on capital projects from the contingency vote must stop. I give the House the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that we will, within the limits of our resources and subject to cash flow considerations, reduce the outrageously large arrears that the Government of Barbados owes to its private citizens for the purposes of the acquisition of land.

Sir, we cannot do it immediately. The fact of the matter is that I have found no record on the Ministry of Finance books to substantiate the claim that the Minister of Finance made in the House today that it was \$10 million and he knew it was \$10 million but he did not put in anything at all in the Estimates this year, he was waiting to see what the outturn was going to be, Sir. Nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt him in his winding up but the point is that the Honourable Member is misleading the House. I said provision was made but there was always the understanding that when that had been expended that a further sum would be sought if necessary. That took place in the Estimates Committee meeting. You would not find that on the file.

We discuss those things. We do not write down everything and in due course you will learn that.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can state a matter of policy and I want to state a matter of policy. I think it is wrong for a Government to acquire the assets of its citizens and put them indefinitely in a position what it does not pay for those assets, having put the assets to an alternative use. I think it is wrong, Sir. I think it is therefore wrong for the Government to have accumulated over \$20 million in arrears that it owes for lands that it has acquired from the people of this country with the knowledge of the Minister of Finance and with not an effort made by him to deal with it. I give the House the assurance that as resources become available, it is the commitment of this Barbados Labour Party's administration to work down those arrears and to put the citizens of this country in a position where they feel they have not been raped by the Government. There are a lot of Barbadians who are aggrieved...

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member please wind up?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: There are a number of people, Sir, who are aggrieved by the fact that the Government has acquired their property and has not been paying them or showing any inclination to pay them. While I may want to commend the former Minister for having thought about it and having had secret discussions about it, this administration is doing something concrete about it I want now to move against that background and with that confidence that this Bill now before this House be read a second time. 6.00 p.m.

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee of Supply.

HEAD NO. 10 - GOVERNOR GENERAL - \$17 500

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 10 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD NO. 12 - PARLIAMENT - \$156 000

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 12 stand pan.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD NO. 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
- \$74 193

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Sir, I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head No. 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - \$1 714 300

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE
- \$539 965

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 16 stand pan.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE - \$1 769 918

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 19 stand pan.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question that Head 19 stand part...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, during the course of the discussion of Head 19, I wish to put on the record of this Committee a situation which was discussed in

second reading in which there may have been, there was an outside possibility, a small slivering chance, that there might have been some misunderstanding and I wish to put it on the record for posterity. There is a rule that was established during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party that Members of Parliament would join the public sector where public officers in the Civil Service were able to borrow loans of a certain sum. That sum was fixed many years ago at \$20 000. It was agreed that the Members of Parliament would be able to borrow whatever was the higher level allowed for civil servants. Many Members of Parliament over the years borrowed from the Government such sums of money as was allowed. Note I said "borrowed", Sir. It was not a slush fund into which Members of Parliament dipped. There was a process where those who were Cabinet Ministers had to go through the Cabinet Office and those who were Members of Parliament went through the Clerk of Parliament. It still is so as far as I know. I believe that most Honourable Members who are here that were here before have benefited from that particular facility. I myself benefited from it in 1986. I think that I got a loan for \$20 000 which was the maximum. The maximum has never changed since it was implemented some many years ago. During the course of my being a Minister and a Member of Parliament, I have always owned a motor car. Since I started working at Cable & Wireless at the age of 16 years, I owned a motor car. I have owned two motorcycles and thereafter I was one of the few who owned motor cars. There was a Member of Parliament called Lionel Craig who could confirm that we always had a motor car of a certain quality even when we could not afford it.

When I returned from the United States in 1971 to become a Minister, I benefited from a policy which was in place at the time that returning diplomats may bring home their motor cars free of duty. That is still at least it was up until yesterday the policy and all returning diplomats have brought home their motor cars free of duty.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That was in 1971. I got the car loan to change that car after 13 years and the then Minister of Finance, the late Tom Adams, used to have great fun every budgetary year raising the taxes and saying that he had the Member for St. Michael South West first in mind as he was contemplating what amount to put on the taxes for the big cars. That was all back in 1971. In 1986, I got a loan and as soon as the Barbados Labour Party came into office a little birdie called me and told me to pay off the money quick because they were likely to change the policy and they wanted to embarrass me. Fortunately, it was only \$13.46 or some such sum and I paid off for the then car which I had for another 8 or 10 years. In 1985, I got another car which is well known. That car has been described in various forms in this House. It has been called the bus or the hearse. I park up by the Honourable Member

from time to time. He has had on occasion to remark that as he was coming from his normal chores he would run into my car parked up by him. He would ask me on the floor of the House what I was doing parking up there. I explained to him what I was doing there and it was acceptable to him.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: In this House when they send you in here, you can even talk foolishness once you get elected. You can come in here and talk. Nobody can stop you from talking. So if you cannot stand the point, you can go outside. But I am discussing how you all tried from time to time to give the people the impression out there that somebody is a thief and that somebody is trying to get something coming in through the back door. I applied for a loan of \$20 000 to buy a car. The loan was approved, Sir, in the normal way by the Prime Minister. It is not approved by any Minister of Finance. 6.10 p.m.

The Honourable Member over there can confirm, unless he has changed the policy, that it is approved by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has to approve it when you apply for a loan. The form says if you are a Cabinet Minister it is approved by (he Prime Minister and if you are a Member of Parliament it has to be approved...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: I know what I am talking about. The Prime Minister has to approve that the person is eligible to get the loan. Do not tell me that. The Prime Minister has to put its calligraphy on it. Then the Minister of Finance approves that the money is available, so you cannot get a loan unless the Prime Minister agrees that you are eligible.

When the loan was approved, I had discussed with the then Minister of Finance, who had indicated that it was contemplated - because the Public Officers had been raising the issue for some considerable time that the limit of \$20 000 was illogical, irrelevant and useless in the context of the price of cars - that they would raise the levels. It was also discussed that the policy might change and I wrote to the Minister of Finance a note, as I am entitled to, and said to the Minister of Finance "apropos your policy proposal I have made application to bring a car from the United States..."

Let me say this, Mr. Chairman. The amount of \$20 000 or \$35 000 will only be a fraction of the cost of the car that I bought. There is no \$30 000 you can pay for the car I have now downstairs in the parking lot. It cannot even buy a Suzuki Swift.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It could buy the Mercedes he has, Sir, because he has had the Mercedes for about 27 years. He masquerades as a poor man all the time when it suits him, but that is a different matter, we are not discussing him today. This concept that appeared in the Investigator and "Pudding and Souse" and all these little nippy people dropping out nippy pieces about this body that brought in a car duty free! I am not a taxi driver. The taxi drivers who are bringing in their first cars can bring them in duty free. They have a whole category of people who can bring in their cars duty free. I want to make it clear, I do not have any difficulty. If I did not get the loan I would still have the car. No \$35 000 at my age and stage in this country can be any source of embarrassment to me, and anyone who seeks to suggest by innuendo any embarrassment about my doing what I am legitimately entitled to do can only be a criminal mentally.

I just want to make it clear. I want to put it in the record because constantly politicians are demeaned in this country and it starts always with some political motivation. I have never complained to anybody that they should not kick me as a politician. I have never complained to any Member on that side that they are beating me too badly. I do not complain on this side either. I am a politician, I take my blows. I give a lot too. Please understand, Mr. Chairman, that he who brings a bone will carry one, and anybody who seeks to demean my reputation over \$35 000 for a loan that I am entitled to is seeking to do a dangerous harm, and that is why I have taken the time of this Committee to put that on the record.

Now, Sir, I did not draw down the \$20 000, because Cabinet having changed the policy to raise it to \$35 000, and the Minister having indicated that he was prepared, given the circumstances, to allow me to get \$35 000, and I asked him in a note if he would guarantee it *ex post facto*, he said as a matter of principle, because his advisers had so advised that it was okay. It is interesting that only a couple of days ago I wrote a letter "Attention, somebody in the Ministry of Finance" saying "I will accept the recommendation made by you that I take the difference between what was offered to me and what is now the new policy."

Mr. Chairman, those are the facts. Anybody who wishes to write down now anything they wish to write may do so happily.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: "Pudding and Souse" does not get information *sui generis*, "Pudding and Souse" gets information from some nippy people in nippy positions,

some who did not expect to be in those positions, who telephone and give information to sub journalists and quasi journalists who would then pass them on. They do not attack only one side, you know, when you least expect it they will be in your own backyard attacking, so the nippy people on one side will give information to them and they talk about the other side and *vice versa*.

But I want to say this. I have said it before. It is in the record over and over again what I am saying. If you seek to demean political person A, it is like those things in Australia. When you throw it out it has a way of boomeranging, it comes back and sooner or later it will stick. I am too old and have been working too long not to be able to afford to drive the kind of car I wish to drive. I see some all kinds of people in this country driving all kinds of cars. If I were not able to borrow the \$35 000 they would probably say I am getting it from the way some other people get theirs. Lead me not to temptation, Sir. Let me stop there.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on this because I have received a lot of calls from journalists making some very silly enquiries of me and I know the kinds of stories that the *Nation* and the *Advocate* can sometimes carry. Let me make the point clear, because I know who the instigator is. As Minister of Finance, one of the responsibilities of that office is to approve car loans in respect of Parliamentarians. The limit was \$20 000 and a proposal was made to increase that limit to \$35 000, or alternatively to give a duty waiver of \$35 000 to Parliamentarians because the cost of cars was exorbitant. We opted to go the route of increasing the car loan limit to \$35 000 and directing at the same time that Public Officers' loans should be so increased. There are different tiers of loans, but we increased all about the same ratio. That was a Cabinet decision and the directive was sent on to the Ministry of the Civil Service. The Honourable Member for St Michael West had applied originally for a \$20 000 loan and it was approved. In the transition period he discovered that we were contemplating the increase and he raised the matter with me. As a result of a letter which he wrote in which he sought either the waiver, if it was going to be that, or alternatively an increase in the car loan limit. Cabinet subsequently made the decision and in respect of that the Honourable Member was told by me in a letter I wrote to him to apply for the additional \$15 000 in loan limit. However, before those arrangements were concluded, his car arrived in the island and, as is customary in the Customs Department with a large number of citizens, far less Parliamentarians, if it is likely that a person is entitled to get a waiver and the item which they imported comes into the Island, the Comptroller will accept a manager's cheque which he puts in a desk drawer until the waiver Comes through rather than let you

pay the duty and then have to wait 7 months for Government to pay you back because there are a large number of people who import agricultural equipment and so on. Rather than have them wait to get back that money which they need, the Comptroller permits them as an administrative discretion - and I think it is a decent thing - to give him a manager's cheque so that if there is a problem you simply go and deposit it. It is encashable at the value which appears on it 6.20 p.m.

In that respect the Honourable Member for St. Michael West deposited a cheque...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is true. We should do that because they owe me some money for what they said about my not paying back my car loan too.

This is the kind of thing that has been going on. The cheque was deposited with the Comptroller of Customs.

There are two additional points I want to make on this issue. When the Government changed, the Honourable Member for the City approached me at Combermere School and indicated that she was in charge of what is called a transition team. I sat down next to her and we discussed a number of issues, including the pending IMF World Bank meetings, some issues relating to the furniture in the office which I occupied, particularly the desk, which I spoke to her and said it was a very old piece of furniture which probably should be restored and put in the museum at an appropriate time among other issues; but I also said to her that there is a matter which is pending which relates to the car loan for the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and as a matter of courtesy I would hope that the matter could be concluded satisfactorily.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter, I understood... I don't know if he paid a visit to the Customs Department but a reporter called me and told me that he visited the Customs Department and as a result of that visit... This is what I was told by a reporter.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, lest misleading information enters into the record, I have not paid any visit to any Customs Departments. I really think that for the records of Parliament to have in it a statement based on what a reporter is alleged to have said about a matter that one can determine if it is truthful or not is not worthy of a parliamentarian. He should not go down that line. I have not visited Customs and it is a foolish line of argument.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Just like the St. Joseph Hospital you want confusion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am still on my feet. I called him to indicate that the matter was still pending and needed to be resolved at the Ministry of Finance. I left the matter there. I explained the facts and I left it there. I am very surprised to think that in a matter, Mr. Chairman, in which in the course of the introduction I was speaking about the fact that it does not make sense to even comment on the issue because if a successor government does not wish to honour that policy that it should be free to abandon it, but that just to ensure that there is no confusion, particularly with those who are going to report what was said in this Chamber, I needed to clarify the point made by the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

In his introduction - he may forget what he said - the Honourable Member for St. Peter, said that he is meeting obligations which were incurred as a result of a decision of the Cabinet. All I did was say that there was only one application pending. What the House needs to know is this. The \$260 000 is to lend to those new parliamentarians who have now entered into this House for the purposes of those car loans and the impression should not be given that those obligations were already incurred by a previous government which is the interpretation which could have been put on what the Honourable Member said in the course of his speech.

I am not leaving anything to chance. So it has been clarified and I would expect the usual courtesies which pass between people operating at this level to obtain. I am surprised therefore that the Honourable Member for St. Peter sought to depart from what I consider to be those courtesies. If I make a telephone call to you as Leader of the Opposition on a matter, just as you called me nearly every day after the election, I do not consider it is necessary for me to tell the public of Barbados the nature of our conversations. Therefore, Parliament must not go through this process.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I really must speak since this matter has been unfortunately dragged into this debate. I made a very brief statement in my introductory remarks to the effect that funds were being provided in the Supplementary Estimates to honour a Cabinet decision in relation to an increase in car loans. Mr. Speaker, I was careful not to distinguish between increase in car loans to civil servants or increase in car loans to parliamentarians because there is one rule that governs both.

This very unfortunate debate has been generated precisely because it fell to the member for St. John to

dilate on the matter for almost 10 minutes to try to prosecute a case that I had not raised and to bring unfortunate matters pertaining to his colleagues into the debate when that was simply not the intention of this side because I spoke in relation to car loans.

Mr. Speaker, since he wants to raise the matter, I must say that the complication in the issue in relation to the former Minister of Foreign Affairs was not the increase in the car loans but the question as to whether or not he was entitled to a waiver of duty on a motor car. Persons who are *bonafide* farmers are entitled to apply for waivers of duties on vehicles which they bring into the country to carry out a commercial purpose, but the same thing does not apply to members of Parliament nor the civil servants so that *if* is two different things to discuss increases in the car loans and to discuss the question as to whether a Minister could properly apply for and be granted a waiver of duty on a car. The complication in the matter was that there was the contemplation that you could either have an increase in the limit of the car loan or you could have for the first time a policy granted that persons who are Ministers or other persons who are in the category to qualify for a car loan could have relief in the form of waivers of duty.

What happened therefore, Sir, in this instance, is that before the matter could have been adjudicated the former Minister of Foreign Affairs' car arrived. He lodged a cheque with Customs, got his car released from Customs without the payment of duty on the understanding that the matter would have been resolved when a decision was taken one way or the other, as already you have the increase in car loans, on a waiver of duties. I want to set the record straight because it is not true to say there has ever been a policy that equates the status of a Minister of the Crown with a farmer.

In a sense the member for St. John was misleading the House when he equated a farmer who is entitled to a waiver if he can be shown to be a *bonafide* farmer...

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, a farmer who is a *bona fide* farmer can apply to the Ministry of Finance for a waiver. It is sent to the Ministry of Agriculture to decide if he has had the vehicle for five years and in the process that that to-ing and fro-ing is going on.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Any person who imports a car into Barbados can apply to the Minister of Finance to get a waiver. It

is a discretion which resides within the Minister of Finance. It is not one that I exercised with respect to the Honourable Member for St Michael West but it has been exercised with returning nationals, fanners and a number of other persons so that statement is therefore misleading.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: All I am saying is that there has not been a policy in the past to give Ministers or persons employed in the Civil Service access to duty free cars. 6.30 p.m.

There was a statement to the effect that persons in the farming community were entitled to the waivers subject to satisfying the condition that they were *bona fide* farmers and that they had been in possession of the vehicle for five years; and that is a policy.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. Public officers who serve in diplomatic missions on returning to Barbados are entitled to a reduction or a waiver of duty. Therefore, once again, the Honourable Minister of Finance is misleading the House if he says that there is no policy in which public officers are entitled to waivers because there are categories of public officers who are entitled. I am merely saying to you if you do not understand the matter, get the facts and return to the House with them. Do not leave it to chance.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am going to lay this to rest but I just want to say this that there are policies regarding who can get access to duty-free vehicles. The policy pertaining to people returning from abroad is a policy. In relating to agricultural farmers that is a policy. The former Minister does not fall into the category of those persons who are entitled to duty-free vehicles.

Sir, I believe this debate is rancid. It is unfortunate and I just want to say for the record that in my introductory remarks I made a simple statement, and as I have a responsibility to do that, we have made provision in the Supplementary Estimates to honour a Cabinet decision, not by us but by a previous administration that says that car loans should be increased. That is all I said. I did not draw any distinction between parliamentarians and other people. If the other side wants to prolong this debate, let them do that. I am finished with it, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, further, when the Honourable Member, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was explaining, he explained his use of the word "complication" and I recall raising the question because I knew the use of the word "complication". Now the

Honourable Member is saying that there was no category for parliamentarians and that is where the complication arose.

The fact is that this former Minister of Foreign Affairs did not apply in any belief that there was such a category. The letter on the file will read something to the effect "apropos the discussion of the proposed policy of doing so and so".

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not get involved with that

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not tell me to leave it and then next week all through Bridgetown and in the call-in programmes they have it that Taitt brought in a duty-free car. Do not tell me to leave it I left the St Joseph Hospital and then the next thing you know all kinds of people dragging my wife's name out every time they open their mouths. The time will come when I will deal with that because they are ignorant of what has happened. They do not wish to find out what has happened and feel able at will to drag at me. It will not happen anymore.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is I wrote a letter to the Minister of Finance. I was a Cabinet Minister. I was entitled to write him a letter apropos policy which he was proposing and since my car had arrived, I wanted to know what the position was. It was not an application. The application that was made, was made on the proposed form. I want to repeat this. Such application as was made, was made on the proposed form, the correct form for a loan. There was no application for duty-free. There was a note to the Minister saying in fact that is what the policy is going to be then I would wish to be considered. But in the same vein I applied for the \$20 000 to which I was entitled and the \$20 000 was approved. Then the Minister said that the whole issue had to go for decision and the decision was made only to raise the limit from \$20 000 to \$35 000. Then the Minister indicated that the policy recommendations by his officials would include my getting the \$35 000 and therefore I should apply to have the \$20 000 application withdrawn and the \$15 000 added and that new Minister has to make the decision on it because the application did not come in until after the change of Government

It was not an application. The application was not to my friend from St. John, or my friend from St Philip. The application was to the Minister of Finance. There being an election called, one did not draw down the money. One waited until the new Minister of Finance was in place. The Minister of Finance to whom I have applied is not

one David Thompson. The Minister of Finance to whom I have applied is the Honourable Member for St Peter so the Minister who has to make the decision on the \$35 000 is the Honourable Member for St Peter. That is the point I want to make. That is .who I have applied to for the additional \$15 000, not to this Honourable Member. If anybody of goodwill is listening to what is going on the question is not a question at all.

I deliberately waited after the election and I told the Honourable Member. I spoke to the Honourable Member for St John and I said to him "Look, I have a problem with this issue, I had better leave it". He told me "It is not a problem. I have discussed it with Miss Miller" - I am quoting him - "and they say there is no problem". That is what happened, Sir, and it is the only reason why I have applied to the Honourable Members.

Let me make the point, Sir. It is not something that I am applying for. It is something to which I am entitled. That is the point I am .entitled to it. Your Honour is entitled to it and every single member in here is entitled to it

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What you mean that is not true? You are not entitled to it? Tell the Honourable Member for St James South that listening is an art I am going to repeat it for her. The application was made on the proposed form. The additional amount was made in the proposed way as recommended by the Minister of Finance.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do not be silly. It was the waiver that was on the proposed...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: How she get to be a lawyer?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member, you are addressing the Chair. You are not responding to asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry, Sir. It is a simple matter. Any first standard child would understand it

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. We have to bring some order back in here. We have strayed beyond the bounds of this and I would like to move that Head 19 stand part.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am addressing you, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot get up in here and mislead the House.

Aside.

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Member for St Michael West, please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think they understand, you know. I am discussing my right as a member of this Committee. That is what I am discussing. There is no-one...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You could tell the Chairman what to do? You just come and you are telling the Chairman to do that? You should take them and instruct them. You are telling the Chairman to tell me to stop? He cannot stop me from speaking unless I contravene the rules. St John you had better send them out

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West you are addressing the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You had better instruct them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Remember you are addressing the Chair. Do not let me have to call the Speaker to take lesser action.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I want to get the list of order when we were going into the Other Place to hear the Throne Speech. I do not think the Honourable Members must have seen it. It said, Forde and right after that/Sir, was the Honourable Member for St Michael West 6.40 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St Michael West has been elected and re-elected 5 times, one after the other, in succession and compassion. So, Sir, we have to get it straight I think the young Members of this committee must understand that when it comes to rights, today they may be my rights but tomorrow they are your rights. Do not let anybody take those rights. Ask the Attorney General and he will tell you that what you are entitled to you are entitled to *per se*.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: You are now talking about moving heads but when you were sitting down here...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member for St Michael West please address the Chair and not deal with asides.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: When the Honourable Member for St Thomas was sitting here, Sir, he would never be in any hurry to go home. I think I have made the point, Sir, that what has been done has all been done aboveboard, has been done properly and if you wish, Sir, I will make the correspondence available to Your Honour because I do not wish again ever for there to be even the semblance... The Ministers seem to be tired, Sir. They want to go, but you can explain that a Minister can get up and go home whenever he or she feels like.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about the way in which the attempt was made. I am not accusing the Prime Minister because I do not think the Prime Minister intended that But it has happened. I have had calls at home where people have called me to curse me about who I think I am to get a duty free car. Well, Sir, the car costs five times as much as any... Do not let me get into that, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: When you all were concocting the 'inky dinky' report that you put in, you did the same thing to me. You tell me not to say anything, not to worry. It is that, Mr. Chairman, that leads me to get up, and if necessary to get up again, to discuss my reputation. Neva* again will I allow any foolishness to pass in political revelry while I sit or stand or walk around in Barbados. I am putting it in the record, Sir, to make sure that there is no doubt whatsoever. I am grateful to Your Honour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have learnt two things from that debate so far, Sir. It appears that the Honourable Member for St Michael West is an Honourable Member, at least in relation to the purchase of that car. The second thing that I have learnt is that if you want to really benefit from the arrangements fully then you should become like myself, a *bona fide* fanner, and get the tax rebates and become a Parliamentarian and get the loan so you can benefit doubly. Sir, I suppose some of us can now go and get a few pigs and put pigs in the backyard tomorrow and that would qualify you as a *bona fide* farmer and you are entitled to bring in a vehicle duty free.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A vehicle for fanning. Well you can bring in an airconditioned Mercedes. A Mercedes van. You ever see those things? They are nicer than cars. You can bring them in and you can get the duty free concessions and you can also get the loan.

I have never understood the basis of this whole business. I am a parliamentarian, Sir, and I have spoken on this many times before, but it seems to me that it would be irrelevant to Government's cash flow basically whether it is a loan or in the alternate some kind of tax concession. A million dollars in loans is a million dollars out which you may get back sooner or later or you may not get back. Anyhow I do not think it is a major point

Sir, I presume that if you believe basically, as I see it, I have never been involved in arguing one way or another for these matters but I presume that the argument behind helping a parliamentarian to get a car is a presumption that he may not be able to obtain a car and he needs a car in order to carry out his duties. If that is the rationale behind it, it might apply to some parliamentarians. We know it would not apply to the Member for Christ Church South because in point of fact he can help the Government by lending out some money to help some of us to buy cars. I bet he has never borrowed money for it yet I do not want to get into that any further but it seems to me that there has to be a clear reason why car loans are made available. I have never understood that I have always presumed that it was to make it possible that every parliamentarian should have the possibility of being able to have a car available to him to carry out his duties and since you do not want to embarrass anybody you make it available to everybody. And I say in those circumstances if that is the basic reason, then it seems to me that one or other policy might be easily applicable but that is entirely a matter for... I am not advocating one or the other. That is my position.

Under Head 19, Sir, there were two things I wanted to advert to as well.

International Business and Financial Services: What is the Government doing to deal with the many problems which the private practitioners have been complaining about for years and years that they could do so much more for Barbados but the problem is that the amount of red tape, the amount of obstruction that they encounter at the level of the Registrar of Corporate Affairs...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, I will finish up and let you have it There are questions I want to ask you. Sir, in order to save time let me deal with all three.

- (1) International Business and Financial Services.
- (2) When do you plan to close down the office of the privatization unit? You may save some money there and you can probably spend some of that money on the International Business and Financial Services, and
- (3) My recollection is that you feel very strongly about land taxes.

I seem to recollect that you feel that in a developing society it is morally wrong; that it is a bad economic position to take; that it is not good for the country at a time when people need to be building homes, acquiring property, acquiring a stake in the country and so on, that they should have to pay land taxes. I believe that it is the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to abolish land taxes.

I was very surprised to have got a land tax bill. I thought it was abolished knowing the speed with which the BLP is implementing its present policies. Now, do I pay that bill or not? Have you put your policy in place or not? Or, have you changed your position? I am quite sure given the philosophical base on which you reached the conclusion that land taxes are highly undesirable in this kind of developing country was the kind of policy that you cannot change. These are the three little points. If I may deal with the more serious question first in relation to the International Business Unit, there will be a supplementary coming next week that has within it provisions to finance the computerization of the Corporate Registry. 6.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major constraints for the expansion of the International Business sector has been the functioning of the Corporate Registry and we have taken the decision to quickly computerize the affairs of the Registry. Financial provision will be made for that in a supplementary next week. I must also advise the House that there used to be a Permanent Secretary in the Ministry. The Privatization Department is now being incorporated into the Ministry without the need for a Permanent Secretary because there will not be the work to justify a Permanent Secretary.

Sir, I should also advise the House in relation to privatization that the Cabinet of Barbados for the first time saw and accepted the recommendations of the consultant not to proceed with the privatization of the NPC and BNOCL in mid-September. The matter had not been resolved although it would have been seen by the Minister. I had made a statement that the Barbados Labour Party's Cabinet had accepted recommendations not to privatize the NPC.

In relation to Land Tax, just quickly to let the Honourable Member for St Michael South Central know, the Barbados Labour Party's proposal to help people with Land Tax applies to persons owning property only below a certain value which falls within the category of poor people. Obviously, that would not apply to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have to respond to this matter because the question was asked about the Privatization Unit I certainly have no objection if the Government absorbs it into the Ministry of Finance. There are still some features of privatization which I think should be pursued particularly the sale of ICB's 20 per cent to the credit unions and so on and for which progress has been made and sums have been spent on, plus there is a large sum of money in the Public Investment Fund which needs to be administered There is still a number of things which have to be done with respect to privatization or related issues which are significant However, the Honourable Member for St Peter must not give this House the impression that the fact that a Cabinet took a decision about BNOCL, that had not that decision been taken that no decision had previously been taken.

The Minister of Finance took a decision that the privatization of NPC and BNOCL was not to proceed on the basis of the offers which were then before the Government. Those offers were from a consortium of staff members together with I think the Tucker Group. The file would reflect that the Minister of Finance took a decision that instead of that the NPC shares should be made available to the public and that the NPC should be listed among those entities for which the rates would be prescribed by the Public Utilities Board. That decision was taken and it is on file. So that for all intents and purposes the abandonment the sale of NPC and BNOCU on the terms which had been previously determined by the Cabinet had already been completed by the time the Barbados Labour Party took office. If the Honourable Member is not aware, I will direct him to the file and file number and the Minutes that I wrote on that file regarding that particular matter.

Hon. H. B. St JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to commend the Government for the speed in which they have moved to deal with one aspect of the constraints in the offshore sector. But I would not like them to get the impression that the mere computerization of the Registry will deal with all of the matters that we have to deal with. There are other genuine constraints particularly with the corporations. Those constraints arise from the interpretation of the existing Company Laws particularly with the regulations which ascribe a great deal of power to a Registrar in such matters as the choice of the name

of a company. So that unless we amend those regulations and reduce the discretion granted to the Registrar, you are likely with the same Registrar to have the same type of constraints in that respect.

I also would like to point out that there are other areas in the International Business area that Barbados has an opportunity to do well in. But again because of human factors we have great difficulty with and one of those areas is the registration of aircraft. Barbados is an area where many people have been trying for many years to register. That is one of the problems. I have been trying to point out to the Honourable Member when he was the former Minister of Finance for a long period of time that Barbados as an international business centre could benefit from a modernization of the approach in relation to aircraft registration.

Sir, I just want to repeat it again. We have a good opportunity to earn substantial income from aircraft registration in Barbados but we have a difficulty. Although we have a modern Civil Aviation Act and Regulations, we have a difficulty with those who administer the regulations and the refusal of the functionaries to ensure that there are swift and speedy decisions in relation to these matters.

We also need a Mortgage Registry and the law makes absolute provision for it. The Civil Aviation Act makes provision for a Mortgage Registry. There are regulations which say that you can register a mortgage, but try and register a mortgage. It cannot be done. So a decision has to be taken to remove, and that is the only hope, from the present functionary the power to deal with the registration of aircraft. You have a Registrar of Shipping. Why can you not have the same person dealing with another mode of transport? These decisions have to be taken because you have come up with obstruction in this area, not for one year but for many years. There are people out there who wish for one reason or the other to use Barbados as a place where they register their aircraft just as in some countries more so than in Barbados you have a Shipping Registry. Therefore, these are problems that we have to grapple with if you want to expand and diversify the base that we are dealing with.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hope the Honourable Members will not be so simplistic as to think that all you would do is to computerize the Corporate Registry. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has put Foreign Trade and International Business with Foreign Affairs. He has also given that portfolio Telecommunications and the Corporate Registry. In effect, what the Ministry of Finance has done is to give the tools to do the job so that Barbados can become a place where you can do business effectively, efficiently and with a certain speed. We have certain priorities for the first 100

days of Government After 8 years between 1986 and 1994, Honourable Members on the other side want within 8 days to see what they could not accomplish in 8 years. In the first 100 days priority, we have made it public already that we will seek to computerize the Corporate Registry. There are a number of pieces of legislation which need also to come before December 31 this year. 7.00 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: All of that is to distract. Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are a number of pieces of legislation which we hope to bring before this Honourable Chamber long before December 31 in order that we will be able, as I said just now, to make Barbados a place where you can do business with a swiftness and with an ease and efficiency which was hitherto definitely unknown during the administration just past

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

HEAD 20 - MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS - \$22 639

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES - \$1 552 604

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St JOHN: As I was coming here today, Sir, my constituents had asked me to raise the question in this important forum, now that the fishing season has started, that swift progress is made towards an early resumption of negotiations with Trinidad and Tobago with respect to some kind of understanding, if not an

agreement, as to what will happen in the oncoming fishing season which will effectively start in this area from about the end of December to June next year. We have a little time* but I would hope that some effort is made at an early date to deal with it

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful to have this opportunity to speak in this Assembly today. Under Head 25 there is a section which says "Rural Development" and when one listened to the discussion from the other side today, one got the impression that the only thing which comes under agriculture is sugar cane. I think we should move away from this concept That is why I believe we have named the company the Barbados Agricultural Management Company and not Barbados Sugar Industry or anything like that.

As you drive through the country, which is rural and of which the Minister is aware, you will see a lot of cotton being grown. I believe you would not have a problem with cotton. Undo* Rural Development the Honourable Member for St Peter mentioned sugar, but he mentioned nothing about the growth of cotton in this country...

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN:... or hot peppers, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am not going to allow the asides to distract me, Sir. I know you will guide this House and ensure that I am not distracted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Please let the Member proceed.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN:⁴ I believe that under Rural Development there are some projects which have been started before, like the Springhalt Land Lease Project, which we can put some emphasis on. If we honestly pay some attention to that, we can develop our agro-industry.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South just mentioned the fishing industry. In the constituency which I am proud to represent we have just started the dolphin project, which the Honourable Member for St Peter is aware of, and I believe that if we develop projects like these we cannot go wrong. I believe the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development will be quite keen in putting some finance into projects like these and the small fishermen of the northern parishes or in the rural districts will be quite happy if the Minister, the Honourable Member for St James North, would pay some attention to

this when he dictates his policy on rural development.

It is true they have said they have budgeted only \$200 000 and it is for staffing, and they also mentioned that they will be implementing policy, but one would have thought that leading up to the campaign - well, maybe they never thought they would have been on the other side - they would have dictated a policy and today they would have been announcing that policy in the House of Assembly and we would not have been looking at \$200 000 but we probably would have been looking for over \$2 million or more to carry a programme to complete the year. But, Sir, this is not the time for pulling down or dragging down.

I would like the new Government to recognise that rural development is something we have been discussing on our platform and I am aware that they have been listening to my speeches, so I am not surprised to hear that they have brought this...

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, my speeches were made before the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto was distributed and I am not surprised that the mandate to carry out this policy was given to the Honourable Member for St James North, because he spent every night of the campaign in St Lucy so he had the opportunity to listen to the tapes. Anything that they bring, once they have listened to the tapes, they will have no problem in getting my support once they implement the things I have discussed.

Thank you.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me congratulate you on your appointment as Chairman of Committees and also congratulate you for the manner in which you are conducting proceedings. I also congratulate the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, a former student of mine, for his maiden address. Just the one caution that there is a convention that when you make your maiden speech you so walk as not to be too controversial and I noticed that you brought some elements of your campaign platform style here today and I will have therefore to respond to what you raised and also to watch you very carefully in the future. 7.10 p.m.

In relation to what we have here under Head 25 this is just a part of the activities of the Ministry of Agriculture. Most of what we are asking for will relate to current expenses. I have noticed that the Member said that agriculture means more than sugar. We are aware that we need to diversify. Certainly, we will be following the cotton programme, the hot pepper programme, the sweet potatoes programme and things like that.

In respect of rural development we will not be concentrating exclusively on agriculture but intend to pursue a wide range of activities in rural areas so as to diversify the range of economic activities occurring in rural Barbados. What we have here today is just the operating expenses for a very short time period. By the time that the Budget and the Estimates of the year 1995-96 are available, we shall be voting for a substantial amount of money for rural development

In respect of the question on fishing, we have already commenced some work by way of talking to the Trinidadians about fishing rights for Barbadians in their waters and we expect to reach some agreement before the start of the flying fish season.

I took note of what the Member said in respect of land leases, in respect of agro-industries and such like. Rest assured that the new Government would be doing its utmost to make sure that agriculture asserts itself as a meaningful form of economic activity in Barbados in this new dispensation.

Asides.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: How many veterinarians? I know about 3 public sector ones. I want to find out now about the private sector ones.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

The question that Head 25 stand part' was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS - \$1 036 940

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 28 stand part I wish to draw the House's attention to certain of the items.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could you please address the Chair, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, under Object No. 626 - Professional Services, the \$200 000 that is sought is in respect to the Forensic Laboratory and the payment of professional services for the Forensic Laboratory. No drawings were done in the financial year 1993/94 and there is a claim from the professionals as follows:

Island Engineering	- \$84209.33
Cooper Kauffman	- \$36 384.16
Sandiford & Small	- \$88 311.00

Under Immigration there are two main components of this. The \$96 000 under other Personal Emoluments relate to the funds to pay 7 temporary posts. These are positions that will come on stream shortly. The Immigration Department is going to be computerised and we therefore need people to man the computer stations at the Immigration Department. Seven posts have been approved by the Ministry of the Civil Service and this money under Other Personnel Emoluments is to cover those expenses.

Computerisation, in fact, should have started before; but let us say a mess was made of the attempt to start it. It cannot now begin and it is unlikely to start before December 15th because of problems with the previous Chief Immigration Officer. I won't go into them in detail.

In reference to the former Chief Immigration Officer there is a sum of money included in these funds to pay the former Chief Immigration Officer in respect of accumulated vacation leave of 118 days. You are allowed 126 days before you lose the right. She accumulated 118 and, in addition to that, she was on a month to month contract after her 60th birthday on March 22nd and she was entitled to one month's notice of termination of the contract. She was given less than one month's notice some time in August this year before elections and so we have to pay her money in lieu of proper notice plus the vacation pay which is in about \$23 000. Those really are the components of the Immigration Department.

Under the Police Headquarters and Management: Object No. 623 - Structures, the sum of \$250 000 is to pay for work done in relation to the mechanical workshop and the Task Force Headquarters at the District A complex. Members on the other side will recall that those were opened in September before Elections. The buildings are completed but there are payables which still have to be met to the tune of \$250 000. Now under that there is a sum of \$61 407 for Plant, Equipment and Furniture. This is for the Hometown Complex in relation to the Police Station at Hometown.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to make it clear that it has been quite distressing to assume responsibility for this Ministry and to find at Hometown a new complex opened on September 2, green and white, but no provision was ever made for the furnishing and equipping of the police station and the Court in the current financial year of the Estimates before us here. So that is evidence, Mr. Chairman, of the poor planning by the previous Administration. They must have known that they

were going to open the building sometime in the fiscal year 1994-95.

Mr. B. M. TAUT: On a point of order. If the Attorney General checks the Financial Administration and Audit Act he will find that there is a very antiquated Rule in there which says that until the property is established you cannot budget for it. So don't go down that road.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to have that argument this evening because I have another very important supplementary with respect to Foreign Affairs. I am only saying that in the Estimates there is an item in every Ministry for planned equipment and furniture and no provision was made for the equipping and furnishing of the Hometown Complex. 7.20 p.m.

When I toured down there the week after, September 14, I found a police station that was finished, that had policemen in it, that had policemen using desks and chairs that were lent or given to them out of the kindness of various members of the private sector. Now, that could not continue. We are now making provision to pay for additional equipment for the Hometown Police Station. But the Hometown Court, the new Court next door to it, has not been opened because it is a bare shack. It has nothing in it at all. You could hold a dance in there and you have to move the Court from District "E" in St. Peter and bring it to Hometown. It is important that we get the new Court furnished and equipped. We will be coming for funds for that, Sir. But at the moment this is for the police station. I just want to say that we have a lovely new court at Hometown, very congenial circumstances and surroundings but, of course, the roof has been leaking. It is a good thing nobody is inside to get wet but it has been leaking.

There are some other big items over the page in relation to Head 28.1 do not think there is anything else I need to mention on Head 28 other than to just explain to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West that it is true, as he indicated, that I did a number of tours and the tours of the several departments - and I am not finished yet, I still have a lot more to do - have revealed criminal neglect of Government properties.

For eight years the Members on the other side were running the affairs of Government You would not believe, Sir, the state of the police stations all over this country. There are some common trends. All the roofs leak. Most of the stations, I think every station, I can say now, that I have visited, is a fine example of poor maintenance to windows and the ventilation systems.

I went around doing the north one day, Sir, and when I got to Belleplaine and I went into the barracks at

Belleplaine, when I saw the condition of the barrack room I had to sit down on a bench and catch myself. I was so distressed. We were in September, in the hurricane season* and Windows to the barracks where the men have to rest were completely off giving full rein and vent to the elements.

I have been doing some sums. The Honourable Member for St Michael West wanted to know what I had discovered during the tours and what I am going to do about them. He says he does not see any money in these Supplementary Estimates to repair what I saw. I want the Honourable Member to know that I have found between the two departments, that is, the Attorney General's side and Home Affairs side, in the maintenance votes on both sides enough money that, taking into account the six weeks that you are obliged to wait for the tendering processes to be gone through, to start and complete before the end of the financial year the necessary emergency works to the police stations in Barbados.

I cannot give the estimates obviously because they are going out to tender but I would indicate some of the work. District "A", mending the roof to stop leaks.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have to build new kitchen cupboards in the kitchen at District "A", paint all the internal walls, replace the windows in the entire station, re-design the training school area.

District "B" Boarded Hall - that was the first one I went to and what confronted me at District ^{M^B} Boarded Hall was that as you went into the yard, the vast overgrowth of bush. So we are going to put on a task force to do the debushing, get rid of the mosquitoes. But in addition to that, in the yard at Boarded Hall for the last three years, to my certain knowledge, has been the shell of an old red car and that former Government has left that there for all this time. That is going to move. We are going to clean it up and have a proper yard. You cannot ask the public to cooperate with the police and have respect for the police and send the public into run-down, dilapidated conditions.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, No. I am talking about simple things like keeping the yard tidy. We have a lot of worm-eaten boards and so on. All of that will be changed. We have to paint the entire station, internally and externally. Boarded Hall is the worst of all.

District "C" will also get substantial works of the same type, rewiring the whole complex, replacing windows, repairing the inside of the station and repainting it

District "E" out on the hill we are doing a little work there. District "F" is also in a bad way. Ultimately we have to condemn some of these stations. I am not going to announce at this stage which stations will be condemned until after we have the relevant interests groups, in particular the Police Association. But some of these stations will have to go like the present District "F". It would be a waste of time spending money on them.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Substantial money, but we have to do some now. Substantial money will be spent at Belleplaine, Crab Hill, Hastings, even Oistins and Worthing, the Drug Squad section, all of them are going to be done. I would not mention the Fire Stations and so on at this stage but I will just throw it in although it is not directly germane to this Head.

The Station at Four Roads, St. John that will also be renovated in the balance of this financial year. I want members to understand, therefore, that...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have half an hour. The Minister introducing the Head has half an hour.

The works will hopefully be done simultaneously. One or two of the smaller jobs will probably be done by the end of this year but I want to be realistic. From January 2 ...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Each one will be a separate contract. You cannot split them up. They will be tendered out in the newspaper and we will start realistically I would say from January 2 and we will finish by March 31. That will use up the vote that currently remains in the maintenance vote to the two departments. 7.30 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, that will be done because I cannot find certain contracts for works done already.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Members, please address the Chair.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But, Mr. Chairman, I ought to mention this. Realistically we need a vote *far* pure maintenance of about \$1.5 million for the department each year for the next 2 years. That has nothing to do with capital. On the recurrent side, we ought to get at least \$1.5 million for two years which will enable us to do a proper job of refurbishment of these properties.

I wish to commend to Government and to the Ministry of Finance, the example of the Regional Police Training Centre. When I toured there - as Members know - it is right beside the sea and therefore susceptible to salt spray and all of that. I would think, apart from the building I am in, which is a new building, of all Government properties, the Regional Police Training Centre is perhaps the best, the cleanest and in the best state of repair. It is an old building. It started back in our time in the fifties when we were the Government. But the secret has been every year to spend not in excess of \$100 000 to paint it and to do whatever repairs have to be done - termite treatment, change wood here and there. That investment, in my view, has made good sense. It has been a good example of preventive maintenance. So you will never need any big supplementary of \$1 million/\$800 000 to do any work up there because it is being done all the time. Surely this is what we must do with Government property. We get an inventory and attack each one in a systematic way by way of preventive maintenance over time and you will get the problem sorted out

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 28 in the sum of \$1 036 940 stand part

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour Mr. SPEAKER, and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION

HON. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended and we should resume at 8.15 p.m.

HON. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 7.36 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To (hat it shall revert.

COMMITTEE Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Committee of Supply is resumed.

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS
-\$11011.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 29 in the sum of \$11 Oil stand part

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 29 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL, MINISTRY
OF JUSTICE AND MINISTRY OF CARICOM
AFFAIRS - \$376 808.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 in the sum of \$376 808 stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without ^vision:

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND
CULTURE - \$6 475 438

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in moving this Head I just wish brjefly to outline the purposes for which the supplementary has come.

In respect of the University of the West Indies, comments were made suggesting that the \$2 million out of the \$5.3 million, - they were unsure what that was for in respect of the Second Reading speeches the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stated -1 would just at this point wish to clarify, Sir, that that \$2 million refers to the fixed costs of tuition for the period 1993/1994 the total sum of which was \$4.7 million payable by the Government of Barbados in respect of Barbadian students at the University. The other part of that \$5.3 million, Sir, is \$3.3 million which was in respect of arrears which stood at some \$20.5 million built up by the former Government over the years and which is being paid to enable them to be able to pay sums for income tax.

In respect of the Barbados Community College, when the Estimates were done earlier this year I am instructed that no sum was provided for in respect of operating expenses and hence the capacity of that institution to function was therefore affected. In the circumstances, Sir, \$400 000 is now being provided for in respect of the Barbados Community College. I would only wish to say at this stage that this is in the context of a Government that came to this Chamber during the last session of Parliament who would be willing to ask for \$300 000 for the establishment and functioning of an institute of democracy which during the tenure of that institute only provided for one single course in Election Administration for less than 10 people. The sum of \$300 000 was granted on that occasion. Sir, yet the same Government would refrain from granting a sum for Operating Expenses when they were in office. 8.20p.m.

In respect of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, Sir, once again the sum which was requested at the time during the Estimates was consistent with an agreement which existed between the Government and the Barbados Museum which the Government was to provide for the payment of salaries and wages for all permanent employees, travel and subscriptions, etcetera. The amount which was granted earlier this year of \$322 350 did not even cover the total cost of salaries and wages for that institution and hence their incapacity to be able to meet their wages and indeed to meet other operating expenses, since the overdraft which they have exceeded the limit by some \$20 000. Therefore, they were not in a position to continue to operate unless we were able to grant this sum to them.

Sir, in so explaining those sums, I beg to move that Head 34 stand part.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, for a maiden presentation, one would have anticipated a little more clarity... or how should one describe it...a better grasp of the facts in these matters. Let me start at the beginning. Allegations are made about the former Government which have to be clarified. There has never ever been a year in which the Barbados Museum has been provided with the full sum necessary to cover the entire cost which the Government, by agreement with the Museum, is required to bear. All of those entities which receive subventions or grants seem to believe that there is some kind of open cheque and that whatever they request from Government that they are entitled to receive in respect of their operation and many of them without justification for what they are doing.

In respect of the Barbados Museum, one of the greater significance is that the Museum owes the

Government of Barbados a substantial sum *of* money for which as an act of good faith the Ministry of Finance took the decision to convert those balances which had built up from previous administrations into a grant and reduced the cost of servicing for those loans. Therefore, the Museum has had substantial sums of money advanced to them by way of loans and all kinds of things. Some are for building, capital expenses and other kinds of things. But we decided to convert them to make the Barbados Museum's finances and as part of the programme which the Democratic Labour Party undertook to clear the cost arrears and to facilitate what essentially was the cleaning up of the financial system in Barbados.

We have heard a lot of talk about specific initiatives which the Government took in respect of cleaning up the financial system, which some people refer to as niggling issues. But the point is that vary often it is those particular policy decisions which are critical to the financial viability of the particular entities which are involved. I do not think that there has ever been a year in which at the Estimates the Museum has ever received the allocation which it had requested or an allocation which was substantially enough to cover the cost of operation. But what is more significant than that, and I have not looked at the Head, it is up to the Minister or the Ministry as a matter of policy to determine the level of subvention or contribution that he or she is going to give to a particular entity. So that any supplementary and you may say it is for the Museum, but it is supplementing a larger head out of which contributions, grants or subventions are made to a number of entities which fall *under* the purview of the Ministry. So it is a decision for the Minister and to ascribe therefore any lack or failure by the Government to provide enough money is not strictly speaking correct because it comes out of a larger vote. The issue is a matter for the Minister and the Ministry to determine.

Regarding the University, I have already said what the position was and the discussions that we held consistently with the officials. Last year we cleared about \$10 million in arrears. These arrears to the best of my recollection are described as arrears but they are pretty current. In other words, they are PAYE deductions which have become arrears either in the University's financial year which travels the fiscal year of the Government and it is not a deliberate attempt by Government not to make the contribution. Because these matters can be settled by way of an internal accounting procedure and they can be treated as cost arrears. They are arrears to NIS or to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue set up against the subvention payable by the Barbados Government or contributions for the operation of the University. Sir, I will go on to say that I did not make it in the opening speech because you were not dealing with the Heads and a very serious analysis has to be undertaken in relation to the

financing of the operations of the University of the West Indies. I have heard talk when the Government was in Opposition about the level of remuneration and about a whole host of other issues which people thought were relevant to the operations of the University and I would expect that those matters would be examined as a matter of urgency because the new funding arrangements for the University in their next triennial will be up *for* consideration shortly.

In addition to that, there are all kinds of proposals generated out of Mona on behalf of the staff in relation to the common salary structure which may not have implications for Barbados as a territory in relationship to its contribution to the Barbados campus but which would have implications if we were ever to follow the very doubtful recommendations of the official well known to the Minister of Finance in respect of the other university. It would have implications for the cost of the university to Barbados. I do not blame the Minister of Finance in Jamaica for the outcome of the proceeding. I think that he was railroaded by the "leading light" in the university who get everything they want wherever they go.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, they are the workers. I am talking about the elite. Your friends. I am talking about the traveling elite and they know how to inveigle Ministers of Finance into accepting all kinds of things on behalf of the University. You cannot quarrel. They know the system better than us and they have beaten it to a frazzle.

Finally, in relation to the Community College, it is an erroneous practice for us to adopt a stance where we seek to compare provision which is made in respect of one programme as against a shortfall which may, for that matter, have been erroneously made in respect of another. In other words, to say that there was a shortfall or some error or lack of provision in respect of some aspect of the operations of the Community College and that because the Government provided \$300 000 for the Institute of Democracy, there is something wrong with that. Unless you are saying that the Institute of Democracy is not serving a purpose and should be shut down, and that those resources should be diverted, which the Minister is entitled to say, then it does not make sense drawing that particular comparison. It is a complete red herring, because if the Institute of Democracy is making no contribution, then as a matter of the priorities of the Ministry of Education it falls within the purview of the Minister to say so and to make her policy decisions as to how the work of the Community College would be configured. 8.30 p.m.

I just thought I would correct the record on these matters and hopefully that certainly with respect to most of these supplementaries there has not been any criticism about the expenditure of the sums of money. I suspect those will be coming later and that these are the matters which are not particularly controversial, so until I heard the Honourable Minister of Education and Culture I was unaware that these would be matters for which blame allocation would be necessary and I do not think it is appropriate.

Thank you.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising to me that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does not recognise matters of clarity when he sees them. He is someone known to speak out of both sides of his mouth with a perfect composure that I do not think anyone else can excel at in here. Indeed, Sir, earlier today during the course of the Second Reading he referred to a practice which he oversaw in the Ministry of Finance, that if a particular Ministry wanted something they had to show savings in another area. Therefore, when we deal with the Barbados Community College coming to us for a sum of \$400 000 to be able to do their basic day to day activity, bearing in mind that that sum goes down as a single sum to that body and not under various Heads, it must be of concern to us that there is an Institute of Democracy which requires expenditure up to the sum of \$300 000, at a time when they can ask us for \$400 000 for operating expenses. To that extent we are going to have to look into this matter, and he is right that we will have to take a policy decision in respect of a non-functioning Institute of Democracy that was set up to satisfy the ego of certain parliamentarians.

In respect of the Barbados Museum, once again, Sir, the Barbados Museum and Historical Society was the recipient of a grant from Government which was the result of a loan made by Government to the Museum and which was convened, but the point in respect of the Museum is this, not that no Government has ever fully met its obligations in respect of the Museum but in pure programming and budgeting where you seek to cut a request for salaries and wages, then you are telling the Museum that they will either have to lay off those people or cut their salaries. There is only one of two options and to that extent the last Government could only have been indicating to the Barbados Museum in its not being prepared to meet its commitment to salaries and wages of full time employees, not part time, that it had no desire to ensure that the basic staff which the Museum requires is paid.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Government has absolutely no obligation to meet the full salary costs of the employees at the Museum,

and to say that the only way that the Museum could avoid cutting staff and so on is if the provision were increased, is quite incorrect. The Museum can raise revenue in a variety of areas and one would expect the Museum to be more creative, and that is the job of the Minister, in advising and assisting them in raising revenue from other sources.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I cannot explain the lack of memory of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, who seems to have forgotten when he was Minister of Community Development and Culture that there was an agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Barbados Museum to meet the full cost of wages and salaries of the full time staff and not the part time staff. Only yesterday I had the honour of meeting with the Director of the Museum and that copy of that memorandum was supplied to us at that stage, so I cannot make apologies for the memory of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. If his memory was going, he would know that the particular subprogramme under which the Museum comes in the Estimates is a subprogramme where it is the only institution that has ever received a grant under that subprogramme. Other grants to other non-profit agencies within the cultural industry come in the subheading before that, so I cannot be responsible for his amnesia, but then again he has selective memory and his speech earlier in the Second Reading shows that in the fullest possible regard, particularly as it related to his putting the Honourable Member for St Michael West in hot water in respect of a car loan and duty free waiver, Sir.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East were ordered by Mr. CHAIRMAN to be expunged from the record at this stage.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: In respect of the arrears with the University, this particular matter of the \$3.3 million is to allow them to be able to pay...

Aside.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am not finished with you yet, so do not worry. This particular matter is to deal with the issue of internal book matter in respect of income tax owed by the University of the West Indies, but having said that, the truth is that the remaining \$17 million or so in arrears, was arrears accumulated by that Government, and that is not an internal book matter, that is money that the Government of Barbados has to find to be able to clear its indebtedness to the University of the West Indies, and merely because the last Government sat down at the Triennium Estimates and committed itself to \$35 million in the first year, \$32 million in the second and \$32 million in the third, knowing full well that they were already in a stabilisation programme and knowing full well that

they were applying cuts in excess of 7% and 8% across Ministries arbitrarily, without reference to the programmes and planning they were cutting. When I listen to the Leader of the Opposition it is clear to me, as I said, that he has perfected the art of speaking out of both sides of his mouth.

With those words, Sir, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, I just wish to ask one more question in relation to this matter, if you do not mind. Since we are on the issue of the Community College and a policy statement has been made relating to the Associate Degree programme and its impact on entry into the University of the West Indies, and a very forceful statement was made, as I understand, on television by the Minister with regard to *her* views and desires about how this would be achieved, under the Head of the Community College, I should like the Minister, particularly since it relates to the operation of the Community College, to let us know the elements of that particular proposal, when it will be introduced, how many students it would impact on...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member for St. John, is this to do with details of the matter under consideration?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, Sir. As I understand it, the Supplementary Appropriation Bill relates to the operating expenses... 8.40 p.m.

Let me just read, "the Operating Expenses of the College", a very wide matter. Sir, which must relate to the operations of the College which would include any policy decisions, ill-conceived or well conceived, any public relations exercises, statements out of turn or in turn relating to the operation, all of which have a financial cost because the young people in Barbados who enter the Community College would expect that if undertakings of that nature are given which would provide new opportunities for them at the Community College that the House should have the benefit of this. This is a new policy initiative and it would certainly be very wrong of the Prime Minister in moving this particular Bill not to speak to this issue, because it has been publicly announced and one should not wish that matters like that be announced publicly unless they*are clearly thought out, lest the expectations of our young citizens are raised beyond what is attainable. So in that regard I will wait to hear what response the Minister wishes to provide with respect to that matter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister replies, I do not know why such words as "ill-conceived" and things like that should be used in

relation to this. The general impression one got here was that it was a snide remark that it was ill conceived.

In fact, Sir, the concept of integrating the Community College with the University is a very old concept That is precisely the point. The Honourable Member knows that it is a good idea. The Honourable Member knows full well that in the United States of America which is a wealthy country, great use is made of tertiary education starting at the Community College level. Indeed, in a state like Florida I believe the vast majority of tertiary education takes place within the complex of going to the equivalent of a community college first and then going to the university for the last year.

All we are trying to do, as I understand it, is to ensure that there is not wasteful duplication in tertiary education in the Caribbean. As a forma* Minister of Finance, the Honourable Member should commend the Minister of Education for *her* effort to ensure that there is no wasteful duplication rather than to indulge in any attempt at criticising.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that once again the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has shown an unbelievable capacity not to understand what he hears because whether it is that he heard from persons in the gallery or whether he heard with his own ears once again he reflects an incapacity to understand. All that was stated by this Ministry was that there must be a definitive timetable for the coordination of programmes between the Barbados Community College and the University of the West Indies so as to allow persons to move from the Community College to the University of the West Indies without having to force Government to take decisions that their Government was prepared to honour in respect of causing youngsters in Barbados to have to pay fees at the University of the West Indies.

We believe that there must be an extensive management of the resources within the Ministry of Education and to that extent we will not continue to preside open-ended as they did for eight years in spite of the promises to see that there was a find determination of the matter of accreditation between the Barbados Community College and the University of the West Indies.

With those words, Sir, once again I beg to move that this Head do stand pan.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: In the introduction of the Head, the Minister raised her concern about the provision of \$300 000 for the establishment of an Institute of Democracy and also implied in the course of the presentation that either the Institute was unworthy of

such an allocation or did not meet the criteria which she felt would offset the supplementary which is sought in relation to operating expenses to date. I should like to find out from the Minister some details about the operation of the Institute of Democracy which she raised in the course of ho* debate and I would like to find out in particular what the seminar costs, whether the Institute of Democracy has employed any staff to date...

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like some information from the Minister about the Institute of Democracy because it is very important, in my view, for us to establish whether the Minister is in fact saying by what she has said in the course of ho* presentation that she wishes the Institute to be closed down or whether it falls within her concept of what is an important adjunct to the operations of the Barbados Community College.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: In response to the Leader of the Opposition, I have spoken to the Principal of the Barbados Community College and I have indicated to her that I wanted a full report on the Institute of Democracy as soon as possible because there has been no indication from her that other than the short course for Election Administration that any other work has been done by that Institute of Democracy to justify the expenditure. To that extent, Sir, when I receive that report I will make sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a copy of that report to see the level of inefficiency of the Government of which he had the honour to be a Member.

With those words, once again, I move that this Head do now stand part

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 34 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS - \$1 557 890

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in moving this Head there are sums of money which were unbudgeted in the approved Estimates to do with a number of matters. One, being that the Honorary Consulate at Miami was upgraded to a Consulate General and additional office space was rented with all of the consequential additional expenses. This is something that happened in 1994. Two, the removal of the office in Ottawa to a suitable accommodation required additional rent as well, and the rental of office accommodation in Brussels. The

embassy was operating out of the residence of the Ambassador.

This supplementary also has to take into account that there is now consequential upon the change of government, a change of Heads of Missions and other changes and transfers and replacements of these individuals will incur certain costings. Also consequential upon the change of Government and the new portfolio added to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and International Business and Telecommunications it meant that we had to find accommodation for an additional 12 persons at the Ministry's Headquarters at Culloiden Road so that all are now under the same roof. This will result in an increased expenditure in a number of areas including utilities, supplies and maintenance of property.

I would like to say a few additional things in respect of Ottawa and Brussels. I am deeply concerned, Sir. During the period of the Government's financial austerity, a restructuring of the Barbados Foreign Service took place. I am not sure whether it was consequential upon the austerity or whether it was something that had been contemplated in its own right.

In respect to the High Commission in Ottawa, it was proposed to reduce Ottawa to a High Commissioner and Home Based Secretary/Office Manager. It was also proposed and agreed that the High Commissioner should operate from his residence. This is what the Barbados Foreign Service was reduced to in the former Administration. 8.50 p.m.

The High Commissioner operated from his residence. It meant, therefore, that the office accommodation had been given up, and fortunately, this arrangement would soon change when it was discovered that the High Commissioner's office could not, because of covenant, be used as business premises - the area in which the residence was located was a strictly residential area. So after much embarrassment to Barbados and subsequent confusion and all of these costs incurred, in the interest of economy and given the reduced staff complement, the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance authorized the Mission to rent what was described as much smaller accommodation. The office accommodation then proved again inadequate and so it was decided to seek more and further suitable accommodation. This circus has got to come to an end.

The Embassy at Brussels was in a similar situation. The Chancery was operating out of the attic of the residence of the Ambassador. It is a disgraceful situation.

Mr. Chairman, what I can say to this House at this time certainly is that there is going to be a property

audit of all the properties that the Government owns overseas and there has to be the appointment of somebody within the Ministry who will be the property manager. The Government has wasted tremendous sums of money because of mismanagement in this respect.

With those words, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 35 stand pan.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay this Committee at this hour. I am sure that at an appropriate time subsequently we will discuss this matter in greater detail. I am sure the Minister would wish to hear the full details rather than to give a synopsis of the position.

The issue of the reduction of the size of the Ottawa mission fell within the ambit of the issue relating to the structural adjustment at the time. I do not think that it is so much a matter of mismanagement as it was a matter of having to do what was necessary. I do not think that it is in the interest for reasons which would have to do with the position between the Canadian Government and the Barbados Government to discuss in great detail some of the issues arising out of the position in Ottawa. Suffice it to say that we were required to reduce the expenditure. When I say "we", Sir, I mean the Government. I was not the Minister on record at that time but it was required to reduce the expenditure of the country as a whole and one of the areas where it was felt could withstand the reduction more than the domestic situation was the Foreign Ministry, especially the overseas mission and in that respect the mission at Ottawa suffered some substantial reduction.

I think the Minister would agree though that so soon as it was possible or, at least, as little as a year ago a very strong effort was made to restore the situation. My recollection is that by the time the Minister had arrived at the Ministry a relatively satisfactory arrangement had been arrived at I do not think that we ought to seek to make this an issue unless the Minister feels it is absolutely necessary.

The point is that the steps that were taken were required in the programme we were running. Since then, when I was Minister, I gave instructions on arrival of the new High Commissioner in Ottawa that necessary steps be taken to retrieve the situation to the best of our financial ability. The running of a foreign ministry and more particularly the missions overseas cannot be done effectively without expenditure and you cannot have on the one hand the requirement to reduce the expenditure and on the other hand an expansion of the services. I myself will have a lot of difficulty being unduly critical of the

decisions that were made at the time because I was not there and I think that the decisions that were made were the best that could be made in the circumstances.

I have a view about foreign affairs which does not accord with the view of a lot of other persons, perhaps on both sides of the House. I do not believe that every whim and fancy of every person who thinks that that is the answer ought to be followed. I do not believe, for example, that we ought, without very much care, to "sell the properties we own". I think there "are some instances where that can be done to the benefit of the country but there are other instances where it would be detrimental not in the short-term, but in the long-term. I do not want to have a divide.

I do not believe that we should have a major divide on foreign policy in Barbados. I think the country is too small and our needs are too great. I do not intend, unless it becomes necessary, to have any great divide on the foreign policy of this country. The people who advise the present Minister would be the same people generally who advised the past Ministers and what the Minister needs to do is to make sure that she does not fall prey to accepting advice that may have been rejected in the past for good and sound reasons. I do not think that Barbados requires us to have any public show of division on our foreign policy and I do not intend to have that unless it becomes necessary. We may disagree on how some things should be done but I think we have been generally successful across the board in what we have set out broadly to accomplish.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has never had enough money ever, ever to carry out its policies. I go back to when the Rt Honourable Member for St John, not this one, was the Minister of Finance. The country has never been able to afford what is necessary in foreign policy so you cannot have it both ways. We cannot pretend. Whatever success we have in foreign policy is due, in no small measure, to some massive efforts on the part of individual people, sometimes heroic efforts, and so we have to be very careful when we are discussing foreign policy that we do not mislead ourselves. There is not a great deal of finance available to do the things that many of us would like to do.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member for Christ Church South is echoing and understands exactly what I am talking about. We have tried our best. We have to fit into the barrel. The barrel is a small barrel and we have to try and roll it but there are some successes which I think Barbados should concentrate on. In spite of those difficulties we have been successful beyond our size, measure and our finances.

I hope that we can have a foreign policy and we can have a foreign policy debate, not necessarily at 9 o'clock a night, in which we can discuss some other things. I do not wish it to seem, therefore, that it was mismanagement which caused Ottawa to get into a problem. The point is that in Brussels we lost a substantial amount of money but it is possible to recover it. If the Minister of Finance of the day will do the necessary thing, we can still recover moneys that appear to have been lost when we had to abandon the purchase of a property in Brussels. I believe, if the information and the reports coming from Brussels are correct, we can still recover that and the Minister of Finance should take the opportunity not to lose the money we have in Brussels and to find a way to... I am told that a mortgage is available out of Brussels itself. We should seek to do that. We could not do it during the time of the economic programme but we should be able to do it now. We should not lose the money which we have invested in that building. If the Minister wishes I can have some more discussion on it. 9.00 p.m.

The question that Head 35 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT, HOUSING AND LANDS - \$3 452 455.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 37 stand part.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that

The question that Head 27 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE - \$300 000.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 40 stand part.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that

The question that Head 40 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, PUBLIC WORKS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SPORTS - \$799 625.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that

The question that Head 42 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 1 through 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Supplementary Appropriation Bill 1994 in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS the Appropriation Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Supplementary Appropriation Act (No. 5) 1994.

ORDER NO. 4

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY Mr.

CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1994-95 NO.1 HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS - \$1 250 000

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in moving this Head, Sir, I think I need first of all to point out to Honourable Members that there is an amendment, which to my knowledge has been circulated at Head 35 - Object No. 207: to delete after Sub-program the figures "02" and substitute "01" and after Object 623 - Structures to add "Object 625 - Plant, equipment and furniture 350201 - provision in the Approved Estimates of \$144 000 Supplementary Provision required \$19 000" so that the substitute would give a total sum for the Resolution of \$1 269 000.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution has to do with the provision of moneys to meet the installation costs of a telephone system on the new floor to which the Barbados offices at New York are to be relocated. It is also to meet accommodation for diplomatic posts abroad and the purchase and improvement of property. But most particularly under "Structures", it is to meet the moving and the building out costs which are in fact contract fees in the relocation of the Barbados Offices in New York from

the 17th and 18th floors at 800 Second Avenue, Manhattan to the second floor. 9.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is a long and disturbing history to this and I feel that I must go into it in some detail for the benefit of Honourable Members. On October 30, 1992 the Barbados Cabinet agreed that a new lease for 800 Second Avenue be entered into for a 15 year period beginning back-dated to the 1st of July, 1992. That was the first bad situation. The conditions were that the offices would remain on the 17th and 18th floors until July 1994 with the rent being reduced from US\$28.00 per square foot to US\$18.00 *per* square foot from April 1992 to December 31, 1992 and to US\$14.00 per square foot from January 1993 to June 30, 1994. After the move to the second floor, the rent would then be at US\$16.00 per square foot, US\$18.00 for the next 3 years and US\$21.00 a square foot *for* the rest of the 15 year lease.

The lease was signed on December 10, 1992. The officers at the Mission in New York would have known because it was very clearly set out in the lease that they had from that time until June 1994 to make plans and to enter into whatever negotiation needed to be entered into to effect this move. The way in which the finances were planned, leaves much to be desired. In the lease, the landlord left in his contribution to construction which was agreed at US\$87 000 which works at roughly \$5.00 a square foot

I have a lot of difficulty with that, Sir. When I was in New York last week attending the General Assembly, I made it my business to take independent advice on what was available in midtown Manhattan at the time when the Barbados Government was negotiating this lease. I see that at that time landlords were leaving in as their contribution to works US\$30.00 and \$35.00 a square foot, but in our case it was US\$5.00 a square foot. I also went to a great deal of trouble to take independent advice as to what was available in midtown Manhattan within walking distance of 800 Second Avenue then and now.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, Sir, is that this was a lease that was loaded in favour of the landlord. This was a lease which disfavoured the Barbados Government. I happened to be sitting on the Board of Trustees of a certain entity which used to meet in New York frequently. It had a building which is owned around the corner from 800 Second Avenue on 43rd Street and they were trying for some 8 years to sell the building. During my 5 year tenure on the Board of Trustees, the building was sold to a government which shall be nameless. I am saying that, Sir, to say that I had before me on a regular basis at around that time several proposals and quotations and I know of

my own knowledge that there were premises in much better condition and which could have been negotiated by the Barbados Government at much better terms and conditions than this lease. This lease is incredible.

Now part of this lease sets out that the landlord would make a loan to the Government of Barbados in excess of US\$600 000 or US\$575 000 and that they would amortize it over* the 15 year life of the lease at 10 per cent interest

Mr. Chairman, I have to stop here again because I have a lot of difficulty with that. That was some of the most expensive money going in New York at that time and there was documentation to show that there was much cheaper money available. During my stay in New York last week, I summoned and was briefed and spoke to the attorney-at-law for the Barbados Government on this matter who helped to negotiate this lease. Among other things that he said to me was, "We never intended to invoke the landlord's loan". Well, I said, "In that case, how did you intend to pay for building out the second floor?" He said, "They were going to see what they could negotiate at banks in New York". This is part of the dereliction of duty. This is part of the scandal of it all not to mention the breach of the financial rules that no effort was made from the signing of the lease in December 1992 to June 1994 to seek funds to pay for building out the second floor. You are moving from floors 17 and 18 to the second floor. It is not only the Barbados Mission, United Nations. It is the Consul General's premises, Barbados Tourism Authority, and it is the IDC as well. We are putting them all together. Oh, I have the files all here and a copy of the lease and the earlier lease as well here with me. It is a shocking and shameful situation. No effort was made to try to negotiate downward with the landlord of the terms. This happens all of the time.

This lease negotiated that over the 15 year lease they would have given us nine months rent free. I have the documents here, Sir. Around the same time where people negotiated 10 year leases, they got a year rent free. So we were getting ripped off at every single turn and venture. There is no condition in this lease which is favourable to the Barbados Government. Everything we had to negotiate at our own expense.

What happened and I need to go through it very carefully, Sir, is that the Ministry asked the Permanent Representative at the U.N. to seek other bids in view of the considerable sum of money involved. We could not contemplate taking up the landlord's loan of US\$610 000 and more. On March 12, 1994 the Permanent Representative at the U.N., our Ambassador, submitted bids from two other contractors and recommended one. The

Ministry considered that to spend a sum of US\$632 000 on property that was not owned by the Barbados Government was extravagant and asked them to not exceed US\$300 000.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: From what I have seen of the second floor myself, it is clear to me that it could not have cost as little as US\$300 000 to do that. So there were people just sitting here in Barbados and making judgments about New York. Part of the problem here is that the attorney who negotiated this was not an attorney who you would describe as a real estate attorney. So we got the worst terms and conditions. Part of it had to do with the period of austerity and the Government clearly instead of looking for the best deal in the circumstances grabbed at a situation or a deal, which meant that it did not have to put its hand into its pocket at that time. But look then down the line. Nearly two years they had to try to negotiate a loan somewhere in New York. It had to wait two weeks before last Friday when I was sitting down with the attorney, for me to say, "By Wednesday next week, I need to have all the options open to the Barbados Government before me" and then they go to three banks which all say no, the contractors were standing ready to down tools and Barbados was in an impossible situation. So the Ministry said try and get this done at US\$300 000 and in response to the Ministry's request for an update the Permanent Representative at the UN on June 16 this year replied that the firm had designed a layout and that an engineering firm should be contracted to begin the work. Not a single word was said about the cost and the cost limitation that the Ministry had laid down. On June 22 this year the Ministry granted approval to engage the engineer. On July 26 the Permanent Representative at the UN informed the Ministry that it was now impossible - this is a new piece of information now coming to the Ministry for the first time - to move from the 17th and 18th floors as agreed in the lease. The last day for vacating was August 29. 9.20 p.m.

They were not in a position to move. It also happens that the persons who were tenants on the second floor had not yet vacated, so that the landlords could not give us vacant possession of the second floor anyhow, and they said: "We invite you now to do a temporary move to the third floor until the second floor becomes vacant." Then a long argy bargy ensues between the attorneys for the Government, the attorneys for the landlord and the attorneys for the contractors as well.

There were inordinate delays, there is blame on all sides, but I have a lot of difficulty with the excuses that are offered. There were several management changes, there was a delay by the occupants on the second floor and so on

and so forth, but I find it difficult that up to this point in time I see nothing on the files and I have great difficulty in understanding why it is that no effort was made by the officers in our various Missions, and particularly the Permanent Representative to the UN at New York, to secure funding or financing to pay for the move to the second floor.

So we have this horrendous situation when we came into Government, because on September 2 bids were decided upon and people were put to work. The situation is that if we had sought at that time to breach the contract, all those people on the 17th and 18th floors who work for the Barbados Government would have found themselves on the pavement, because the landlord would have had no compunction about putting us out once we had breached the contract. Over all the years we had been an exemplary tenant. The landlord did not give us anything for that. Nothing in the lease showed that we gained anything by the fact that we were a good tenant over the years. The landlord did not have to go outside and advertise and look for somebody, we were there, we were renewing a lease, and to have agreed to such bad conditions borders on negligence on the part of the Government.

There is a long saga of dereliction of duty, of bad advice, poor judgement in this matter. It is going to cost the Government at least - because they are still in the process of arguing and negotiating about damages which have to do with the fact that we did not relocate at the time when we ought to have done - \$1.4 million. We are spending that kind of money on premises which we are never going to own and we are bound to a lease whose terms and conditions do not favour us. Of all the options that were put to me by the attorneys, the one option that was not put to me is that we should look at the earliest opportunity to get somebody to buy out that lease, get out of that and try and look for something that is better suited for our pocket and for our needs in New York.

It is really, Mr. Chairman, a disgraceful situation. The position is that this time last week we had three invoices in hand, the workmen were prepared to stop the work and we simply had to have the money. In the end, I have advised that the Government should take the position which we are here about today. This is, in the end, the cheapest way to go in the circumstances. It means that we do not have to pay any interest and it means that as soon as we can find alternative accommodation, an alternative situation which we think is more advantageous to us, we can set about trying to get ourselves out of that. But it is a nasty, ugly thing. I am shocked at the way in which senior Civil Servants have behaved. We have to be very careful in this administration that a lot of the nasty, squalid baggage that has come to us from the former administration does

not create a drag on our initiatives and *on* the charter for change that we are committed to. It means that we have had to be looking for money...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: This is baggage, this is like Sherbourne, this is like St Joseph Hospital.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member, but if the Honourable Member is talking about baggage, she is talking about Public Officers and she should so say. There are no political appointees involved here. If you say "nasty, squalid baggage" you should also identify you are discussing Public Officers. Do not leave any impression that you are discussing politicians and political appointees.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: No, no. St. Joseph Hospital dropped in because that is your trigger point to make a point, but it is the nasty, squalid baggage you have to say that you are saying that about the Public Officers.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But that is what you mean. The only people who are involved are Public Officers. Do not come with that.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, nobody will put words in my mouth. I will say what I mean. When I talk about nasty, squalid baggage, the buck stops at the Minister. I am saying that this is costly unfinished business, not unlike Sherbourne, not unlike the St Joseph Hospital, not unlike the unfinished Queen's College, not unlike the unfinished St. Thomas Secondary School and so many more I could talk about. All of those projects the Democratic Labour Party administration could not finish, but the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will get up in here today and look at page 29 of our Manifesto and say he does not see anything about rural development happening in Barbados yet, but in eight years he could not finish the Glebe Polyclinic, nor the St. John Polyclinic and the St. John Development Plan never began. I believe it never existed.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. That should be struck from the record. It is totally irrelevant to this debate, it has nothing to do with the Head which we are debating. If the Honourable Member wishes to deliver herself of that diatribe, she should have done it at the beginning.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Honourable Member was trying to expand on her point.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is a lot of nastiness that is coming down out of every Ministry. We heard a certain ministerial statement in here earlier today. Whenever the Democratic Labour Party leaves Government, the Barbados Labour Party has to come behind to be cleaning up a lot of graft and a lot of corruption, and we have to be very careful that this does not sidetrack us from what is our commitment to the people of Barbados, but there are things that we have to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has only one minute more. 9.30 p.m.

In that minute, Sir, all that I can do now is to say that this is \$1.5 million, at least at this time, and I am still counting, to finance what is still an awful piece of maladministration, an awful mess created, another situation where the Government was just left to run itself where there was no management of the situation and things just went on and on. If I had not gone to New York last week and had called back to the Minister of Finance to say this is the advice that I can give at this time, only heaven knows what the situation would be today. Certainly there would have been international embarrassment because the Barbadian people working at 800 Second Avenue would have been on the pavement and we would be at the end of a sticky lawsuit, diplomatic privilege notwithstanding. Our name would have been mud in New York.

This typifies what the Government's attitude was right across all of the Missions, not only New York. As I had to say earlier in here tonight, Brussels is a mess. Ottawa is a mess. Miami is a mess. We upgraded a Consulate General in Miami because somebody said that they wanted to get upgraded. No business in Miami,

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Changes are going to come. Miami is not the city from which business comes out of the South East of the United States. All these things were done to accommodate egos and private and personal interests, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, much of what I have heard from the Honourable Minister of Foreign Affairs I find extremely disturbing. Shocking. The question of \$1V₂ million going down the drain because of what the Honourable Minister classified as maladministration.

A number of things spring to mind. One was the fallacy that career diplomats had something in them

that non-career people did not have. In the period before 1986, the then Government took the decision that the Heads of Missions should be accounting officers whether they were career officers or non-career officers. The DLP Government took a decision that political appointees who are Heads of Missions could not be trusted to be accounting officers. If you are a politician and you are made a Head of a Mission, they felt that somehow or the other you were not suitable to look after the money of the Government of Barbados. I am glad to hear, Sir, that we have been vindicated because the people who run the Mission at the U.N. are career officers. The career officers are civil servants.

I have to make the point, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that a number of things would have to be considered in this whole debate. One is the fact that for our officers overseas it is difficult, particularly in a place like the U.N. We have very small missions overseas. The U.N. Mission is a very small mission and our U.N. officers are busy most of the time day and night. I think it is unreasonable to expect a Head of Mission to be doing the work at the U.N. which sometimes takes to 3 or 4 in the morning and still be responsible for negotiating lease contracts in New York City. Here in Barbados, there are agencies of Government that are responsible for dealing with these things. It is not every Permanent Secretary in home departments who is responsible for the negotiations of leases and building contracts and this kind of thing. Therefore it makes very little sense that we should do this when we are overseas. I could have foreseen from my experience in these matters that something like this would have arisen.

I find it a bit difficult too that the Minister said that she was in New York and she was moving around checking out the cost of real estate and leases in the area around the United Nations because I do not believe that it should fall to any Minister of Government to have to deal with these matters. These matters that fall fairly and squarely within the purview of the public officers. Around that area, Sir, this is the area around the U.N. where 800 Second Avenue is, the real estate is extremely expensive because of the very reason of its closeness to the United Nations. I am troubled too, Sir, by the fact that there is this movement from the 17th and 18th floor to the second floor for reasons of security. Downstairs at 800 Second Avenue there is immediately below the offices that will be occupied by the Barbados Government a coffee shop and stationery and therefore it is a question of security. Now the floors that were occupied at 800 Second Avenue below the 17th and 18th where the Barbados Government occupied offices was the Israeli Mission to the United Nations. There was a feeling when things are hot in the Middle East - and certain peace agreements were reached in the last year - that the 17th and the 18th floor of 800 Second Avenue were perhaps part of the safest accommodation in New

York, because of the known skills and abilities of the Israeli Government in looking after its own.

I am troubled about this 2nd floor and I am wondering if the Minister could tell us whether this is the only option that is left. She did mention that there were a few options and she is going for one of them. I am wondering whether this for security reasons is not the wrong place to be putting the Government offices in New York. Nearby, you have a building that is owned by Trinidad and Tobago, a big fancy building a block away and further up on Second Avenue is also a building owned by the Jamaican Government and both the buildings owned by the Trinidad and Tobago Government and the one by the Jamaica Government to my certain knowledge have space available in them. I have not been there last week but I have been there recently. I am just wondering whether the options are closed and whether the Government of Barbados could not be looking at those two areas rather than sitting on the 2nd Floor of 800 Second Avenue.

I also want to raise two other questions and one of them relates to the question of the integration of these overseas offices. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is now expanded into a super Ministry that deals with a number of external activities of Government other than political matters. We have a situation in New York where the IDC, the Tourist Board, the Consulate and the United Nations Mission barely co-exist. We have been talking about this for many years. There is a lot of duplication and multiplication of effort from what is reported to me. I am wondering whether in view of the new move, because I understand now that they are going on one floor as distinct from two floors as they occupied for many years in the past, whether because of this \$1.5 million we are wasting, if we cannot recoup some by doing a proper integration of those four agencies of Government and therefore see if we can have some genuine savings that we did not experience in the past. 9.40 p.m.

I would also like to say as my final point that perhaps in the future a lot of these problems can be avoided if professionals from Barbados are sent up to deal with certain matters and deal with the consultation in the cities where these matters arise.

I know that some years ago the Barbados Government contemplated buying a building at Second Avenue in New York and we sent up from Barbados property valuers and agents who were in a position to discuss with their peers in New York City and were able to give us advice which stood the test of time, so I guess the advice was good at the time, and prevented us from making a decision that could have been catastrophic for the finances of Barbados.

I am urging the Minister that perhaps, in the future, instead of leaving a harried and overworked head of mission who is working with only one or two diplomatic officers, that we send professionals to do what is, in fact, a professional job. This loss of \$1.4 million, I find even more distressing in view of the fact that we are in a situation generally where Government's finances are limited and where unnecessary expenditure has to be avoided. I am sure that I would not be entirely out of order if I say that this \$1.4 million could have put a good few of my constituents in St. George South to work. It is a lot of money to be going down the drain because of the negligence of whoever. I really do not know who it is.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: If it is the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, so be it. I do not know, but it is a lot of money to be going down the drain because of the negligence of any public officer. I am expecting and I am going to be keeping a very clear watch on these things to make sure that this kind of malfeasance, because that is apparently what it amounts to, does not happen again.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West keeps mentioning the public officer. He has already accepted that the buck stops with the Minister. This is not a buck, it is a lot of bucks. The Minister is responsible for what his officers do, no more or no less so than the Minister is responsible for other departments where we find this thing is happening with increasing regularity.

Mr. Chairman, I had said that was my final point, but I do want to say in closing that the accommodation for the offices of the Barbados Government in New York City is not in the category of lavish. The residences may be lavish but the office space for the Government of Barbados in New York is not at all lavish. Perhaps, it might be useful if the Government of Barbados might again give some consideration to moving away somewhat from that immediate area where the real estate is so expensive or if not, keeping only the UN mission in close proximity to the United Nations and then the others together in some other more reasonable location in the City.

Thank you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and I only have 15 minutes so I will try and see if I can compress what I have to say in that. The question of accommodation in New York for the Government of Barbados over the last 27 years has been a sorry story. There has been point and counter point and at the end of the day we have to examine the reality of our situation.

First of all, in the presentation by the two Honourable Members and more particularly the Minister, they seem to lose sight of the fact that leases are signed and they are long-term leases. There are no short-term leases. The Government of the Barbados Labour Party well understands the predicament because on one occasion during the 27 years let it not be forgotten the Barbados Labour Party Government paid leases both at one building near the United Nations and at Second Avenue at the same time for two years in order to secure the premises at 800, Second Avenue. At that time there were public officers who were misadvising them and they did not take advice at that time because when you have public officers functioning in that capacity in New York, you have to rely on them.

I think, however, that it is not right that the Minister in presenting this issue should leave any impression that there was some sordid continuous maladministration in relation to leases. She cannot do that properly without letting some of the sparks fall out on all of the public officers in New York and in Barbados and I do not think that is fair. I was Minister for 9 months or thereabouts.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: There can be no criticism of my 9 months. You think when you full up your mouth and put it in those terms that that will fool somebody but it will only fool the people who want to listen to you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is reminded that he has to address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member does not move me with her fulsome utterances. The Honourable Member must read the files and she will see that the first question raised about this lease, was raised by this Minister who refused to accept the advice that was given and told them that I wanted to hear more. When I became Minister it was settled already. I do not want the Honourable Member to come in here and leave any impressions. It was a done deal. The Minister before me had gone to New York and had sat down with all of the officers and had gone through the whole thing and it was agreed by all of them and the record so shows.

What is wrong, Sir, is that the Barbados Labour Party in its administration before, employed an unpaid lawyer. Whenever you have an unpaid lawyer you can expect the problem. I defy anyone to show me at any point along the way where our so-called legal adviser has ever received a fee from the Government of Barbados. Show me. Let the Honourable Member get up and show us where. Whenever you have a lawyer advising a client and not collecting a fee, you should start asking questions. Those were the questions I started to ask.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Why you did not ask the questions you are getting answers to? That is what I did about it because I did not understand it I still do not understand it. How can you have legal advice coining continuously over a long period of time and no one can show me what are the arrangements between the lawyer and the client That is the first problem.

Secondly, we are treating with the same landlord that we had from the time we moved from 801 Second Avenue to 800 Second Avenue. The move from 801 to 800 is the beginning of the confusion with 800, Second Avenue. There is a feeling in Barbados by a number of people that if you get a short-term benefit you do not have to worry about the long-term benefit All of the leases have been faulty, every single one of them since the one at 801, Second Avenue.

I declare an interest, Sir. I was Consul General when there was an 801, Second Avenue office so I might be blowing my own trumpet. But the leases have been faulty, not in the sense that there was anything wrong with them per se. What is wrong is the negotiating techniques that have been used, and we have been taken in constantly by the blandishments of the landlords in New York. If you look at this and if you look at the one in Canada people say, we will give you a whole year's rent free, we will help you with the moving expenses, we will do this and we will do that 9.50 p.m.

All of us. Do not say you all. This is no Democratic Labour Party/Barbados Labour Party situation, this is about Governments like ours who fall prey, what happens in the big cities with those sharks - the landlords and the people who negotiate and the entrepreneurs. If you do not pay for advice what you get you have to take. If you do not pay for proper advice you cannot be hgard subsequently to be letting it drop out of your mouths about who do this and who did that. You have never had proper legal advisers in New York on real estate and the legal advisers we have now, if you will check the files, were chosen by the Barbados Labour Party Government Before that person, there was a man called Penniston and we used to pay him \$1 000 a year. He was the best man of the right honourable gentleman that represented St. John and then he was replaced by an arrangement that can only be described as an amorphous arrangement.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, that is true. A thousand dollars a year, and we made sure there was an arrangement and that is the problem. No one can show you any

arrangements by which anybody is advised about doing anything. So do not let the Honourable Member come in here now leaving some impression that she suddenly went to New York and sat down with the people and ironed out this. Nothing was ironed out What we have is a lease that was signed some considerable time ago for some considerable time in the future. If it was a bad lease, it was a lease that was approved by legal minds that are superior to yours.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As the Honourable Member must know, the Cabinet is a decision making agency that operates on the basis of the information that is available to it at the time. I have never heard anybody describe a lease as a bad lease who knew about leases. Suffice it to say, and it is important because they always throw out these little throw aways so that the people can grab them like morsels and then run with them and they then build on them. The fact is that whatever arrangement was made in New York, was made as far as the Cabinet of the day was concerned, in good faith.

This Minister raised questions about it and the files will so show. As a matter of fact the Minister was described as obstreperous.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order it is not correct to say that it was made in good faith. I have already said that the attorney had advised me that they never intended to take up the landlord's loan even though it was built in the lease. That is where the Financial Rules were broken.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What financial rules is the Honourable Member talking about. The Honourable Member knows that the Financial Rules which she has not pursued or perused in years, make provision for decisions made outside of Barbados not to fall completely within the ambit of the financial rules. Do not quote the Financial Rules about something in New York City. New York City does not operate on the basis of the Financial Rules of Barbados. The Financial Administration and Audit Act of 1964 is an antediluvian piece of legislation that has been written. It is antediluvian and you cannot bring it up and every time throw it out so that people out there who do not understand what is going on could be confused. You have rules in here that are impossible of application.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have never been in trouble with the St Joseph Hospital, I am in trouble with you. I always get into trouble with the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member happens to understand that it is her attorney that was chosen by the Barbados Labour Party

that has advised and if the attorney never intended to negotiate and he advised and she cannot so show, Sir ... The Honourable Member cannot show any advice that was given by the attorney on the file. All she can show, Sir, is communication from the Head of Mission which says that the attorney has advised as follows. We cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. If you do not pay for advice how do you expect to quarrel about what you get.

Now, Sir, the lease was signed in 1992. In 1992 it was agreed that by 1994 they would move. What the Honourable Member did not say to this Committee is that the Israelis were involved and part of the arrangement that was made then was not capable of fulfillment now.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAUT: We had structural adjustment, Sir. And in the structural adjustment we were not permitted or allowed or agreed to borrow, spend or expend large sums of money. When the lease that we had was coming to an end and was capable of being replaced by a lease that could be paid for subsequently, the officers in the United States, working for the Government of Barbados saw it as a proper way of accommodating both requirements for Barbados. It is not fair now to load it off on them as if they were doing something criminal. At that time Barbados was not even permitted to buy a pack of sugar cakes beyond a certain level.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: The Honourable Member is concerned about the Guatemala sugar. The Honourable Member has certain predilections for certain matters which I do not know anything about. The Honourable Member knows about the Guatemala sugar. The Honourable Member knows about special deals. The Honourable Member has much information about those kinds of things and the Honourable Member has relationships in various cities in the United States that will allow her to know about those things. Sir, I do not know about them so I cannot talk about the Guatemala sugar. I can talk about the fact that the lease which was signed, was signed in good faith because the Government assumed that the information was valid.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will Members please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Government has no option to buy. If you cannot spend money somebody can offer you but if you are not entitled to spend money... You said earlier in another debate why the Government is in danger

of losing money in Brussels because it literally could not come up with the rest of the funding to avoid losing the deposit in Brussels and it is no point pretending that the Government was made up of super humans. The Government of the day at that time was in mortal financial difficulty.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Or whoever. The fact is though that to now turn on those facts and throw them on their heads is to be, at the most, unreasonable.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that if the Honourable Member would give an honest representation of what she has found on the files she will indicate...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two more minutes.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I actually read from the file and that remark absolutely has to be withdrawn. 10.00 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will withdraw it, Sir. I invite the Honourable Member to read what the Minister before her wrote on the file in relation to the matter. That would settle it. If the Honourable Member would get up and read the minute which the Minister wrote to the Permanent Secretary. That would help. That would settle the matter. I would say nothing more. Because the Honourable Member left "sleazy-like" from her mouth the impression that there was some hanky-panky maladministration which therefore led the Honourable Member for St George South to talk about malfeasance. All the Honourable Member has to do is to read the files properly, Sir. I know she can read. I have heard her reading. I will take the risk and say that she can read.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: When you put the new Permanent Representative in New York, he would have had ministerial experience as well and therefore he would be able to iron out this. The Honourable Member likes to have personal representation wherever she is functioning. So when she puts the new Permanent Representative in New York all will be well. He will iron out this mess.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We know who it is not going to be. We know about that. It definitely will not be him.

Sir, this question of the lease cannot be put into the same framework as for the next 20 months there will

be a beating of it in the *Advocate* Newspaper with the editorials about malfeasance and maladministration. This is a straightforward case.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: The built-out is part of the normal methodology of moving in New York. Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable Member is not saying to you by putting it in terms of \$1.4 million, that it is US\$700 000. The US\$700 000 is apparently the fee which is being charged for reproducing on the second floor a set of offices which the Honourable Member for St George South said are not lavish. If you are going to move in New York City, Sir, you have to pay an engineer and designer, and you have the offices in a particular way. It is US\$700 000 and for all the space that is being used it is not considered exorbitant. For them to talk about \$1.4 million as if it was some magic number is not fair. We would have paid for it by coming to the House of Assembly because the same officers who advised you to come here would have been the officers who advised the Government

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member should wind up his presentation.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member must have brought it herself. But that is not valid, Sir. If she is saying that she brought it down here by herself without any help, well then she should get rid of them. They now have 4 Permanent Secretaries where we only had one. If she got no advice, she should get rid of them or they should get rid of her. Because she is not taking any advice from them she is of no use. If they are not giving her advice, they are of no use. If she said that she was not advised, either she should go or they should go. There are 4 Permanent Secretaries in there. But we would have done exactly what you have done. We would come down here for \$1.4 million or whatever. They went out to tender. They had 7 tenders who came in.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I never agreed to anything.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please address the Chair and wind up his presentation? Finish your sentence and wind up your presentation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was not in any Cabinet that agreed to anything. If a Minister brings a matter to the Cabinet and it is well reasoned, the Cabinet does not go behind to find what it is the Minister is reasoning about and US\$700 000 would not have been included in the lease

because the lease did not have anything that would have said what the configuration of the offices would be. This US\$700 000 is to pay for putting the IDC, BMC, QEC, QPT and all of them in such a way that when people come into the offices they will get an image of Barbados. That is what it is all about and US\$700 000 is normal in New York City. The Honourable Member is misleading the House if she does not give better information than that, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I listened to all of that talk, which is nothing new in here, from the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. The fact is that in the lease the Barbados Government in 1992 agreed to a landlord loan at 10 per cent interest in excess of US\$600 000. The Honourable Member for St Michael West is now saying that if he were still the Foreign Minister today that he would do exactly what I am doing. That means that he had no intention of picking up the landlord's loan and they had agreed for works to start..this is where the financial rules were breached..in New York and not a cent was voted by this Parliament to pay for it. That is a serious breach of the financial rules. I listened with care to hear the Honourable Member for St Michael West say that the financial rules of this country are antediluvian and irrelevant. I do not want to hear about you and every Ministry. We know what you did in yours.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has a lot of difficulty with the law. So the word "antediluvian" might create a problem for her. But the Honourable Member's Government has indicated that these are in need of amendment and repeal in some instances. So there is no point in getting up and talking about antediluvian. That is foolishness.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member actually said here tonight that they do not apply in New York. He said that and he was the Foreign Minister who presided over the last nine months on this.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. If the Honourable Member understood the law, she would agree that they do not apply in New York in some instances. They do not apply in New York. They cannot. For example, Sir, these rules require that every sum that is received a receipt must be issued for and a stamp be placed on it.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are one or two things that have to be cleared. There is an attorney who has worked for successive administrations in New York. This attorney is in fact paid out of the Crown Solicitor's Office. It is not my fault that the Honourable Member for St Michael West does not know that So

it is not as though it is *pro bono* work. He is paid out of the Crown Solicitor's Office. He is not paid out of the Foreign Affairs vote.

The fact is this, Sir. We are hoping on the second floor at 800 Second Avenue to put in place what we are calling a "country team approach" so that all of those four divisions are there. You see, Sir, in the past Foreign Affairs did not have Foreign Trade and did not have International Business, and it did not have any goals in common with IDC and Tourism Authority. Now that all four entities under this administration have certain goals in common, we are hoping that it will be easier and more efficient for them to work together. It is ridiculous that there will be 4 messengers, 4 receptionists, 4 drivers and 6 motor cars.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: The Honourable Member is misleading the House because she is leaving the impression that there are 4 messengers, 4 drivers and 4 motor cars and none of that is true. The Honourable Member just said that she has just come from New York. Maybe it has changed. In fact, one of the things that can be said about the officers is that in terms of the visitor numbers they have one receptionist.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, back to the problems which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was so busy dealing with, matters that were unfinished in the Ministry, he did not pay enough attention to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member will give way, Sir. She has given way. One of the things that history will record is that the most ever accomplished in Foreign Affairs was accomplished in the one year that the Minister was there. Do not come with that Check the four main things that we achieved. I can give you chapter and verse even though you do not want to acknowledge it One of the greatest achievements that Barbados has ever had in foreign policy happened during our office. You cannot move that

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You mean the photograph of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West that arrived after the elections and the light that was to shine <yi it in the Ministry up at Culloden Road. 10.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are residences in New York and in our Missions around the world, and as I have said already, where we are going to have a property audit. As I have said already, there is going to be a property audit. We have to manage these properties in a decent way. Gone are the days, Sir, when small developing countries like ours

can afford the most expensive real estate in midtown to house a Chancery and the most expensive real estate in the suburbs to house a residence. We cannot afford it, it is not the case anymore. The Governments of Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, the Bahamas and a whole host of others now house their people in Manhattan. Property rates are cheaper in Manhattan than in Pelham and New Rochelle where we have big, lugubrious premises that we cannot afford to upkeep. All of this has to be reviewed, a cost analysis has to be done and we have to make a decision as to whether we are going to continue to do business in the old fashioned way at terrible expense and a lot of wastage as well, or whether we will get modern. Big Cadillac motor cars, when you could buy three good Lincoln town cars for the cost of one Cadillac.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Do not tell me it is not true. I just checked it out last week. I know whereof I speak, but you are talking about somebody who would go and stay in a suite for US\$400 a night

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. To say that you could get three town cars for the price of one Cadillac is deliberately, grossly misleading. Mr. Chairman, the Cadillac which they have is tax free. The town cars which they will buy will not be tax free because town cars are not tax free, and there is no way you can get three town cars to equal one Cadillac, even if it is a gold Cadillac. The Honourable Member must know that the Mission had a directive to lease instead of purchase cars. That is how you save money, not purchasing town cars. In New York City all of the Missions are doing exactly that

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you have made the point.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The priorities will change. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs now, Mr. Chairman, has an economic component in it. It is going to be a productive Ministry, it is out there to do the people's business and bring the business home and generate jobs in this country. No more cooling out jobs.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You are bound to hear that from a Minister who went up there to stay in the New York Helmsley at US\$410 a night, so-he will not see anything wrong with that

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It is clear that this debate is now getting down to the gutter. It is not true that I ever stayed at the Helmsley. The Helmsley has \$170 a night and they multiply it by 2. I know

the Honourable Member cannot multiply too well, but two 170's cannot come to 410.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: Because a suite is two rooms.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I checked that out too, US\$410 a night Mr. Chairman, the point is that this mess at 800 Second Avenue, as I have said, is in the order of the St Joseph Hospital, Sherbourne and a whole host of other projects which the forma* administration has left in a state of confusion, maladministration and in conditions where we now have to be expending money that could better have been spent to be promoting our plans, our programmes and our policies.

I beg to move that the Head stand part

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. OS. ARTHUR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution, with amendments, in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Honourable House do now adjourn until Tuesday, October 25, 1994 at 11.00 un.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 10.20 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES****Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER.....**

13

**Confirmation of Minutes of Wednesday,
October 5, 1994.****ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE
SPEAKER.....**

13

Receipt of Accounts and Statements for the months of March, April, May and June 1994 as prepared by the Accountant General.

**MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL****Mr. SPEAKER 14**

Message No. 1/1994 informing the House that Her Excellency the Governor-General, Dame Nita Barrow, GCMG, DA, will be absent from the country during the period October 13 to November 12, 1994 and that the Hon. Sir Denys Williams, KCMG, GCM, will perform the functions of the office during that period.

PAPERS**Hon. O. S. ARTHUR 14**

1. The Representation of the People (Expenses) (Amendment) Regulations, 1994.
2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 2) Order, 1994.
3. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 4) Order, 1994.
4. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 5) Order, 1994.
5. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 6) Order, 1994.
6. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 7) Order, 1994.
7. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 8) Order, 1994.
8. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1994.

9. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 10) Order, 1994.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES**Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 14**

1. Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 269 000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1994-95 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1994-95 No. 1 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
2. The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES**Mr. H. deB. FORDE 14**

Resolution to take note of the Throne Speech delivered by Her Excellency the Governor-General on October 5, 1994.

FIRST READING OF BILLS**Hon. O. S. ARTHUR 14**

1. The Supplementary Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1994.
2. The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1994.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS**Hon. G. W. PAYNE 14**

Statement concerning the granting of Public Service Vehicle Permits.

OBITUARY SPEECHES**Mr. B. M. TAITT 16**

Tribute to the late Sir C. Edwy Talma, former Member of Parliament and expression of condolences to his family.

Hon. H. B. St John, 17; Mr. H. deB. Forde, 17; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 18; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 19.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 20**

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 - THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION (NO. 5) BILLS, 1994 ____ 20

Hon. O. S. Arthur, 20, 26, 42; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 26,42,43; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 33; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 40, 43; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 43.

HEAD 10 - GOVERNOR-GENERAL - \$17 500 .. 48

HEAD 12 - PARLIAMENT - \$156 000 49

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE-
\$74 193..... 49

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE - \$1 714 300 ____ 49

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF CIVIL SERVICE -
\$539965..... 49

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE -
\$1 769 918..... 49

Mr. B. M. Taitt, 49; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 51; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 51; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 54, 57; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 55; Hon. H. B. St John, 56.

HEAD 20 - MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS
- \$22 639 57

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE,
FOOD AND FISHERIES - \$1 552 604..... 57

Hon. H. B. St. John, 57; Mr. D. StE. Kellman, 58; Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 58.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS -
\$1 036 940 59

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 59; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 60.

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECU
TIONS - \$11 Oil 62

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL, MINISTRY
OF JUSTICE AND MINISTRY OF CARICOM
AFFAIRS - \$376 808 62

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND
CULTURE - \$6 475 438 62

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 64, 66; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 62; Hon. H. B. St John, 65.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS -
\$1557890 66

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 66; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 67.

HEAD 37 - MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT,
HOUSING AND LANDS - \$3 452 455..... 68

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF TRADE, INDUSTRY
AND COMMERCE - \$300 000..... 68

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, PUBLIC
WORKS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND SPORTS - \$799 625..... 68

ORDER NO. 4 - COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1994-95 N O .
1 68

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 68; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 71; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 71; Mr. L. R. Tull, 71.

SUSPENSIONS 25, 61

ADJOURNMENT ^78

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 78.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St. James North) FORDE, Mr. H. deB. (Christ Church West) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KELLMAN, Mr. D. St.E. (St. Lucy) MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown) MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East) PAYNE, Hon. G. W. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) ST. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church South) TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St John)