

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 20, 1995.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.15 a.m. o'clock on Tuesday, June 20, 1995.

PRESENT

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

J.R,

Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.)

Mr. L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P.

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.) (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

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

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

Mr. J. O. TUDOR, J.P.

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

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, J.P., B.A. (Hons.), Dip. Ed., LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development)

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

Mr. D. Carter

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

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

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

Mr. F. J. STUART, B.A., LL.M.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, J.P., B.A., Dip. Ed., B.Sc. (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Minister of Health and the Environment)

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

Prayers were led by Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 13th June, 1995.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of proceedings of the Honourable the House of Assembly for Tuesday, the 13th day of June, 1995, which Minutes have been circulated, be taken as read.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to report that I am in receipt of the Special Report of the Ombudsman for Barbados on the Inequitable Operation of the Severance Payments Act.

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the Sugar Industry (Sugar Workers Provident Fund) Order, 1995.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit (Amendment) Bill, 1995 be read a first time.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that, Sir. *The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Agricultural Diagnostic and Other Services (Fees) Bill, 1995 be read a first time.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that those Standing Orders so mentioned be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting. All those Honourable Members in favour please say Aye, those against please say No.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on that motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Standing Orders which the Leader of the House proposes to suspend relate to the arrangement of business for today's sitting. Standing Order No. 20 - 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 - relates to the order in which matters are taken.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since January 1995 Standing Order No. 20 has been suspended on every occasion that this House has met. Because of the suspension of this Order, Private Members' Business has not been facilitated during the course of the day's sitting. The Opposition has not objected because we believe that Government should be given the opportunity to conclude its business, but we have always been ready at any time, when Private Members' Business is called, to debate matters which are on the Order Paper in respect of Private Members' Business.

I wish to make it abundantly clear today, Sir, as I did last week, that the Opposition is ready to debate any and all matters which are on the Order Paper with respect to Private Members' Business, and I will go a step further and say that those matters specifically which are in my name on the Order Paper I am ready to debate in the order in which I see fit when Private Members' Business is called, and therefore the Opposition is not agreeing to the suspension of Standing Order No. 20, if in the event of that suspension, Private Members' Business will not be accommodated, because this is now nearly six months that

Private Members' Business has not been accommodated by the House and this particular Standing Order has been suspended.

Now, Sir, the reason why this concerns me is because as I understand it attempts were made during this session to have Items removed from the Order Paper which constituted Private Members' Business because, according to interpretations which were put before Your Honour, a period of time had elapsed under the Standing Orders which would have made it necessary for those Items to be removed. We had a previous precedent to this, Sir, in another session of this House when the then Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, found that matters had been removed from the Order Paper without his consent and the House agreed to put them back on. He made the very telling point on that occasion, which I wish to reiterate, that normally the Opposition goes along with Government's desire to suspend Standing Order No. 20 so that Government's Business can be facilitated. But I wish to make it very clear that as soon as Private Members' Business is called the Opposition is ready to debate those Items which are on the Order Paper standing in the name of myself, and in particular, to conclude the debate on the Resolution relating to casino gambling, to commence debate on the no-confidence motion in the Minister of Education and to commence, and conclude if necessary, the debate relating to the anniversary of Combermere School.

So we are ready, Sir, and I wish to say therefore that we cannot support the suspension of this Standing Order if Private Members' Business is not going to be accommodated.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have heard the Honourable Member. I will direct a question directly to the Leader of the House. Can you give the Honourable Member the assurance that Private Members' Business will be accommodated?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will be very happy to advise that the Government is ready at this moment to proceed with Private Members' Business in respect of Item No. 3 under Private Members' Business on the Order Paper. It is important that we... 11.25a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The assurance has been given that Private Members' Business will be accommodated. There is a Motion before the Floor.

The question that those Standing Orders so mentioned be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We would propose Sir, that Item No. 3 undo* Private Members' Business standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be the order of the day.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I assume that is a Motion which is being made. I have 3 items on the Order Paper and I believe it would be unheard of in the parliamentary history of the Commonwealth if the person who has the items on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business must be subject to the dictates of the Government. There can be no basis on which another Member in this House can require a Member who has resolutions under Private Members' Business to take them in the order in which they wish to take them.

I am ready, Sir, to do Private Members' Business. We have a matter which was started on November 15. Debate took place on January 24. The matter has not been concluded. The Government requested that further consideration be postponed and I wish to tidy up those matters which I have under Private Members' Business lest a Rule be invoked against me. That Resolution predates the one in relation to the Kola Syrup. As soon as I have concluded debate on that matter, we can then get to the issue of Item No. 3. So I am ready, Sir, to conclude debate with respect to Item No. 2 and then I will proceed to commence debate with respect to Item No. 3.

I am ready and the Opposition is ready, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, today is the 20th day of June, 1995. Exactly 6 months ago, on the 20th day of December, 1994 the Motion standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, No. 3 * under Private Members' Business, notice of this Resolution was given in this House. It is the custom and practice in this House of Assembly, Sir, of long-standing that Motions of No-Confidence Against Ministers of the Crown should be dealt with expeditiously and the practice and the custom has been that the Government should set aside a date at the earliest opportunity for the matter to be debated.

On 2 separate occasions, during the month of January this year, the 20th of December having fallen during Christmas week, I offered to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the opportunity for debate of this Motion understanding it to be a motion which the Leader of the Opposition would want to be debated expeditiously. On both occasions this was done. This offer was made on the Floor of this Honourable House and on both occasions the Leader of the Opposition declined my offer.

I have in my possession a letter written to me by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition dated the 23rd January, 1994 which starts in this way and I quote:

Aside.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: It was a mistake. It was meant to be 1995.

It starts:

"Dear Miss Miller.

Thank you for your letter dated January 20, 1994 in which you were kind enough to inform me of your desire to request that His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly agreed to the broadcast of certain debates."

The letter goes on to say.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Read the whole thing out? Very well.

"Consequent on my consultations with the Opposition parliamentary group, I will respond formally to your missive. It is assumed that this method of writing to His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly to request that certain debates be broadcast live on television and radio will be the method used until arrangements acceptable to all Members of the House are put in place, that it indicates that each individual Member must be entitled to say whether or not he wishes his contribution broadcast.

In the interim period, am I to assume that your request of His Honour will constitute the methods which Members, as individuals or on behalf of their respective parliamentary groups, should use to have their debates broadcast. If so, one would expect that His Honour would rule on this issue because I am likely to raise it during the Motion on the Adjournment of the House.

Yours faithfully"

I have in my possession Mr. Speaker, Sir, another letter written to me by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition dated the 18th day of January, 1995.

"Dear Miss Miller.

A No-Confidence Motion in the Minister of Education.

I regard yesterday's debate on the Adjournment as being unnecessarily divisive and contentious on an issue which could as His Honour the Speaker of the House has advised be resolved through discussion.

In that vein, since the Speaker has approved the Resolution, one assumes that he would regard your comment about it being frivolous and vexatious as being contemptuous of his decision. That apart, Private Members' Business is not governed by the Leader of Government Business in the House.

I have no intention of, nor the power to delay Government's Business, but it will be a matter for me subject to the Standing Orders of the House when the debate will commence on the No Confidence Motion.

In due course, I will inform you in writing of my decision."

Signed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition has consistently been making the point in recent times that we on the Government side would not call Private Members' Business.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, behind Your Honour's Chair, said to me that he would indicate to me, and then in writing I have it here, on the 18th of January. Even before I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition on the 20th of January he had written me on the 18th of January making it clear that it will be a matter for him to indicate when he wishes to debate.

Now, Sir, as I have said already. This is a Motion of No Confidence in a Minister of the Crown. It is my duty as Leader of the House as expeditiously as possible to make debating time available to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for this.

I have done so on 2 occasions. This is the 3rd occasion on which the Government is offering an entire day for the debate of this Motion.

Sir, I go back to Standing Order 26(3) and I read it again.

"If an interval of three calendar months has elapsed after notice of motion has been given without further action having been taken on the motion,¹¹ [as in the case of this No Confidence Resolution] "the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn unless the House otherwise orders."

There is a proviso, Sir.

"Provided that the time during which the House is in recess, shall not be counted in computing the interval of three calendar months herein before mentioned."

I have checked with the Clerk, Sir. The House has not been in recess in the interim and by the counting of the Clerks at the Table this matter would have been deemed to be withdrawn on the 18th day of April, 1995 because no further action has been taken.

The difference between this Resolution and the Resolution on Casino Gambling is that further action has been taken on the Resolution re casino gambling so that Resolution is not caught by Standing Order 26(3). The Resolution re No-Confidence in the Honourable Minister of Education no further action has been taken on it and so by virtue of that it is caught by Standing Order 26(3). 11:35a.m.

I am saying, Sir, that the Government is ready to proceed at this time with debate on this matter according to the custom and practice of this Honourable House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, I bring your attention once again to Standing Order 26(3). As far as this House is concerned the Standing Order clearly says that this motion is deemed to have been withdrawn unless the House otherwise orders.

Today, I make it clear. We are not going down the route we went down last time. I want to hear from all Honourable Members now if the House otherwise orders and let us proceed, please. Am I to understand that the House otherwise orders? Do we have a motion or where do we go? It is deemed to have been withdrawn as the Standing Order clearly states here "unless the House otherwise orders". I am asking Honourable Members - is the House otherwise ordering?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I beg to move that for the purposes of today's sitting that Standing Order No. 26(3) be suspended to facilitate debate on the no-confidence motion after we have concluded the debate on Item No. 2 on the Order Paper.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could you for the benefit of the Chair, please give me that again, Sir?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am moving that Standing Order No. 26(3), which would deem this Resolution as having been withdrawn, be suspended for today's sitting so that we can have debate in relation to Item No. 3 as soon as we have concluded debate on Item No. 2 on the Private Memr -rs' Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that what the Chair would like you to do is to recognise that you...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I will move the suspension....

Mr. SPEAKER: But at the same time you are adding on a whole set of conditionality once again.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I will take the conditions off.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could you give us...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am moving for the suspension of Standing Order No. 26(3).

Mr. SPEAKER: Seconded?

Aside.

The question that Standing Order No. 26(3) be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, His HONOUR R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL and Mr. G. A. CLARKE - 14.

Ayes: Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. F. J. STUART, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN - 7.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: "Unless the House otherwise decides" so it remains then?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business be the order of the day.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It would be improper for the Leader, I submit, to move that Private Members' Business is a matter for private members.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please. Am I to understand that we are still on the item of Private Members' Business? Which item is being proposed that we discuss?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude debate in respect of Item No. 2 on the Order Paper. I am begging to move that further

consideration of Item No. 2 take place now and if no further Members wish to speak on the Item, I would wrap up debate in respect of Item No. 2.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. I have already stated on the Floor of this House this morning that I am offering the entire balance of this day to debate on Item No. 3 standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition under Private Members' Business. If the Honourable Member for St. John does not wish to proceed with that Item, I am disposed to close Private Members' Business at this time.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put this matter in some perspective. The Leader of the House was out of the island at the end of last week on Government Business. She asked me to write the Leader of the Opposition to alert him once again and I believe this is for the third time that the Government proposed to set aside today for debate on his no-confidence motion. 11:45a.m.

You have to bear with me, Sir. I am going to read my letter into the record.

"The Honourable the Leader of the House of Assembly, Miss B. A. Miller has had to leave the island on urgent Government Business. She has asked that I convey the following to you in respect of the No Confidence Motion standing in your name on the Order Paper of the House of Assembly.

1. Your motion has been on the Order Paper since December 20, 1994 and no action has been taken thereon subsequently.
2. Under Standing Order 26. (3) the Motion is deemed to have been withdrawn as at April 18, 1995 insofar as there has been no recess of Parliament since the day of filing the Motion.
3. It has been the custom and practice of the House of Assembly that Motions of No Confidence are treated seriously by Governments and are dealt with expeditiously. Notwithstanding that the Motion may strictly be characterized as a Private Members' Motion, it has been the custom and practice of the House of Assembly that the Government sets aside a special time to provide the occasion for debate of the Motion at the earliest opportunity available after filing.
4. I am advised that in correspondence passing between you and the Leader of the House you expressed a wish to initiate debate on the No Confidence Motion after conclusion of the debate on your Resolution concerning casino gambling. As events have turned out, debate on casino

gambling has commenced but has not been concluded, as at the time of this letter.

5. The Government is anxious to have the Motion of No Confidence debated and disposed of without further delay.
6. The Honourable Leader of the House has asked me to reiterate her statements on the ROOT of the House during the debate on the Motion for adjournment last Tuesday that the Government is proposing to set aside Tuesday, June 20 as the date for debate of the Motion of No Confidence filed by you against the Minister of Education, the Honourable M. A. Mottley and should be obliged if you would let me know whether you are prepared to debate the motion on Tuesday, June 20, as offered."

I received a reply yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition which went into all kinds of things other than what I was writing about I think I must read that one too, to be fair.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am going to read all 4 pages of it.

"Thank you for your letter dated 16th June, 1995 which seeks to intervene to resolve an issue created by the conduct of the Leader of the House."

It is not true of course. I was not intervening. I said I was substituting for the Minister who was out of the island.

"I- welcome the opportunity to reply to your message as follows:

1. The fact that no action has been taken on the matter of my Motion since December 20, 1995."

He gets these years wrong all the time. He means 1994:

"is as a result of the decision by the Leader of the House in not facilitating debate on Private Members' Motions since 1994 when the casino gambling resolution was debated and then, at the Government's request, deferred. Private Members' Business has not been dealt with in the last 6 months and for that matter the House has met with frequent lengthy breaks for the past 6 months. That apparently was the Leader of the House who requested the broadcast on the Motion against the Minister of Education and

Culture together with one other item under Private Members' Business.

I was heartened to hear the Speaker point out to the House last week that there was some misunderstanding relating to the matter of whose request it was to broadcast the debate. It was in fact as a result of receiving our letter dated January 20, 1995 from the Leader of the House which sought the Speaker's permission to broadcast certain debates including the No Confidence Motion that our parliamentary group met and agreed to the terms of a letter dated January 23, 1995 which was addressed to the Speaker and sought to clarify the matter of broadcast of parliamentary debates during an interim period which is now almost 6 months.

Thereafter an article appeared in the NATION newspaper and the Speaker called *for* a meeting between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition and then made a ruling on a matter which, strictly speaking, was not before the House. That meeting was the first and only meeting held between the Speaker, the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition on such a matter. It was held, after the request was made relative to the broadcast of certain debates.

It was specifically decided that in future such matters would be dealt with through consultation, none of which has taken place since then, except at your behest when we were dealing with the Vagrancy (Amendment) Bill. It was thoroughly misleading and mischievous for any statement to be made to the House which represented that I had requested the broadcast of the No Confidence Motion. But the Opposition welcomes its public broadcast. The relevance of this to the entire issue is that the Government appears unable to effectively make provision for the broadcast of parliamentary debates and this has been another reason why the casino gambling resolution has not been completed and debate on the Motion of No Confidence started.

2. Your interpretation of Standing Order 26. (3) does not accord with mine and is merely an opinion of a Member of the House. But this matter does not fail to be determined on any individual Member's interpretation and is a matter for the Speaker to rule on."

That is why I am reading this letter, Sir, because the Leader of the Opposition says it is a matter for you to rule on.

"having hopefully heard and listened to submissions of Members and then giving due regard to his ruling as clected Speaker of the House and

not to die Government I have been a Member of the House of Assembly of Barbados for almost 8 years and I accept fully the matter which you relate as customary or as forming part of the practice of the House except, that I do not think that you wish to convey the impression that the procedures of the House are subject only to Government's dictates. Had the Leader of the House facilitated Private Members' Business between December, 1994 and now, the No Confidence Motion could have been disposed of quickly.

Thank you for acknowledging that there has been correspondence between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition because until I had heard from you I was of the impression that it was never received by the Leader of the House since the common courtesy of a reply to my letter was not offered.

5. I share your desire to have the Motion of No Confidence debated and disposed of without delay. But I reiterate my position, previously stated in correspondence and on the Floor of the House that I should like Private Members' Business called at our next sitting so that I can complete debate on the Casino Gambling Motion and commence debate on the No Confidence Motion.

In that regard, the Leader of the House is free to say anything she wishes on the Floor of the House or elsewhere. Those who take the view that Government's offer is unconditional or that the Standing Orders are unconditional may persist in such a view if they are so inclined.

The natural consequence of the Speaker's ruling last Tuesday that the Standing Orders are not conditional is that Private Members' Business should not be dealt with conditionally on Government setting aside a day for a debate. But it is clear that that logical conclusion will not be pursued.

The House of Assembly's role should not be subordinated in such a way to the dictates of the Government. We would normally, in such circumstances, seek the protection of the Speaker and his understanding of the role of Private Members' Business. Regrettably there are some who take the view that removing an item from the Order Paper represents some final act by which a Member is forever stopped from dealing with an issue. But my own response to any such action will be simply to restore the Motion and debate it thereafter, on the same conditions. But when Private Members' Business is called on Tuesday, the Opposition will be ready to debate any and all items on the Order Paper.

Finally when last the Leader of the House and I met with the Speaker, it was decided that matters such as this should be dealt with in consultation between the Leaders. The Leader of the House rose last week and was permitted, in speaking on the Adjournment, to comment fully on her disposition prior to consulting me. Regrettably, time interruptions and an unanticipated ruling from the Chair reduced the scope of my response. In the circumstances I feel no longer obligated to a process which is being flagrantly disregarded by the Leader of the House and I propose to let the Speaker know that these matters which require consultation should be dealt with by the Leader of the House formally in writing and that I will not now restrain myself from commenting on this publicly and in the media, if requested.

Yours faithfully,
Leader of the Opposition."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the importance of this letter from the Leader of the Opposition resides in the fact that he took issue with me to the interpretation of Standing Order 26 (3). I said in my letter that under the Standing Order, the Motion is deemed to have been withdrawn, 3 months having elapsed and so on. He said and I wish you to listen, Mr. Speaker, "This matter does not fall to be determined on any individual Member's interpretation." He said my interpretation does not accord with his. It is a matter for the Speaker to rule on having heard and listened to submissions of Members."

In the light of that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move a Motion that Your Honour rule on whether this matter is deemed to have been withdrawn. I have 2 more things. That is the first one. I am going to move it this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, before you do, there is no need for any Motion. The Standing Order clearly states the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn and I have made my position clear on that a few minutes ago. The Honourable Member could you take your seat one minute please? I have made my position clear on that. We had a motion moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition which was defeated, and as I stated, the Standing Order clearly states here, unless the House otherwise orders, and I am asking, are you moving a motion which will show me or show this House that the House otherwise orders. Can we have the motion, please, and let us move on? I think we have really spent too much time on this. Let us move on, please. 11:55 a.m.

DR. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order please.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking and you asked me to take my seat. I am claiming my right to speak. Mr. Speaker, insofar as Your Honour had indicated that the Standing Order is clear that the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn then it serves no useful purpose having it on the Order Paper. I therefore move that this motion be removed from the Order Paper insofar as it has been deemed to have been withdrawn.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member *for* St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I wish just to make a very brief contribution to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, let us hear the Honourable Member.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wish to make a brief contribution on this matter because it is causing me some disturbance. I am disturbed to the extent that it is my understanding that if a No Confidence Motion is brought, either in a Government in particular or in a Minister, that the sole responsibility of the Leader of the House is to appoint a day, as soon as possible, subject only the exigencies of Government Business for the debate and disposal of that particular motion.

I think there has been some element of delay in the appointment of the day and it would seem to me that there is some element of delay in the appointment of the day because that is not a matter of negotiation. There is a presumption, as I understand the Westminster system, that once a day is set aside that is the end of the obligation of the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House certainly cannot take the next step to determine which item of Private Members' Business is debated at any given time. She cannot cross that barrier. Therefore I do not see what the issue is. A day has been set aside and, as far as I am concerned, I do not see what the issue is.

Now, just one minute. I am not finished. I want to say this too. We have to take this matter of no confidence motions in this House more seriously. For some time now there has been a lot of dilly dallying and delays in relation to the provision of time for debating no confidence motions and this has led, in my view, to a departure from the fundamental assumptions of the Westminster System. I believe that this is now the third occasion on which this has happened in the past 5 years. I believe, Sir, that you need, Sir, as Speaker of the House to deal with that particular matter. As far as you, the Leader of the House, are concerned you have appointed a day, nothing more is your business at all. If the Opposition does not deal with

the matter it is also in your discretion whether you suspend Private Members' Business and move on or what you do. So let us have no more messing around and above all let us not behave in a manner which I think undermines that very fundamental principle of the need to deal with these issues.

You see, Sir, in the long run there is going to come a time when a No Confidence Motion will dislodge or may dislodge somebody. Therefore it is very, very important that these principles be adhered to, so that in no circumstances, anyone can duck around no confidence motions and linger on in office beyond a particular time otherwise you will have people loitering in office when in fact it would be the expressed wish of Government to deal with it. We need, Sir, to establish these fundamental rules and unless we do that, and I think as Leader of the House, I think you caused a bit of the confusion because if you had stuck to your remit, full stop, that would have been the end of the story.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: But she has to avoid the temptation of trying to determine what the Opposition will do.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, I am not That is all you have to do and nothing more. I am not contradicting myself. That is all you have to do. If Private Members' Business is called and the Opposition does not go ahead with the No Confidence Motion then it is entirely up to you to do what you wish to do. It is within your powers to do what you want at that point in time. So all this argumentation, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is totally unnecessary. I believe I am right in my interpretation of the conventions of Westminster system, the conventions that should be the conventions of this Parliament and taking into consideration the Standing Orders of this Honourable House. That is my position on that matter, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, for a very specific point, Sir. In the course of his presentation the Attorney General, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas indicated that the matter is "deemed", and he was quoting, and then he cited a date on which the matter would purportedly be deemed to have fallen prey to the words and language of the rules. 12:05 p.m.

However, Sir, I wish for the record to point out - and I am sure that the Attorney General will take the point on reflection - the fact that this matter appeared on the

Order Paper was itself an indication of "otherwise". The matter, therefore, being on the Order Paper is an expression, I submit, of the House "deeming otherwise" and that would be based...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Mr. B. M. TAUT: Mr. Speaker, I know that in terms of the interpretation of the law I am correct I am not going to be moved. Sir, as I said, this is a matter of legal interpretation. That is based on the fact that this House has allowed that particular rule to remain in abeyance on at least three No Confidence Motions that had occurred before. I will give you an example, Sir. There was a No Confidence Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition of the time. Notice was given on November 21, 1991 and it appeared on the Order Paper up to June 3, 1992. It remained on the Order Paper up to June, 1992. Your Honour will be able to confirm that.

I am saying, Sir...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us hear the Honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:...the interpretation of law does not depend only on the little words that are written, but it has to be taken in conjunction with the judicial circumstances and because this matter remained on the Order Paper, and taking into account the residual powers of the Speaker for and on behalf of the Members of the House, if it appears on the Order Paper it is assumed that Mr. Speaker in consultation or not in consultation has allowed the matter to remain on the Order Paper notwithstanding Section 26(3). The Honourable Members who know about the law can examine this in some detail.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to ask the Honourable Member a question relating to that because you brought the Speaker into it You are saying that as long as it remains there that therefore it has the concerns of the House. But surely the rule clearly states "Unless the House otherwise"...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, you missed it.

Mr. SPEAKER: When does the House decide?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is a very subtle point. It may be hard for some people to grasp. The point that I am making, Sir, is that the "otherwise" occurs by virtue of the fact that no action has been taken on it. If I may use the same phrase, the House is deemed to have acted otherwise unless Mr. Speaker indicates. That is all I am saying and it is not

an unreasonable interpretation, on reflection. In fact, Sir, the subtlety of it might be such as to be only capable of grasping by certain kinds of minds, Sir. I said those who understand the law. How did you get into this?

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I thank the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central for his observation. But I need to point out again for the record that this matter was tabled on the December 20, 1994. The House next met on December 21st the next day on which date, Sir, I offered to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the opportunity for debate. It was declined. The House next met on January 17th, 1995 on which date I again for a second time made an offer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for this matter to be debated. It was again declined and then I have a letter dated January 18th, the very next day after the day of the debate that has been already quoted in this House this morning, Sir, where the Leader of the Opposition is saying that it is a matter for him to indicate when he wants his date set down. But staying with the practice and the custom, Sir.

The Honourable Member for St Michael South Central perhaps was a little mistaken on the matter of notice. Last Tuesday on this Floor speaking on the Adjournment, I gave notice that I was going to offer this entire day for the debate and that remains the case, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: But there is only one other thing I want to say in that when I set aside the day for the debate, I set it aside for debate on a specific motion which was the No Confidence Motion. Not that I am trying to fix the order of debating of motions, but the No Confidence Motion attracts this *modus operandi*. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to trespass on your patience.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, very, very briefly. There is a motion before the Floor which has been seconded.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am debating that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are craving the indulgence of this House.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Let me make a brief submission. When I wrote the letter on January 18th, 1995, I specifically indicated that I would appoint a day and time for the debate. The Honourable Member constantly makes the point in here that what the House does is subject to Government's timetable. The Honourable Member has

never consulted with me since January 18th on the issue of a suitable date.

Mr. Speaker, you ruled in this House last week that we should consult on these matters. On a previous occasion you ruled that we should consult and the Honourable Member for the City has neither replied in writing to contradict my view and say "No, you are wrong. You will not appoint the date. The date is to be appointed by the Leader of the House". Nor did the Leader of the House consult with me. She got up last week and took me by complete surprise. I happened to be in my office downstairs and heard her talking all kinds of things, some of which were misleading the House, and I had to come in here to correct the record. But prior to that we had no discussion about it. I want to make the point very clear, Mr. Speaker. I am ready to debate the matter relating to the No Confidence Motion. However, there is a motion on the Order Paper relating to Private Members' Business. I do not know why the Government does not wish this Casino Gambling matter to be completed. There are very few people who wish to speak on it But you are running away from allowing me to conclude matters which I have on the Order Paper. I want to conclude the casino gambling and commence the No Confidence Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member please, as I told you, there is a motion before the Floor. I have given you a little leverage and you are going a little far away now. But you have made your points already.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, I apologize. Mr. Speaker, do not let it be said at all that we are not ready to debate the No Confidence Motion. We are ready and whatever means can be provided for me to conclude my •Resolution on casino gambling immediately thereafter I will commence debate on the kola syrup and I understand there are not many people who wish to speak on casino gambling. There are only two more and therefore I can wrap up with great dispatch and we can get on to the other items under Private Members' Business immediately thereafter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the floor although I had seen the Honourable Member for SL Michael West - Sir, do you still want to make a contribution?

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I think first of all the facts have been very clear. My only intervention is that I am saddened by this whole development although it is not surprising because if we stick to the Westminster system we would not be in this problem and therefore this whole question of setting aside today in the system that I understand is primarily targeted at a Government and an alternative Government. We for some reason have been able to do that and this is why we are having this problem, Sir. Therefore, Sir, what I want to draw to your attention that this is not the first time this problem has arisen.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have realised that.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: In 1992, Sir, while presiding in the Chair a similar problem arose. I saw the Order Paper for that section and you will see that there are a number of Private Members' Motions including a No Confidence Motion. They were never debated and months passed but the House had always extended the courtesy and it was quoted in Hansard, July 7, 1992, No. 2192. The Honourable Member Mr. Forde was aggrieved by the facts that the Order was taken off unknown to him. Therefore, Sir, it deprived him of the very essence of Private Members' Business. The House was very clear that some kind of arrangements would have to be made because these precedences come up all the time. 12:15 p.m.

The one section I want to read is this:

"Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I note from today's Order Paper that various Orders which were down in Private Members' names have been removed from the Order Paper leaving only one matter"

and that matter resided with the Honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we conclude, please? Could we move on, please?

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: There have been several motions that we have been waiting to deal with, but to accommodate the Government, which has always been the essence of the whole delay in Private Members' Business, and from Mr. Forde's position they were always willing as an Opposition to accommodate, so therefore when the motions came up these matters were dealt with logically and in an understanding manner.

But, Sir, I did make a ruling myself and my ruling tends to suggest that the House should give consideration to the matter before it and I think we actually dealt with it as put by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, and this is what the Honourable Member for Christ Church South said:

"Hon. H. B. SL JOHN: Sir, I just want to add, since there is one motion left on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business in my name, today for the purposes of making this matter abundantly clear I am seeking help as to the relevant Standing Order which empowers the clearance of the Order Paper, because I would like to move that that Standing Order be suspended for today's sitting."

As the Honourable Member for St. John actually did.

"The fundamental point, as I understand it, is that when you suspend the Standing Orders, it suspends the time which is allocated under the Rules to Private Members' Business in order to prevent the removal of matters in the name of Private Members, which are not dealt with because those Standing Orders are suspended. I would like to move that that Order that liquidates Private Members' Business be suspended today so that one would be able not to count today as part of any period...."

— That was the precedent set, Sir.

My ruling was, in essence: "I do not think there is a need to suspend that Order in view of the fact that the understanding is there.**"

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South went on to say:

~ "Very well, Sir. I will move alternatively then that, notwithstanding the suspension of Standing Orders today, that Order which expires today, as I understand it, remains on the Order Paper. It has been suggested that that is a proper motion to put before the House.**"

This is the point we talk about, the decision of the House. I put it to the House, there was no objection, because leave was granted so to do. What I am saying, Sir, there is no need for all of this wrangling. How the House will deal with the matter depends entirely on the feeling of the House.

— ^ Mr. SPEAKER: I thank you for your contribution, although it was a little funny and ironic that your extract I have it here with me. I do not know how we ended up with the same one. Could we move on?

Rt Hon, L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence. I wish to make a few comments on the motion that is before the House. I am sure you will understand my position, because I am the expert in this House on no-confidence motions. It took two — Leaders of the Opposition to deal with the Member for St Michael South by way of a no-confidence motion.

The no-confidence motion to which the Member for St Michael West and the Member for St Michael North West were referring to was as no-confidence motion in me. Notice was given on 21st November, 1991 and it left the Order Paper, or last appeared on the Notice Paper, on 23rd June, 1991 For all of those months there was a no-confidence motion in the Prime Minister by the ~ Opposition hanging over my head. We allocated time for it, it was not taken up, on some specious grounds that they

wanted to dragoon the television facilities; and now you have a motion in the Minister of Education, not as long as that one which was on the Order Paper, and now this is some big problem that has to be decided now.

It is very ironical that the second no-confidence motion against me was almost in the same terms as the first one. These matters have not been pointed out yet, Sir, but I will be pointing them out in due course.

The point I wish to make is that if we are following the Standing Orders in here, then things have to be done in a certain way. The Leader of the House is perfectly correct in seeking to set aside an early time for the debate on a no-confidence motion. But no Leader of the House can bully the Opposition - I know you would not permit it, Sir, because there should be no bullying in here. But you cannot permit the Leader of the House to arrogate unto herself the right to dictate how the Opposition should debate the Items under Private Members' Business that they have set down, and then on top of it to go and broadcast it to the whole of Barbados and the Caribbean that there is going to be this debate on a no-confidence motion today. What this is showing, Sir, is that the Leader of the House is obviously too busy to study the matters for which she has responsibility. That is what is happening. This House has been led into problems already over the Vagrancy Act, but I would not refer to that anymore; and there will be more instances of this unless the matters that come before this House are given due study by the Leader of the House - due study on procedure, and the deference and consideration that should be given to all Members of the House, including the Opposition. You have a right, Sir, as Speaker, to preserve my rights as a Member of this House and the rights of all Honourable Members, particularly the Opposition. That is the origin and development of the office of the Speaker of this Honourable Assembly. So, Sir, the matter is up to you within the framework of the Standing Orders of this House.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I have had the honour in this House of bringing a no-confidence motion in another Member and I know the gravity attached to it, but in this particular issue there is a distinction that obviously has to be drawn, which is not being drawn by the Opposition, that is, the setting aside of a day to deal with Private Members' Business as distinct from the setting aside of a day to deal with a no-confidence motion. 12:25 p.m.

In this particular instance, we are not so much setting aside a day to deal with Private Members' Business. Indeed, all sides agree that there is a convention that a day could probably be set aside to deal with a No-Confidence Motion given the gravity of the matter.

The Leader of the House has written very clearly specifying that we want to set aside a day to deal with a

No-Confidence Motion. The Opposition side is trying to confuse the issue by saying that in order for us to accommodate with a day dealing with a No-Confidence Motion that we have to deal with other matters that are extraneous to that particular motion. I am saying that it is either we accept... it is an exercise in sophistry and it conveys the impression that they understand the convention that given the gravity of a No-Confidence Motion it should be dealt with despatch and that the House should isolate that matter, Private Members' Business.

I just want to remind the House that on the occasion that I brought a No-Confidence Motion in the Member for St. Michael South that standing on the Order Paper was Private Members' Motions brought relating to the Throne Speech which had not been completed but had been started. There had been Private Members' Business brought by me on privatisation that had been started but for which further action had been postponed. When I brought the No-Confidence Motion it was understood that although there were other Private Members' Business in my name on which action had been started, given the gravity of the matter, they could wait. The House set aside a time to deal not with Private Members' Business but with a No-Confidence Motion.

The Government is today prepared to set aside the time in the House to deal with a No-Confidence Motion. If it is the will of the Opposition not to participate in that debate, it should come forward and say so but it must stop confusing the issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House. Before we entertain the Motion, let me say that the Chair's observations that it is clear that there is some need for our Standing Orders to be revised, certain areas must be looked at I would like to suggest that until we have reached that point that we continue the process of consultation between the sides.

Contrary to what we have heard, I believe that we have started so far and we have done very well in terms of consultation and I think that until we are able to revise our Standing Orders I believe this method of consultation should continue.

The motion before the Floor...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, let us continue, please. The motion before the Floor. It has been proposed and seconded.

WHEREAS the Motion standing as Item No. 3 on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition under Private Members' Business is deemed to be withdrawn under provisions of Standing Order 26(3);

BE IT RESOLVED that the said Motion be removed from the Order Paper of this Honourable House of Assembly.

DIVISION

The bell was rung.

The question that the Motion be removed from the Order Paper was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Sir HAROLD St JOHN, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. L. R. TULL, Mr. D. CARTER, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL, Mr. G. A. CLARKE, Mr. R. St. C. Toppin - 15,

Noes: Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. F. J. STUART, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN - 7.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you speak, I would like to say that the Motion has been removed from the Order Paper and I would like to advise the Leader of the Opposition and to emphasise to all Honourable Members that the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly within his rights to give notice of the Motion again.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hearken to your Ruling with a provision provided that it is not frivolous and vexatious, the matter in which...

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay, let us proceed please.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are in Private Members' Business. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said in a loud voice on this Floor several times this morning that he stands ready to continue with the debate on casino gambling now. Let us proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take note as I begin my contribution to this debate that those Honourable Members who have spoken before me had the privilege of speaking to the whole community by way of the broadcasting of the debate.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are on television, Sir. You may proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I just wish to be certain, Sir. I do not wish to detain the House unnecessarily on this matter because in some ways events have galloped past the Resolution, but it is necessary to put in the record my position, a position which to all persons who have observed me in the Cabinet of Barbados is well known, has always been well known, and I hope will continue to be well known.

I have always argued that there is no redeeming value in casino gambling as a contributor to the development of Barbados. I argue that, Sir, not only from the moral position because in the final analysis each individual will have to answer for his or her own morality. 12:35 p.m.

I think it is sometimes unreasonable of persons who have been able to work out their own personal morality to urge it on other persons who may or may not be at the level of understanding and/or knowledge to accept without more any morality which is being urged upon them. Many of us have determined that we would accept a particular religion, for example. I do not think it is any secret that I have been a practising Anglican from, as far as I can remember, age 6 or 7, but assuming that *one* is not clear what one believes at 6 and 7, certainly from the age of mature understanding considered and continued to accept the basic precepts of the religion that is defined and determined as the Anglican religion in Barbados.

I have had the honour, Sir, of serving as a member of the Anglican Synod for the last 20 plus years representing St. Leonard's Church. In between that time I have had the honour of being a member of the Anglican Synod Council which is, for want of a better description, the cabinet of Synod Government in Barbados. Only this year I have had the honour of being selected by the Anglican Diocese as the Provincial Representative of the Anglican Church in Barbados for the Caribbean. So, Sir, I have had a long association with the Church.

I remember when I was running for office in this House back in 1976 when at a meeting at Parris Gap, I indicated to my constituents whose responsibility it was then to choose between another distinguished Barbadian and myself, that the only day I would not be available to them would be Sunday. I said that, and I have the privilege of saying, that on Sundays those who wanted me would have to come to St. Leonard's Church to find me.

I am saying all of that, Sir, to make the point that the Anglican Church has a policy, and I as a member of the Synod, participated in that policy, that gambling should not normally be an activity of the members of the Anglican Church and, in any event, that we would be against casino gambling.

But that apart, Mr. Speaker, I have had the experience of working for Barbados outside of Barbados *from 1965*. I have participated since 1965 in one form or another in the development of this country and I have had an opportunity to examine and to take a position on the kinds of activity that would redound to the benefit of this country. It was always clear to me, going back to the days when I functioned in the United States inducing people to invest in this country, that casino gambling was one of the areas in which Barbados could find no solace and from which Barbados should keep as far as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Casino Gambling has subsequently reported, and they quote copiously from a Professor Eadington. Professor Eadington is only one of many scholars in the United States who have carefully, meticulously and clearly indicated that casino gambling appears to be much more than it actually is when it comes to the specific development of particular communities. Communities the size of New Jersey, Atlantic City have now, by 1994, clearly demonstrated that in spite of the massive resources that have been expended in the development of Atlantic City as a casino capital, despite the tremendous promotion that has been done in Atlantic City as a place of gaming, that by 1994 the authorities in that City were seeking to find alternate methods of development because they have discovered, they have heard and they have recognised that the resources which they thought would accrue from the development of gambling have not been either at the level or of the quality which they anticipated.

In the State of Nevada recently, 1994 again, the second largest city in that State (Reno) has developed a sports arena as an attempt to move away from gaining as a methodology for development because they recognise that the tremendous amount of ancillary resources which are required to maintain gambling at a reasonable level makes a mockery of the concept of large dollars flowing to the coffers to assist in the development

Mr. Speaker, in the United States until recently there were only two places that one could go legitimately to engage in casino gambling and I have always said and often wondered that in a country of 250 million people they could only until very recently find two areas: one you had to travel out into the desert and the other you had to travel to the back waters of New Jersey. Those who are familiar with travelling in the United States know that to go to Atlantic City you have to make a specific decision that you would go to Atlantic City. It is not a place that anyone would go for any particular reason unless one was suicidal. But generally speaking, I wondered. Two hundred and fifty million people and they did not find casino gambling especially worthwhile but it was always set aside for places like Puerto Rico and other places like that for those who controlled the purse strings of casino gambling

and the ancillary relationships to operate away from the oversight committees in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados is of such a size that had we decided to have casino gambling in Barbados, there would have been no way that any Government, the present Government, or any Government to come, could have had the kind of control over those who direct casino gambling by whatever rules or form they manufactured.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Attorney General recently discussing the question of money laundering in this country and he was able to say that up to now Barbados has successfully eluded the difficulties of money laundering. There is no better way, no clearer path for the activity called money laundering than casino gambling. It is the perfect methodology that has been used in other places for money laundering and the question of money laundering is not one that allows for simple solutions to the problems which it brings. Mr. Speaker, everyone talks about prostitution. Everyone talks about dope. Everyone talks about the other ancillary negatives that go with casino gambling but for a country the size of Barbados that will forever have to depend on investment from elsewhere, that will forever have to look to what we call the offshore sector for the buttressing of our economy, the offshore sector is wary of anywhere that has finally been deemed, if you will pardon the expression, to be a money laundering place. For that reason it is important that Barbados remains free of any known capacity to launder money because when once the reputation is enwrapped around this country, much of the investment possibilities which now exist will disappear because the country will no longer attract straightforward, willing and committed investors who would have a stake in the quality of life of the people who live in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate allows us limited time and one can go on at length pointing out why the decision not to have casino gambling in Barbados is a good, solid decision on both moral and economic grounds. 12:45 p.m.

But there is one aspect of this that I feel bound to put on the record. During the course of the debate which raged across this community, much was made of the Democratic Labour Party Administration's participation in the creation of a gaming mentality and casino gambling in Barbados. A lot was said in the call-in programmes and I believe during this debate which sought to suggest that the Democratic Labour Party's Government knowingly participated in the creation, through the Foreign Exchange Committee, of casino gambling in this country.

The Committee has actually spoken. I think that all Barbadians could do no worse than to listen to the words of the Commission on Casino Gambling as it speaks to the issue of Barbados' casino gambling and the situation of the

previous Government. I quote from page 24 of the Report of the Commission on Casino Gambling in Barbados chaired by Mr. Justice Eric Bishop, published in Barbados in May, 1995. After addressing the issue of Mr. David Bynoe being appointed Chairman of a Committee of the FXC to examine the question of gambling in Barbados, the Commission delivered itself of these 2 paragraphs. I am quoting, Sir:

"It would seem that the General Election having been set for September 6, 1994 the Task Force did not fulfil its role; and indeed the Foreign Exchange Committee probably ceased to function for the said reason."

It went on to say:

"The Chairman of the Task Force, David Bynoe, was later reported in the Broad Street Journal, as stating that the Solomon Report was neither accepted nor rejected by his committee, nor did the Committee reach a conclusion on recommendations regarding gambling. Mr. Bynoe is also reported to have said that some of the member organisations with whom the Committee spoke "expressed reservations or came out against it."

Here now is the conclusion by the Report of the Commission on Casino Gambling.

"It must be concluded, that the FXC, under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Finance, took steps towards ascertaining what, if any, were the benefits of "gambling in the context of tourism development" in the island, and that the Task Force which was appointed to report on the matter never went beyond obtaining the report of Mr. Nat Solomon."

That is the conclusion of the Commission. I wish to go further and I wish to put on the record that the Committee discusses the Trade Commissioner writing a letter to the Minister of Finance and:

"copied to the Chairman of the FXC Sub-Committee on Casino Gambling - in which he advised of a proposed visit by him and the Comptroller of Customs (also Chairman of the Betting and Gaming Committee) to London via New York, for the purpose of entering into "discussions concerning the St. Philip Land Project as it relates to casino gambling" and of the fact that there would be no cost to the Government as to the visit was being funded partly by TDC and partly by their host Barstow Associates of the United Kingdom."

Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is that the Honourable Member, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs can find on the file in the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the specific reason why the Trade Commissioner was unable to go to London. The Minister of the day wrote on the file that the trip would serve no useful purpose because, under no circumstances, would casino gambling be introduced into Barbados under this Government and therefore he was forbidden from going.

As a matter of fact, when the Trade Commissioner wrote to the Acting Minister of Finance saying:

"I am proposing subject to your approval to travel to London via New York from July 21 to 31," *et cetera**

The Trade Commissioner saw this on the file. This was written by me:

"I have noted this. I do not necessarily agree that it is worthwhile."

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that that will be made a document of the House.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: It is a document of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is already a document of the House?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am making all of that to say, Sir, that my position is not one that I arrived at yesterday. The Honourable Member, the then Prime Minister, the Honourable Member for St Michael South can confirm that the 2 of us, from time immemorial, and right up to the very present, had taken a position which indicated clearly that we were not and were not likely to be in agreement with the introduction of casino gambling in Barbados. That is the position which the Government took. It is the position which the Democratic Labour Party of which I happen to be the General Secretary and for which I was President on occasions, has always taken.

Any attempt on the part of anyone or any group surreptitiously or otherwise to suggest anything to the contrary is nothing more than either a smokescreen or an attempt to befuddle and confuse. I am glad that the Commission of Enquiry and the Government have decided against casino gambling. I have to say that the Government could have come to that conclusion - I have come to the conclusion myself - that based, for example, on an interview which the Honourable Member, the Deputy Prime Minister gave to a young woman about 30 years ago, a copy of which I still have, indicating her unalterable opposition to casino gambling. I would have been surprised if she could have participated in a Government that would have agreed to casino gambling. I have always suspected that the Prime Minister was never in favour of casino gambling. And I have wondered why he had to go through

the long, difficult, expensive task of getting a Commission to say what he wants it to say so that he can agree, at that price, that this is what he wants. But a long road to Tipperary, as long as you get to Tipperary, the important thing is to arrive there. It is better late than never.

If the Government has been able to come on board, in spite of the moral minority and all of the other difficulties, if they have been able to come on board with the vast majority of people in Barbados who, recognizing, because this is another sophistry that is put in that everybody in Barbados gambles, everybody buys a ticket, everybody plays bingo, mostly everybody does these things. There is a fundamental difference between recognizing that they cast lots for the garment of Jesus Christ, that gaming and/or using these kinds of techniques of using numbers is part of the development of a people all over the world, and recognizing that people in Barbados take chances and go to the races and do all these things, after all, one of the most lucrative aspects of the House of Windsor is its vast capacity to own race horses. This is all part of the ethos of growing up and developing in this society. But there is a fundamental difference and there has always been a fundamental difference in that taking a chance, that gaming, that systematic acceptance of betting one against the other. 12:55 p.m.

Because, Sir, even in life insurance, even when you examine what one does when one takes a life insurance policy one is in many ways betting against oneself. There is a difference between that kind of taking a chance and the kind of ruthless, systematic, moronic, application of casino gambling where the people who are allowed to participate and those who come from afar to participate become nothing more than mindless widgets in the process of enriching a few.

There is another point, Sir, that I want to make in the time allotted to me. There are many people who have suggested that we could have had casino gambling and we could have controlled it and we could have prevented our Barbadians from gaming in these places. In the first place the experience in the Bahamas does not bear that out. I have had discussions with colleagues in the Bahamas in the Ministerial system and with both of the major political parties and they confirm that they were unable and have been unable to keep Bahamians of a certain level from entering the gaming houses. But that is not the point. Had any Government sought by legislation to prevent any Barbadian from going into any place, I had always concluded and would have spent some time assisting people to conclude, that it would be contrary to the Constitution of this country. This country does not have a Constitution that allows anybody to preclude certain people from going to any place in this Barbados and it would have been extremely difficult, as it is extremely difficult in

any Caribbean constitution, to preclude people from going into these places.

Now, Sir, I started off by saying that each individual has the right to determine his or her morality. And in the final analysis I would not be one to indicate that "X" or "Y", Mr. Speaker, Your Honour or the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition, ought to go or not go into a casino. That would have been a matter for each of you and for me to determine. But I know that there is a number of people in Barbados, who given the opportunity, whether they could afford it or not would have found much interest in those one-armed bandits, the electronic kind, Sir, that before your finger can touch the number the money is gone. There are those who would have found great pleasure in sitting at the black jack table until all the money is gone because never in my life have I met anybody who can say or has said to me, I went to the casino and I won over the last 15 years.

I recall very well a friend of mine, a Barbadian, who* lives in New York who has constantly gone to Atlantic City. I have another friend who in essence was my banker and her husband is a frequent visitor to Atlantic City ever since it was opened. She keeps score on his activity. Both of the men who have been going there, one to Atlantic City and one actually goes to Nevada, this lady points out to me that her husband, the last time she spoke to me about two years ago, he was \$279 000 behind. And my friend, whom I believe is about 10 years older than I am, is about 67 this year. He plays both the horses and goes to Nevada occasionally and he feels that conservatively he has won and lost, minus net \$V₂ million. He says it with a certain joy and I think he has enjoyed his life but when you think of what has happened to those two persons that I know about personally just try to picture what the situation is or could be for Barbadians who would have enjoyed this massive, lights flying, bells ringing, psychological equipment designed specifically to make people do things in this small community of Barbados.

I hope I have not lost any friends over the years because of my vigorous arguments against casino gambling but I am glad that the Commission has reported as it has. If you look at the amount of money that is spent in Barbados on the regular gaming, the lotto, the Olympic, horse racing, it is a massive amount of money. This is my final point, Sir. That money, Sir, at least as far as we know, to a large extent, remains in Barbados. The Commission's Report indicates what some of us have always known, that in spite of the fact that large quantities of money are raked into the casino operation, except in one or two instances very little of the casino gambling money is retained in the country. For once these ancillary operations have been put in place, the owners are interested in one thing and one thing only. First they must get as many concessions as possible from the Government and Mr. Speaker, it is like when a salesman gets a foot in the

door. When once you have an operation that is employing a lot of people, that is attracting some people to the country and that on the face of it is turning over a lot of money, it is very difficult for a Government to say no to that operation when it starts to like a maw worm, to claw and get more.

Secondly, I have never believed that there was going to be this massive employment that was going to flow out of the operation. But be that as it may, the major interest which they would have had - and the operation in St. Vincent is a good example, it is closed more than it is open in any given year - but what would have happened, Mr. Speaker, and what I hope would never happen in this country is that those persons who would have operated the casinos in this country would have been taking large quantities of money that passed through Barbados out of Barbados. Some would have gone out legitimately and some would have been washed in whatever it is that they wash this money that comes in, in what I call money laundering. I think the single most important aspect of the refusal of casino gambling, I will end as I began, is the capacity of Barbados to help keep the lid on this possibility of money laundering from this country.

As long as we can continue to maintain the reputation which we have earned over the last 30 years or so as a country for investment, as long as we can maintain the attitude which we have demonstrated over the last 30 years or so, notwithstanding the rows which go on between the two major political parties, as long as we can maintain Barbados as a place where people can come and have a good vacation, where they can come and invest their money and get a reasonable return and where they can live in a society that is above all civilized, as long as we can maintain that whichever Government runs this country, Barbadians will be able to maintain the quality of life to which we aspire.

I have no doubt that within the next 15 to 20 years we will move to an even higher plain. 1:05 p.m.

It is unfortunate that the Democratic Labour Party did not have the opportunity to put some of its magnificent plans in progress. But who knows, Sir, the opportunity may present itself much earlier than some people anticipate. But quite seriously I am proud to have been one of the moral minority. I am proud to have been one of those persons who can say up to now that we have stopped this particular cancer from spreading out to the easternmost country of the Caribbean.

I am grateful to Your Honour.

SUSPENSION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House be suspended until 2:10 p.m.

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

The question that this Honourable House be now suspended until 2:10 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1:07 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. We will revert to Government Business. The Honourable Member for St. John.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice of Parliamentary Question No. 12 to ask of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs and Culture:

1. Will the Minister of Education state whether it is the intention of the Government to close Hothersal Primary School, St John?
2. Will the Minister state the date on which such a decision was made and the reasons for the decision?
3. Will the Minister state whether the Hothersal Primary School is in need of repairs, estimated cost of such repairs, whether repairs were previously scheduled and whether such repairs will be undertaken?
4. Will the Minister state whether and give details of any meetings to explain the Ministry's policies relating to closure of schools which have taken place between:
 - a. the parents of students attending the school, and
 - b. the teaching, ancillary and administrative staff of the school?

Question No. 12 to ask of the Prime Minister:

1. Will the Prime Minister state whether there have been any applications for television or radio licences made to the Broadcasting Authority since January 1, 1994?
2. Will the Minister state in respect of each application the recommendation of the Authority, the decision taken and the reason for the decision?

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Private Members' Notices, Sir. I should like to give notice, Sir, of a Resolution that this House has no confidence in the Honourable Minister of Education and Culture and calls on the Minister to resign.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please proceed with the Resolution before the House on casino gambling. The Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, unless any other Members wish to speak, I am exercising my right under Standing Order 29(1) as the mover of the motion to reply. I understand that somebody on the Government is exercising their fundamental right of reply and I have no objection whatsoever. I think, Sir, that the fullest possible discussion of this issue should be made available to the public of Barbados.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I shall start in a vein similar to that in which the Honourable Member for St. Peter started his presentation on the last occasion. He did not quote directly, Sir, but he dealt with an article which appeared in a newspaper in September 1993. He gave information arising out of that article which gave the impression that I was in favour of the introduction of casino gambling in Barbados. That is not what the article said, Mr. Speaker, Sir. The article made the position very clear and in that particular interview - (I do not wish to quote from the article.) - I went on to make the point to the reporter and I recall it very vividly, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that I said to him that I do not gamble but I have no objection to casino gambling. That is my personal view but I cannot speak for the rest of the Cabinet because there has been no such proposal by the Democratic Labour Party Government and I cannot foresee that in the next 2 or 3 years that such a decision will be taken. So casino gambling is not on the cards.

Now the Honourable Member for St. Pete was not charitable enough. There are some Prime Ministers who exercise a level of charity in matters such as this that when they are informing the House they seek to give the fullest possible picture. I cannot account for the conduct of the Honourable Member for St. Peter. The weight of the Office of Prime Minister, the stature of it, requires a different kind of approach to politics than other Members. An Opposition Leader does not carry that weight. An Opposition Leader, which is well known, has a task to perform and has a difficult job because he is in the minority of putting his case. The Prime Minister elected by the people as a whole should take the high road on these matters, Mr. Speaker, and not seek to use an article and quote selectively from it. The fullest possible picture should be given. That is why, Mr. Speaker, if I were uncharitable, I would also refer to an address which the Honourable Member for St. Peter

gave at the very first Town Hall Meeting that he ever addressed after becoming leader of the Barbados Labour Party. 2:20 p.m.

It took place some time in December 1993 when the Honourable Member for St Peter called upon Barbadians to be mature about casino gambling, and he said that casino gambling may have to be on the cards for Barbados if the island is to compete for tourists in the future. The article is entitled "Casino Call". It appeared in a newspaper on December 13, 1993 and it said in the by-line: "Arthur: It's an option Barbados can't ignore." Mr. Speaker, this is a report in a newspaper so I cannot refer to it, I do not wish to, so I am only telling you, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to give the fullest possible picture. Casino Call. Somebody was calling for casinos and the only person who was speaking in this article was the Honourable Member for St. Peter. He said it is a fact of life in London and all of the established tourist markets.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are aware of the relevant Standing Order, I take it

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, Sir, that is why I would not pursue it. I will not bother to pursue it

Mr. Speaker, that is the road that an effete debater would take, picking up all kinds of little articles and letters and throwing them around in the House seeking to score points. But the Honourable Member for St Peter has to be forever estopped from continuing in this exercise, because he told the people of Barbados that he was going to set up a Commission on Casino Gambling, and the Honourable Member for St. Peter said he would abide by the findings of that Commission. I will tell the Honourable Members now what that Commission said, because the Commission not only investigated whether casino gambling should be introduced in Barbados now, but it went backwards, it analysed what happened under the Democratic Labour Party prior to the elections, it took a look at the St. Philip Land Development and the Commission made certain findings of fact, and the Honourable Member for St Peter must know that if I have a chance of taking the word of the Commission or his word, that I am going to take the word of this Commission headed by a Judge.

I want to say this. This Resolution is not to endorse this Report, because as far as I am concerned this was an expensive exercise in which the Honourable Member took up \$200 000 of taxpayers' money to establish a Commission when that \$200 000 could have been divided into eight to establish eight small businesses in this country, giving them seed money each of \$25 000 so that they could contribute to the economic development of this country. This Report is not going to contribute one/zillionth of a percentage to the Gross Domestic Product of Barbados. In other words, it is \$200 000 thrown down the

drain, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and we are talking about a Minister of Finance who said he was so prudent and he was managing the people's affairs with scrupulousness. This is a Minister of Finance spending money because he does not know what to spend it on, because if in a list of priorities he could take \$200 000 and spend it on a Gambling Commission, which Commission said exactly the same thing that I said about the Democratic Labour Party's position in this debate - basically I assume the Commission must have read what I said in the House of Assembly - because this Commission made it very clear, and I am quoting from page 22 of the Report:

"It is relevant to our task that the events which gave rise to the invitation be recalled in order to demonstrate what was the attitude and approach to the introduction of casino gambling by the Government of Barbados prior to the general election of September 6, 1994 which brought about a change in the Government"

The Commission addressed its mind very clearly to what was the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party. They had before them information provided, as I understand it, from the relevant Ministry, because they say in their Report the persons who they heard from, and they would have heard from the Comptroller of Customs and a whole range of other officials, and if the Ministry of Finance is doing its job, I am making the assumption that all the files and letters which were thrown around in here and which the Honourable Member for St Peter with such incredulity and such high-minded passion----- He reminded me so much of a quotation about . . . What is that quotation again, Mr. Speaker? You are a man of literature. ... about the ceremony of innocence being drowned. Does anybody remember it? About those with the high intensity. I had it written down here, because his presentation reminded me of the poem "The Second Coming" by W.B. Yeats:

"Everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst Are
full of passionate intensity."

The Honourable Member was full of passionate intensity in seeking to say that I was some way involved in some exercise to bring casino gambling to Barbados through the back door, that I set up a Commission to introduce it, not to consider it Well, the Commission that the Honourable Member set up, which he said he will abide by, found the following facts, Mr. Speaker.

First of all:

"On January 28, 1994, the FXC, an intra-ministerial body established in August 1991 by the Cabinet, agreed (along with representatives from the private sector) that a study should be carried out in relation

to the pros and cons of tourist related gambling in Barbados, . . ."

not casino gambling,

"... and to this end a Task Force should be formed with the specific mandate to prepare a report on.. ."

not gambling in the context of casinos, not casino gambling, but

" . . . 'Gambling in the Context of Tourism Development'."

I am quoting from the Report, Mr. Speaker, that was a finding of fact by the Commission.

" . . . It was also agreed that the report should be made available by the end of March 1994."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the letter that went out from the Secretary of the FXC to the Chairman they quoted. They say:

"By letter dated February 18, 1994, the secretary of the FXC advised Mr. C. David Bynoe, who was invited to be the Chairman of the Task Force, as follows:

'In recent times the Betting and Gaming Committee has been beset by persons wishing to set up gambling enterprises,

not casinos. The Honourable Member for St. Peter just increased the number of slot machine licences in Barbados, quietly during a Budget, even before he had this Report in his hand. We were under siege to increase them and we set up a Commission to look at gambling as a whole. The Honourable Member quietly did it and people talk about grubby-fingered politicians. I agreed to that, one would assume, because it passed through this House, and therefore I would have to be a grubby-fingered politician if I agreed, by implication, to the increase in licences for coin operated gaming machines when there was not even the slightest discussion by a Gambling Commission which was paid \$200 000, which was meeting at the same time as the Honourable Member was introducing it

A mockery is being made of public affairs in this country, Mr. Speaker. What they said is that we have been beset by people to set up gambling enterprises. The letter went on:

" . . . but the existing legislation does not allow for gambling activity other than by coin operated machines. In view of the frequency involved with the submission of these applications it is now a matter of

extreme urgency to have a report prepared for submission to the Cabinet;"

The Chairman was told by the Secretary that he would be expected to consider the views of a wide variety of persons and organisations in the society. This is a finding of fact by a retired Judge, a distinguished Barbadian, and a panel of distinguished persons who were paid \$200 000 by the Minister of Finance to do their job.

On page 23:

"The record which was made available to us showed that on March 4, 1994, the Task Force/Working Group, also described as 'the Subcommittee on Gambling' held its second meeting, and that each of the above named 'agencies' was represented."

And it goes on to say:

"It would seem that the General Election having been set for September 6, 1994 the Task Force did not fulfil its role; and indeed the Foreign Exchange Committee probably ceased to function for the said reason."

This is a finding by a Judge, Sir, and a Commission. The Honourable Member for St. Peter said he would accept whatever they say. He is now gathering to make all kinds of other documents documents of the House. 2:30 p.m.

He can make what he likes. I believe the Commission and I think the public should believe them on this. It goes on:

"It must be concluded that the FXC under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Finance took steps towards ascertaining what if any were the benefits of gambling in the context of tourism development:"

They do not find that I took steps to find out whether we should introduce casino gambling. They may be a finding of fact that the FXC under my Chairmanship took steps to find out what the benefits of gambling in the context of tourism development and the task force which was appointed to report on the matter never went beyond obtaining the report of Mr. Nat Solomon.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Peter gave the impression that the task force was involved in all kinds of nefarious activities behind the backs of the people of Barbados to introduce casino gambling in this country. The task force Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Commission made a finding of fact. What the Commission also said which is a great interest is that the private sector appointed Mr. Solomon because he was not appointed by the Government. Mr. Solomon was appointed by the private sector and they said it was difficult to avoid the

impression after considering all that was stated in writing and orally that Mr. Solomon had more than a casual or passing interest in seeing that casinos were introduced into Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, listen to what they say about St. Philip land development because this sordid approach which is being exercised in this country of people walking around feeling that they are producing documents to show that all kinds of things were happening. Let me tell you what the Commission found on the St. Philip Land Development on 82 of the Report.

"A written submission from the St. Philip Land Limited dated January 1995 showed that in early 1993 an application (No. 0031/01/93D) was made to the appropriate authority for permission to develop land at Bushy Park Plantation, SL Philip. On September 3, 1993 a letter from the relevant Ministry advised that having examined the facts and representations from professional and interested parties, the Minister had approved the application for St. Philip Land Limited "to develop a golf-centred resort" on about 346 acres of land at Bushy Park:"

The Commission said this, Mr. Speaker. The emphasis was then clearly on golf. The letter made it clear that the permission was given subject to a number of conditions.

Mr. Speaker, listen to what the major condition was:

"one of which specifically excluded the erection or use of any building for the purposes of a casino."

Mr. Speaker, do you understand that? The letter from the Minister to St. Philip Land Development specifically said that the permission was not granted for the erection or use of any building for the purpose of a casino.

Reasons set out in the letter included this, Mr. Speaker,

"to accord with Government policy on casino operation on the island."

Mr. Speaker, I will go to page 83 at the top of the page.

"... there was correspondence with the then Government about an application to operate a casino at Bushy Park, which was now, as a matter of interest, described as "the proposed leisure resort." The submission indicated that the application to operate a casino was made, receipt of it was acknowledged in March 1993..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Commissioner found that the people at Bushy Park had been told on September 3,

1993 that there would be no permission for a casino to be erected or operated.

In March 1993, 6 months earlier, they were making an application to establish casinos. By September 1993 the Government's position was clearly known to them. The applicant was told and he was told this by the Minister of Finance because the application was made to me and since I had no power to grant any casino license and did not wish any further discussions at that level on the matter. The matter was sent on to the Betting and Gaming Committee and the Betting and Gaming Committee, I believe, took no further action on the matter because I certainly have no recollection of any file coming back to me in relation to casinos.

Unless you were to amend the Vagrancy Act, section 3G, I think it is, we cannot have casinos in Barbados. That is the Democratic Labour Party's position.

This Commission Report which is relying on the facts not innuendo has absolved the Democratic Labour Party and has also put paid and flatly contradicts which the Honourable Member for St Peter made in the course of his debate in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is a serious matter because I didn't appear before the Commission. So they cannot even say that there was any self-centred submission from the Democratic Labour Party. We did not even reply to their letter so on the basis of independent information which they had - I don't know if the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central submitted anything to the Commission so they can't even blame him.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I always like to cover all the flanks, in front and behind because I know what is in front of me. The impression being given in this House that we are some kind of underhand operators who were negotiating to do all kinds of things.

The people from St. Philip Land Development Limited wrote letter after letter to the Minister of Finance. I sent all on to be processed urgently, not because of any casino. I believed then and I still believe now that that site is an ideal site in my view for a golf resort. I am in favour and I wish to make it go abroad and the Democratic Labour Party is in favour of a golf course ~ mg established at Bushy Park to give jobs to those people liv^g in St. Philip and in St. John but we were always of the view that it was necessary...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: My house isn't up for sale. Don't worry. I don't have money like you so I can't own more than one property. The house I live in is the

only thing I own. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting sequel to this. On the 2nd of February, 1993 the then Minister of State in the Prime Minister's office Senator L. V. H. Lewis wrote to me. I am going to make this a document of the House:

"Dear David:

You may be already aware of the above reference application which relates to Mr. Wright's proposal to develop (a) a major international hotel to be run by the Radisson Group..."

and he goes down through the items. He said in his last 2 paragraphs:

"The Prime Minister has asked me to bring to your attention the attached note of a meeting held with Messrs. John Wright and Richard Lyons. The latter have indicated to me in a letter dated 5th January 1993 - the final sentence. The "latter" meaning a Mr. Richard Lyons and I quote:

"Finally, I would reiterate that we are fully committed to the development at Bushy Paik regardless of any decision about casinos."

In his final paragraph, Senator Lewis says to me:

"The Prime Minister has also indicated in a Minute dated 1st February 1993 "as you know there has been no change in the Government's position in respect of casino gambling."

The Prime Minister asked the then Senator to co-ordinate work relating to the investment in Bushy Park and one of the features of it was tax concessions and the question that they raised about casinos! Let me tell you what the note in the meeting was about, Mr. Speaker. I am going to make that a document of the House.

Paragraph 4 of the note written by Senator Lewis this is what was said:

"In the circumstances, considering the pro-casino orientation of the paper attached to Mr. Lyon's letter of 5th January, 1993 to Senator Lewis - this is a note of the meeting. He said he found the last sentence of Mr. Lyon's letter reassuring. 2:40 p.m.

You know what the sentence was, Mr. Speaker, that he found reassuring? "Finally, I would reiterate that we are fully committed to the development of Bushy Park regardless of any decision about casinos."

Mr. Speaker, in Senator Lewis' note, he makes it very clear at the bottom that the operators of Bushy Paik themselves felt that part of their task was to convince the churches of the innocuous nature of a properly controlled gambling regime with access to actual gambling being limited to visitors and he also went on to say "to persuade the Prime Minister in the direction of approving casino gambling in Barbados albeit controlled at first" This was the remit of the developers at the St. Philip Land Development.

Well I know the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is not easy to persuade. I never tried to persuade him one way or the other on casino gambling. I do not think I have ever....

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Peter has that document and was flashing it at me earlier because he wants to drop bombshells so I can let him drop some. I drop them first and he will drop something else, eggs. Mr. Speaker, I do not function like that so I do not have to worry. The facts are here. Any of these documents can be made available.

Bushy Park applied to the Ministry of Finance for concessions on a casino but they have people who apply to the Ministry of Finance on all kinds of things. They asked for a waiver of imposts on materials, furnishings, fixtures and equipment imported whether new or used for the construction and development of the resort, apartment, villas, hotel, casino, conference facilities, water park, tenpin, bowling complex, restaurants, business communications centre and shops.

These people were told from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I maintain, as were the developers of Durant's when the Honourable Member for Christ Church South wrote to me, that the Cabinet had a policy on concessions and that any developer of a golf course so long as he had Town Planning permission would be entitled to exactly those same concessions. We had never granted a concession on casinos and therefore I had not addressed and was not about to address my mind to the question of a grant in respect to casinos.

There are some facts which the Honourable Member for St. Peter will not be able to put before this Chamber in all of his talk. In all that he talks, Mr. Speaker, he cannot say that this Honourable Member has ever given anybody in this country any commitment in writing or verbally relating to the establishment of any casino. He cannot say that in any correspondence emanating from me officially or in any confrontations with anybody that I did not set out the Cabinet's position at the time clearly. He cannot say that concessions were ever given on a casino by the Minister of Finance. He cannot say so. He would have to

produce the file with my handwriting and signature for me to see that that happened. I am saying categorically that as Minister of Finance neither myself nor the Honourable Member for St. Michael South or St. Michael South Central when he was Minister of Finance under the Democratic Labour Party approved any concessions for the establishment of any casino.

The Honourable Member cannot say that I ever met with any Mr. John Wright. I do not know the man. I met a Mr. Barstow about tax concessions and I met a Mr. Lyons relating to water. When I saw the gentleman on television it was the first time in my life I had ever set eyes on him. I do not know him. I have never seen him. I have never had any conversation or discussion with him. My correspondence has been with a Mr. Barstow and a Mr. Lyons.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to engage in these charades. If anything else needs to be said on the matter, the Honourable Member for St. Peter can make all of those files available to a judge. I would go as far as to say this. The Democratic Labour Party would take up a collection, if necessary, to fund the operations of an independent judicial enquiry into St. Philip Land Development and if the Honourable Member for St. Peter at the end of the day can come up with one single fact which leads to the conclusion that we had approved any application for a casino in Barbados, then, Mr. Speaker, he can take the file to the Director of Public Prosecutions and do whatever he thinks he should do.

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in the face of all of his passionate intensity, the Honourable Member for St. Peter cannot stand behind that poem that I remember from my youth entitled "Truth Never Dies". We feel thoroughly vindicated by the Commissioners, even though it was at a cost of \$200 000.

In a sense, the Honourable Member for St. Peter not having anything to do with his time nor with money, far less finding jobs, could have found something better to do. But, Mr. Speaker:

"Truth never dies. It answers not.

It does not take offence but with a mighty silence bides its time as some great cliff that braves the elements and lives through all the storms its head sublime.

It ever stands uplifted by the wise and never dies.

As rests the Sphinx amidst Egyptian sands, as looms on high the snowy peaks and crest, as firm the patient

Gibraltar stands, So truth unwearied waits the era blest,

When man shall turn to it with great surprise,

Truth never dies." Thank you, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been on the Order Paper for so long that the House could be forgiven if we do not recall that the motion before us is to condemn and deplore the statement by the Minister of Tourism, International Transport and Environment in support of casino gambling and to reject the proposal by the Prime Minister to establish a Commission to enquire into the introduction of casino gambling.

Now, Sir, the matter has come full circle to such an extent that in the final analysis the Leader of the Opposition was left scrambling to find references in the very Commission that he said this House should not have set up to try to justify a position that he believes the Democratic Labour Party is purported to have held.

Now, Sir, before I go into any of the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and for that matter by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, I just want to exercise my responsibility to thank the members of the Commission on Casino Gambling who discharged their responsibility on a very difficult matter with integrity. I also would like to thank all those members of the public who gave evidence before that Commission. There will be times in this country's political experience and in our administration of our public affairs when it will be necessary for us to be able to sound out the public on matters that are difficult and are potentially contentious.

I believe that a Commission can be used for such a purpose. I believe that the public of Barbados also is satisfied that the Commission on Casino Gambling discharged its responsibility on the difficult matter with integrity and that all the members of the Commission and the work of the Commissions stand to be commended rather than pilloried as the Leader of the Opposition would want us to do.

It is an exercise in participatory democracy and when the history of this matter comes to be written, the facts will have to be told that one party, the Democratic Labour Party did, in fact, agree to the setting up of a Task Force to deal with casino gambling, that that Task Force was set up. It functioned in secret. It got a report and no decision was taken on it. On this side, the Barbados Labour Party set up a Commission in public. It invited all and sundry to make submissions to the Commission. We got a recommendation from the Commission and we acted upon it. 2:50 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St John, the Leader of the Opposition has now taken a very disturbing act in this particular matter. He now wants this House to believe and all the rest of the country who is listening to this debate to believe that the Task Force that was set up under the auspices of the Foreign Exchange Commission was not a Task Force to deal with casino gambling. Mr. Speaker, I have already made the first reference to this matter a document of the House. I should say, for the benefit of the House, that, unfortunately, all of these files dealing with the Task Force on casino gambling, Sir, were not made available to the Commission. But I have already made a document of the House a letter of January 17, 1994.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I regret very much interrupting the Honourable Member, Sir. On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member may be unwittingly misleading the House. The Task Force was established to consider all forms of gambling including casino gambling. I have never given the impression that it was not to consider casino gambling. It was to consider gambling in the context of tourism development and casino gambling is also gambling, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to refocus the matter for the House's benefit. On January 17, 1994 - and I have made this a document of the House, Sir. I will quote it again - a letter went to the:

"Honourable David Thompson, M.P., Chairman of the Foreign Exchange Committee, Ministry of Finance.

Dear Minister,

CASINO GAMBLING"

That is the title of the letter, Sir.

"I believe the most effective way of dealing with the casino gambling issue would be to appoint a special Task Force comprising of representatives from the various organizations cited"

It said:

"This Task Force would be mandated to carry out a full investigation on all matters pertaining to casino gambling and report to the Foreign Exchange Committee such recommendations for action as the group is in a position to make. This approach would enable the FXC to make the necessary recommendations to Government with the likelihood of getting substantial support from the public, at large."

It was set up not with reference to Cabinet. It never went to Cabinet. It was set up under the auspices and...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The matter relating to the restructuring of the Foreign Exchange Committee went to Cabinet and the Cabinet took a decision in relation to the Task Forces which should be established and it was announced, in the press in December, that the Cabinet had agreed to the establishment of a Task Force to consider gambling in the context of tourism development. It was a Cabinet decision.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Task Force that was established was a Task Force dealing entirely with casino gambling. The only Report that it has ever received from a Mr. Nat Solomon was a Report dealing with casino gambling.

I want to go further and say that it would appear that all the Members of the Democratic Labour Party's Cabinet were aware, fully seized of the scope and function of this committee. The Member for St. Michael West was good enough today to read a minute that I made a document of the House, a minute of the 4th July. But he neglected to refresh his memory about a minute that went to him on the 31st May from the Trade Commissioner reading as such:

"Subject to your approval, I am proposing to travel to Antigua and St Maarten from June 19 to 24, 1994 in my capacity as a Member of the Foreign Exchange Sub-Committee on casino gambling."

This is the Trade Commissioner to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sir:

"Subject to your approval, I am proposing to travel to Antigua and St Maarten from June 19 to 24, 1994 in my capacity as a Member of the Foreign Exchange Sub-Committee on casino gambling. The objective of the above visit will be to acquire as much information as possible on the positive and negative aspects of casino gambling in Antigua and St. Maarten."

The minute by the Minister was:

"I agree to your visits."

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The minister then was B. M. Taitt. He was not telling him then that the DLP had taken a position on casino gambling, they had taken a decision on June 4, 1993 on casino gambling, and that any trips to Antigua and St Maarten to deal with casino gambling would be a waste of time.

The Democratic Labour Party knows why there was this duplicity because they were saying one thing in public, as they are doing today, Sir, and doing something else, behind the scenes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member would give way, Sir. On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is quoting selectively from an extract from a file. If the Honourable Member will give the totality of the arrangements. To simply quote I said I agree, and then use the word duplicity to suggest that there was duplicity, I am stating categorically that if that whole file were read, it will indicate that the gentleman was going for other purposes and other reasons. Let her give you the whole file. Because the important point to which I spoke was when the gentleman was going to London. That is what I spoke of and that is what I indicated...

Mr. SPEAKER: Get on with your point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of order, Sir, and I am laying the foundation for the point of order.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: All right, Sir. I will make another one.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House will find it strange that a DLP Cabinet could, on June 4, 1993 make a decision that there shall be no casino gambling and Prime Minister should say, let nothing else happen thereafter to suggest that there has been a change in policy but that, thereafter, a Committee established, under the Ministry of Finance could be functioning on this matter. Perhaps a letter written to me...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Yes. That is the whole point, that there was a minute by the Prime Minister on June 4, 1993 saying look, kill all action on this matter about casino gambling but, nonetheless, the Foreign Exchange Committee set up a casino planning committee in 1994 and all of these trips agreed to by the Member for St. Michael West included could take place in 1994.

But, Sir, I want to read into the records of this Parliament...

Asides.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I need to read into the records of this Parliament...

Asides.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I need to make a document of this House and I am reading it into

the records of this Parliament a letter written to me on January 25, 1995 by the principals of St Philip Land Limited. I shall read it slowly, Sir:

"Our company is a development company and its principal function is to acquire and to develop the site using different operators for the integral part of the overall development

We are businessmen with no political allegiance to any political party in Barbados. As such, we have always dealt in a straightforward manner with the Government of the day and I very much regret that we may have been drawn into the political arena. We have detailed discussions over a lengthy period with a variety of hotels and leisure operators. We are very keen to create a resort complex with all the individual parts given the up market tourists...."

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St John, the House sat and listened to you. Let us hear the Honourable Prime Minister.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I go back to my letter of January 25, 1995 because the Member for St. John does not want to hear this:

"We are very keen to create a resort complex with all the individual parts giving the up market tourists the type of facility which is on offer elsewhere in the tourist market but which is not available in Barbados." 3.00 p.m.

"In order to progress the overall project, executives and project managers of this company have made regular visits to Barbados since 1992. During the course of these visits and on occasions in London there have been meetings with various Ministers of the Government We were careful to do this as the project as envisaged from the beginning required a large outlay of capital. Also after we had had a chance to evaluate the project we came to the conclusion that it would not be viable without a casino. We were completely ..."

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: "After we had had a chance to evaluate the project we came to the conclusion that it would not be viable without a casino. We were completely straightforward in our approach to Government. We made it clear from the very beginning that the project would not be viable unless permission could be obtained for the operation of a casino gambling or similar type operation.

The then Government being perfectly aware of all the facts made certain representations to us which convinced us to proceed. Without those representations we would never have continued with the project.

In addition to these representations we have had from time to time, assurances from different Ministers to the effect that they supported our project in full and it was on this basis, acting in good faith, that we proceeded with the purchase of Bushy Park. In fact it was based on certain representations and assurances, made to us by the Government of the day, that our company laid out considerable sums in acquisition, professional fees, feasibility studies and scheme preparation, all of which was designed to enable us to get a project of this scale under way. It was on this basis that we purchased the site in September 1994 for US\$750 000 and we have disbursed somewhere in the region of \$2 million to date in professional fees, surveys, planning applications, architectural designs and drawings, feasibility studies and general expenses including the acquisition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to make this a document of the House because it is abundantly clear to me that the involvement as weU of this same company with the Foreign Exchange Committee and its willingness to finance trips by a Mr. Frank DaSilva and other Government officials to places in the rest of the world to study the operation of casino gambling facilities substantiates the assertion being made in this letter to me by that same company, Sir, that from the very outset the Democratic Labour Party Government was made aware that the project could not be viable without casino gambling, that the Government of the day, Sir, encouraged it. The Government of the day not only encouraged it, they also collaborated with it because it must be said in this House and in this debate that part of the expenses incurred by the Foreign Exchange Committee under the Democratic Labour Party to study the effects of casino gambling in Barbados, part of those expenses were met by this same company. And the trip that was to be made to London in July of that year was to be financed by this same company.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member is misleading this House. I rise on a point of order. He is a Minister of Finance and he would know that if any Government entity was to expend money it would have to be provided for in the Estimates. The money which was spent by the St. Philip Land Development people was spent by and on behalf of the private sector and the TDC in commissioning a report by Mr. Solomon. Not a cent was spent by the Government of Barbados on any activities relating to the FXC other than the provision of personnel.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I refer back to the Minute that the Member for St. Michael West referred to earlier. It concerns the Minute to him on the 4th of July 1994 and it reads as such: "Acting Minister, I am

proposing, subject to your approval to travel to London via New York from the 21st July to the 31st July 1994. The purpose of my visit is to have discussions concerning the St. Philip Land Project as it relates to casino gambling. There is no cost to the Government since this visit is funded in part by the Tourism Development Corporation and our host Barstow Associates of the United Kingdom".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am submitting to the House that this letter, Sir, sent to me by the same Mr. Barstow that was financing the trip by Mr. DaSilva to London, bears out the point that I am making to this Parliament that the Democratic Labour Party and the St. Philip Land Lease were cooperating on the introduction of casino gambling to this country.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir, the Cabinet met pursuant to that letter and the Cabinet of Barbados came to the conclusion that the visit should not be approved and that the expenditure should not be incurred. What is written by an individual he is free to write. The Cabinet which is the policy making entity came to a decision that the trip should not take place and it should not be approved in July 1994. It is disgusting.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I have made it a document of the House already.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member would not have given this House a full picture unless he reads the Minute that was written by the then Minister about that letter.

Mr. SPEAKER: So what is your point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That the Honourable Member is misleading the House. Furthermore, Sir, I have the Cabinet Minutes here, Sir. I have the Cabinet Minutes of 1994.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that still your point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No that cannot be a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am giving information. I am giving the Cabinet Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be a point of order. Your point of order must relate to what is being said.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am saying you are misleading the House and I am giving Your Honour the information, authentic information, the Cabinet Minutes which says, visit to London by Mr. Frank DaSilva, Trade Commissioner and Captain Randolph Straughan, not approved.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, you are out of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with the greatest respect I do not see how I can give information. I am telling you about the Cabinet Minutes and you tell me that authenticity is not acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: My point of order is that the Minister was misleading the House. I am telling Your Honour the Cabinet Minutes said that the trip was not approved by the Cabinet

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am saying the Cabinet said, not approved. These are the Cabinet Minutes. You cannot tell me that I am out of order, Sir. You can, Sir, because you are the Speaker. But I am saying the Cabinet said it was not approved.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, let us proceed please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Minute was written on the 4th July, 1994. On the 4th July 1994, Minister Harcourt Lewis responded to the Trade Commissioner saying, "There is no objection". Now we hear now, Sir, that the Cabinet said no. It went to Mr. Taitt, Sir. He said, I have difficulty with this and requested that they should speak and then the last part on this, Sir, is, "I spoke to the Minister on the 15th July and the visit will be looked at in September." I will make this a document of the House if necessary. 3:10 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that it...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the Honourable Member please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member would give complete information which is available on the file, I spoke about this matter and I wrote on the files and indicated that there would be no reason why the Honourable Member should go to London and therefore that was deprived. But I have further information. The Cabinet of Barbados, Sir, the Minutes of 1994 - 07014G - Matters Not On The Agenda - (2) Visit to London by Mr. Frank DaSilva, Trade Commissioner and Captain Randolph Straughan, Comptroller of Customs from July 21 to 31, 1994 Re: Discussions on the St. Philip Land Project regarding casino gambling, Note 94588/Ministry of Finance

113, Not Approved. That is the Cabinet's decision and that is the only thing that can make any difference. Thank you, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has taken the decision about casino gambling. There will be no casino gambling in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, and we established a Commission that undertook a comprehensive survey of this matter in investigating all aspects of it. But the only thing that stands in this whole issue to be resolved is the credibility of the Democratic Labour Party on the question of casino gambling. That is the only outstanding issue, Mr. Speaker, and they would find it hard to convince the public that they had taken a decision not to have casino gambling as far back as June 1993, but that in 1994 the very same people who had applied for the casino gambling licence was proposing to Government that it should fund the trip of Government officials to go to London to discuss with them the project within the context of casino gambling.

Now the Member for St John, Sir, misled the House in relation to the matter in which the St. Philip Land Development Limited intends to proceed in relation to their investment at Bushy Park that if there is no casino gambling there will be no hotel. Mr. Speaker, if there is no casino gambling there would be no hotel. But from the outset it was understood that if they were to have a hotel facility, the hotel facility could only have been viable if there was going to be casino gambling. The Democratic Labour Party approved the hotel knowing that it depended upon casino gambling to be viable. The latest correspondence that I have had from this same company, Mr. Speaker, is to this effect that they understand now that there is to be no casino gambling in Barbados and they are prepared to proceed with the project without the hotel. I want to simplify that, Sir, because it is the key to this entire issue that the Democratic Labour Party gave permission to this company to go ahead with a hotel resort. The company made it clear from the outset and the DLP was challenging that that overall project including a hotel could only have been viable if it included a casino. They are saying in this letter, Sir, of January 25 that they had made that clear to the DLP from the outset of the project.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as it stands now, the latest position of the company is that they are going to proceed with the project without the hotel component but with a golf course and luxury houses because they have always understood from the start and the DLP Government has always understood from the start that in order to get that scale of investment profitable, Sir, it had to have casino gambling to it. I am prepared in this matter to believe the words of this company that put down U.S.\$2 million behind the word, so they believed, given to them by Ministers of the Crown. This is a very, very serious matter. This letter of January 25, Sir, is a very serious matter. People came to Barbados. They were given assurances by a Government,

they went ahead in good faith, they committed U.S.\$2 million in an investment, Sir, because they were satisfied by the Government of the day and the representations made to them by the Government of the day, Sir, were sound and bankable. They even went to the expense, Mr. Speaker, of putting up money to assist persons who were instrumental in dealing with that matter for the Government to come to London to discuss their project in the context of casino gambling. I say if it comes to this I am going to stand on the word of the St. Philip Land Limited, Sir. I want to make this a document of the House. In this matter, Sir, the DLP stands condemned.

I just want to say, Sir, that I hope that never again will any company having to deal with a Government be made to commit resources of this size on the basis of assurances given to it by a Government and then that Government or a representative of that Government come in public and disassociates itself from its commitment. When investors commit money of this scale and Bds. \$4 million in studies and design is not two pennies. It is a lot. When people make investments of this scale, Mr. Speaker, they do so in good faith and we will undermine the economic stability of this country if Government causes investors to believe that one set of actions will be taken, Sir, and if Government also by the actions to which it is party supports those representations by actions, as was so very evident in this particular instance and then something entirely different results. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, Government was waiting until after the 6...

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order, Sir, and I believe that the House may be misled by the language used by the Prime Minister in talking about Government, Ministers of the Crown and Cabinet. I have heard, Sir, from the mouth of the Prime Minister that Ministers of the Crown gave assurances to some company or group of associates called St. Philip Land Development Company. I was a Minister of the Crown, Sir, and I am saying that the Ministers of the Crown as far as I am aware never gave any such assurance about the establishment of casino gambling in Barbados. When you flick between the words Government which is an amorphous kind of term and Cabinet, then we are opening ourselves to confusion. I want to make it clear that you can use a term Government and that may include Government officers at varying levels and varying descriptions, those who go off on their own escapades without any authorization and going beyond their remit or whatever it may be - that is not the Cabinet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you saying there were some of those?

Rt Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: There could very well be, Sir. I do not know, but I want to make it absolutely clear that the Ministers of the Crown as far as I am aware did not give any comfort or any commitment to any

company or associates or whatever on this particular matter and I would not like the House to be misled on this matter.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. One minute please. Let us have some order.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this is the point. At least one Member of the Cabinet on July 4, 1994 in response to the Trade Commissioner, it was said that he was proposing to go to London and his trip was to be funded in part by the St. Philip Land Developers to discuss casino gambling. 3:20 p.m.

The range of concessions that were sought were also brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance in a letter of the 12th August, 1994. In that letter, Sir, it was made clear that the developers had met with the Ministry and agreement had been reached in principle on a range of concessions. Those concessions were outlined. Among those concessions were concessions for waivers of imposts on material and other things used for casino gambling. The Minister of Finance did not at any stage minute the file that his Ministry was not intending whatsoever to grant these concessions and I am satisfied....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I give the House the assurance that the Cabinet specifically made a decision that no casino gambling would be included in the concessions granted to the company for the development of St. Philip. The Honourable Member will find a Cabinet decision in which the question of casino gambling was specifically addressed by the Cabinet and it was agreed that no approval will be given for casino gambling.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to conclude, Sir. Everything was being left to be dealt with after September, including the visit to London to discuss with the St. Philip land project people. Everything was being left until after September, Sir. But in the interval, mercifully the people of Barbados had their say in the matter and they have put in place a Government that has brought this matter into the open rather than in backrooms amidst the blue smoke and mirrors where it was being dealt with by the Democratic Labour Party. This is now out in the open.

We have received a Report from the Casino Gambling Commission that we believe is worthy of public support. I believe that the money on this Commission was money well spent. This matter now can be laid to rest and it is against that background...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. Before the Honourable Member sits down and puts the motion, this debate is being televised and I would just like to make

it quite clear that what I would be voting on would be a condemnation and deploring the statement of a former Minister in support of casino gambling in Barbados and rejecting the proposal of the Prime Minister to inquire into the introduction of casino gambling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, what is your point of order?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: My point of order, Sir, is that to those who are listening to this debate it will be perfectly clear as to what I am voting on. I will ask the Honourable Prime Minister to address those 2 points.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, these files that I hold in my hand are all files having to do with the discussions and the plans for casino gambling by the Democratic Labour Party after the Cabinet took a decision on the 3rd June, 1993 that there should have been no casino gambling.

These files were files that were developed after that decision and the fact that they existed at all is the proof that despite what the Cabinet might have said and what the Prime Minister said the proof of the existence of these files after June 1993 is evidence of what were the true intentions of the Democratic Labour Party. They stand condemned. This Resolution in my view was brought to this House for purely mischievous purposes, Sir. It is not worthy of the attention of the House and this side will not be supporting the Resolution.

Obliged to you.

DIVISION

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. G. W. PAYNE, Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Hon. H. E. THOMPSON, Hon. Sir Harold ST. JOHN, His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, Mr. L. R. Tull, Mr. D. Carter, Mr. J. M. EDGHILL, Mr. G. A. CLARKE - 14.

Ayes: Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. J. O. TUDOR, Mr. L. A. WEEKES, Dr. R. C. HAYNES - 6.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would want to revert to Government Business at this time.

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ROAD VIEW, ST. PETER FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SIDEWALK AND CAR PARK

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before this Honourable House seeks approval for the acquisition of 3 parcels of land at Road View, St. Peter for the construction of a sidewalk and car park in the immediate vicinity of the cemetery of the St. Peter's Church.

The parcels of land measure 169.77 square metres from the Barbados Diocesan Trustees, 231.60 square metres from a Lottie Chandler and 568.19 from Nancy Morrison. It will be used to relieve parking congestion and improve the safety of both pedestrians and motorists using the road in the vicinity of the cemetery. 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat shameful that the approval of this project was granted since 1985, the year before the Barbados Labour Party demitted office, and notices required in accordance with the Land Acquisition Act were published and the authorisation signed, yet it is a project which was given a very low priority by the last administration compared with other minor road projects undertaken by the Ministry of Transport. However, at this time the wall of the cemetery is weakening and is considered a safety hazard. Therefore, it is very important that these works be undertaken at this particular point in time. The passage of this Resolution would permit the Crown to finalise the acquisition procedure and pave the way for the implementation of the project at the earliest opportunity.

The Resolution has been certified by the Attorney General to be in order. The survey plans relating to the area of land is required for inspection by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, and the other Honourable Members on that side.

In the circumstances, I hereby beg that this Resolution seeking approval for the acquisition for the said three parcels of land at Road View at this particular point in time for construction of a sidewalk and a car park do now pass.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have discerned little out of the language used by my honourable friend who introduced this; he has put me at some difficulty in trying to interpret everything he said because he was using some very strange language for a man of his training. However, Sir, I have gleaned out of this that he purported to quarrel about the time it has taken.

Actually, Sir, this is a matter that has more to it than apparently meets the eye. First of all it was discovered subsequently that whereas it was believed that land was owned by the Government near the cemetery in Road View, only a part of the land is owned by the Government and another part is owned by the Diocesan Trustees and that the question of straightening the road as it comes from north to south to allow for some safety to pedestrians and to build an appropriate sidewalk would require some additional action from that which had been elicited in 1985 or whenever the Honourable Member had referred.

The further question had to do with the removal of some graves that would necessarily have to be resiled, and also some area of land on the western side of the cemetery where an attempt would be made, because the St. Peter Church was running out of grave sites, to expand and develop the Cemetery in Road View. I am disappointed that the Honourable Member did not include an attempt that has, in fact, been made and is being made, and I have seen recent reference to it in the newspapers, to restore the Chapel so that it will now become a project for the entire country rather than merely for the people of St. Peter and to a lesser extent the people of the north.

I recall very well that as the Minister responsible for the Sanitation Service Authority when we paid a site visit and arising out of the site visit we gave instructions that a whole series of acquisitions should be enquired into by the Ministry responsible so that the Chapel could (a) be restored, and (b) that the burial ground which was in a dilapidated and deplorable condition could form part of the remit of the Sanitation Service Authority to look after public cemeteries. It is not often recognised that except for the Westbury Cemetery the upkeep of public cemeteries in Barbados was not at the level that was required and this was an attempt to bring that cemetery up to the required level; so there were some intricacies connected with the ownership of the land.

Then there was the question of that very ugly and dangerous wall that surrounds the cemetery and the necessity to have the people who live on the western side of the road donate some of their land so that the road could be widened. I would have hoped that the Minister in seeking to acquire this piece of land, which will receive no negative input from Honourable Members on this side, would have been in a position to tell us whether in fact the straightening of the road would form part of this particular project; because as the road comes out of the Highway from the north and goes into Road View, it is very necessary that there be a straightening of that road that would take account of the wall, a part of which had fallen during one of the hurricanes. It is very necessary that we have a foot path for pedestrians who are walking along the Road View area as it abuts and abounds on the properties identified here.

So there was no negligence on the part of anyone, as far as I can recall. There was an attempt to make the matter a much more sensible arrangement than merely acquiring one piece of land. If the Honourable Member would search with his officials he would find that, in fact, he will soon have to come back to the House to acquire land on the northern side of the cemetery because there are some private houses some of the owners of which do not intend to give up any of their land for the necessary curtilage.

In all the circumstances then, Sir, I speak not to contend with the Honourable Member but merely to give some additional information to Honourable Members of the House. We will support this Resolution, Sir.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the acquisition that is being done today is for the purposes of doing improvements for an area which is geographically in the parish of St. Peter but which since 1991 is in the constituency of St. James North. Over time because of the relatively narrow road and the fact that for years school children from Road View and Mullins going down to what is now the Roland Edwards School were often inconvenienced along with other pedestrians in a passage along that road. 3:40 p.m.

A lot of concern was raised for a long time about the fact that not only was the road narrow but there was this wall which was always in a state of disrepair.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Honourable Minister for bringing this acquisition for the reason that, at times, for the last 25, 30 years, we have had situations where, when there were very big funerals, there was congestion, there was great inconvenience and there were a few near misses. In fact, through a stroke of fortune when north cemetery road was made into a proper road, it became a place where several persons could use that road, as a car park.

I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps its capacity as being representative of the biggest storehouse of our ancestors in Barbados, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West could speak with so much authority. But he is right.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that it has been a real problem that half of the property is owned by the Anglican Church and another part by the Crown? This has raised some problems precisely because there were times when the Church would look at the Government and say, it is your responsibility to fix it and at times the Government would look at the Church and say, it is your responsibility to fix it.

The Honourable Member for St Michael West, I believe because he is the representative of the biggest

cemetery in Barbados also made reference to a very important thing, that the Chapel has fallen into disrepair. Again, that said chapel is interesting for the reason that the northern part of the chapel belongs to the Anglican Church and the southern part of the chapel belongs to the Crown.

I believe the time may have come when Government may have to sit down with the Anglican Church and work out some arrangement where the whole property is handed over to the Government. I believe they are going to perhaps ask the Minister to contemplate a situation where he approaches the Diocesan Trustees who are the owners of the property for the Anglican Church and have some arrangement worked out because what has happened is that, as a result of this uncertainty as to who had the right to maintain it that cemetery has been one of the worst kept cemeteries in the western hemisphere. It is often overgrown in bush and shrubbery. The chapel cannot now be used. Mr. Speaker, there are chapels in cemeteries in other parts of Barbados which can be used for the purposes of services. That chapel does not have a roof. It does not have any doors because they are rotten out and gone. There are no windows. The result is that the cemetery is not the best kept in the country.

The other thing is the fact that, perhaps, the Ministry of Health and the Sanitation Services Authority may have to look at the western section of the cemetery because, at high tide, over there close to where the wall is now, you sometimes see sea water spring up especially before the grave digger is able to go down 6 feet, which means that the whole question as to the condition of the St. Peter's cemetery is now up obviously for close scrutiny. We are going to have to look at this matter.

I commend the Minister for bringing the Resolution for the reason that the question of space, for parking and such like are very important questions. But also the condition of the chapel, the condition of the wall and the whole cemetery must, definitely, be approached.

I really do not want to commend the Honourable Member for St. Michael West but I know that because he is an expert in these matters by having the biggest ever cemetery in this country, he would feel a sense of pride to know that he can be seen as the guardian of sacred storehouses of our ancestors. I know the particular pride in which he approaches this question of cemeteries and I will say that he was telling the truth and, perhaps, maybe it is best to leave his speech when he, for once, was able to bring some accuracy to this House of Assembly.

With those remarks, I lend my support to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James South.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief observations as I speak on this Resolution. One is to raise a parochial concern. I note that the land is being acquired for the construction of a sidewalk and car park. I would wish to urge the Honourable Member for St. Andrew and the Minister to take note of the fact that St James South, particularly, along the main, the coast road is in dire need of sidewalks. The road is very narrow for what remains one of our major highways. There are no sidewalks along that road. It is therefore very difficult for the large numbers of people who live in the area and the large numbers of tourists because there are a lot of hotels and restaurants along that coast, to walk freely along the road. It is particularly difficult when buses have to pass. In fact, at Fitts Village, there is a bridge in front of Mr. Chandler's house and in that area buses have actually collided. This is part of the history of St. James South and the climate of the constituency and I just want to draw it to the attention of the Minister that there is a need for sidewalks in that part of the constituency, in other parts of the constituency but, particularly, in that part of the constituency given the high volume of both pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The one who is the staunch member of the DLP lives at Paynes' Bay. The Mr. Chandler of whom I speak lives at Fitts Village. But I know them both. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be distracted by the Members on the other side who, it is their wont to target and attack me perpetually. But I would wish to pass to the other thing on which I want to focus today.

That is that the question of the construction of sidewalks and car parks raises the issue of what will happen and the Honourable Member for St. James North did raise it, the question of graveyards in Barbados. I think there have been repeated concerns raised about what is happening with grave space in Barbados and the maintenance of graves, generally.

I would just want to inform the House of 2 things. First that we have put extra money into the SSA in this Financial Year so that an exercise can be started to grade and properly maintain cemeteries throughout the island because they have fallen into disrepair and they tend to look very bad, overgrown with weeds and shrubs and not properly maintained. Part of the SSA vote will deal with that in this year.

In addition, I think that this is an opportune time to inform the House that the Ministry of Health has, at the moment, an application for the construction of a crematorium. I think it is long overdue. Increasingly various religious sects within the country and private persons have been expressing an interest in being cremated as there has been no facility for that in Barbados, even

though it has been touted, perhaps, for as long as 20 years. The private sector concern is a local one, not a foreign one and it is actively engaging the attention of the Ministry with a view to making a decision on the crematorium. I know it is part of the plan of that private sector organization who have met with me...

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

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: ...in my capacity as the Minister to use Barbados - and that is among their plans - as their base for cremation also for persons from the Eastern Caribbean. Because in this part of the Caribbean, cremation facilities are available only in Trinidad. So that apart from the use that a crematorium can be put to for the local citizenry here in Barbados, that there is also some interest in other nationals from the Eastern Caribbean to use such a facility if it is set up here in Barbados.

The plan, as I understand it, is that there will be a very well laid out and very attractive establishment which is going to be very high tech. I believe that if we are going to encourage the private sector to get involved in all sorts of businesses and industries, and bearing in mind that this is an island with limited land space and that the option of cremation should be made available to citizens who desire to be cremated then, Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Health should comply with making such a facility, as long as it meets the health requirements available.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have noted the comments of Honourable Members. I should like to assure the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, with respect to the dwelling house, that this would form the basis of a separate Resolution.

With respect to the comments of the Honourable Member for St. James South relevant to the repairs to the roads on the coast, this will also form part of a separate project by the Ministry of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do not pass.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, without division. 3.50 p.m.

ORDER NO. 5- RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE TO THE PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANISATION OF LAND AT DAYRELLS ROAD, CHRIST CHURCH TO HOUSE THE OFFICES OF THE CARIBBEAN PROGRAMME COORDINATION

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Government proposes to lease 12 658.8 square metres of land at

Dayrells Road, Christ Church to the Pan American Health Organisation to house its offices. Since 1979 the Pan American Health Organisation occupied a 200-year old building called "Albergeldie" on 12 658.8 square metres of land at Dayrells Road, Christ Church.

The building is in need of extensive repairs and the organisation has considered the option of constructing a new building which is estimated to cost US\$1.3 million. The matter was submitted to the executive committee of the organisation which authorised the Director to proceed with the alternative of constructing a new building.

A building committee comprising the Ministry of Health and PAHO Officials has been established to oversee the project and negotiate the various contracts and payments in accordance with the standard procedure. Tenders have been invited for the construction of the building, expected to take between 12 to 15 months for completion at an estimated cost of \$3.2 million. The architects fee and the cost of equipping and furnishing the building are not included in this figure. The closing date for the return of the tenders is 15th July, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the Government's commitment of one-third of the cost of construction an amount of \$300 000 has been included in the Ministry of Health's Draft Estimates for 1995-96 to meet part-payment of the Government's contribution. Because PAHO will be providing two-thirds of the cost of construction of the new building the Organisation has requested a long-term lease to be put in place with the Government of Barbados as a form of security to enable a release of funds.

One of the conditions of the agreement entered into between PAHO and the Barbados Government states that the premises will revert to the Government of Barbados for nil consideration after termination of the lease term.

The terms of the lease agreement between the Government of Barbados and PAHO will be as follows:

The premises will comprise the property known as "Abergeldie" at Dayrells Road with a new office building to be constructed subject to Town and Country Planning Permission. The period of the lease will be 99 years.

The rent should be a nominal rent of \$1.00 per year.

The Government of Barbados should be responsible for major maintenance of premises, works of a structural nature other than adaptation works and for maintenance of grounds as currently agreed.

PAHO would be responsible for interior decorations, minor repairs, maintenance, payment of utilities, insurance, equipment The premises to revert to the Barbados

Government as I stated above for nil consideration on determination of the lease.

Parliamentary approval is hereby sought to lease the said parcel of land to the Pan American Health Organisation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members can be assured that there will be support of this Resolution which formalises an arrangement that was entered into more than 3 years ago with the international inter-governmental agency called the Pan American Health Organisation. I am very pleased to be able to lend my support from this position to this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is the result of efforts to find a solution to a problem which arose during and indeed at the height of the economic difficulties which Barbados had a few years ago when we happened to be responsible for the administration of this country.

You will recall, Sir, that the terms of the arrangements with the International Monetary Fund were that Barbados could borrow no money other than the amounts which would accrue from the International Monetary Fund and in that context Barbados was not able to solicit money in the international markets and the economic situation was very difficult.

At the same time Barbados had given a commitment earlier to provide premises for the Pan American Health Organisation under the Headquarters Agreement and the premises into which PAHO had gone originally had reached the point of dilapidation, almost. Some examination of the property suggested that a substantial sum of money would have to be expended on its repair and we were on the horns of a dilemma because we could not raise the necessary money to repair the existing building to the level that would be necessary without in some way interfering with the conditionalities surrounding the International Monetary Fund arrangements with Barbados.

It was during that time that I entered, as Minister, into discussions and subsequent negotiations with the then Director of the Pan American Health Organisation, Dr. Carlyle De-Macedo, and we came to an understanding which was subsequently, I think because of the level of acceptance and appreciation of Barbados at PAHO, that Barbados could meet its commitment to provide premises and accommodation for PAHO over a period of time if PAHO could advance as it were the capital sum required for construction of a new building on the property where the old building existed.

I think it is a tribute to the interest and in some ways the ingenuity of the PAHO officials and the Barbados Government at the time through the Ministry of Health that we were able to reach an accommodation which extended

into an Agreement to construct the new premises at "Albergeldie" for PAHO.

Mr. Speaker, it was not an easy arrangement because even as we were discussing that particular arrangement the powers that be at the U.N. were forging forth towards a system by which all United Nations buildings, all United Nations agencies would be compressed within one entity in the respective countries where they would exist. It is because the Pan American Health Organization has its own genealogy and does not depend for its existence on the existence of the United Nations that PAHO was able to resist a very strong press on the part of certain developed countries for an arrangement that would have seen PAHO subsumed within the generality of the United Nations Organization, that PAHO was able to proceed notwithstanding the discussions that were going on to establish its own entity in Barbados to the tune of U.S.\$3.2 million, I believe. 4:00 p.m.

As a result, it means that we are assured for as far as the eye can see into the future of an arrangement by which the Pan American Health Organization will have its CPC located in Barbados. On the face of it, that may not seem important; but given that at least one sister country in CARICOM has been during the last two years especially working towards the establishment of a central system in its capitol where it would woo all of the international and regional agencies to its own capitol and some of them away from Barbados, I think that it was a victory for us that we have been able to establish PAHO's CPC (central programme coordinator) for the Caribbean located in Barbados, and that is fairly certain, along with other agencies.

As a matter of fact, Sir, from another Ministry subsequently one was able to discuss with the Secretary General of the United Nations the desirability of establishing UNDP and other U.N. agencies within the same compound at Albergeldie and that the Government would be willing to make the land available if they would make the capital investment to build new U.N. agency offices in Barbados. Those agency offices now exist at Jemmotts Lane and even though they have a higher quality than the Ministerial accommodation at Jemmotts Lane for the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health, they were still arguing theirs would be a better accommodation if they could somehow be located at Sherbourne where they had cast their eyes, at least one UNDP Director, as a desirable place for location. We were able to tell the Secretary General during the time of the U.N. Conference on Sustainable Development when he visited these shores that we were not in a position to consider Sherbourne as a place for the U.N. system which includes PAHO. PAHO forms part of the U.N. system and that is why I took the opportunity to discuss the U.N.'s concept that all of their agencies should be in the same place.

The fact that PAHO has been able to forge ahead and that this building has proceeded and will eventually not long from now come to fruition was one of the reasons why the U.N. was unable to convince anybody at New York that they should move the U.N. Headquarters, that is the regional headquarters of U.N. agencies, from Barbados to Port-of-Spain where the Government of Trinidad and Tobago was working very vigorously to induce the various U.N. agencies to move. It is an ambition which has not died with the change of Government from my information and the Government would be well-advised to keep their eyes and ears open. Not only was the Government of Trinidad and Tobago trying to steer away agencies from Barbados, but they were trying to steer away ambassadorships as well saying to countries in the ACS and other places that it would be better for them to locate in Trinidad and Tobago. They went so far as to offer free accommodation in Port-of-Spain if those agencies and countries would relocate their ambassadors and their representation from Bridgetown to Port-of-Spain.

Some might say that this is not a matter that I should air publicly, but I do not consider giving information of this kind to the House of Assembly to be airing the matter publicly so much as to be putting the Government and Honourable Members on guard. This business of location is not a simple matter. It is an economic matter as well as a political and constitutional matter. It is an economic matter because the more agencies that are located in a capitol, the more foreign exchange will come to that capitol from and for the persons who are located here and the people in Port-of-Spain are not unmindful as are the people in other capitols in the Caribbean and within CARICOM of the benefits which accrue from having these agencies located in their respective capitols.

It is important when we are discussing these matters that the record shows outside of Barbados to all that will listen that we are *ad idem* and not divided in our quest for having Barbados as the number one place in the Caribbean for agencies of this kind. When I rise to give support to this Resolution, I am giving support with pride because the continuation of work which we have started and I am not seeking to take credit necessarily because the credit here does not accrue for political purposes only but rather it forms part of our national pride.

I, therefore, commend the Honourable Member for bringing the Resolution as swiftly as he has done. It is going to result in the continuation of the recognition of Barbados as a major centre for activity of this kind. Considering that this was accomplished before we had reached the point where one of our own nationals had ascended to the very highest level in this organization, I think it speaks well of the recognition which Barbados has outside of our own shores for the Ministries of Health, Education and Foreign Affairs, *et cetera*.

Mr. Speaker, during the time of my sitting in this House, I have seen a lot of advancement of our country but I do not think that there is any doubt that the ascendancy of a Barbadian to the highest position in the Pan American Health Organization is the epitome of our achievement to date. Unfortunately, this House as it is constituted does not take cognizance as a matter of course of such happenings. And so some of the erstwhile colleagues in the rest of the Caribbean have asked me from time to time why there was no resolution in this House of congratulations for the Head of PAHO when he achieved his position. 4:10 p.m.

I take this opportunity now to place on record at least on this side our appreciation of the very high honour which came to Barbados by the acquisition of the position of Director of PAHO. I think that on another occasion and under certain circumstances which would allow for a wider discussion because this resolution is merely acquisition, one would wish to go on record in a much more specific way but the fact that the Director will have to be and I believe has in fact signed the agreement will be the one signing the agreement to establish this arrangement between the Government of Barbados and the Pan American Health Organisation to make this property available for 99 years provides sufficient basis on which I can mention in passing the significant achievement of our having Sir George Alleyne as the Director of PAHO.

I think that the arrangement which we made is one that is acceptable and one which can serve as a model for Barbados over the years. We had offered to UNDP the property formerly owned by N. E. Wilson on Fontabelle as a potential site for UNDP Headquarters in the region and I hope that the Government will continue to pursue the possibility of their locating approximate to this property at Albergeldie because locating the U.N. regional headquarters in Barbados is of economic and political and other benefit to Barbados. I hope that the Minister therefore will allow for continued access to that property in the surrounding areas of Albergeldie.

It is desirable that where the Government has property that the Government should seek to induce as many international agencies as possible to locate in that property because it raises the level of the area surrounding the property and it gives us a continuation of the influx of appropriate foreign exchange for our own development.

Sir, although I took a little long to agree we will have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this Resolution which has come before us this afternoon.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been fully aware of the work done by PAHO in Barbados and I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting this Resolution.

There is some slight area of clarification that I need. What is going to happen to the existing building? Is that going to be pushed down and a new building put up? I am not very much in favour of pushing down old buildings and I know that there is going to be a continuing demand for office space in that area. If it is condemned they can rehabilitate it and if the building can be in anyway be rehabilitated you might find that the rentals from that building offsets the cost for the new building because I believe I am correct in saying that entire area seems to me to be becoming very much like the new city of Barbados, from Oistins right down to the Garrison.

I notice a lot of development and a significant change in the character of the area over the past few years. If the building can be rescued in anyway at all I think some consideration should be given to that. In Barbados, Sir, we have a tendency to go knocking down old buildings and putting up new buildings but the point is that some of those old buildings can be restored and can be made very attractive and can be financially viable and a tremendous source of income.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I am quite sure that if the Government wishes advice as to the present and future economic viability of that old building then we have in our presence here an expert on buildings in the Christ Church area. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South. He is an expert on these matters.

I sincerely hope that there will be no rush to destroy unless the building cannot be rehabilitated because...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You know, Sir, condemning public buildings is one thing but condemning it from a private sector point of view is another thing altogether. It is easy to condemn a government building but most private sector organisations and the private 'sector individuals would take the same building and rehabilitate it and it would last another hundred years.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is just the point I want to make to deal with that particular issue, if the building can be rescued at all I think every effort should be made to rescue it because the demands for office space is there. I have noticed recently and I believe that a group now will be coming in on the other side and I notice that they are acquiring a lot of old properties - it is a private sector group - which many people would consider to be properties to be condemned and they plan to renovate them and cause them to become a very effective unit. Just over the hill, on Hastings. I don't want to mention the name in the House. It is a private sector organisation. Near the Marine Gardens area there and my understanding is that

this organisation will be buying up those old properties and will be renovating them and turning them into effective commercial properties.

So, Sir, with those few words and my one enquiry as to the status of the existing building and whether or not it could be rescued I will rest my position there. I don't think I need to go into the history of PAHO or into the history of this matter which has been charted quite adequately by the Honourable Member *for* St. Michael West. Thank you.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution to say a few words. Much of the history of the matter has been detailed by the Honourable Member *for* St. Michael West. I think though that we must not let the occasion pass unless I commend the Minister of Foreign Affairs because she did fight a battle to keep PAHO and the other U.N. organisations here.

The Honourable Member *for* St. Michael West did point out the full implications of that and alluded to the economic implications but it is important *for* us to remain the diplomatic centre and the centre for the U.N. organisations with the full import of the prestige and economic advantage of so remaining. The Honourable Member *for* St. Michael South Central has voiced some concerns over the building itself. I do not think that the existing building is going to be saved but I know that in the new design that the architects and the directorate of PAHO and the Caribbean Programme Co-ordinator were very careful to ensure that as many of the mature trees - because it really is a beautiful sight with a lot of trees on it - were not damaged or cut down, that the building will be so sited on the compound that the present ambiance and environment is preserved. 4:20 p.m.

Before I resume my seat I think that I would also wish for the sake of the record and history to note that the present Minister of Foreign Affairs was the Minister of Health when PAHO came to Barbados, I think it was in 1979 and therefore she was very much involved at the time in their choice of site and so on. Again, as Minister of Foreign Affairs and Deputy Prime Minister, she has been very much involved in this site together with the Caribbean Programme Coordinator.

Some weeks ago we turned the sod at Albergeldie and the Ministry of Health looks forward to a very fruitful relationship with PAHO particularly under its new Director, Sir George Alleyne. I think all sides of the House - the Honourable Member *for* St. Michael West said that side - have worked towards promoting him as Director and ensuring that he was, in fact, placed. I think Barbados as a whole is proud to have a Barbadian elevated to the directorship of PAHO. The Ministry of Health will ensure that good relations with PAHO continue in so far as it is possible for us to do so.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, in response to the comments which were made by Honourable Members on that side, firstly with respect to the state of the building, the building is in need of extensive repairs. It is a building of about 200 years old. Based on the findings of a structural engineer and a quantity surveyor engaged by PAHO, the following estimates have been submitted for the repairs:-

Replacement of roofs and gutter, repairs to windows, doors, internal and external walls, floor reinforcement, ceilings, fire exit doors, plumbing, termite treatment, painting, external drainage modification and upgrading the electrical systems to modern codes	U.S. \$440 000
Central air conditioning	130 500
Hurricane protection of the building	10 000
Internal space arrangement	200 000
Professional fees for specification and work supervision	<u>35 000</u>
	U.S. \$815 500

This estimate does not include the cost of the replacement of the floors which are sagging as well as the possible and expected problems which are always likely when old buildings are repaired. It is estimated that these additional works would cost an additional U.S. \$1 million. The building is in a state where it cannot now be saved.

With respect to the reference by the Honourable Member for St Michael West about the United Nations wanting to utilise the area in the vicinity of PAHO, I would like to state that we have already had discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a site has been identified to the north of the Marine House building which would also involve the demolition of Marine House as well on 3V₂ acres of the total land area of 8V₂ acres. It is hoped that this building will be shortly constructed. Very shortly when all the plans and arrangements are finalised I will be coming to Cabinet for a special lease to the United Nations of this particular area for the construction of this new building.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, June 27, 1995 at 11 o'clock in the morning. In

view of the fact that the Honourable Member has moved his Resolution again, his motion of no-confidence...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It will be on the Order Paper for next week.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes. It was done in here. He moved it in here this afternoon.

The Government is prepared to set aside next Tuesday, June 27 to debate the motion of no-confidence as refiled.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It seems that my choice of language was not sufficiently positive. We are prepared to debate the matter next Tuesday, June 27, 1995.

With those words, Sir, I beg to move that this Honourable House do now adjourn as proposed.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion and I wish to speak on the adjournment and to say to the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who does the duties of Leader of the House, not only with great relish, as one can see, but also with great aplomb, that I will be willing to consult with him at anytime, or all of them over there on this matter if he wishes to consult with me but that, in fact, I am ready and will be ready now, or next Tuesday, to complete the no-confidence motion. I am anxious to do it and I therefore accept his offer. If he wishes further consultation with me as the *de facto* leader of the House, I will be quite willing to have any discussion with him on the matter in that new role.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion, Sir, they have a habit...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. I just wish to know. Is it that the Leader of the Opposition is saying that where the *de facto* leader is negotiating that he is available for consultation but where *titdejure* leader is concerned, only in writing? I just wish to be certain that that is my understanding. Is that your understanding, Mr. Speaker? 4.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. My understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition is willing to consult with the Other Side to ensure the smooth running of the House.

The question is...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to say because I know that in the DLP column in the *Advocate* for Friday, I will get some more damages to add to the ones that I am claiming for last Friday.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: All right We will wait and see. I am careful about those who try to create splits by flattery. The Leader of the House has her papers here.

In her absence, I am moving the Adjournment of the House. There is nothing more to it than that. I am not taking any chances with them over there.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you finished?

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now adjourned until Tuesday, June 27,1995 at 11.00a.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 4.32 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 1396

Confirmation of Minutes of Tuesday, June, 13, 1995.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE SPEAKER**Mr. SPEAKER** 1396

Receipt of a special report on the Inequitable Operation of the Severance Payments Act, Cap. 355A.

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR 1396

The Sugar Industry (Sugar Workers Provident Fund) Order, 1995.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR 1396

The Financial Administration and Audit ^ (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND 1397

The Agricultural Diagnostic and Other i/ Services (Fees) Bill, 1995.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 1397

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

Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 1397; Mr. Speaker, 1397.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 1397, 1404; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 1400; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 1400, 1404; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 1403; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1403,1404; Mr. L. A. Weekes, 1405; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1406; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 1406; Mr. Speaker, 1407.

RESOLUTION AGAINST INTRODUCTION OF
CASINO GAMBLING IN BARBADOS 1408

Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1408.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON 1412

1. Question re the closure of Hothersal Primary School, St John.

2. Question re applications for television or radio licences made to the Broadcasting Authority since January 1, 1994.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON 1412

Resolution of No Confidence in the Honourable Minister of Education and Culture and calling upon the Minister to resign.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS (resumed)

ORDER NO. 2 (resumed)

Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 1412, 1418, 1420; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 1417, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1422,1423; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1419, 1420; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1422.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY
THE CROWN OF LAND AT ROAD VIEW,
ST. PETER 1423

Hon. G. W. Payne, 1423; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1423; Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 1424; Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 1425.

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
LEASE TO THE PAN AMERICAN HEALTH
ORGANISATION OF LAND AT DAYRELLS
ROAD, CHRIST CHURCH . . 1426

Hon. G. W. Payne, 1426, 1430; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1427, 1430; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 1429; Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 1430.

SUSPENSION 1411

ADJOURNMENT..... 1430

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 1430; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 1430; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 1430.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St. James North) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown) PAYNE, Hon. G. W. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St John) THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St James South) WEEKES, Mr. L. A. (St Michael North West)