

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, November 17, 1995.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Friday, November 17, 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.P.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.
Mr. L. A. WEEKES

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, and Ministry 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.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM/Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)

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

Hon. G. V£. 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.)

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

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. H. F. LASHLEY

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 Rev. Laurence Small. Mr.

SPEAKER: The House is now in session.

MINUTES Mr. SPEAKER: The

Minutes of November 14, 1995.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Minutes of this Honourable House of Assembly for Tuesday, November 14, 1995 are not yet ready and I would beg thee for postponement

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If that be the wish of the House, we will defer that item.

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the Reports of the Public Enterprise Investment Fund for the quarters ending June 30, 1995 and September 30, 1995.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

The question that those Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of this days sitting -was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the Order of the Day.

ORDER NO. 5 - TO MOVE THAT THIS HOUSE RESOLVE ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY TO CONSIDER THE GRANT OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE SERVICE OF BARBADOS

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable Chamber is now in Committee of Supply.

ORDER NO. 5(a) - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE ADDITIONAL SUM OF \$32 489 562 FROM THE CONSOL- IDATED FUND TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 1995/96 AS SHOWN IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 6 OF 1995-96

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Head 13 Prime Minister's Office stands part of an overall supplementary in the amount of \$32 507 110 and before I deal specifically with the matters being addressed under the items falling under the Prime Minister's Office, I ought to set this omnibus Resolution in its proper fiscal context.

Mr. Chairman, at the middle of the fiscal year Government undertook a review of Government's fiscal position in the light of revenue and expenditure trends. The fiscal review undertaken at the end of September indicated that the fiscal deficit for the first half of the fiscal year was some \$93 million less than targeted. If I might give the House the benefit of the outturn in relation to projection, Sir, in 1994/95 for the first half of the fiscal year some \$465.9 million in revenue were raised. In the first half of the fiscal year 1995/96, Sir, that is the period ending September 30th, \$492.8 million were raised. So that our

revenue for this first half was \$26.9 million more than the first half of 94/95. In addition, Sir, there was an amount of \$14.2 million that was taken in from the Customs Department on 29th of September, 1995 but that was not brought until October and that is not included in the revenue statement for the first half of the year/Revenue projections for the first half of the year were \$490 million. So that the revenue was not only above the outturn for last year but also was above projections. By contrast, current expenditure was \$496.8 million for 1994/95 and in 1995/96 there was \$547 million as compared to a projection for the half of \$591 million. So that we spent \$46 million less on the current side than what we projected. On the capital side, Sir, for the first half of 1994/95, \$62.3 million in capital expenditures were incurred and for the first half of this fiscal year \$46 million in capital expenditures were incurred. So that capital expenditure, Sir, for the first half of this year was \$16 million less than for the same period last year. But more to the point, Sir, within the context of the overall capital budget for this year 1995/96 we had anticipated spending \$94 million in the first half of the year. As you would have observed, Sir, capital expenditure for the first half of the fiscal year was some \$48 million less than projected.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I might have to repeat that. Capital expenditure for the first half of the fiscal year was \$46 million as compared to \$62.3 million for last year and as compared to \$94 million projected to be spent. So that the Government has a bit of elbow room within which it can re-order its spending priorities, particularly on the capital side, and still keep within the overall boundaries of the fiscal policy that was set at the start of the year. 11.30a.m.

If I may give the House a more complete picture, the fiscal target for the year would have required us to incur a deficit of well over 1% of GDP in the context of a situation where we wanted to maintain healthy reserves. Our reserves have held up better than expected. The Government does not, at this stage, want to deviate from its position of maintaining a deficit of just over 1% of GDP. In the context of a situation where our expenditure for the first half of the year was some \$96 million less than anticipated, the Government, arising out of its fiscal review, thought it desirable to introduce supplementaries amounting to \$32 million. We feel satisfied, Sir, that we can incur this expenditure and still keep within the fiscal targets for the year because of the low levels of overall spending in the first half of the year and equally, Sir, because as I said, revenues have not only grown but have exceeded expectations.

Sir, I would now like to deal specifically with matters raised by Head 13, but before I do so, I just wish to say that the composition of our expenditures as envisioned by this supplementary shows that, of the \$32 million in supplementaries being sought, there is a relative equality between capital and current expenditures. We are envisioning, Mr. Chairman, spending \$14 million more on the capital side and \$17.8 million more on the current side.

Within the context of current expenditure, the largest increase goes to Tourism where an additional \$5 million is being given to the Tourism Authority to increase its expenditure on advertising.

Even within the context of the current account, \$17 million supplementary, fully 1/3rd is in fact designed to help expand the foreign exchange earning capabilities of the country. I trust that in the course of this debate Ministers will have the opportunity to speak to some of the new priorities as identified for capital purposes and I would just want to highlight that the major beneficiaries will be again tourism, industry, commerce and public works.

As regards the Prime Minister's Office, the main increases pertain to enlarge provision for the Defence Force as well as provisions relating to the Independence celebrations. Mr. Chairman, last year's Independence celebrations, in the judgement of Government, were not sufficiently broadly based to involve the community and the Government this year has decided that we would want to have independence celebrations that involve all Barbados in the celebration of its Independence.

We are seeking the House's permission to expend \$100 000 on community independence celebrations. In addition, Mr. Chairman, under Head 13, the Prime Minister's Office: General Management and Co-ordination, \$50 000 is being sought to support the establishment of a Commission on the Constitution. We believe that the time has come for a full-fledged review of the Constitution of Barbados and this fund is to start this work in train. In addition, as the House might be aware, the Government of Barbados has just recently entered into an Economic Co-operation Agreement with the countries of the OECS and an additional \$8 000 is now being sought in order to facilitate the work of giving effect to that Economic Co-operation Agreement.

Under the Defence Force - \$613 844 are being sought. Of this amount \$350 000 are intended to support the deployment of our soldiers in Haiti as part of the CARICOM Contingent. Most of this will be reimbursed, given the basis on which our forces are deployed and in addition, Sir, \$2 000 are being sought to deal with major structural damages to the Trident which was discovered early in the financial year and which cannot wait.

We are also seeking under this Head, Mr. Chairman, funds under Program 03: Information and Media Relations to enable the Government Information Service to cover the costs of mounting a public education programme pertaining to the VAT. Some \$56 000 is being sought for this purpose.

Another major item of expenditure in relation to the Prime Minister's Office has to do with the Government Printing Department where \$30 000 is being sought to supplement the expenditure which has already been approved by Parliament. Much of this is arising out of the printing required to publicise the Independence Celebrations and matters of that character.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have covered most of the major items falling under Head 13: Prime Minister's Office and I stand ready to answer any questions arising therefrom. We have unlimited time in this House to deal with all of these various heads and, as I said, I would like all of them to be appraised. So at this stage, I would beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the presentation of the Honourable Member for St. Peter. It reminded me and I had to remark to the shadow Minister of Legal Affairs that it reminded me of an unsworn statement from the dock: very subdued tones, deferential, an exercise in what one would describe as eating humble pie.

Mr. Chairman, I would not be surprised that we would get a presentation like this today, but because there is reason for sobriety and restraint on that side does not mean that the Opposition feels likewise. We have a lot to say about this particular supplementary and we have a lot to say about it in the context of the pronouncements made by the Prime Minister, from overseas, from all parts of the world, about the economic management of this country since he certainly hasn't had a lot of time to say it here in Barbados, particularly in response to comments that I may have made from time to time.

This must have been an embarrassing moment. It must have been a salutary exercise for the Minister of Finance and I certainly don't propose to rely on anything that he has said in his presentation, except to say, Mr. Chairman, that having heard him stand in this place on previous occasions and criticise other Ministers of Finance for bringing supplementaries to increase provision for National Insurance Contributions, to increase provision for personal emoluments, to increase provision for supplies and materials. He used to describe it as financial madness, as recklessness, lack of proper economic management.

He even went as far as to say during the course of the past year that management by supplementaries would be a thing of the past, that his qualifications, experience and ability were in forecasting, and if a simple Ministry could not forecast what it was to spend in any given year on things like National Insurance, personal emoluments, and the level of its capital expenditure, then something had to be wrong with the top. Those, Mr. Chairman, were his statements from time to time. He said all of that had come to an end. There was a new form of economic management in place. There would be reviews before the Estimates. There would be 15 meetings of the Estimates Committee where people would sit down and defend programmes and determine them down to their minute details so that the House would not be kept back in this exercise of supplementaries. 11.40a.m.

Mr. Chairman, a few short months after those grandiose statements, the Honourable Member for St. Peter in that statement which he delivered this morning has once again reversed himself. I am not surprised on this occasion that he is so restrained and subdued in presenting this exercise. It must have been an embarrassing moment. Who could believe that there would be a supplementary for National Insurance Contributions under the economic management of the Honourable Member for St. Peter? That was supposed to be something of the past.

Mr. Chairman, this is surprising because, as I said, the Honourable Member for St. Peter has quite clearly made it known to the people of Barbados that the skills he brings to politics are not things like background and position, but management and economic skills, and that he made a living on forecasting. Therefore, what the Honourable Prime Minister needs to do in this debate is to say what has suddenly happened to those forecasting skills, and if he is not here often enough to manage the Ministry carefully, then he has to depute people to do it. You cannot have Government by Personal Assistants, although it seems as though that is one effort that is being undertaken. You have to find another excuse for this horrendous exercise, \$32 million, and we are in the month of November!

Unless the Prime Minister can give a very clear undertaking that he will bring no more supplementaries after this, that this so-called mid-term review which he heralded as some kind of new approach to management, will mean that there will never be another supplementary between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year, I would apply all of the epithets, all of the criticisms, all of the carping which I have heard previously from him to this exercise which we are going through today. I do not need to repeat it because the doctrine, *res ipso loquitur*, applies to this.

This supplementary speaks for itself. It tells a story of economic management in Barbados. It tells the story that

all of the Press releases from Washington, Jamaica and elsewhere cannot tell. I say that because I have made the point outside of Barbados about the capital works programme being under-executed. I have made the point outside of Barbados that one of the first areas for cut-backs by a Government when it is seeking to carefully manage its fiscal deficit is the capital works programme. In response to what I said, the Honourable Prime Minister issued a Press release and said that the public will have to judge who is telling the truth.

Mr. Chairman, he went on to say that supplementaries would soon be brought to the House for capital projects. Listen to what is being brought before the House, Mr. Chairman? The Honourable Member for St. Peter is telling this Chamber that the existing capital programme is under-executed and that it is \$48 million less than the capital programme expenditure for the last fiscal year.

The Central Bank's documentation tells us that the capital works programme is not on track, that it is lagging, or under-executed. Yet, you have a supplementary for \$32 million which I thought the Prime Minister would not need to bring at this time if he already had a capital works programme approved in March. These supplementaries are not for any major new projects. That is the thing about it. When you look through it you see the Holetown Complex. The Holetown Complex is not a new project. You see a whole list of projects which are being completed.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. As regards the Holetown Complex, that is money they owed to the contractor when they were the Government.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: So that is a new capital project, Mr. Chairman! He got up to tell us that paying for part capital works project is a new capital project because that is what I was talking about, that we were going to get a new tranche of capital projects which would create employment and that it was untrue to say, and that the Leader of the Opposition was essentially lying when he made comments about the nature of the capital works programme.

Well, anybody can carry out any simple economic analysis and come to the very straightforward conclusion that what I said about Government's capital works programme is correct. It is correct for the simple reason that the Prime Minister himself has not even been able to give us a clear explanation for what accounts for the slowness in the execution of this capital works project. So you can see the level of fiscal disarray and confusion. You can see clearly a scenario in which the Minister responsible does not have full control of his Ministry and can say things far away from Barbados which bear no relation

to what is happening on the ground in this country. I describe it as an exercise in eating humble pie. It does not surprise me. The public can now judge who was telling the truth when those comments were made about the capital works programme and the tight fiscal programme which the Government is running.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, we have not seen the so-called medium-term, macro-economic programme on which the Government has essentially committed itself to governing this country...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: It is none of my business, the Prime Minister says. I always thought it would never be any of my business. It is the IMF's business because they were permitted to see and approve it, but it is none of my business. That is the problem that we are facing in this country today, Mr. Chairman, that that macro-economic programme is not forming part of the public discourse. It is not going to be made available to us and we know why because there are elements of the programme that the Prime Minister does not want us to discuss here. What are the implications in respect of the wage bill? What kind of deficit is he going to be running over that period? What is the level of the foreign financing?

Mr. Chairman, when people speak about borrowing cap in hand, I am very happy to congratulate the Prime Minister on finally accepting the IADB loan. It was the second line in the letter from the IADB that really brought home to me what kind of bind the Honourable Prime Minister finds himself in, because of less significance in that letter than the approval of the loan, was the matter relating to the guarantee arrangements which the IADB can put in place for the Barbados Government to float bonds on the international capital markets, or some other facility of such type, for which there had been preliminary discussions, according to the writer of that letter to the Prime Minister. I then saw the entire picture very clearly, before my eyes, when I saw the documentation. 11.50a.m.

Mr. Chairman, I expect no better. This debate exposes fully the level of management of our economic affairs and I think the public is going to have to be the judge, at the end of the day, of all of this.

Imagine that a couple of years ago, you could hear people on this side of the House laughing and saying that the only capital project the Democratic Labour had was an Independence Arch and now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, probably will get up with pride to extol a capital works programme which is \$48 million less than the level of capital

expenditure to this point, in the last fiscal year. This is something that is unbelievable. I think the Prime Minister should read his own speeches.

I am having trouble speaking because I do not believe in hypocrisy. Perhaps somebody in here may be able to explain it to me but I do not believe in it and therefore that is why I have trouble.

Let us get to the so-called new programmes. You have \$100 000 for community Independence celebrations. Divide that by 28 constituencies and work out how much you would get.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: How much I had? That is the question I want to answer now and I am glad that question came. In my constituency, the community council has been programming Independence celebrations for the past 9 years without a cent from any Government department. This Government comes along, puts a jingle on the radio, puts a logo on some envelopes, provides some large, bristol boards posters with a logo on it and a list of activities which the St. John community had been doing for the past 9 years, setting aside football, cricket match, church service, fun walk, an exhibition, all of that and seeks to give the public the impression that it is launching some major community Independence celebrations. Before that, Barbadians were starved of the opportunity of adequately reflecting and celebrating Independence in this country.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, I consider it to be another sham because there is nothing much that has been added to the programme which had been previously financed by the hard earned dollars of the citizens of communities throughout Barbados that is being added by this. And then when you write to the National Cultural Foundation to ask for some stages to put on activities assuming that you would have gotten those items, free of cost, you get back a letter from the National Cultural Foundation telling you that the cost of transportation of the stages is \$120. So that that is not being provided, I assume, out of this \$100 000. I know how these things go. I am going to be watching to see who is going to be paid honoraria because that is something that happens in Barbados all the time. People go out into communities where others have been doing work from time immemorial, hand-picked individuals...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one more minute.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir... give the impression that they are doing community work and

they get paid honoraria by the Government and the people who have been doing the work consistently, in times of hardship, do not get any recognition or any form of financial assistance.

I believe that the Minister needs to account to us what is this \$100 000 going to be spent on? Inter-parish games, travelling, office supplies, parish productions, advertising contingencies and technical costs. Twenty-eight constituencies throughout Barbados, hundreds of communities and the impression will be given that this is a major thrust in the area of Independence celebrations when the Chairpersons of the Committee say that the only thing they can give you is 2 pieces of bristol board and a few logos to put on any kind of activity which you are generating in your constituency. There is some other item they will be providing. I cannot remember what it is but, essentially, advertising of activities which already exist. This is not any new initiative. This is an initiative at public relations, giving the people the impression that the Barbados Labour party is funding and sponsoring activities which it has nothing to do with.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I will come back, Sir. Thank you.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Member for St. John took his usual dip in his private intellectual cesspool once again, the kind of dip in his intellectual cesspool that now causes him to be held in such disrepute by serious people in Barbados.

Under this Head dealing with the Prime Minister's Office he waxed warm, went wide, questioned Government's economic management and talked, once again, about our supposed secret relationship with the International Monetary Fund. One would have thought that, by now, the Member for St. John above all other people would not want to even mention the name of the IMF in Barbados. He took a whole crew and drowned them.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, at no point in my presentation...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order. You cannot ask me what I am rising on. Mr. Chairman, at no point during the course of my presentation today did I say anything about a secret deal with the International Monetary Fund. You heard my presentation and therefore

the Honourable Member should be asked to withdraw that misleading statement.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it bothers the Member for St. John that I travel. He keeps repeating it in his speeches so I have to deal with it once and for all. It bothers him, for example, that I went to the Canadian Barbados Business Association meeting to speak on behalf of Barbados, although he was there travelling first class. It bothers him that I went to London to speak...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Not your money, the man at the helm's money. They are hand in hand with the man at the helm. It bothers him that I should go to New York, as one of the world leaders, to address the UN on its fiftieth anniversary but he goes there to address people in New York. It bothers him that I should go to London to meet the Prime Minister of England to give a lecture to the West Indian Committee but he goes there to address the people in London. My going abroad is a bother to him.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question of Government's economic management and statements about the Government's economic management have been the subject of commentary abroad and at home by the Member for St. John. His statement in New York was that the nature of the relationship that we were supposed to have entered into, under an IMF programme, as a condition for the IABD loan which does not exist because there is no IMF programme, there is no surveillance programme...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. At no point in my interview with Mr. Tony Best did I say IMF programme. I said IMF surveillance scheme and, in the course of my interview, I indicated to the Prime Minister that it was for him to tell us what the arrangement was. I have, at no point - and you are not going to distort the Record and give people another opinion accused the Government of entering into any programme with the IMF relative to the IADB loan.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I expect him soon to come to this House and say that at no stage in the election campaign did he invite the people of Barbados to come and hear about this secret deal that had been entered into by Owen Arthur and the IMF.

He went to New York and told the world that the Government of Barbados was to be under a surveillance programme from the International Monetary Fund. An enhanced surveillance programme by the IMF has a specific meaning. When you speak of a surveillance programme with the Fund, it has a specific meaning.

You can have a stand-by arrangement or you can have an enhanced surveillance programme. The fact of the matter is that the previous Democratic Labour Party Administration led by the Member for St. John had agreed that there should be an enhanced surveillance programme between Barbados and the IMF to the point where there was a man sitting in the Ministry of Finance, an IMF Representative, telling the Member for St. John how he should run the country. Everything that he did had to be sent downstairs to the IMF officials for approval. That is what Barbados had come to. That is what this country had come to. 12.00 noon.

The difference between them and us is that we told the IMF, go home. We neither want funded programmes nor do we want an enhanced surveillance programme with you. But he was in New York talking about a surveillance programme. He also said, Mr. Chairman, that under the IMF Programme we would have to cut capital expenditures and that a lot of Ministers would be disappointed because there would be a cut in capital expenditure. What this supplementary is doing, Sir, is saying, once again that the Member for St. John is the liar that he is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that it is out of order to....

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Complete stranger to the truth, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are therefore asked to withdraw the remark.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I withdraw the remark. We are bringing a supplementary to this Parliament, Sir, in the light of the fact, as I said, that we have done a review of the fiscal position. Estimates are Estimates, Sir. A Government has the responsibility to review its fiscal position in the light of revenue outturn and in the light of expenditure patterns. Revenue is up. Expenditure is down and these Supplementary Estimates reflect Government's re-ordering of expenditures in the light of the fact that our expenditure is down substantially and our revenue is up. What can be wrong with that? There are a large number of capital projects, Mr. Chairman, that were devised by the Democratic Labour Party and are wrapped up in so many policy conditions as to create only the greatest difficulties in their execution.

Today, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I met with the World Bank before coming to Parliament on the second World Bank rural rehabilitation programme. That US\$21 million that has been voted by the World Bank to support that programme is not only about repairing roads. A large number of conditionalities have been attached to it and

agreed to by the Democratic Labour Party, such that it is almost impossible to get access to the funds to spend unless you meet condition after condition.

This morning, Sir, I was discussing with the World Bank why this Government would have a difficulty agreeing to access funds for road rehabilitation in this country as if a condition is a serious change in bus fares. But the DLP administration had a World Bank road rehabilitation programme ostensibly intended to allow us to get funds to repair roads but wrapped up, Sir, in all kinds of conditionalities which the Minister of Works should have the opportunity to speak to. Mr. Chairman, Sir, one of the reasons why we have had this slow down in capital expenditure execution is precisely because we have a difficulty with a lot of the conditionalities that are attached to most of the foreign funded projects that the Democratic Labour Party agreed to.

We have had a problem, Mr. Chairman, with the TVET Council. \$18 million in World Bank funds have been voted for Technical and Vocational Education in this country. We have put the funds in the Estimates but the problem is, Mr. Chairman, that we could never accept the conditions agreed to by the DLP. We could never agree that you should charge fees at the Community College in Barbados. We could never agree, Mr. Chairman, that you should charge fees at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, but that is what they had agreed to and it goes on and on in that fashion. A large part of the difficulty on the capital side, as I said therefore, is that there has been a lot of policy based borrowing by the DLP Government. We have had to review most of those policies and therefore, although the funds have been voted, our rate of disbursement has been slow because there are a lot of the conditions that we have asked to be reviewed. In the interim, Sir, because capital expenditure for the half has been down, we now see the opportunity to bring on things that we would not have been in a position to execute if the expenditure was at the level that we had projected.

I want to say, Sir, the fact that \$48 million was spent is not because the IMF said cut the programme as the Member for St. John was trying to impute in New York. The Member for St. John left the impression in New York that this Government would not have been able at all to come to this House with any request for an increase in capital expenditure of any sort and today we are asking this House to vote an increase of \$14 million in capital expenditure.

We are setting up a drainage unit in the Ministry of Public Works. Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are repairing all or most of the police stations, we are doing the Fire Station in St. John which a former Minister of Finance made sure that he neglected.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, under this capital programme, we are repairing the airport. We are putting funds as well into the capital programme to accelerate the work to do the studies for the design of the expansion of the airport and the port. The point, Mr. Chairman, is that this gives the lie to the vicious untruth perpetrated by the Member for St. John in New York that under the so-called secret deal with the IMF we could not bring any increase in capital expenditures to this Parliament and they are here now and this is the moment of decision. It is the same kind of wickedness from him as we saw in that General Election Campaign where he made the people of this country believe that I had entered a deal to devalue the Barbados dollar.

Now, Sir, he made reference to some loan guarantee.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I really do not want to intervene. I leave this House to be guided by the precepts which you think are suitable. In the comments which the Honourable Member made just now he imputed improper motives to me. He made an allegation about wickedness and he accused me of speaking untruths. Mr. Chairman, Sir, all of that must be unparliamentary and therefore I will wait for you to rule on the matter but it is my submission that it should be withdrawn and struck from the record.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of fact that the Member for St. John said over and over again in the election campaign that I had entered a secret deal with the IMF to devalue the Barbados dollar. I say, Sir, that was a lie. It is a lie. It will always be a lie and I am challenging him now, Sir, bring the proof.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member can continue to talk if he wishes but I have made a submission to you as Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could you refer to the specific words?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, wickedness perpetrated by the Honourable Member for St. John. Untruth, Mr. Chairman, Sir, relative to an accusation which he said I made in New York. Not on political platforms. He was talking about what I said in New York.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He is now saying, political campaign, Sir. If not, let us call for the record, Mr. Chairman. He said, in New York I said that there was a secret deal with the IMF which forced him to cut capital

expenditure and that is an untruth perpetrated by the Honourable Member for St. John. Mr. Chairman, Sir, those things would have to be struck out.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I stand by what I said, Sir, that the Member for St. John went through a general election campaign accusing me of having cut a secret deal with the IMF to devalue the Barbados dollar. Sir, that was a lie then, it is a lie now. 12.10 p.m.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order again, Sir. The Honourable Member got up and accused the Honourable Member for St. John of wickedness. That is the first objection that I am making. Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, if you accept that as being parliamentary, fine. I have a right to reply and I will so reply. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Peter also accused me of speaking an untruth in New York when I said there was a secret deal with the IMF which forced him to cut capital expenditure. I am not dealing with any election campaign. He wants to deal with that and he is free to. I am dealing with what he said about what I said in New York and that is part of the record. If we have difficulty, then we have to call for the record so that it can be perused and so that it can be ruled upon. But I expect those remarks to be withdrawn and struck from the record because they impute improper motives to me.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am now also going to state that, having said in the election campaign that I cut a secret deal with the IMF to devalue Barbados dollars, he went to New York and insisted as well that we were under a surveillance programme to cut the capital programme and that is also a wicked lie.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, unless there is going to be some problem from hereon in, I have pointed out to Your Honour what the position was relative to what the Honourable Member said. I heard what he said. What he said is not relevant to me, Mr. Chairman. I have pointed out the two expressions or phrases that he used which are offensive to the rules of the House and, Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will rule on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is ruling that following the first initial reference the Honourable Member for St. Peter has clarified what he said. I am taking his clarification and not his original statement. Secondly, in reference to the Honourable Member for St. John's statement in New York, the Honourable Member for St. Peter is saying that your statement is untrue. You referred to your statement. If you are saying that your statement is not untrue, could you bring the relevant documentation to me?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the documentation is here. I do not have to worry about that. So if that is how you are ruling, Sir, when I reply I will know what to say accordingly.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, at the heart of this is the question of the Member for St. John's understanding of public finances. This House has already in March voted funds for capital expenditure. That amount stands...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ...and you also understand that your solution to unemployment in Barbados is to have young people to work for bus fares and lunch money and you will go down in infamy as a man whose solution to unemployment in this country is bus fares and lunch money! You should be ashamed to open your mouth on unemployment in this country. You are a bus fare and lunch money man.

Mr. Chairman, I am making the point that Government has nothing to be defensive about where these capital expenditures are concerned.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, can I be heard in silence? He will have his chance. He cannot hold his blows, Sir. He likes to get up in this House, as I said, and go for his dips in his cesspool.

These supplementaries that are being sought, Sir, give the lie to what the Member for St. John said in New York, that this Government could not come to this Parliament and seek an increase in capital expenditures because it was under surveillance with the IMF. I am saying to this House that the proof is here today, because in addition to what this House has already voted we are asking this Parliament to supplement that by \$14 million. This is what this debate is about. This Government is not embarrassed, Sir. The amounts that were voted stand. We are asking that an additional amount, Sir, be now voted and this amount reflects Government's new priority.

I just want to make one point, Sir, in relation to something about an IDE Loan. He saw a letter that was faxed to me, Sir. He did not understand what it was about. Again, he rushed to foolish judgment. We are trying, Mr. Chairman, to refinance a very expensive loan that was raised by the Democratic Labour Party Government in 1990 over the objection of the two Opposition parties of the day. That Barclays' loan, Sir, is at 25 years and 13 per cent interest with a break for Government and we gave a commitment then as with the NDP that if we ever had the

chance we were going to refinance. We are seeking to do that, Sir, and the IDB says that they will be prepared to assist us by including us in what they call a loan guarantee programme, because like us they also accept that it was a form of folly for Government to borrow at 13 per cent for 25 years and that is what that reference was about. This is nothing more sinister than that. It is a representation of what is in fact, Sir, part of a happier relationship between our principal lending institution and the Government of Barbados.

I want, Sir, to commend Head 13 to the House again. The Independence celebration funds are in addition to what is being spent by community groups not a subtraction from them and the fact that none was voted in the past by the Democratic Labour Party should be an embarrassment on the other side insofar as their Government left it to the community groups alone. We are now supplementing the efforts of community groups and if we had come for a million you would hear that we are being extravagant. Last year they voted \$35 000 for Independence celebrations entirely. We are making provisions within the limits of our resources, Sir, and we are now being criticized for unfairing the community groups.

I again commend Head 13 to this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, let me first of all express my feelings of gladness that you have made a very rapid recovery from your temporary left hemianopia. I came down here all dressed up, Sir, expecting that this debate would have been televised seeing that all previous mini budgets have been televised. I wish to make the point that this mini budget should have been televised. The reason why I make that point is because I believe about 2 months ago I called on the Honourable Member for St. Peter to look into the question of an autumnal statement and a new budget for the country, a call that was fully supported by that well known and highly renowned and respected economist, Mr. Wendell McClean.

Therefore, I am not at all surprised that one has to address a document of this size at this time of the year because I had no doubt whatsoever that at sometime we would have been seeing something in some form and in some shape reflecting a mini budget.

Sir, you do not have to raise new taxes in order for something to qualify as a mini budget. You do not have to be raising taxes. As a matter of fact, this is a technical matter because in truth and in fact what the Honourable Prime Minister has said is that his revenues have performed better than expected and therefore he can make

an adjustment on the expenditure side. But that is the nature of a mini budget and that is what we are dealing with. We are addressing the revenue realities and we are addressing the expenditure realities. So in point of fact what we are doing here is and can properly and honestly be defined as a mini budget following an autumnal review.

Now as to whether or not one can put an end to supplementaries, I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Peter tended to go overboard in the past in his criticism of supplementaries. There is no question about that. 12.20 p.m.

I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Peter tended to go over board in the past in his criticisms of supplementaries. There is no question about that. The reality is that supplementaries have always been part and parcel of the fiscal life of this country, but they have taken on a different significance in recent times. In the past, when supplementaries came before Parliament, by and large, those supplementaries represented areas of new expenditure and a corresponding allowance was made where money previously voted was not spent and so, at the end of the day the expenditure came out the same. That used to be the pattern. Then a new pattern developed where the supplementaries in fact represented net increases in expenditure, and I sincerely hope that we will get back to the day when if Government wants to establish or change its direction or its emphasis on expenditure during the year, there should be a routine statement before Parliament in early October as a standard thing, and at that point any adjustment should be made. It is my own personal feeling on these matters, that there should be what they call an autumnal statement, a statement around early October and it should be a standard procedure, in order to improve the situation.

As far as the IMF, World Bank, IDB, the whole lot of them are concerned, the position of the National Democratic Party is crystal clear. We have served notice on the Government of Barbados that by the year 1997, giving allowances for the fact that we were in an IMF programme and we are coming out of one, I do not want to hear anything about the IMF, apart from the Article IV consultation that they are entitled to do. I do not want to hear anything about the World Bank or any conditionalities or any structural adjustment. I do not want to hear anything about the IDB except in relation to the conditions attaching to the intrinsics of a loan and nothing to do with our macro-economic policies. I am not saying anything new, all I am saying is what it was before. Let us return to the situation which existed before, when this country enjoyed that measure of freedom...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not want the Honourable Member to mislead the

House. There has always been a level of conditions attached to all IDB loans, as the Right Honourable Member for St. Michael South would well know, because the loan for the sewerage carried conditionalities pertaining to water rates and so on, so to say that this country has never had that.... There has always been and there will always be such, so do not let us deceive ourselves and the House. That is foolish talk.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was quite careful. I said except in matters intrinsic to the loan. Obviously when you borrow money from anybody that person can impose certain conditions relating to a project or to the purposes for which that money is being used. What I am talking about is that if somebody wants to come and lend you \$40 million for a particular reason, they cannot tell you you have to raise taxes or you have to do that or the other in terms of macro-economic policy, but only on matters intrinsic to the loan. That, I think, is the position that existed before. I would like to see that by 1997 this country is back in that position.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member boasts, takes great pride in the fact that he has received so much money in the first half of the year. What is the case to be made from that? It is the same case which the Honourable Member for St. Peter has made repeatedly alongside of me, in front of me, behind me, with me...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Member to mislead the House. I do not want to remind both him and the Member for St. John that they both said that the Government's revenues could not be realised, that our projections were too ambitious. This Government has not raised taxes, but the revenues have increased. We still have the same taxes we inherited. It means, therefore, that the economy is performing stronger than we anticipated. If we had raised taxes and had given rise to increased taxes, that would be a different issue, but our revenues are higher than they were despite the fact that taxes have not been increased. That is the point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have no problem with that. The bottom line is that there has been an increased yield of revenue.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I made no comment on that. All I am saying is that I believe that since that has happened the Honourable Member should remember his statements on overtaxation and recognise that the time has come to address the question of overtaxation in Barbados, especially in the area of direct taxes. I believe I am correct in saying, if you look at the Central Bank Reports, that a significant percentage of this increased revenue came by way of

direct taxation rather than by way of indirect taxation in the first half of the year. Of course, a significant amount came from double taxation in relation to land taxes. There is some land tax as well in that increased revenue, but I do not want to anticipate the House since there is a substantive Resolution on that matter before the House, which will be debated.

The point I wish to make is this. I think the time has come when the levels of taxation in this country need to be addressed. I am not a betting man, but despite all the cautions of a whole lot of people in the Barbados Labour Party, I am willing to wager anything that the Honourable Member for St. Peter, if the revenue holds up, is going to try to return this country to a level of direct taxation which he opposed in the past.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the Honourable Member so mislead the House. I introduced a Budget this year that gave new home allowances, I gave concessions to reduce taxes in the recycling industry, I reduced taxes on energy products to agriculture and manufacturing, I gave a whole range of new concessions to reduce the burden of direct taxes, and the Member in the face of that evidence set out in a Budget is now trying to say that I want to increase taxes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am taking a bet. I will bet anything that so long as your indirect tax take continues to hold up, whether in the present form or in the form of VAT, your tax policy is going to be one towards a drastic and progressive reduction in direct taxation between now and 1999. I will bet anything on that.

We welcome, Sir, the appointment of the Commission on the Constitution and the NDP, as you know, has put a whole lot of issues on the agenda and we will be pursuing this very vigorously over the next year or so. 12.30 p.m.

I want to know what is happening to the Barbados Regiment. The Prime Minister might not know, because he was in New Zealand, what has happened. It happened when he was away, I think. Is there, Sir, a Barbados Regiment? How many members constitute the Barbados Regiment today? Why has it been run down? Is it a plateau division of the Defence Force? What is the future of the Barbados Regiment? Sir, we need to know these things, because I can foresee a policy where we expand the Barbados Regiment which would cost us very little and contract one section of the Defence Force which would save us some money and enhance the naval section of the Defence Force which is a policy position that we are committed to because of the realities in the region.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you didn't have the Trident it would cost you less, but you bought the Trident. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South was the man who went and bought the Trident. Are you going to deny that you bought the Trident?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is a very expensive thing to maintain. Sometimes the repairs cost more than a new boat to buy.

Anyhow, Sir, there are other things: the whole issue of independence and the celebration of independence. If we are spending public money on independence in the various constituencies, the Members of Parliament in each constituency should be informed of what is going on and should have a say in it. I didn't say give anybody any money. What I am saying is that at least the Members of Parliament for the various constituencies should be informed of what the Government's policies are and what the Government's position is in relation to the given constituency. As a matter of courtesy, this should be done.

I hope that in the future - we won't have enough time now - when Government is planning programmes at independence in the various constituencies the least it can do is inform the various Members of Parliament of what the Government is planning to do and how it is planning to spend the money and who it is spending the money on in the various constituencies. That is reasonable.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am forced to intervene in this debate, because I don't believe that we are giving the public the real impression about what we are doing here today.

We are today seeking to vote \$34 million to supplement the existing expenditure on capital and on recurrent expenditure for the current year. It amounts, as I understand it, to some 2.4%.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, I think I need to find out whether there has been some error. I was debating a Resolution relative to \$32 million, not \$34 million. I think the Honourable Member is in the same Chamber as I am. I thought it was \$32 million.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: It amounts to 2.4% of the amount which was voted for this year.

Sir, with any kind of experience in these matters, that is a very small variation from the original amount proposed. As I understand it, also, the method of

financing this - I got these figures from the Ministry of Finance. That is my understanding.

Aside.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: As I understand it, Sir, the method of finance will be partially by savings and what has already been obvious in the current financial year and some new items of expenditure. There are some new items of expenditure, but there are also savings, arising from the fact, that having regard to the state of expenditure today and the revenues today that there will be some savings. Everybody also knows in Barbados, and it is time that the public is made fully aware of the fact, that in Barbados a government is not permitted to vary its expenditure without coming back to the House. That is our system of budgeting. So you can have new items of expenditure arising from unforeseen matters, arising from new matters. I want to illustrate this very clearly, because anybody with experience on how government in Barbados is run knows full well that every year when Estimates are prepared most of the departments do not truthfully say how much money they have not paid arising out of activities in the last financial year. They never do it. So that during the course of a financial year, successive Ministers of Finance have had to face the issue of being presented with claims for supplementary and when you ask for the justification: "Oh, this was incurred in the last financial year and we have to meet it".

So this is a matter that has to be dealt with. I am one of those who firmly believe that the whole method of estimates should be recast and in addition to your expected expenditure and expected revenue. You should put in your receivables and your payables. That is my view. Other countries in the Commonwealth have had to face it and they have come up with that.

All the time, as constituents, people besiege you over the fact that they supplied to Government good services and have never been paid; and when you write letters to the department you don't even get a reply. That is the position that we are facing. We are facing the fact that our antiquated system of presenting on an annual basis our Estimates of revenue and expenditure need to be revised.

With that as a background, I do not understand all of this quarrelling that is going along in here, because it seems to me that it is crystal clear that this Government has taken control of how it wants to expend the money in Barbados so as to effectuate the programmes that the electorate has endorsed by voting for them in the last election.

Obviously, as a government being a continuum, we have had to implement and finish some programmes that

were left before. All of that is part and parcel of the nature of government that we have. Because the Honourable Member for St. Michael South commenced the "museum of madness", that doesn't mean that we have not got to finish it. It is too far advanced. We have to finish it. 12.40 p.m.

It would be irresponsible of any successive Government not to finish Sherbourne. You have to finish it. What is more, there is an obligation to see that it is not too great a charge on the public treasury. As I understand it, and as I look around Barbados, I see that we have to finish the programmes.

Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never as Prime Minister of this country and responsible for the administration created any museum of madness. I wish the Honourable Member for Christ Church South would reconsider his statement because it is very far from the truth.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: I did not intend to offend the Honourable Member in anyway. I unhesitatingly withdraw it. I would use the word "Sherbourne", Sir, and leave it at that. Various people will have various views on that.

Now, Sir, the basic position is that we must remember that a Government that is elected has to finish some programmes that were in existence before so that freedom to manoeuvre of a Government to implement its own programmes is, to a large extent, conditioned by the fact that during its first years of office it has to deal with that.

It is clear to me, Sir, also, that even within that context an analysis of this expenditure will disclose what the Government is doing towards the implementation of its programmes. I believe the Honourable Attorney General is very anxious to speak because his Ministry has been able to do things already, and I do not want to steal his thunder. I leave it for him to say what he has been able to do.

I want to say this, Sir. I think in our debates we should condition the public to understand that a Minister of Finance in Barbados today has little freedom to manoeuvre in relation to capital expenditure because of the fact, as I see it, we have committed ourselves to the development of sewerage schemes in the South coast and West coast. The two of them alone would cost about \$400 million. We have committed ourselves to look at the expansion of the airport and the seaport. The two of them alone will cost over \$200 million. When one takes that into account one will see that within the context of those 4 capital projects alone you are talking of very large sums of money.

This Government has committed itself to a programme of rural and urban redevelopment. I can

tell you, Sir, that that in itself is going to cost millions of dollars. This is not 1999, as the Honourable Member will say, and by that time who knows what will happen? By 1999 the Honourable Member who just spoke will be like me, a standby observer as to what takes place, We must condition the public to understand that these large and major projects are going to have a tremendous impact upon the ability of a Government to initiate new programmes.

I am very happy to see that the emphasis which the Labour Party has always placed upon the productive sector has continued. When I read all the reports in the short period of time that the Labour Party has been in office in its fundamental policy change in reintroducing the opportunities for manufacturers by way of the removal of the duties that have been placed by the last administration, tremendous progress has been made in that sector. Even the Central Bank has to admit that it has gone up by over 9% in the first 8 or 9 months of this year, That is a policy matter. That is reflective of the Labour Party's policy.

Now, Sir, to say that this is a mini budget, how can you have a mini budget and there is not even an iota, a suggestion, a scintilla of evidence of any kind of taxation? You do not think of a budget except you are having a fireside chat...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. As a former Minister of Finance, I must conclude that the Honourable Member is deliberately misleading the House. He knows perfectly well that you can have a budget without raising any taxes, reducing taxes, all kinds of things. He knows that perfectly well.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Sir, if you are to have a mini budget in-between the budgetary section, in 99 cases out of 100 you are forced to have it because of the fact that you need to have taxation, so do not come to me with that. The object of having a budget between your budgetary periods is to deal with a drastic situation that has arisen] which necessitated a recasting of either your taxation measures or something great, there was a hurricane or something like that.

Sir, 2.4% in additional expenditure, by any stretch of reasonable imagination, cannot possibly be called a mini budget, so that is a hyperbolic expression. That is one of those expressions that goes for impressions. The Mr. Impressionist of this House is just playing true to form, attempting to mislead the public of Barbados once again. This time it is not going to cost \$150 million though, nor is it going to incur the statement from the Honourable Member for St. John that he would never ever in his life have anything to do with that Mr. Impressionist again, having regard to his conduct on that occasion when one man made a policy statement, and introduced in Parliament

policy measures which the rest of the party did not know anything about.

Sir, I would only like to ask under this specific Head about the tax administration because it is in this Head, and there is a supplementary on it.

Aside.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: There is a document here on which the Explanatory Note has been pinned together at the beginning which is wrong, Sir, I will deal with that later on because I want to know about that.

Sir, I do not see anything that is likely to excite all of this kind of debate that has taken place. It is a well known fact that the World Bank, the IMF and other banking institutions of a multinational nature have, of late, taken upon themselves the path of trying to criticise all Ministers of Finance in the world. They want to pontificate from Washington to all Chancellors of the Exchequer and Ministers of Finance. The recent one is, they are telling Britain that they are not to ease the situation there. If you read the newspaper you will see that the British Chancellor, Kenneth Clarke, is being given advice left, right and centre from the World Bank: "Do not ease now. Forget the election". None of them has ever had to face the electorate. They do not understand the practical realities of politics.

Barbados is not going to get anymore loans from the World Bank because it has been graduated. What we have to do is to ensure that we have established a reputation for ourselves, that we will go and borrow money on the commercial market and try and increase our grading from a BB to an AA so that we will get the money cheaper. We have to educate our public not to expect miracles because politicians cannot do that. Only Jesus Christ can do that and let us understand that.

We have a programme for sewerage the West coast.

Aside.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Yes, Sir, and I want to tell it because I do not believe the enormity of the magnitude of commitment that Governments have made to those programmes is understood. 12.50 p.m.

Do you know how long it took them to understand the enormity and the magnitude of the programme of building the ABC Highway? Those are very important things. We are changing, completely, the infrastructure in Barbados and it will have a devastating effect upon the small things because it is big, big, big.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDEFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to join this debate for a few minutes. I believe there are few small Parliaments in the world that can boast of the accumulated wisdom and perspicacity of four former and serving Ministers of Finance. I think it is really a tribute to the Parliament of Barbados that, in the discussion of our public affairs, that accumulated wisdom and perspicacity can be brought to bear on matters that come before us.

But I was a little saddened myself at the tone of this debate. The words that came to my mind were words from Shakespeare's Hamlet I believe:

"How weary stale, flat and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world.
Fie on't! 'tis an unweeded garden
That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
Possess it merely".

I think that we deserve a little better. I do not think that this discussion should be at the level of whether there is an IMF Representative in Barbados when, Sir, the IMF has Representatives in many countries, and when other financial institutions have Representatives in Barbados like the Inter-American Development Bank for example. They have a staff in Barbados.

I do not think that these matters should be imported as major points to be made! Why are we trying to deal with matters about who said what and those kinds of things? I think we should be able to rise above that. I think, basically, the Prime Minister of all persons should definitely rise above that, take the lashes from the Leader of the Opposition, pass on and seek to enlighten the people as to the reasons behind policy.

Under this particular Head 13, Sir, I am not going to talk about the Prime Minister's Official Residence, I am not going to get into debate at that particular level. I know what it was to hear uninformed persons in every debate talking about all kinds of things about Ilaro Court, and whatever else, for lack of anything of substance to say. But I am not getting into that. That is between the two of us. I am not getting into that.

I will just pass over also Programme 03 Information and Media Relations, subprogramme 01 Operations of Government Information Service. I am particularly pleased that there is a programme going on relating to VAT. The Prime Minister himself made a commitment on the Floor of the House; I was able to put his particular commitment to the test and the VAT Implementation Unit and the Government Information Service responded very speedily,

I am grateful to the Prime Minister. I am still waiting on the Minister of Education to deliver on a promise of not charging institutions or bodies like the Pinelands Creative Workshop or St. Michael South Community Development Council, for having access to school buildings.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You are not the Chairman. You are only the Attorney General. That is all. I am talking about the Prime Minister, and his delivering on his commitment.

But what I want to say relates to the general management and co-ordination of services. I think the significance of this particular debate is that all of the criticisms that used to be made by the Barbados Labour Party in Opposition have turned out to be groundless. They are now realizing that Barbados had good, solid Government, a Government that was taking the right decisions. They have exerted a lot of energy in order to finalize a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank, not because they wanted to follow our policies, but because they realize that this was the right thing for Barbados, and that the stances that they took in Opposition were wrong stances.

I do not have to go on any house top to shout about it. But I sat, not only in the general meetings of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank, but also on a Committee which was specially looking at the whole question of policy changes in approaches to lending by the Inter-American Development Bank in this region. I was representing not only Barbados but other members of the CARICOM constituency. I attended the meetings helping to shape and form the new policy approach to lending. As a result, lending shifted into the area of policy based lending. But if we have policy based lending, there must be conditions attached. We have to understand that.

If we are able to access a loan which, according to what I read in the newspapers, may lead to another kind of loan through IDE sources, that is what the whole approach was all about. We should stand to benefit, as a country, from access to lending, because the Inter-American Development Bank is the Bank that knows us best in the Caribbean and Latin America. We hope that the bank should continue to have a measure of Independence and not simply become a carbon copy of other institutions the IMF or like the World Bank.

I think that what the Prime Minister can best do in order to clear the decks, and this is free advice, is to get up and say that the Democratic Labour Party Government took the right decisions for Barbados, and opened up the channels and avenues for Barbados to continue to

maintain its position and, hopefully, improve upon that position as one of the leading small leading developing countries in the world. 1.00 p.m.

I think if we can put the debate in that particular framework, it will be best for Barbados, and we will be able to get away from the petty rancour and the resurgence of prestige, and status, and whatever else.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: Well the two of us can speak like this, as statesmen, because we are not competing with anybody else for anything. We have to say it as we see it, and that is what this country needs. We have a Government in office, and it is for that Government to take the lead in setting the tone. I think that is where it is. I think that what we should be doing and what the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance can do, is to get up and say that his immediate predecessor as Minister of Finance, the Member for St. John, did an outstanding job as Minister of Finance, and provided astute leadership in helping to shape the finances of Barbados at one of the most difficult times in its history.

Sir, there was an economist, I believe he was given this year's Nobel Prize in Economics. He is one of the professors of the University of Chicago. He looked at the whole theory of inflation and unemployment, took a look at Keynes' theory and added to it the theory of rational expectations, and came up with a new approach to the old question of the business cycle and interventionism by Government.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: My reading is not limited to the book reviews. I do not know how far you have got. You do not have time. Sir, I think if we take an interest in these bigger issues and relate them to our own development here we would see that in our country, our Governments have been seeking to deal with problems which are causing major problems in the leading countries of the world. For if you look at what is happening in the United States now, you would realise that here in Barbados we faced similar issues, albeit on a smaller scale, and we were able to deal with some of those policy issues through our approach towards the shaping of our financial and economic policies.

I hope, Sir, that we do not lose the political will and the economic efficacy by spending and over-spending, when some caution might be advisable. I thank, you.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I would not be very long but there are some current concerns under

this Head which need to be addressed and which certainly have not been dealt with in the presentation nor the reply by the Minister of Finance.

The point which the Honourable Member for Christ Church South made is one that needs to be borne in mind. The fact that Government has come to reorient its priorities does not mean that the overall level of capital expenditure will be higher for this fiscal year and therefore I think he wanted the public to be clear in their minds that this Resolution will not mean more capital expenditure automatically and that is a fact for which the public needs to be very clear because the impression may be given that in addition to what Government had voted in March that these are a whole series of new capital expenditures and that the overall capital works programme will be higher.

I maintained the position at the beginning that in fact, based not only on what we have before us, or what the Prime Minister said about the phasing and sequencing of capital expenditure, but based on his own admissions, that of the foreign funded capital projects he is having great difficulty in resolving some of the problems relating to the conditionalities for those funds that the overall level of capital expenditure may not reach the voted provision.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, that allegation when made about foreign funding and conditionalities with respect to World Bank TVET project...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order, lest the House be misled, I have made it clear from the outset that these supplementaries are designed with a view to keeping us within the same fiscal boundaries that we started the year with. I have also made it clear to the House, Sir, that because there has been such a drastic difference between projected expenditure and capital expenditure that we are bringing these to the House as a way of reordering some of our capital priorities. Therefore, Sir, if there is an impression cast that these are going to be on top of, when I have already made the point, Sir, that we are keeping within the same boundaries, then that impression has not been brought from this side. I made that point at the start of the debate.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am glad the Honourable Minister reinforced that point because as I say, it makes very clear to the public what this exercise is about, reordering priorities within the existing allocations. Sir, it is not any new kind of capital projects to spur new investments and create jobs and all of the implications that would have flowed from that impression, whoever created it, whether in Barbados or outside.

The second point I want to make relates to the policy implications of projects like the World Bank road

project and so on, Again, Sir, in the course of the response the impression may be given that the Democratic Labour Party stepped outside of some traditional remit or was wrong to enter into loans with the World Bank, the IADB or other agencies for which policy conditions are attached. 1.10 p.m.

But there are very few soft loans from those institutions which are going to be available to Barbados or to any other countries in the world without policy conditions and that is another fact which one would think that an economist of the Honourable Minister's standing make available to the public. Because the impression is being given that the Democratic Labour Party permitted the people of Barbados to loans which had conditions and that there are some other ways to access those loans other than on the basis of conditions. The very Inter-American Development Bank Loan comes under this Head and is predicated on some conditionalities to which the Democratic Labour Party did not at the time of leaving office agree relating for example to land use policy. I see under Programme 7 - Land Use...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Member is misleading the House. The Democratic Labour Party when it was dealing with the IADB for an investment sector loan, as when it was dealing with the World Bank's structural adjustment loan, compartmentalized the matters that were going to fall under the World Bank and those that would fall under the IADB. Under the World Bank, Sir, trade reform and other things. Under the IADB, three major sectors were financial reform, land use policy, as well as investment decision making. Therefore, it is wrong for the Member now to come to the House and say that under the Democratic Labour Party that was part of the conditionally. That is what you said.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I said that the conditionalities had not been agreed to. They have only now been agreed to under this administration and that is why the Government is getting the loan. If they were agreed to, we would have gotten the loan ever since. It is because we did not agree with the IADB's approach on land use policy, it is because the Cabinet did not agree of the closure of the Barbados Development Bank before an alternative institution was put in place...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Member for St. John is again misleading the House. The fundamental difficulty between the IADB and the then Government of Barbados, Sir, were matters pertaining to micro-economic policy particularly in the area of those things that the Dems had committed themselves to do under the IMF Programme and had failed to do. If I may be specific, Sir, the question of the 8 per cent wage cuts, the question as to whether we are going to increase rents

at NHC and things of that character. Those were the things that mattered. That is a fact.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, precisely because we did not agree on all of those things that we had not even come to agreement on the element of the IADB Programme because they essentially reduced the level of negotiations and up to when we left office the elements of the IADB Programme with Barbados had not been concluded.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. There are a series of aid memoirs that set out what the Democratic Labour Party committed itself to in relation to the investment sector loan that I will bring to the House. Please, I do not want to make an issue out of this. The fundamental difficulty between the IADB and the Government of Barbados was in relation to certain micro-economic matters but there was a broad agreement on financial reform. Indeed, Sir, the initial position was that the BNB and BDB should have been amalgamated and all of the financial reform that was taken between 1992 and now, Sir, was to fall under the auspices of the IADB and that is a fact.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Honourable Member is only supporting what I am saying. If we agree to amalgamate the BDB and the BNB and he agrees to close the BDB, is there no difference in that? There were policy differences and what has resulted in the present economic policy letter was not acceptable to the Democratic Labour Party. The Ministry of Agriculture had devised a land use policy for Barbados which the Cabinet had agreed to prior to our demitting office. That land use policy would be inconsistent with the conditions which the Prime Minister has now agreed to under the Inter-American Bank because it saw the zoning of land in this country. Such zoning therefore would not have permitted land to reach its highest economic use because there were certain areas of land that were limited to agriculture.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party's position on land use policy *inter alia* IADB was to make sure that as much land as possible go into golf courses in this country and we have tried to rescue the country from becoming just a country of a series of golf courses. The euphemism is with the highest rate of return. That is the point. That is what we are opposed to.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have established all that I need to establish. We had no economic policy letter and were still in the throws of discussion. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I can make those aid memoirs and the reply thereto documents of this House, because the Honourable Member for St. Peter has a very bad habit of laying what other people say to

the Government of Barbados but not laying what the Government replies. So that the impression is given that there was agreement but a memoir has to be responded to and it is in responding to that aid memoir that you set out whether you agree to the conditions which are in the last two paragraphs.

Now the reason why I have raised this is because under the Prime Minister's Office there are some very important matters relative to land use regulation of Town and Country Planning Department, I would like to know whether the pledges made in the Economic Policy document to the restaffing and restructuring of the Town and Country Planning Department which forms part of the conditionalities for the access to the ISL have been accounted for in this particular supplementary and what it will mean relative to that department and the role of the Chief Town Planner and the other officers in that department.

I want to go further, Sir, and say that although attempts are now being made to plug the loop-hole in the VAT Education Programme both by way of the work of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South in his constituency and the work of the Democratic Labour Party in bringing independent economists and commentators together to discuss the impact of VAT on Barbados. It is unbelievable that provision had not been made for a public education programme in the Estimates of this year. That is almost inconceivable because the VAT forms a very important component of both Government's tax reform programme and public education is at the forefront of what is involved in a VAT Programme. Fifty-six thousand dollars can hardly make a dent on what is required in Barbados to help Barbadians understand what a VAT programme is all about. Even with the limited resources that the Democratic Labour Party has, there are certain basic inescapable costs which one has to meet in going out to school rooms throughout Barbados to help educate people. Therefore, either it means that there is no comprehensive programme for the education of the public on the VAT or that this matter needs to be revisited so that Barbadians fully understand the impact of the VAT in relation to Barbados.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never made any assertions about the performance of revenue. I have never made any forecast about revenue. If you read my speech in the Budget or the Estimates, I have always believed the Honourable Prime Minister. He said his skill is forecasting and that he used to bring the bauxite price within .5 per cent of a pound and he was always right and, therefore, I have left his revenue forecast on that basis. The fact that it is not turning out right is not my problem. The fact that he is so subdued today in presenting this scenario of the capital works programme which we were so viciously

attacked when it was under executed in 1993 and now it is also under executed is that the Honourable Member for St. Peter does not know what to do, There are enough meetings of the Planning and Priorities Committee in which the Honourable Member brings all of his Ministers to book and deals with them effectively for the expenditure on capital works. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as far as we are concerned we expect that the capital works programme should be achieving the objectives. It is not sufficient to blame the Democratic Labour Party when a Government has been in office for a year and say that a capital works programme is under executed because there were policy components which the Democratic Labour Party had put in place which the present Government does not agree to. 1.20 p.m.

At what point did the present Government discover that those policy implications were there? Do you mean you woke up one night two months ago and discovered that there were policy implications? There have always been those policy implications, and the record should show, and sound fiscal and prudent management of our financial affairs should mean that the Prime Minister, when he has time in Barbados, should sit down and go through each loan and the policy implications of each loan to see whether it is acceptable to his outlook and his philosophy and predilection in life or not. That is not our job on this side, that is the job of the Minister of Finance, and instead of looking to see what aeroplane I am on and what class I am sitting in and who invite me to Toronto or London before him, as if he is following me around...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Opposition Leader should be following you. In other countries the Opposition Leader usually has to follow the Prime Minister to those places. I did not invite myself anywhere and the Honourable Member for St. Peter should know that. He should not be upset that when I go to New York the members of the Democratic Labour Party go and address Barbadians, not for five minutes, but that we spend an evening with them understanding what their problems are, listening to their concerns and seeking to minister to their needs as representatives of the people. That should not upset him. It should not upset him that the Right Honourable Member for St. Michael South or any other Honourable Member use the talent which they have to promote the image of Barbados, whether it is at the level of parliamentary affairs or whatever other area, but what the Honourable Member for St. Peter must be accountable for is the fact that he travels on taxpayers' funds, and there is absolutely nothing wrong with that and I certainly have never made any public criticism of the travel by the Honourable Member for St. Peter to the United Nations

or anywhere else, So why blame me? Because a column criticised the Prime Minister he must attack me?

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The only person who would begrudge him that is the person sitting next to him, Nobody over here begrudges him, nobody over here has ever raised any matter about expenditure of public money for the Prime Minister travelling to do what is official Government Business, The person who is the past master at that kind of criticism, and the sniping, and the remarks which seek to reflect on the character of individuals in that regard is the Honourable Member who is not now in her seat. We had to face it when we were in Government, every week criticism about Government expenditure on travel, the travels of the former Prime Minister, what was he doing overseas, and that kind of thing, It was the Democratic Labour Party which introduced a system where at offshore promotions like the one in Toronto that the Minister would travel, because of the nature of those promotions, Prior to that, lower level officials in the Ministries of Trade and Finance used to travel, but we decided that these things needed the profile that was necessary. No two Ministers used to travel at the same time, but nowadays you see two Ministers in the same city at the same time. We have seen it in Canada, we have seen it in New York, we see it in New Zealand. If the public criticised that, that is the public's right, because if you have a sovereign government you only need one representative there to put the view of the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for St. Peter is under pressure for his travel, he should not blame anybody on this side. We have kept at home, we have been here to do our job as an Opposition. As I have said before, in the event that the Honourable Member for St. Peter feels comfort in coming to the House with this Resolution, he can take comfort from the fact that when the Democratic Labour Party was in office we could never have brought a \$32 million supplementary by way of Resolution, we always brought it as a Bill, because we felt, akin to what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying, that the entire House should have an opportunity to discuss Government's overall fiscal scenario and then deal Head by Head, so I have never brought a supplementary - and I believe the Right Honourable Member for St. Michael South, as a matter of policy, we always brought these as Bills so we could have the widest possible debate. You would not need a supplementary budget in October, because if you had a Bill we would be able to discuss the matter in a fulsome way and the Honourable Minister would have been able to give full account to Parliament on these issues.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the good thing about the last comment made by the Honourable

Member is that these are yet early days in the life of this Government and we have ample time to check the record. These are early days, Sir, for us to be able to check the accuracy of that, but I remember well the three hour Resolutions that were practised by them, I am not saying that from time to time they did not bring a Supplementary Appropriation Bill, but what is the problem? Is the Honourable Member going to tell us now how to order our business?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like the record to be very clear. What I was saying was not gratuitous advice at all, I was seeking to say what the Democratic Labour Party did and that is our position on matters of this sort, It has nothing to do with what the Government chooses to do, we know that they do not want more than three hours* debate,

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On 24th August, 1993 they came in here with a supplementary of \$56.4 million.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Are you saying \$65 million? I was saying \$56.4 million. I remember it well though. I really hope we have the time today to deal with the Personal Assistants, we want to get to the Head dealing with the Personal Assistants, we want to explain to the public about them, so I am not going to be long on this except to deal with a few Items.

First of all, the VAT. Within the last two weeks I heard the Democratic Labour Party say that they were going to hold meetings and discussions with the public on VAT as a matter of public education. I want to say that ever since September, when the Prime Minister came back from England, I think it was, he explained then that there would be a programme of public education by the Government, and he went further. He said that the public must be assured that VAT will not be introduced in Barbados until the public has had its say and until the impact of the incidence of the tax at all levels and across goods and services was analysed.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: That might be a historical thing, you go along and say that. I am sure that it has also been publicised in Barbados that two teams from GIS went to two Caribbean countries, one to Jamaica and one to Trinidad, to study the way in which Jamaica and Trinidad dealt with the VAT by way of public relations and public education. Those teams I believe are back, because I saw one of the persons from GIS in Barbados recently. A package therefore has to be prepared for public information and education, but in addition to that, if it is anticipated

by a Government that what we put out as a draft Bill will be substantially amended and reviewed, having regard to the extent of public comment, to what extent can a Government jump now in advance of those comments and substantial amendments? The Democratic Labour Party can and you can be out there talking to the public about this thing being zero rated and so on, and then you will find all of a sudden ten months down the road that what you were telling them is not true. 130 p.m.

We feel it is better to wait until... Let me just say, I am not criticising the Democratic Labour Party at the level of principle, because I think it is very noble to assume some responsibility for public education; but we have to be careful as to what extent we get in depth now before the contents of the Bill... It is separate. Otherwise, we might be giving misinformation. If you want to talk to the public generally about VAT and how it works in other places, fine. But if you start to condescend, as the lawyer says, on specifics, then you might find that what information you are giving the public is misleading, not because it is deliberately so, but because whenever VAT ultimately comes there may have been significant changes in policy and drafting that make what you say now nonsense.

Both parties are committed to public education, but the Government is preparing a structured approach to public education. We want to emphasise that the Bill that is currently in circulation is very much a first draft, and may not in several respects reflect the ultimate, agreed position between the Government and the public.

Sir, the second matter I want to deal with is what is called the Regiment. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, despite the assurances which I gave the public last week, Monday, is still persisting in trying to confuse the public or deliberately mislead them, because after my having given certain assurances, he comes after, 3 or 4 days later, and still seeks to take the position that was taken by the *Advocate* on Sunday last week. There are 1 or 2 persons who have a militaristic bent who have come through as amateur soldiers - I don't want to offend people. I am not going to call names, so I am thinking very carefully what I am saying - who have come through the ranks and who are still hanging onto the fact that they were members of the Regiment. They remember the Regiment in the 50s when we were cadets and they still believe that in 1995 the Regiment should function and be organised and staffed as it was in 1955. It is impossible.

All that is being done, and I say it for the last time, is that certain restructuring is taking place in the Regiment, not the Barbados Defence Force. Certain restructuring necessitated by reason of the fact that the Lt. Colonel who headed it - I didn't want to say it but they force me to say

it - is not only 63 but is a very ill person. He can no longer do it. So we have to find somebody else to head it. At the same time, they had interviews with the Commission Board a day last week and they agreed to take on 3 other persons. If it was being disbanded or rinsed out, do you think they would still be taking on people?

There are persons who have - it is very well expressed on my right- institutional dependency syndrome. I can't blame them. You get an attachment to something and you feel that it is yours and that you have known it all your life and it must go in a particular direction, It cannot make a shift, otherwise something is wrong.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the next thing I agree with is the matter of independence and the \$100 000. The Government has gone to great lengths to try a new strategy this year aimed at greater community involvement in the celebration of independence. I am not going to pretend that it will be perfect this year.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They do not ignore the MPs. If you don't have a relationship with the Committee that is organising in your constituency, that is your problem. Two Saturdays ago, I could hardly walk, my back was giving me so much trouble; but at 4 o'clock I found myself at Sharon where a programme was presented launching the one in St. Thomas. They have a calendar of events in St. Thomas to which I am invited. I will go to those that I can manage.

In St. Philip, I see them on television. I hear the gentleman, Mr. Burke, on the radio, explaining to the public that they are having an explosion of activity in St. Philip this year. I would assume that the MPs have been involved in St. Philip as I have been in St. Thomas; but it is not a secret. There is a special unit in Government Headquarters where you can phone and get the information. It is on the radio all the time. I hear the name Randall Miller. I don't know the person but you can call him and the number is given and he will put you in touch with whoever the person is that is organising. He is the overall person but each constituency may be a part. I treat mine as a constituency. There is a committee that operates and they wrote me at my house and sent me a calendar of events. I don't know how the others are organised.

Let us assume that Members on the other side and some on this side have not been as involved as I have been or have not been recognised, then clearly that is a weakness out of this year's activity which we can correct next year. I hope that the particular department will use

the experiences and the mistakes of this year with a view to improving it next year. The essential quality of this supplementary is that Government not only said that it wanted the community involved to have more activities not on Independence Day alone, but for the whole month. Having done that, we are making money available to ensure that it does not flounder for want of resources,

I would have thought that Government would have received the compliments of the Opposition for broadening the concept of independence and involving the community. 1,40 p.m.

Finally, Sir, I just wish to say, since everybody has spoken generally, that I have a newspaper in my office, I think the debate is March 17 this year, on the front page the Leader of the Opposition is quoted (inverted commas) from a programme that he did the day before prognosticating that I would be unable to repair any police station, any fire station or any Government property under my Ministries this year.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have it. It is on the front page.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: They have you in inverted commas and I have not forgotten. Part of this \$32 million is to ensure...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Look at page 21 of "The Advocate" today. In the report I gave of the police stations, I was so angry with "The Advocate's" editorial that I even forgot that Crab Hill and Belleplaine Stations have been done in addition to District "F", District "E" and Worthing Police Station. You can pass by Hastings now and see what is going on there. Go and look at District "C". It has been ripped down to start fresh. At District "B", all that is going on now. He predicted I would not be able to do any. I do not talk about Eagle Hall Post Office. I will invite him to the opening. He is very grateful for what I am doing to the Fire Service in St. John...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: But why you all could not do that when you were in power? In 14 months I have done that. You had about 9 years. Too long. You cannot find anything.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He is saying that we had to do St. John because for 5 years they promised to do the St. John Fire Station, and in one year I come and do it, More anon, Sir,

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr, Chairman, after listening to the various speakers in this Assembly this morning, I am a bit worried about our system of accounting in the public service, We are hearing that we have expenditure budgeted for, and not expended, that we have revenues that are projected at one level and they are much higher than was budgeted for. We have a situation that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South has said in this assembly this morning that we are not accounting for our accruals at the time of the Estimates, and that is very important, because there are statutory boards in this country that owe people money and when they submit budgets, they do not include that expense in the new budget, and it is worrying me.

We also have a situation where the paymaster account is very high in this country, and I would like to see the paymaster account extended. I would like to see the expense because when it is expense, the surplus we are talking about we would not have, so we should stop fooling ourselves in this House that we have a lot of money to play with, when we do not, because if we give the wrong impression, the trade unions in this country will come and say: "You have a lot of money so we should have a large increase". I would like to know if I am wrong. If I am wrong I would like to be corrected, but the impression is that we have a lot of money to play with. I know that whenever workers hear that there is a lot of money they are always asking, so we have to be very careful.

We also have another situation where it was said on the floor of the House this morning that the IDE has advised us to renegotiate the euro loan.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am enjoying the Honourable Member's speech, but I really have to intervene to say that he is on the point of misleading the House. The IDB is not advising Government to renegotiate the loan. I announced long ago that the Government had determined that Barclay's loan was too expensive and we have been in discussion with Rothchild Inc. to replace a 25-year 13% loan with a loan with a different interest structure. The IDB will help us put the loan on the market. That is the point I made.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, for that information. But I remember well that 10-years ago, and we seem to have a 10 year syndrome in this country, the World Bank advised us that even though we were told at the time that there was no need to borrow the money, iluui it would have been good if we had gone

on the Japanese market and borrowed Japanese loans, I remember that. If you doubt me you can ask the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. It is a fact that the World Bank advised Barbados at the point in time to take the Japanese loans. I am saying that we, as a country, must be very careful how we take advice from those countries because I am clear...

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is no record that the World Bank gave the Government of Barbados any directions or policy advice in relation to accessing the Japanese loan. If my memory serves me correctly, Sir, a Mr. Geoffrey Bell was engaged in 1985 as an advisor to the Government of Barbados in relation to debt management, and the market placements since then largely have been on the advice of Mr. Geoffrey Bell, and not the World Bank.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to take the advice at this point in time from the Honourable Member for Christ Church South because, on a call-in programme, when I started to criticise the Japanese loans the Honourable Member said to me that it was advice from the World Bank.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of the identity of people who call on the call-in programmes, nor do I recall myself going on a call-in programme except on one occasion when I had to correct the Honourable Member for St. John with something to do with Mobil. But, Sir, I have never had any knowledge of the World Bank advising the Barbados Government on a Japanese loan.

What I can tell the Honourable Member is, at the time when the Japanese loans were made, I believe they were readily available with a very cheap interest rate at that particular period of time. But everyone knew that because of the possibility of exchange with fluctuations that the cheap interest rate might have, in the end, turned out to be a higher rate. That was the position.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful to the Honourable Member for Christ Church South. I totally agree with what he said in his last statement because what happened at the point in time was that we had a situation, and I keep warning this House that interest rates are not the only factors to judge loans. We had a situation that in 1985 the interest rate charged on the Japanese loans were very low, but the World Bank was quite sure that the Japanese yen would have fallen in value.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that while I have been giving some leverage to the House generally to allude to such matters, I think you are going a bit too deeply into matters relating to finance, whilst we are discussing Head 13, Prime Minister's Office.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes. I agree, Sir, but when we are talking about leverage, I can only deal with the IDB and the World Bank because they were mentioned previously on the floor of this House. That is why I could enter debate into this matter. 1.50 p.m.

But I want to get back to the issue that we were dealing with a situation where it was said that we will be renegotiating that loan. My advice to you is that I would think twice about it now because I know these international institutions. I would run a bet that I strongly believe that the pound (£) would drop in value. That is why they would want to tie us to a new loan, at this point in time, exactly what the Japanese did to us 10 years ago.

I would say to the Honourable Prime Minister to check with the people at the Central Bank and ask them to have another look at this loan. Ask them if there are any projections or if they have any idea that there is a possibility of the £ falling in value. Because we do not want to have a situation where we tie ourselves into a loan, where we put ourselves into a fixed rate situation only to have to find out, when we have to repay it later on, that we could have gotten out of the loan without being in a fixed rate situation.

Mr. Speaker, like the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, I agree with accrual system accounting because if we have accrual system accounting adopted tomorrow, all the surpluses that people are bragging about will be deficits.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if other Honourable Members wanted to speak on Head 13, I would give way, but I was rising to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is a point I want to make and that is that the Government has to be careful not to get involved in exchange rate speculation in terms of its borrowing because I do not know anyway or means in which you can speculate rationally on exchange rate changes. It is far too expensive to insure, against them. People, for example, who have done forward purchasing in Japanese Yen over the past 3 or 4 years are making millions today. But it is a risk that people are prepared to take. If you wish to take those risks, then they can go one way or another. Those who did forward purchasing have made a fortune in respect of the Japanese Yen in recent times, in the past 3 years or so.

I am still unclear, unhappy and I wish a clarification from the Chairman of the Defence Board as to exactly what is happening to the Barbados Regiment because

I have never heard the Honourable Attorney General tip-toe through a speech in the way he tip-toed through his short intervention on the Barbados Regiment and the Barbados Defence Force.

Is it the policy of the Barbados Government to run down the Regiment in terms of numbers and in terms of its importance to this country? I ask that question in order to get the support of the Honourable Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Member for the City who is very interested or says she is interested in heritage tourism. The Honourable Member for the City, I am, quite sure, is fully aware that the Barbados Regiment is one of our oldest institutions. She is fully aware of its capacity to add ceremony to so many occasions like Independence and other important occasions in this country.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about the Barbados Regiment. I feel that the Barbados Regiment should be preserved for a variety of reasons. It should be expanded. It should not be contracted. I want to know whether that is the policy of the Government or whether the policy is to contract it or to absorb it into the Defence Force or whatever. My position has always been clear. An effective Coast Guard to look after our inner waters and to protect our shipping especially from the Japanese.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He bought the wrong boat. It was the wrong boat for the purpose for which it was intended. The Coast Guard needs to be expanded.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not struggling. I am quite clear in my mind. The professional element of the Defence Force needs to be contracted because that is where the money is spent and that is where hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent, over the years, for no visible good reason and the Regiment needs to be expanded. Is that the policy of the Government? Nobody knows what the policy of the Government is. Nobody has a clear understanding as to what the Government's policy is in relation to the Regiment, the Defence Force and the Coast Guard component of the Defence Force. This is not a laughing matter because there are a lot of people who are knowledgeable in the area of defence and security and they are not people who have any abnormal, emotional commitment to any particular aspect of the security forces. They are not madmen. There is no need to advance the suggestion that these people, for some reason or another, are over-attached to the past. I think that their views are logical. I think they make sense when they say that it is important to preserve and expand the Regiment that one should be looking very closely at contracting down the

numbers in the land-based Defence Force and one should be looking at expanding the Coast Guard in a dual direction with equipment capable of dealing with the problems arising in our inner shores and also, at the same time, being able to protect our shipping and so on.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Okay. Let us suspend now because I want to get this thing on Defence and Security straight.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that you do now report progress to His Honour the Speaker and beg for leave to sit again.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and reported progress to Mr. SPEAKER and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.00 o'clock.

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

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply, to that it should now revert.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House now reverts to Committee of Supply.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few things on the item Town Planning. I am one of the most vocal critics of town planning legislation and it arises, Sir, because of the fact that very few people appreciate that it is possible to have an appeal mechanism when the Town Planner refuses planning permission under our law. There is nothing in the world that anybody can do when he has given permission. In other words, a citizen can find himself, as the owner of a piece of land, affected by a planning decision of which he knows nothing and that there is no recourse, within the law, for him to object

to that planning application decision before the decision was made.

I have always advocated two things in relation to Town Planning; one is that it is wrong for a small society like Barbados to give one man the power to be able, by a decision, to affect the interest of so many people without a mechanism to ensure that before that decision comes into effect there can be an opportunity for representation to be made and the decision be confirmed before it can become effective. I have always advocated that and over the years, from the nineteen sixties when it was started that is a point that I have taken.

The second point is, Sir, there is little scope in Barbados for a very radical change in town planning policy because of the fact that it is recognised that the amount of land that we have in Barbados must be used for a number of different purposes. Only an administration or a group of people with a reckless disregard for our environment could think that it would be possible for all the land in Barbados to be subdivided for housing or for other purposes.

It is a fact of life and it is a known fact that 40 000 to 50 000 acres of land in Barbados has to be devoted to some kind of agricultural activity, be it sugar, pasture, whatever it is. We only have 90 000-odd acres of land, so that a land use policy in Barbados must be conditioned by the fact that over the course of the whole history of Barbados, with our type of soils, it is necessary for us to devote to some kind of agriculture that amount of acreage of land.

I know that there have been policy directives that have been made in the past with respect to this but the Labour Party has always affirmed that a land use policy in Barbados must take into account that of course there is scope within the context of the area that is divided into housing for differences of opinion as to the more intensive use of that land. I am one of those who firmly believe, Sir, there is need for a change in some of our density regulations, bearing in mind that it is impossible in Barbados for those who live in the urban areas, and in that I include from Silver Sands right down to Half Moon Fort, St. Lucy, it is impossible to satisfy all of the demands for housing within that lower crest of Barbados with a single storey unit on a single piece of land. We have to educate our people to understand that if they want to live at that level they have to have more intensive development of land. There will need to be some scope for that.

I do not understand what the Democratic Labour Party is trying to say about these changes on land use policy. It is time for a review of it. I am one of those who believe that the state sometime or the other will have to

decide whether it is not to capture some of the gain that is derived from the stroke of a pen on a town planning permission.

I believe in that. It is a matter that has been discussed time and time again. I know also you have a problem of the impact of the major road schemes that have occurred. The ABC Highway and the Highway 2A, and the one from St. Andrew to St. Lucy. Is it right and fair that all that public expenditure has taken place. It has exposed a number of areas of land which were never in agriculture because they were sourgrass land and because they happen to have been within the area of the particular plantations they are caught by the rule that since it was in an agricultural area it cannot be subdivided. I do not agree with that because it is foolishness. So again there is scope there. I believe there is scope for revision of the land lease policy but within the context of the overall over-riding policy that there will be no radical change in the land use in the sense that land must be devoted to agriculture, land must be devoted for housing and land must be devoted to industrial development and other uses.

I do not think that we should try in anyway to disturb the public mind about any statement or any commitment, or any letter that has been written because people who understand the constitutional process in Barbados would know that you cannot carry out a radical change in the law in Barbados without coming to the legislature. When you come to the legislature you will have to meet the resistance that inevitably arises if foolishness is brought here.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to have to speak again but the Honourable Member for Christ Church South is free to put his views to the House and I may very well agree with them but he should not give the impression that I was opposing anything.

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: I got the distinct impression from the Honourable Member's speech that he was of that frame of mind.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No. Let me say what I was saying. About a year ago, we had a debate in here and the Honourable Prime Minister alerted the public that there were certain conditions attached to the ISL with the IADB and accused me, not the Government, directly accused me of entering into an arrangement with the IADB, such as would affect the entire land use pattern in this country and would take the effective decision making for land use matters out of the hands of the Minister. I did not say anything. I remained mute in my seat and I listened carefully. He also was bitterly critical of the Government's position relative to the BDB and he was even more

critical of the Democratic Labour Party's position relative to things like the aspects of the trade reform policy and so on. 3.10 p.m.

Okay. I accepted that. It shocked me subsequently to have discovered that the decision of the Barbados Labour Party relative to the conditions on which the ISL is predicated go even further than the Democratic Labour Party was contemplating and particularly with land use policy I want to explain what happened. The Ministry of Agriculture I think was suspect that the IADB was coming for a more flexible land use policy in Barbados. Their technicians sat down and devised a land use policy for Barbados, which the Honourable Member for St. James North should have knowledge of, which zoned the country into what they essentially declared as permanent zones for livestock farming, zones for sugar agriculture, zones for housing, *et cetera* and the Cabinet agreed to it. Then when the Cabinet for the first time came to consider the policy implications of the first aid memoir for the IADB, those conditionalities that were being suggested related to a more flexible land use policy and quite rightly the issue came up as to how we could agree to a more flexible land use policy when we had just concurred in the recommendations of the Ministry of Agriculture about a zoning of land use in Barbados. How could we agree, and I put this to the IADB myself, to a more flexible land use policy in which land would be taken out of agriculture and find a higher economic use while at the same time committing ourselves and the taxpayers of Barbados to an agricultural policy which would require a fixed amount of land to be available for sugar production and rotation of other crops within the context of the Booker Tate Plan?

Therefore, we said that it did not make sense borrowing \$18 million from the CDB predicated on a future for agriculture of 65 000 tonnes of sugar now carried to 75 000 tonnes and at the same time going with the IADB and saying that we agree to a more flexible land use policy which could very well see not only rab land but possibly other land taking over agricultural production. That was the dilemma which the Government faced. That is why we came to no firm conclusion and, therefore, when I heard the criticisms which the Honourable Member for St. Peter levelled against me on that occasion and the public record is there on it, I was then horrified in taking up the Economic Policy Letter and reading what the elements of the reform were. But the Government is free to come to a decision. I am not criticising them for coming to that decision. I am surprised but I am not critical of it. Because if there is a way to do this and also meet your sugar targets, fine. If that can be done, fine because the taxpayers of Barbados right now have to underwrite all of that debt which the sugar industry is in. We know that there are only so many ways that it can be done and one of

them is to find a way to get some of the land that is not in agriculture, maybe isolated spots but plantation land nevertheless, sold and developed to pay off that.

We are not fighting against it. We are just saying we have concerns. Now we have to however raise public concern about the process that is going to replace the present system of Town Planning regulation in Barbados. Until that is revealed to us, all we are doing is commenting on what we see. But it is not entirely surprising. Look, I listened to my radio one morning. I heard the Prime Minister saying that I almost shut down the BNB. His words were "Thanks to Thompson" - I only assumed that he meant me - that I went and did a bond issue that gave the BNB bonds bearing a 4 per cent interest rate. That was a conscious policy decision, not an error. Why should a bank which failed to manage its portfolio effectively have interest bearing bonds at either a commercial, semi-commercial or any rate which gives it the full benefit at the end of the day of some of the errors that it made earlier? It had to have a bond in my view unless you were going to privatize it right away and was not going to be earning the full income. If the Government changes its mind and wants the BNB to continue to be supported at this level by the taxpayers, fine. I took a conscious policy decision and the BNB in my view had enough potential to be able to earn enough revenue that it could find a way out of that problem. It is an institution that is supported by Government deposits and that would be the very strength of it. But anyway somebody convinced people that the market must rule and therefore they must get market rates.

I then read in the Economic Policy Letter - it was made a document of the House, Mr. Chairman. This is from the Prime Minister to the President of the IADB, the same Minister of Finance who said that I almost shut down the BNB due to my wrong policies. I was the greatest threat to the BNB. He wrote these words:

"I am pleased to report however that the single largest threat to the solvency of the Bank was eliminated when non-performing loans to the sugar sector were removed from the books of the BNB and transferred to a specialized work-out entity in 1993".

Then I was the Minister of Finance. So on the one hand the Government is telling Mr. Iglacius and the action of the then Minister of Finance and the Democratic Labour Party took solved the single largest threat to the BNB, while on the other hand the public of Barbados was being told in a Press Conference three weeks ago on a Saturday morning at 11.00 o'clock that thanks to a man called Thompson in giving the BNB bonds earning less than market interest rate or with a high enough yield who almost shut down the BNB. So all of this contradicts the stated positions of the Prime Minister. That is the

essence of what I am saying. Now there is a lot of talk in Barbados of who lies and gives the impression, but I am not making an accusation against anybody. The public always finds out at the end of the day and this policy when the Hansard is finally printed, because that debate is not printed yet, which we are going to do and contrast what this document says as against what the Prime Minister said on the floor of this House about positions which the Democratic Labour Party was alleged to have taken then the public will be able to judge very, very clearly who is consistent and who is fair-minded in relation to their policies.

Let me say a little bit about that because there are other implications to it. I do not want to stray too far, Mr. Speaker. But with the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet, I had and have my views on the BDB and my views may be synonymous with the position taken by the Prime Minister. We are from a different age but people from the age of the Honourable Member for Christ Church South feels strongly about development institutions. I know from experience and I had a rocky time trying to convince the Cabinet that the BDB should be shut and the Cabinet of Barbados, if the Prime Minister checks it, came to a firm decision that the BDB or some similar entity must continue to exist. Therefore, there was no formal response to the IADB on the closure of the BDB. We had a number of people here - Harriet Hunte or somebody Hunte. I remember all of them traipsing in and out of offices trying to convince people that in fact they wanted the BACT to be the debt workout institution for the BDB. So transfer all of the bad debt from every Government institution over to the BACT and then set up a specialized unit of a loan analysis section. They expected that the private banks in Barbados were going to hire this loan analysis section to do loan analysis for the private banks; that Barclays was going to hire the loan analysis section of the closed down BDB to analyze their loans for them. They would be providing that service. Now tell me which commercial bank in Barbados is going to hire a loan analysis unit from the Government to analyze the risk in respect of loans they are going to make? 3.20 p.m.

So we have all of these pie in the sky proposals, *aide memoirs* passing from meeting to meeting and then everything shut down at the point at which we could not secure an enhanced surveillance programme with the International Monetary Fund. Thereafter the IADB would have resumed as long as the macro-economic programme between Barbados and the IMF under an enhanced surveillance programme was agreed to. The Prime Minister has indicated that they relaxed that requirement, he did say they removed it.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That was a public statement in the newspaper, unless I am quoting you wrong, that the IADB relaxed that requirement. He then said that the Ministry of Finance devised a medium-term macro-economic programme and that it was shown to the IMF and that the IMF said it is okay. So under the Democratic Labour Party they were insisting on an enhanced surveillance programme, under the Barbados Labour Party they said no, but at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, what concerns us now is the policy implications of this letter.

The point which the Honourable Member for Christ Church South makes is a relevant point, that it is true that the town planning laws and regulations in this country need to be revised, but as to what will replace them has to be discussed. What is here is basically the same scenario that the Democratic Labour Party would have faced when the IADB came to Barbados, but we never agreed to it because of the fact that we had previously agreed to an agricultural land use policy which would have been in conflict with this proposal. So it is not a question of us criticising anything, I will wait and see what the Prime Minister proposes and if he is willing to surrender elements of the land use policy to let us say a committee or whatever is being proposed, we will wait and see what happens. It is not a big thing at this stage, except that if you have certain targets you cannot say that you have a target of 75 000 tonnes of sugar and at the same time have a scenario which strikes at the confidence of those who are growing sugar - not just confidence, because a lot of them would prefer to sell the land and do other things with it as well, so it goes beyond that. Their very *raison d'être* in the agricultural sector would come into question and you would never reach those targets, not on the existing land space in Barbados.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to close the debate on Head 13, unless another Member wishes to speak. I would like to respond to the issues, just simply to say that I welcome some of the remarks made by those Honourable Members who have contributed to the debate. Budgeting is a continuous exercise and estimates are estimates. Government has a responsibility to review the position it sets out with at the start of the financial year in the light of the outturn of revenue and in relation to the expenditure patterns. That is what we are involved with here, Sir.

The Right Honourable Member for St. Michael South gave strong support to the items of expenditure contemplated, again signalling his complete variance with his Leader on matters of this nature. I am not going to detain the House on matters pertaining to the IADB and the Investment Sector Loan, I have already made a document of the House my policy letter to the IADB. Yesterday the Executive Directors of the Bank approved it and once

the contract is drawn we will debate the matter in the House, I am going to bring to this House all of what was set out in the *aide me moire*. An *aide memoir e* is what is drawn up at the end of a meeting when people meet and say this is what we have met, discussed and agreed to. I am going to bring all to this House, Sir, it will all hang out in this House, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to debate it right now, but I understand the discomfiture of the Member for St. John. In the Budget Debate this year the Member for St. John went on record as saying it could not be accomplished, how he would congratulate the Government if they could get it in place and a whole range of things, because he himself well knows the tremendous difficulty the Democratic Labour Party had in getting the international institutions to take the DLP at its word.

I have made the point, Sir, that it is not just the policy dimensions of this particular arrangement, it is the nature of the relationship between the DLP Government and the institutions which came to be bogged down in what I call a lot of niggling foolishness about what should be the rents charged on individual units of the NHC; on the question of giving back the 8%; on commitments given in the Letter of Intent to the IMF that were not carried through in relation to bus fares and matters of that character. I have said that as far as I am concerned a relationship between the Government of Barbados and any institution must be based upon serious fundamentals rather than the niggling foolishness in the realm of things that fall, in my view, outside the purview of multilateral lending institutions. The International Monetary Fund is entitled through its Articles of Association to discuss with countries matters pertaining to the exchange rate and macro-policy, but there is nothing in their Articles that gives it the right to come to countries and micro-manage things like rents. That is the point we are making. The Member for St. John has a convenient memory in this matter, but as I said I will bring all the documents to the House.

I just want to say, Sir, that we heard today from him what I can only regard as a piece of monumental ignorance about financial matters. The question of the interest rates paid to the BNB on the bonds held by the BNB is a matter that is absolutely separate from the taking of the agricultural debts off the books of the BNB and transferring them into a specialised workout entity. They are two actions. In the one part, on the one hand the bad debt of the sugar industry has been taken off the books of the BNB and transferred to the BACT. I think that is a commendable thing. At the same time, and this is the point, Sir, the then Government asked the BNB to hold in their place bonds at a rate that is below the rate at which the Bank has to borrow money from the public. To the extent that those bonds represent one-third of the total asset portfolio of the Bank, with the Bank having to borrow at 7% and above and earning a rate of interest at 4% on the

bonds, it means that you commit that Bank to a loss on that particular part of its portfolio. Therefore, it should be clear to anybody who understands the matter that the transfer of the bad debt from the books of the Bank to a workout entity is separate and distinct as an issue from the interest paid to the BNB on the borrowings it holds in lieu of the bad debt.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of elucidation, if the Honourable Member would give way, the Honourable Member is forgetting one part of the equation. The debt that was being moved from the BNB was non-performing, it was not earning anything.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the point that stands is that you transfer the debt from the BNB to the BDB, you want to find a solution to the BNB problem, so you ask it to hold bonds at a rate that is below the cost of borrowing. I repeat what I said, Sir. The Minister of Finance who committed the BNB to holding bonds that are lower than the cost of funds to the BNB committed the BNB to a loss of one-third of its portfolio and he stands to be condemned. He cannot now justify that in terms of my saying that the Government of the day was correct to transfer part of the non-performing portfolio of the Bank. They are two separate entities. But he has come to this House, Sir, I think portraying complete financial ignorance and sought to discuss the rates of interest payable on the bonds held by the BDB with the fact that the non-performing debt of the sugar industry has been transferred to a workout entity - two separate issues he would wish to confuse the House about as if they are one and the same thing. But I think the House can forgive him, because he has totally confused himself and he expects to get away with this kind of cheap foolishness in all of his public utterances. 3.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House has had a full debate on Head 13 and I now want to move that Head 13 do stand part.

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

Head 15 was called.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Head 15 is a matter that has aroused some public controversy and I welcome this opportunity to speak to some of the issues that have now crept into the public domain, particularly in relation to the engagement of personal assistants to Ministers.

Sir, over time and incrementally so, provision has been made to improve the conditions under which Members of Parliament, Ministers, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition function. It was not that long ago, Sir, that Members of Parliament did not have constituency assistants, but it was within the last 15 years that it was recognised that in order for a Member of Parliament to function effectively he had to have personal assistants or a constituency assistant, however you choose to call it.

Subsequently afterwards, Mr. Chairman, it was recognised that if Members of Parliament are to discharge their responsibilities properly to the public that they should have constituency offices. It was within the last DLP Administration - and I give them credit for it and we supported it ~ that the Government of the day took the decision that it would pay the rents of constituency offices for Members of Parliament up to a limit of \$500 a month.

I feel that that is not a matter that has to end because it still falls to each Member of Parliament to have to furnish his constituency office and to pay for the utilities and the like. I believe that if you want Members of Parliament not only to be respected in this community but also to perform effectively we have to equip their office in the same way as any office is equipped, and as soon as financial resources allow, I am going to make sure that the incremental process that has been in train for the last 15 years is improved upon. We owe it to ourselves as Members of Parliament to do these things to increase the effectiveness and efficiency with which Members of this Parliament discharge their responsibilities.

A case has been put that the Leader of the Minority Opposition deserves accommodation, and the truth of the matter, Sir, is that having regard to the way in which he has performed relative to the real Leader of the Opposition I would like to move a Resolution in this House that the Leader of the Opposition be thrown out of his office and the Leader of the Minority Opposition should be substituted in his place. That, Sir, would be natural justice.

The fact is, Sir, that what is at issue here is our capacity to make sure that those who are called upon to do public duty are given the facilities to enable them to discharge their responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

I also want to say, Sir, that the status of ex-Prime Ministers is a matter that has also concerned my Cabinet. I do not believe that we should allow ex-Prime Ministers of this country to walk and drag nor to allow them to be treated with any discourtesy nor to have before the public a standing that is not commensurate with their contribution to the development of this country.

Cabinet has already agreed that ex-Prime Ministers should be entitled to official cars on official occasions. If the need arises, they should be entitled to security. When they travel to a city in which Barbados has a diplomatic presence, they should be entitled to an official car. They should be placed on the table of precedence in an appropriate level befitting their standing.

I must also tell this House that I have started to discuss the question of a subvention to ex-Prime Ministers to help them defray what from time to time are costs associated with the fact that the rest of the world may involve them in activities befitting the standing of an ex-Prime Minister.

We have a situation in other Caribbean countries where another ex-Prime Minister, whose name I will not call, at his age, and in a condition that is not wonderful, is now walking the world touting for research contracts. We had the case of Harold Wilson who when he died attracted a column in *The Times* to the effect that he died under conditions of genteel poverty.

I feel that we owe it to ourselves to lift up ourselves.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I said that as soon as circumstances allow, I am not going to expect Members of Parliament to continue to have to run an office and equip it themselves and have to pay all the utilities. We expect the rest of the society if they are working on behalf of the public, that the public should meet the cost. That can only be fair. As soon as the sources allow it is going to be done.

In the case of Ministers, Sir, Ministers have responsibility to function at the international level, the national level, the regional level and the constituency level and many things come to them arising out of the obligations and responsibilities they must discharge at the international, the regional and national level.

I also want to say, Sir, very often we hear criticism on the call-in programmes that things have been referred to Ministers and there is no response to them and we can, if we want, continue to have the public alienated from us and cynical of the political process because we do not do the correct things to remedy the deficiency in public life. A large number of the things that are referred to the Ministers either in their political or personal capacity that require action sometimes cannot be handled by the bureaucracy. When they are referred to the bureaucracy, Sir, they go in the system and they get lost, they are handled with diffidence and I am speaking here now with representations being made by their own colleagues to

them, representations made by the general public, representations from institutions, ideas referred to Ministers for follow up.

The Minister now, without a staff to help him track things, has to refer it to the public servants and it goes into the system. What becomes of it is dependent upon the work programme of the Ministry itself and the priority attached to it; but the public expects the Minister to respond.

In addition, Sir, Ministers have a lot of social responsibilities and activities arising out of their standing and in many instances it is inappropriate because of the political nature of the tasks involved to have civil servants compromise themselves by having to be party to and involved in those social or political activities. The Minister at the end of the day is a political animal and in the same way as we have recognised that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition by reason of their office and their involvement at the international and local level need somebody to help them keep track of these things, to do research for them, to help them with speeches, to help them relate, not just to the bureaucracy because that is not their function at all, but to relate to institutions and the society; in the same way, Sir, I think the time has come for Ministers to be provided with the same facilities.

Now, Sir, I have made it abundantly clear that the persons must not be involved in policy. We have seen under a previous Administration where a so-called political scientist in the person of a political assistant got himself deeply involved in policy matters. 3.40 p.m.

I, myself, have a Personal Assistant. He is not involved in policy. This entity that is being created by this act of Parliament is not intended to be a person to take over the responsibility...

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ...it is a fact. You would recognise that was part of the difficulty. This is not a person intended to take over the role of the Permanent Secretary, to meet with the Permanent Secretary or to tell the Permanent Secretary what policies must be instituted. This is a person who will do exactly what the Personal Assistant does for a Leader of the Opposition, or what my Personal Assistant does for me.

There are a large number of things, Sir, that must be remedied in this country, but among them must be the responsiveness of Members of Cabinet to their colleagues, to Parliament as a whole, to the society in general, to all the institutions in that society and in relation to the things that are referred to those Members of Cabinet by all of

those entities. In many instances Members of Cabinet, past and present, who are not without some sense of delicacy, are at the mercy of the bureaucracy in terms of their capacity to keep track of things that are referred to them, and to be able to respond to them.

I believe, Sir, it is a major deficiency in our present system of Government. It really is, because what we are doing is asking people to assume responsibilities without giving them the requisite resources to make sure those responsibilities are effectively discharged. What has happened is in past Cabinets, as well as in this, ministerial time comes to be taken up massively so, with having to write your own speeches, or do substantial redraft of your speeches or do a lot of research on your own speeches. Ministers now have to keep track of things referred to them and, very often, we come to this Parliament and someone reminds a Minister that he sent him a letter on such and such a date and the Minister himself has to go and try to check it, foolishness. It wastes the Minister's time, executive time that is devoted to policy making and making sure -that the country is run effectively.

I truly feel, Sir, if we were to provide Ministers with Personal Assistants to help in those respects, that this should be seen as an effort that falls in line with what we have come accustomed to over the last 20 years, to provide resources and facilities incrementally to entities in Government to be better able to discharge their responsibilities.

Now, Sir, the notion of a Personal Assistant is not something that is foreign to the Commonwealth, or to other Caribbean countries. I went to the World Bank/IMF meetings in Jamaica and, in addition to the bureaucrats, the Minister of Finance had his Personal Assistant there for keeping a record of things he had to follow up, keeping his diary and helping with such research as might be necessary.

I believe, Sir, that on reflection this is a matter that does not deserve the kind of public controversy that is now being aroused. Of course, I have heard the view that we should give this money to the Ministers and supplement their salaries. Now, if we were to do that we would get real blows.

Sir, I would urge Members of the House to see it in this light that, yes, I know that in this country if you do something you have to be open to criticism but at the end of the day, this Government has a responsibility to make sure that we provide people who are charged with managing public affairs with such reasonable resources and facilities as will enable them to get the job done. There is nobody who has pressed for this more strenuously than I have. In fact, from the very first session of Cabinet, I have told Ministers, I am not going to be satisfied with

people saying they cannot remember what was to be done, and so on. Get Personal Assistants. Keep tract of things. Get research done. If your colleagues write you, you cannot go and tell them you forgot because it got passed on to somebody. You have to know where it is in the system, give people the courtesy of responses, be effective and efficient and I feel this is going to help.

Now, Sir, when the DLP introduced the notion that the Government should pay for a headquarters for Members of Parliament, there was no issue. Why should it be an issue? There will be things I feel I will have to do during the course of this administration to improve the lot of Members of Parliament and I will do it, despite the fact that in the wider society you are going to hear that the politicians are looking after themselves. I feel that if the public wants us to do a good job, they have to accept that people have to be provided with the resources to do the job.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that this particular measure, controversial as some people may want to cast it, will allow us to address one of the serious deficiencies in Government that one hears from day-to-day on the call-in programmes, that the people keep saying they write a Minister and they have not got any response. Our colleagues keep referring to the same issue over and over again. It is going to help us, I think, deliver a more effective Government. I will therefore press to see that this Parliament fixes this within the context of the development of parliamentary Government in Barbados. There is no craft here, Sir. It is a simple, simple exercise in trying to provide people who have to carry our public responsibility with the facilities and resources to discharge that burden more effectively.

The other aspect to this Head that is fairly substantial is a provision for half a million dollars to cover the cost of settlement of claims for compensation for damage or injury during the rest of the financial year. This is one area that has been growing in great financial severity, but the Government has the responsibility to provide properly for the settlement of these claims. I am also urging this Parliament to vote and agree to this vote of an additional half a million dollars for this particular purpose.

Sir, I welcome this debate on the question of the Personal Assistants. This Cabinet has agonized over it. We have had discussions with the top public servants about it. I just want to stress, Sir, that there is no intention here to supplant the role of the top public servants as advisers to Government. In point of fact, I can see where Personal Assistants can make the life of Permanent Secretaries easier, because a lot of the routine work, like drafting of speeches for social events and matters of that character that

now occupy the time of Permanent Secretaries, can now be passed on in this particular respect.

It is a simple exercise in trying to improve Government and I, within that context, Sir, would like to move that this Head do stand part,

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully. I have noted the supplications and pleadings for bipartisanship, or tripartisanship, in this matter. I have heard all the Prime Minister has said. I do not have to sell this policy to anybody. I am not presently a serving Minister of Government. It is you who have to sell this policy to the public of Barbados, and if this is an issue with the public of Barbados, it was not an issue when rent was provided for constituency offices because at the time when that rent was being provided, the economy of Barbados could support that kind of thing. Politicians were not faced with mixed-up priorities by a government. Reasonable adequate wage increases were being paid in the public sector and, at that time, the talk about the economy performing was being buttressed by actual performance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the Barbados Labour Party was elected on September 6, 1994, I also listened to a similar speech like that from the Prime Minister. I put on my radio, I was very happy for him, and I listened. He reached out his arm and said: "I want you to come on board. We need to heal and so on. We need to right some wrongs which the Democratic Labour Party had inflicted on this country." We knew what those wrongs were because he had said enough about them on the platforms. The NCC workers, on less than 5-day work week, the fact that civil servants had not received adequate reward for the sacrifice which they made during the stabilisation period, that is what the Honourable Member told the public. A whole series of wrongs were to be righted, but the only person who seems to be able to right wrongs in this Government is the Honourable Member for St. Thomas because this supplementary is really his. I praise him for what he got in this. You are a master player. The Honourable Member is the Lara on that team. 3.50 p.m.

When you look at this supplementary you could call this the Attorney General's money. Today he said he fulfilled 15 promises in one year. In terms of righting wrongs, if you had made the speech which the Honourable Prime Minister made, I probably would reflect but I cannot accept that it can be fair and reasonable if 3 weeks ago you put your ink on the dotted line of an incomes policy which sets out certain priorities for this country which the Government...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Nobody said you cannot employ people. That is not the issue. Far from.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. The incomes policy of Barbados does not say that Government should not employ people such as this purports to do. The incomes policy deals with increases in wages and incomes. We are not seeking to put more money in the pockets of Ministers. We are seeking to employ additional people to help them discharge their responsibility. Therefore to discuss this in the context of an incomes policy that we do something entirely different is, I think, to seriously mislead the House and it is syndicated to the kind of foolish public controversy that the public is seeing through, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I do not need a seminar from anybody. I have been in this House for 9 years now and I have passed that stage.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, under Head 15 the amount of \$187 813 to provide payment of salaries to Personal Assistants to Ministers, under Travel the amount of \$13 200 is required for the payment of travel allowances to Personal Assistants. Under another Head - I cannot get to that now - the sum of \$385 000 to pay car loans for these Personal Assistants.

The Minister has said what the Personal Assistants are to do. I am going to get to the incomes policy. It has decided to create 11 posts of Personal Assistants, one to be assigned to each Minister. One Personal Assistant will be assigned to a Minister. The Personal Assistant will *inter alia* work directly with and be accountable to the Minister. Assist the Minister with research and preparation of speeches. Follow the Minister's diary and deal with the Minister's correspondence of a personal or political nature and will also attend and assist the Minister at Meetings, site visits, media briefings and the like. That is the Addendum. I am not quarrelling with that. It is what you said it is. You are talking about \$500 000, \$V₂ million.

If I went to my constituency office on Saturday morning and saw an NCC worker who is on a 3-day week, who has to wait until January, how would I explain to him that there are some Ministers who already have Personal Aids working for them? Mr. Speaker, how would one explain that?

We had an Estimates Debate in here in March. The Government discussed its policies and its proposals with respect to the fiscal year which was coming. Why is it that, at that time, the Government could not put before this

House of Assembly its plan relative to this matter? Why could you not wait? People are already in those positions. Was the post advertised? Were the qualifications known?

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am only asking. Those things have never bothered you before. Relax.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, the Honourable Member for St. Peter has gone on bended knee and has asked us to be bipartisan our support of this. A few weeks or so from this, we are going to be debating an incomes policy. We are going to have to explain to the public of Barbados why it is that an element of restraint must be exercised by them when they are receiving money and justify that as against Government creating posts in the public sector, not to take on people who were dislocated by the wrongs of the 1991 era, not to increase the salary or the work week of the NCC workers, not to right any of those wrongs, but to perceive that there are new wrongs in the system, that need to be righted. It goes a step further than that. A Minister is entitled to pick who he or she wishes as a Personal Assistant.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: That is right. Quite entitled to do that. None of those people who would have been dislocated are going to benefit in anyway. Why, in the circumstances, should the Opposition feel obliged to join its voice in selling this? This is a hard sell for the Prime Minister. He is going to want us to help him with the incomes policy too. But how can you sell these kinds of things with these very glaring inconsistencies, car loans and Personal Assistants to Ministers? But the bill for Ministers has increased too. There are other benefits which Ministers now enjoy, not salaries. But there are other benefits that previous Ministers did not enjoy.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Cellular telephones. I would not like to go through the whole list of them now.

As I said, when we increased the allowances for rents, the provision of constituency aides for Parliamentarians, on occasion there was bipartisan support and I felt that the circumstances merited that kind of thing. But it has to be taken against the prevailing economic circumstances. Those are the bare facts of the issue. The Government cannot expect that it can ask us to lend it a helping hand.

We would have been quite happy to assist if we thought it was the correct strategy because the private incomes protocol in and of itself does not set out

goals which are inconsistent with our goals. But how could you assist in that process with these horrendous precedents which are presenting themselves to the public of Barbados at this time. That is where the dilemma.... I understand the position the Honourable Prime Minister is in and he will have to try and sell it to the policemen. He will have to try and sell it to all of those workers at the bottom of the scale that he could find \$500 000 to provide Personal Assistants, car loans and so on for Ministers and yet, could not get the NCC workers back to work on a 5-day week after a year and a half, since the night on which all those wrongs which were perpetrated by the past Administration were to be righted. That is just one example. There are several other examples of that scenario.

I have heard a lot of talk where Ministers were having difficulty finding posts for people in certain departments, a big hue and cry on the radio. At one time it was with the doctors. It was difficult to find 11 or 13 posts, however many it was in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. But it has not been difficult to find 11 posts of Personal Assistant to Ministers. That did not even cause a furor. It was quietly done. It is already in place and this Parliament is being asked to rubber stamp the action which Ministers took, in that regard.

The Prime Minister then cast it in a mode which, on the one hand while he is begging for this bipartisanship, is cutting the ground from underneath him. Because he talks of a previous Personal Aide who is a political scientist getting involved in policy activities which is foolishness. 4.00 p.m.

There was a personal aide who used to minute personnel files too. He has been elevated to higher office but when the Democratic Labour Party took over in 1986 there were files found which had notes in them indicating the political allegiance of people to be appointed to various posts, where they lived and a family background to them.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You do not worry. So it is nothing new. We know the kind of work that goes out and can go on in those kinds of positions because nobody raised them before. We never had a scenario like this so the opportunity did not present itself to raise it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question of complaints about Ministers not responding to access is not something that is going to be solved by personal assistants. I want to advise the Prime Minister of that. I have worked near to Prime Ministers, whether it was here as Leader of the Opposition here at the Opposition Office or under two Prime Ministers in Government Headquarters. When people come to see the Prime Minister the only person they want

to see is the Prime Minister. You cannot send any personal assistant to deal with people. It does not work. What is needed probably if this money is to be better spent, is if it sought to assist and educate the public on what the rolls and responsibilities of officials like Ministers of Government and Parliamentarians is all about.

GIS has never done a story, a day in the life of a Member of Parliament, and would not know that at five o'clock in the morning, not that I complain,...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have said that I do not complain because I accept it, that my telephone rings and it does not stop until 10.00 p.m. and when I am not there the people who are in the house have to deal with those problems whether it is wife, mother, maid or children. And no personal assistants can solve that problem either.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Precisely, it is not their job so there must be some other approach to the solution of the problems which the Prime Minister has raised. I do not think acknowledgement of letters, other than if you write to the Leader of the House, because she does not reply to anything that you write to her so I would be very glad if you gave her a personal assistant. You could give her about five.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, personal assistants may not solve that kind of problem. That is a conscious decision of the Barbados Labour Party Government

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, a policy difference. You have a policy difference on it? Fine. Do not beg for any bipartisanship on it. If you want bipartisanship on these issues, discuss it with political parties before, as happened with the VAT legislation and other issues. Do not present them in a Resolution when we have a 3V₂-hour debate and expect that the Opposition has any duty to agree. If this was a step that was going to be taken and bipartisanship was required, well get the triparties together. Just as we discussed things in the Management Commission of Parliament in an orderly, accommodating manner, there must be a mechanism in which the Government, the Oppositions, can get together and can discuss issues of this sort. The way this is done does not inspire any confidence. Anyway I would not talk about the missing parts of Addenda that were circulated. This cannot inspire confidence. There has to be a better way to attract bipartisanship support and if that was necessary we could have sat down and discussed the entire scenario of terms and conditions of service of parliamentarians, the rights of the minority opposition and the opposition. I am not

talking about salaries, other terms and conditions of service, It cannot be done like this. This cannot be the basis of it. Nobody on bended knee in this Chamber at the last minute could expect easy bipartisanship support for a measure such as this. It requires another mechanism for that kind of discussion.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, what we are witnessing here as I listen to this debate is a situation where Members have become victims of the political cultures which have been cultivated in this country. They have become victims of a political culture that has been carefully developed in this country. That is why in the United States today 62% of the population are looking towards a new political party. That is why in Jamaica a new political party has been formed. That is why one is being formed in St. Lucia. That is why in Trinidad and Tobago today, despite the statement allegedly made by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, another political party holds the balance of power. That is why in the Commonwealth of Dominica today, a political party that was formed in recent times forms the Government. The point I am making is that this Resolution is before us today because of a particular political culture that has developed in this country that virtually makes it impossible to govern the country and today I can safely say that the Prime Minister's biggest problem in Barbados today is not running the economy, is not administering the country, his biggest problem is dealing with the demands of his supporters, those who supported him in the past, those who all of a sudden became supporters the day he won the Government. Those are his biggest problems.

The point I am making is that the culture that has developed in this country is one which virtually makes it impossible for people to govern in the same way that they govern in other countries, both because of the size of the country and many of the issues raised by the Prime Minister... The concept of a Minister as a policy-maker, as distinct from someone administering a department, the concept of a Minister with the powers to delegate functions or people accepting that someone delegated by him or her can in fact satisfy their demands without seeing the Minister is unknown in this country and all of these things. Everyday invitations come and everybody wants the Minister or Prime Minister or the Leader of the NDP or the Leader of the Opposition to attend every cock fight in Barbados. When you cannot attend a cock fight, everybody gets upset. Over and above that, they expect you to go to every funeral. If you cannot go because you have to be in Parliament, it can be a problem. So that what has happened is that the political culture fostered over the years is now making it virtually impossible for Governments to function. 4.10 p.m.

Now this is partially a response to this situation. It is not popular. I can tell you that it is very unpopular.

Whether you like it or not, let me tell you this and you better recognize this. It is very unpopular with the people out there. As a matter of fact, I first heard about it on a call-in programme and I am a Member of Parliament and I had not read my papers. I heard the responses on call-in programmes. So there is no question about it that it is unpopular and I think what is very necessary is virtually a re-definition of the role of people in Government in this country. I think it is only going to come through the influence of a new political party and I will tell you why. This is a reality because what you have accumulated over the years which creates the problem for you. Now you take a very simple thing. The Barbados Labour Party, the Leader of this House, has articulated the policy of a multi-party democracy yet they cannot find it within their heart to recognize that my responsibilities in here as leader of a political party go far beyond that as just another member for a constituency. It goes far beyond that. I have to respond to all of those people who support the emergence of a new political movement in this country throughout Barbados. I was also the person who said to him that, if you wish to use my office at any time, you may do so. He never replied firstly. Secondly, I was also the person who approached the then Leader of the House supporting the position that an office should be found for the Barbados Labour Party. It never happened and I lost my seat. I was not in Parliament, so what happened in those days I do not know. It is unfair to say (1) that I did not take steps to accommodate and (2) that I did not take steps to ensure the third political party in this House at the time was accommodated in an appropriate manner. All right.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is what I call bogus reasoning. I did not say that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West asked me anything. I said that I offered him. That is what I said and they are two different things. So that I really believe that if we are really serious the effort should be in a much broader concept. That is a problem and it is a problem with the management of this country and it goes deep into the political culture.

Now as far as what this will do to solve the problem, I do not know. I presume these people are being paid \$17 000 a year for 11 people roughly at \$187 000. How much is it?

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Do you mean that they have been paid already? Are you telling me that none are already employed? Now do not say that.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is right. If you say no, I will embarrass you. That is not true. Some are working already. As a matter of fact, I might be able to go andL.anyhow, I say no more.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I would like to know what is the salary. How much will these people be paid? That is the first thing. It is not set out here. The only thing that it says is \$187 813 for eleven posts. Now we do not know exactly how much they will be paid. Now it would seem to me that, if you want somebody to do research, someone to be involved in the preparation of speeches and to deal with correspondence of a personal and political nature, you probably need somebody at least at graduate level you are talking about. I presume so. For someone who is capable of doing the research and assisting in the writing of a speech for a Minister, the least you would expect in this day and age is that person would be at graduate level. So I presume that.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, I do not know the job description. That is why I am trying to find out exactly how much money will be paid. That is what I am trying to find out. Now when you listen to the uninspiring speeches that Ministers make day after day, I have no idea who could have prepared those speeches without any kind of emotion, without any kind of vision and you just get the same ridiculous content coming out speech after speech.

So I have no doubt whatsoever that quite clearly if we redefine and carefully define the role that Ministers and parliamentarians are expected to play in this society then we will eventually get better Government and a better relationship between the people and the Government. This is why I am a very firm believer in the need to have local community base Government in this country because a lot of the problems, probably 75 per cent of the problems which would be coming to a Minister, would not be attracting the attention of the Minister because it would be dealt with at a different level. Sir, the reality is that a Minister who comes to Parliament regularly when Parliament is meeting regularly is here on a Tuesday. Cabinet meets on a Thursday. The Minister is here on a Tuesday. You are left with three days in the week to run one or more Ministries. That is the reality. 4.20 p.m.

That is the reality. Over and above that, one is called upon to deal with things that should be done at local

government level and that is where the crisis is. That is why as a new political party which understands that that involvement and empowerment of the people to solve problems at the level of their communities will solve 75% of the problems, that is the problem we have to solve. This is not dealing with the fundamental problems, because the structures are going to remain there. There are fundamental problems and they can only be addressed by adopting the policies of the NDP to reintroduce into this country community-based local government, empowering the people so that when they have a problem with garbage, with trees falling down, a problem with pot holes, all those kinds of problems that you are inundated with day after day, that those problems can be dealt with in their communities by people who are empowered to deal with them and have the resources to deal with them.

Now, Sir, I want to make another observation. A President of the United States...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you would listen carefully, you would get some political education.

... A President of the United States virtually has to eat, sleep, remain fit and sign documents coming to him in a very reduced form, because he has a whole pile of people there to research everything. He has far less work to do than a leader of the NDP in Barbados, not to mention a Prime Minister. That is a fact, because the infrastructure is supported there and there are other layers of government.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am making a case for the backbenchers. I am going to deal with all of those things. I think there needs to be research provided for all parliamentarians.

So the point I am making is that if you have identified a problem - I accept there is a problem - then you need to deal with the problem more fundamentally and that is why new political movements, not faced with the same cultural problems, can look at these things with greater objectivity and look and see where the problems lie.

I personally believe that what we should be talking about here today is not just trying to put a little plaster over one particular area - somebody to answer the telephone. We are dealing with a very fundamental problem. If that problem is dealt with we would get better government.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I wind up and as we approach yet another independence, let us all move forward

together to empower the people of Barbados more. Let us all commit ourselves today to the reintroduction of community-based local government in order to allow ministers of the Crown and parliamentarians to deal with those national macro-issues which should be their primary responsibility and, in this way, let us send a signal out there that we are not only interested in patching things but we are interested in dealing with matters fundamentally and for better government for all. This is the time.

When the Honourable Member for the City gets up, I expect to hear her commit herself to local, community-based government.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You can't back off now. You have been talking about this for years. I know I have at least one supporter in this House and you cannot back away from it. I would go to Hansard and quote you a hundred times inside here when we are on television. Thank you very much.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, when Cabinet Government began in Barbados in the 1950s, Cabinet Ministers were paid \$600 a month. When Government Headquarters was built on Bay Street, in the 1950s, it housed comfortably all of the Ministries. The entire Government found a seat there. It was called the Ministerial Buildings. It was called Adam's Castle. It was called some of everything.

Since those days, through the 50s, the style of government has become far more sophisticated, far more complex. I am amazed to hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central advert to the constitutional rights which he may or may not have. As I remember it, he was a front-line member of the Democratic Labour Party in the 1960s when the Constitution of this country was being framed out. He may well have been one of the framers of the Constitution for all I know. But I remember all through the 1950s and through the 1960s up to the time of the Constitution this was a country with a multi-party democracy. Yet the Constitution framed by the framers of the Democratic Labour Party admitted only of a 2-party democracy.

The Honourable Member for....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I must stop the Honourable Member. The Constitution says nothing about political parties.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the words "2-party democracy" may not appear in the Constitution, but the Constitution speaks of a Prime

Minister. It speaks of an Attorney General. It speaks of a Leader of the Opposition. So it addresses the concept of a 2-party democracy.

The Honourable Member for St. George South and myself went to the Senate for the Barbados Labour Party in 1986 when the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central became the official leader of the Opposition. The Constitution accorded to him the right to name 2 Members to the Senate. I absolutely refused to give up my seat in the Senate on principle, and my appointment had to be revoked by the then Governor General, the late Sir Hugh Springer. Yet we all grew up in a multi-party democracy and we have lived to see the wheel come full circle that through the offices of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central Barbados returned to a multi-party democracy in the 1980s and the 1990s and may possibly make it to the year 2000.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hope that in the early 21st century Barbados will in fact be a multi-party democracy. I find it passing strange that the Honourable Member should be making a case now when he had an opportunity in the 1960s to make a case, when he had an opportunity when he was a member of the Democratic Labour Party Administration in 1986 to do something about this, he did nothing. Now he is caught in the pincers of their own policies.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard it said that there is a policy difference between that side and this side in respect of personal assistants. I don't see any policy distinction, Sir. 4.30 p.m.

The Prime Minister has a Personal Assistant, and so does the Leader of the Opposition. I also find it passing strange that the Leader of the Opposition has this facility and he would get up in here today to deny it to Members of the Cabinet. There is no way the Leader of the Opposition could have...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. When I became Leader of the Opposition I found there was a post in the Opposition Office called Executive Assistant. I know of no such Personal Assistant. I filled the post called Executive Assistant made by law under the Management Commission of Parliament Act and it is designated Executive Assistant.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, that little exercise in sophistry does not move us on this side. In effect, what the Leader of the Opposition has is a Personal Assistant. By no stretch of the imagination could the Leader of the Opposition have more official functions

and more work to do than the people who sit on the front bench over here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Protocol for the Implementation of a Prices and Incomes Policy, among other things, *inter alia* as we would say, is seeking for improved productivity and increased efficiency through reforms, *et cetera, et cetera* and *et cetera*. This is what this is about, improved performance, improved productivity and improved efficiency among Ministers. As Government becomes more complex and as Government becomes more sophisticated, it is only a small step, as has been pointed out, in a number of steps that have been taken.

The late Owen T. Alder, a former member of this Chamber, once said that part of the problem with us as Barbadians is that we constantly peep up under ourselves, and parliamentarians have a history and a tradition in this Chamber of treating themselves less than well. I am not talking about salaries, or perks. I am talking about the ability to serve one's constituents and the ability to discharge the responsibility of Government when you are in Government, and of Opposition when you are in Opposition. It is not by any chance that the Leader of the Opposition enjoys a salary in excess of \$80 000 a year. There are some people who ask, but what does the Leader of the Opposition do apart from oppose? But we know different.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No. You could not qualify for that job. That is a job that requires high competence in certain areas.

Mr. Chairman, we have been doing this in an *ad hoc* manner in this Chamber. At one stage we gaye ourselves Parliamentary Assistants, and goodness knows we needed them. Mine is worth her weight in gold. I have nothing but praise for my Parliamentary Assistant, and I do not think there is any Member in here who would say other than that. They are much appreciated at the level of the constituencies, and the obligations we have to discharge at that level. Then we voted, as has been pointed out, Assistants...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: If the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is, in fact, my superior landlord, there are certain structural repairs needed on the west walls.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, we get a certain amount of money to help us towards the rental of a constituency office. It is only a contribution to it. All of the other

ancillary services that go to making a constituency office really work fall to us.

Mr. Chairman, the job description, the role and function of the Personal Assistant has already been defined in the debate. As has been pointed out, there are functions which, in this day and age, fall to a Minister of Government which would make it very difficult, in fact, very compromising, for a civil servant to carry out. There are functions which are really, properly speaking, quite extraneous to the portfolios for which Ministers have responsibility, but which still fall to them by virtue of being Ministers which a civil servant could not be expected to carry out.

I have heard the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance say, as this Head was introduced, that as time goes on and as finances allow, we will come to the day when I hope we would sit down and in a clearly defined and structured way rather than in this *ad hoc* way where you add on here and you add on there, look toward the 21st Century at the role and function of Ministers of Government, back-benchers, Members of the Opposition, and define very clearly the way in which we would expect them to be working in a new millennium. We cannot do it...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is part of the problem too. Ministers have to travel.

Mr. Chairman, there is nobody on this front bench who is a Minister who does not hold at least two portfolios. The Prime Minister has drivers. I have four. I lead Government Business in the House, there are duties which fall to me as a Deputy, and a whole host of other things beside. The Attorney General has several Ministries, the Minister of Public Works, and you go down the road. They also carry the parastatal or the statutory corporations as well. They are almost portfolios in themselves in the way they have evolved in what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would call our political culture.

I really would find it difficult to believe that Honourable Members of this House, all of whom would be expected to know better, could find opposition to a measure meant to increase the productivity and efficiency of Ministers. Something has to be wrong.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or elucidation. We have not opposed anything. We are saying we are not helping you to sell it. It is your job to sell it to the public and, if you do that, full marks to you, but you are not getting any assistance on this side, none whatsoever.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, something has to be wrong when Ministers find themselves in their offices at night at 10.00 o'clock, 11.00 o'clock and at midnight. 4.40 p.m.

When we are working 7 days a week. We need a trade union on this side. We are the worst represented workers in this country. We do not get vacation. We do not get health coverage. All the things that workers in Barbados take for granted do not apply to us.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would wish to give my support to the introduction of the Personal Assistant not as a new thing but I give the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance credit for recognizing that a facility which works well for him and for the Leader of the Opposition one would suppose would be something which his Ministers would need to increase their productivity and their efficiency.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I want to put this briefly in context. In this country, there is a debate and I believe that the matter itself formed part of negotiations with international lending agencies, that is to say, there is a debate for public sector reform.

I do not conceive public sector reform merely as changing certain systems at the level of the public officers and how they operate. But I think it must span the whole spectrum of Government departments. Part of the contemporary dogma is that Government must become more customer oriented, more customer friendly. Ministers will be expected to give leadership to departments which function within that kind of context. As we are presently organized, it is impossible - I use the word impossible for any one of us as a Minister to perform at optimum efficiency and effectiveness. I am going to tell you why, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. Only today I was saying in the room out there to the representative of GIS, nobody has ever gone into any of our homes and followed us from 5.30 in the morning when you take off your pyjamas until 11.00 o'clock at night But, Sir, it is important. Let me show you what happens. I want to put this on the Record because on these matters the Honourable Member for St Michael North West knows that when I was over there in Opposition I took positions about the rights of Members of Parliament and so on.

Monday morning you start, you may have management meetings, you may have other meetings during the day. By the evening you get your Order Papers for the House and each one of us has to attend parliamentary party oh Monday night You do not get home before 10.30, 11.00 o'clock. Sometimes later depending on the nature of the business.

The next day, from 11.00 o'clock you have to be in here. Sometimes until late. Apart from an hour and a half on the Tuesday morning, 9.00 to 10.30 a.m. you cannot do any work in your office, you are down here. If you leave here 7.00 o'clock, 8.00 o'clock, it is very unlikely, some of us may nip back into the office but most of us will go home.

Wednesday you have a day for work. Wednesday evening you get the Cabinet Papers. You cannot read them before 4.30. You may stay behind and read them or carry them home. Some of them are so voluminous you cannot complete them before late at night.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not talking about foolishness. I am talking seriously. People read Cabinet Papers.

Thursday from 9.30 sometimes until 7.00 o'clock you are in Cabinet. You have not been into your office all day.

Friday, you may get a break back to your office.

In the meantime from 5.30 in the morning and a head of department called me a few weeks ago at 4.30 to say he wanted to see me. There was no emergency. He called me at 4.30 in the morning.

I do not have any answering service. I have Max. From 5.30 the phone rings. Some days as many as 18 calls are registered before I leave home at 8.30 to go to work. I am able because I keep, you know one of those little pads called, "From the desk of, I keep one right by my bedhead by the phone. People call and I am able to write down their name, address and telephone number. Sometimes a little note to remind me what it is. I would take that pad to work but I am not able, every day, to follow through on those calls. I have to be honest I have to take the phone off sometimes at 7.00 o'clock to get a bath. If somebody home says, "He is in the shower" or, "He is having a bath" they feel they are making an excuse. But when am I going to bathe?

I go to work on the Monday. Look at this. This is the telephone book from my Ministry Monday this week. Check it I cannot make it a document of the House but I can let you all see it. Have a look. I do not have any secrets in there. Thirty calls on Monday. I have Immigration and the files are so high. Every person who gets status in this country I have to write on that file, except for the short-term work permits and the extensions, plus legislation; every resolution the Minister of Housing brings. I have to see all of them on a Tuesday.

How can I, efficiently, do all of this work and still answer all of these calls plus the ones at home? Are you all joking?

Wait. I have not talked about the constituency yet. I am talking about my business as a Minister. This is marked "Wednesday's Mail". I have not had a chance to deal with it yet. This one is marked "Faxed Messages". This one is "15-11-95." I am not able to deal...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Tuesday, I was in here. Yesterday, I was in Cabinet Today, I am in here. Let me tell you tomorrow I am going and watch a little cricket in the morning, Barbados and Guyana, to get my head clear. Sunday I have to deal with these and try and find some of these people who have been calling all yesterday when I was in Cabinet. What Maurice King and Philip Greaves did, what Maurice King and Keith Simmons did, I alone am doing. I alone am the man. I am not complaining. I am saying that there is a volume. If you want me to be efficient, if you want me to be effective - do not mind page 21 of today's *Advocate*. I got through 18 of 39 promises on the AGs. Would not let me sleep at night waking up at all kinds of hours - we need Personal Assistants where one can say, return some of these calls, go through this mail here and you will see a letter from a man called Burgess - it is nothing to do with a Permanent Secretary - call him and explain to him and help me to follow it up.

I write every speech I make. I do not ask anybody to do it. Not that they are not competent but sometimes there still is this interlarding with too much officialese and they talk at people. I like to talk with people. It means I have to be up late at night writing my speeches. As the Minister says I cannot ask any Permanent Secretary to do that. I have to do that myself.

I want to say to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central - because I want the Prime Minister to wind up this debate - that we are going to treat his request more kindly than he treated us when he was in Government in the Democratic Labour Party and when he was Leader of the Opposition. But a case has been made that the Leader of the Opposition should have a Personal Assistant. I believe we can be more efficient with help.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to wind up the debate, Sir. I want to thank Members who have spoken in this debate, I just want to reiterate the point of principle from which I started, that we have an obligation to put persons elected to Parliament in a position where they can effectively and efficiently discharge their responsibility to the public they serve and effectively carry

out their functions at whatever level they have to discharge that function.

It has now become part of our tradition with each succeeding Administration to improve the facilities at the disposal of persons in elected office and this Administration is going to be faithful to that tradition. I also want to reiterate, in the presence of the former Prime Ministers, that I am giving recognition to the status of former Prime Minister of Barbados. 4.50 p.m.

I believe that it is an office that carries certain responsibilities and that it should also attract a subvention that would allow the person to be able to discharge responsibilities in relation to the office. I want to say that publicly, Sir, because I think it is the correct thing to do.

Sir, this has been an unfortunate debate if only because of the position of the Democratic Labour Party as articulated by its leader, and I want to state what he said: "We are not opposing this but it is for you to sell it to the public". I want that, Sir, to be understood. He said, we are not opposing it but it is for you to sell it to the public. Now we accept our responsibility, Sir, to sell it to the public but I want the public to know that the Leader of the Opposition has said in this House that he is not opposing this measure. We are now going to see, Sir, having said in here that he is not opposing it, if he is going to go out in public and say something else. He has gone on record, Sir, and I want to repeat it, he has gone on record as saying that he is not opposing it, but then he wants to tell the Barbados Labour Party what they are to do and I keep making the point that, the way in which the Member for St. John seeks to tell the Barbados Labour Party what to do, you could be forgiven for believing that either his grandfather or his father left him political shares in this party.

Sir, there were some false tears that were shed. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition spent his time shedding false tears on behalf of the workers of the NCC. No worker of the NCC holds the Leader of the Opposition with respect nor do they have any regard for Members of the Democratic Labour Party. They know that it was the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, who put them on a 3-day week. They know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that it is the Democratic Labour Party who put them on the 3-day week when they were spending millions of dollars at Sherbourne and they know that the reason why we could not have restored the 3-day week to a 5-day week before now was that we were having to pay back a lot of the arrears and the unpaid bills that the Democratic Labour Party left which we had to clear, including \$2.9 million that we have even now in this supplementary to pay on Sherbourne. Sir, all of that debt has been cleared and we are now in

a position to deal with their needs as we are in a position to deal with the needs of Ministers who have to be as effective in the discharge of their responsibilities as we expect the NCC workers to be.

He spoke about productivity and what they are paying to certain people in the public service and I just want to say that I do not want to hear from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition any criticism about how much Mr. Shuffler is being paid when he could agree to pay white people coming from England millions of dollars to manage the sugar industry in this country. The Democratic Labour Party and the Leader of the Opposition responsible for BAMC agreed to pay a few white people millions of dollars to manage a \$60 million industry in Barbados but we are not to pay Barbadians properly.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir, the people who presently manage the sugar industry, manage it on the basis of international competitive bids. Anybody in Barbados, anywhere in the world, could have bid for that contract and we gave it to the entity which offered the services at the lowest price at that time. Simple as that.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the Barbados Agricultural Management Company is a company owned by Government in the same way as the Barbados Tourism Authority is a parastatal. The resources, Sir, come out of public funds. And we are here in this country, thanks to the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. John, paying people from England millions of dollars to manage a sugar industry in this country and they are saying that you should not pay to the leaders of the Tourism Authority who are managing a-billion dollar industry, more than they paid to the leaders of CARSICOT. What the president and other officers of the Tourism Authority are being paid is no way different from what was paid by the Democratic Labour Party to the management of CARSICOT. As many as 5 years ago men employed by CARSICOT were earning \$12 000 a month to manage a 5 million dollar cotton industry. Thanks to the Democratic Labour Party, nothing was wrong with that. But people managing a-million dollar industry being paid \$12 000 a month are to be criticized by people who can pay people billions of dollars to manage the sugar industry of this country. That is what we have to deal with from a leaderless opposition. It is consistent with the political case put this evening, Sir, that we are not opposing this but you have to sell it to the public. Sir, we know what our responsibilities are.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I will be the only person there because the public has lost confidence in you.

Sir, I believe that I should come back to first principle, but I have sat in this Parliament as we have incrementally improved the facilities available for elected public officials to effectively and efficiently discharge their responsibilities. We do so with a reference to its impact on the public purse. We feel the time has come, Sir, that, just as we can afford to put back the NCC workers on a 5-day week that we can at the same time allow Ministers to have Personal Assistants to help them more effectively discharge their responsibilities. 5.00 p.m.

It is part and parcel, Sir, of the same process. The public, Sir, knows what the Member for St. John stands for. They do not have any respect for him just like the dead weight in his party, Sir, has no respect for him, just like the old gardener of the DLP, Sir, has no respect for him. If he feels that he can send home NCC workers and put them on a 3-day week and then come and tell them foolishness that they are doing this in preference to pay them, Sir, he is going to be surprised just as he is going to be surprised by the reaction of the 35 000 and more people that he left unemployed in this country and told them that the only solution to their plight was the payment of bus fares and lunch money. They will never forget him because they know what he stands for. He stands for a man who will come to Parliament and say that I am not opposing this, but it is for you to sell it to the public. If he says that, this has captured the emptiness and dust at the centre of his political soul that we are not opposing this but you must sell it to the public. It takes a special man without strength of character to come to a Parliament and say that I am not opposing this but I am going to go out in public and say something else about it. You are either for it or you are against it. If you are against it, then I think you must put yourself on the line. If Ministers in this Cabinet, Sir, cannot have Personal Assistants because the Leader of the Opposition says so, I think that he should set the example himself by giving up his own Personal Assistant so that we can by that action divert those resources to employing more NCC workers. I am going to tell the NCC workers of Barbados that until the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, gives up his Personal Assistant to enable us to employ more of them, Sir, that they are to treat him as the emptiness and bareness, Sir, that is exemplified by the folly he has exposed in this House this afternoon.

I beg, Sir, that Head 16 as amended stand part.

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

Head 17 was called and passed.

HEAD 18-AUDIT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 18 stand part.

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

The question that Head 18 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 19 - (AS AMENDED) - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 19 as amended stand part.

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

The question that Head 19 as amended now stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

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

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

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

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 28 stand part.

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

The question that Head 28 now stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

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

The question that Head 30 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH AFFAIRS & CULTURE

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Head 34 stand part, Sir.

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

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

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, FOREIGN TRADE & INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I beg to move that Head 36 stand part, Sir.

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

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & SPORTS

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: I beg to move that Head 39 stand part.

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

The question that Head 39 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY, COMMERCE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

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

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

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

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS,
TRANSPORT AND HOUSING

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM,
INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT AND
THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 43 stand part.

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

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move that Head 50 stand part.

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

The question that Head 50 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one money Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now adjourned until Tuesday, November 28, 1995 at 11 o'clock in the morning.

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

The question that the House be now adjourned until Tuesday, November 28, 1995 at 11:00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.10 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 1975

Confirmatidn of Minutes of Tuesday,
November14, 1995 deferred.

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR ____ . ____ 1975

Report of the Public Enterprise Investment Fund
for the Quarters ending June 30, 1995 and
September 30, 1995.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 1975

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS**ORDER NO. 5 - COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 1976

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1995 - 1996
NO. 6 - \$32 507 110..... 1976

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Hon. O. S. Arthur, 1976, 1980, 1983; Mr. D. J.
H. Thompson, 1977,1979,1990; Hon. D. A. C.
Simmons, 1992, 1993, 1995; Dr. R. C. Haynes,
1983, 1985; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 1985,
1986, 1987; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 1988,
1989; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 1994.

RESUMPTION HEAD 13 - PRIME**MINISTER'S OFFICE (resumed)**

Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 1996; Mr. D. J. H.
Thompson, 1997, 1999; Hon. O. S. Arthur,
1999, 2000.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE..... 2000

Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2000, 2002, 2012; Mr. D. J.
H. Thompson, 2003, 2005; Dr. R. C. Haynes,
2006, 2007; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2008,
2010; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2011.

HEAD 18 - AUDIT..... . ____ 2013

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

HEAD 19 - (AS AMENDED) - MINISTRY AND**ECONOMIC AFFAIRS 2013**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND**RURAL DEVELOPMENT..... ____ 2013**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS . . . 2013

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

**HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSE
CUTIONS 2013**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL 2013

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2013.

**HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH
AFFAIRS AND CULTURE 2013**

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 2013.

**HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
FOREIGN TRADE & INTERNATIONAL
BUSINESS 2013**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH..... 2013

Hon Miss H. E. Thompson, 2013.

**HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, COMMU
NITY DEVELOPMENT & SPORTS 2013**

Hon. R. N. Greenidge, 2013.

**HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY, COM
MERCE AND BUSINESS DEVELOP
MENT 2013**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2013.

**HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS,
TRANSPORT AND HOUSING 2014**

Hon. G. W. Payne, 2014.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM, INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT AND THE ENVIRONMENT.....2014

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2014.

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE 2014

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2014.

SUSPENSION 1996

ADJOURNMENT.....2014

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2014.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central) KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (S*. Lucy) MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown) St. JOHN, Hon. Sir Harold (Christ Church South) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John)