
THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 27, 1996.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.15 a.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 1996.

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

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

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

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.) (Leader of the Opposition)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. D. Carter

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

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

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

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

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

Mr. H. F. LASHLEY

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B. (Minister of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tourism and International Transport)

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. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. **SPEAKER:** This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minutes of the meeting of the House of Assembly for its meeting of Friday, February 23, 1996 have not yet been circulated. I beg to move that these be deferred.

Mr. **SPEAKER:** If this be the will of the House, so be it.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay The Charter for Returning and Overseas Nationals.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

WHEREAS the Government of Barbados recognises Barbadian nationals overseas as an integral part of Barbados' assets and resources and the invaluable contribution they have made to the development of the nation;

AND WHEREAS over the years a number of Barbadians have been returning to Barbados to resettle; and the Government, recognising that every effort should be made to facilitate their settlement and re-integration into the national society, has ~~created~~ a Charter for Returning and Overseas Nationals and has established a Facilitation Unit for Returning Nationals in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Parliament welcome the creation of the Charter and the establishment of the Facilitation Unit for Returning Nationals and endorse their objectives.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Parliament congratulate the Government on the creation of the Charter and the establishment of the Facilitation Unit for Returning Nationals.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

The question 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 – COMMITTEE OF **SUPPLY** – THE
GRANT OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE
SERVICE OF BARBADOS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in respect of this Order No. 5, I would wish to give notice that the Government intends to withdraw 5(a), notice of which was given on the 20th of February and 5(b) becomes 5(a) and 5(c) becomes 5(b). (a) is subsumed in (c), 5(a)

will be subsumed in 5(c). Probably we should withdraw and renumber accordingly.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite unusual for such changes to be made to the Resolution which was duly circulated without any explanation and I am wondering if we could be given some explanation on why it is necessary to do this and what were the circumstances leading up to this situation. There should be some explanation, Sir. I think this Chamber is due some explanation why there are changes.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the changes were self evident. I used the word subsumed. 5(a) has in effect been overtaken by events so that it will now become consolidated within what is 5(c). There is nothing to hide. We do not want to hide it. We want them out and it will all come out in the debate.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking about hiding, I am saying that we are here and elected to do the people's business and **as** a Chamber we should be given the information so that we can understand the procedural steps **which** will follow before any substantive debate takes place. If **you** wish to make a change I think that Honourable Members are due the courtesy of some **explanation** as to why this procedural change is necessary.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it is within the prerogative of Government, as has been stated in this House from time immemorial, to ask for an item on the Order Paper to be withdrawn at any time. If the Members on the other side, Sir, do not want the matter withdrawn, Sir, the matter is before the House, Sir, for a vote, they can vote against it, Sir, but the Government is asking, Sir, that 5(a) should be withdrawn. If Members on the other side want to vote against it, it is in their discretion. A motion is before the House, inviting the House to have 5(a) withdrawn.

I have been in this House now for almost 12 years and Sir, this is the third Government whose behaviour I have witnessed in this House and there **are** countless times when items on the Order Paper have **been** withdrawn. The Member for St. Michael South has come to this House on a number of occasions and asked **for** things to be withdrawn. Sir, I am asking therefore to let us proceed to **have** a vote on the question as to whether 5(a) can be withdrawn.
11.25 a.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of arrogance - I call this Prime Ministerial arrogance. I can recognize it. What we are asking about, Mr. Speaker, is not whether a matter can be withdrawn or not but the courtesy of explaining to the Chamber why these steps are necessary. Mr. Speaker, if we get that kind of arrogance in the execution of public affairs, no wonder this will be happening in other areas of the Government and in other ways as well. We are simply asking for an explanation and I believe that this Chamber is due an explanation. I know that you do not have to give an explanation. You do not have to do anything. You have the numbers vote, but that is not how a democracy works. That is not how a parliamentary democracy should operate. It is a simple procedural matter. If you are asking for a change, simply say why it is necessary.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Leader of the House has already explained that the sums that were being sought under Item 5(a) are now also being sought under Item 5(c). Now, Sir, if the Member for St. Michael South wants us to vote the same sum of money twice then say so.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Sir. I rise on a point of order. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. The Right Honourable Member, will you take your seat please?

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, you have two members standing, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am saying to you to **take your** seat please.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Why should I sit when you have another member standing? Let him sit down. If you wish to put me out, I will go out and we will all go out. Sit down.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: You want to run from this Bill today. But it will hold us in here today. We will not run.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please Honourable Members we seem to be getting testy today. Honourable Members please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was speaking on the motion before the House. The Government has explained that the sum...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not here to explain to the satisfaction of the Member for St. Michael South. But we have explained to the House that the sum that was being sought under Item 5 (a) is included in the request under Item 5 (c). Therefore, the Government wants to proceed to discuss 5 (c) on the understanding that in so doing it will be making provision to discuss what was being requested under 5 (a). Now that is as simple, Sir, as you can have. We have said that 5 (a) is subsumed in 5 (c) and therefore we are withdrawing 5 (a). As to the circumstances why it has now **been** subsumed, Sir, that will come out in the debate. But the vote under 5 (a) is now being provided under 5 (c) and it is part of the \$5 million request and we are asking therefore with that full explanation that the House proceeds to deal with 5 (c).

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, speaking on the motion before the House, until the...

Mr. SPEAKER: Which motion is this?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The motion that all other members are speaking on, Sir. That is the motion I am speaking on. Whatever is before the House, Sir, I am speaking on that and, if I am irrelevant, you can rule me irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, until the Honourable Member for the City spoke and put before the House that Item 5 (a) should be deleted and that 5 (b) should be 5 (a) and 5 (c) should be 5 (b) which as I understand it is the motion which the Leader of the House put to the Chamber, I was unaware that this particular item was going to be **changed**. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we on this side have always tried to cooperate once there has been adequate consultation and once there are the basic courtesies which should be extended by the Leader of the House to the Leader of the Opposition prior to the day's sitting. What the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying and is right to say is that not even the Leader of the Opposition, who normally engages in those consultations, was able to give an explanation to his parliamentary colleagues as to why this was being done because there had been no consultation whatsoever. All that is being said on this side, Mr. Speaker, is that the basic courtesy between Government and Opposition should be extended. When the Honourable Member for St. Thomas leads the House, these matters are fully discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John, please!

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am extending the courtesy. I want to congratulate you on your 20 years as a Member of this Chamber and say that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas rises to the high parliamentary traditions which are expected. I am not coming in this Chamber to sit down and be dictated to by any Leader of this House, I have the same right as every other member in this Chamber, The Honourable Member for St. Michael South has the same right and each member on this side has the same right, The Honourable Member for the City needs to understand that there are certain basic courtesies which need to be extended to all individual members of this House and that the way in which we have worked out that these things should be discussed is that prior to the sitting the Leader of the House should consult with the Leader of the Opposition. You have even made other **kinds** of suggestions, Mr. Speaker, by which this can work effectively. So I have to entirely condone, accept and praise the Honourable Member for St. Michael South for drawing to the House's attention this grave unwarranted discourtesy by the Honourable Member for the City in running the affairs of this Chamber.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is really regrettable that there should be heat generating at this time. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will recall that on Friday at the time after the Resolution for \$9 million was circulated, as the Clerk reminded me just now, I did indicate to the House that we will be proceeding with the Resolution for the \$9 million in place of the \$850 000 forming a part of the \$9 million. But all of us seem to have forgotten that at that time the Leader of the Opposition had returned to his sick bed. He was not in here. He does not know. He was not well, Sir. He left the House early on Friday and he went back home.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas was able to reach me on my sick bed during the course of the week to tell me what other arrangements were being made. My absence from this Chamber did not mean that the basic courtesy should **not** be extended. I was not on my sick **bed** this morning and I have had no discussion whatsoever with anybody with these arrangements. I was here from 9 o'clock this morning and the first person to enter these gates this morning was the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members please.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am just saying this is a simple point. All that a Government needs to do is to say that the Government does not intend to proceed with Item 5 (a). That is **all**. You can do that and that is in fact what the Leader of the House was doing and

she went further. She gave **an** explanation. It has never happened that anybody has protested. This is nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, I believe that you have spent enough time on that. Let us proceed please. I believe the Government has the **right... Your** point is well taken. Your point about consultation has been raised once again and once again I suggest to both sides, whenever it is possible, if there is **an** opportunity for consultation which will help **to** expedite the business of the **House**, by all means of course it should be **entertained**.

11.35 a.m.

Aside,

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was interrupted. There is no motion to withdraw something of this kind, there is no discourtesy to anybody; It is not **as** though something is being replaced by something else, it is being subsumed. We are going to debate it, it is going to be subsumed in (c).

I would like to move, Sir, that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into **Committee** on this matter.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that I do now leave the Chair...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Order, please. Order. Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to **try** to help the House...

Mr. SPEAKER: That's very kind of you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:... by suggesting that we proceed with the debate on both Resolutions and all we have to do is to reduce the amount in the second Resolution by the amount of the first Resolution.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay. Please, please. Your suggestion has been made, Sir.

1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
16

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am just trying to be helpful, Sir. Thank you very much.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

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

ITEM 5(c) – SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1995-96 – No. 13

HEAD 30 – ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 30 stand part, I draw attention that the Government is **seeking** supplementary provision today in respect of – I am going to take Members through carefully because it seems that everybody is not *au fait* with the contents of the Resolution – we are **seeking** supplementary provision under Head 30, subsequently Head 36 will be called if there is time for debate, and Head 39 – Ministry of Labour, Community Development and Sports. There are three different Heads in this Resolution of \$9 807 695.

The part of the Resolution for which I have responsibility is Head 30, The Government is **seeking** to supplement Object No. 211 – Maintenance of Property, Object No. 212 – Operating Expenses and Object No. 316 – Grants to Public Institutions, with specific reference to the Regional Police Training College. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition will note **Subprogram** 3 dealing with the Regional Police Training Centre and Grants to Public Institutions. He and I **have** spoken elsewhere on this matter and I will deal with it in detail later on.

Mr. Chairman, in respect of Maintenance of Property, the amount voted for the financial year 1995-96 was \$1 251 500. Of this amount \$766 255.75 has been spent, leaving a balance of \$485 244.25. That balance, however, is inadequate to meet projected expenditure to the end of March this calendar year. A supplementary provision is therefore required to enable the Police Department to cover projected expenditure, of which insurance premiums alone on the vehicles are now showing an amount of \$374 631.07. That is inescapable expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, in respect of Operating Expenses, all the funds from this Item have been expended and as a consequence the Police Department has been unable to meet the payment of certain operating expenses, which include monthly personal allowances due to the rank and file of the Force.

Honourable Members will have seen some statements in the Press on behalf of the Police calling for their various allowances to be paid. This Resolution today is to ensure that outstanding arrears of allowances are settled. Those allowances include all types and I will give the House some more information later on, but particularly the washing and plain clothes allowances average \$95 000 a month, and we therefore need a sum of \$380 000 to cover the payments from December, 1995 to the end of March, 1996. In addition to **that**, there are other outstanding items under Operating Expenses which we are taking the opportunity to satisfy. Uniforms were ordered in the fiscal year 1994-95 but they are only now being billed for and we need \$175 000 to pay for those uniforms.
11.45 a.m.

The Police Department also pays for the removal and storage of dead bodies. On 4th February, 1994 a contract was offered to Two Sons' Funeral Home of Stadium Road, Bush Hall to deal with the removal, conveyance and keeping and preservation of bodies. I will give the House, because I don't think it has ever been done in here and it is something that all members ought to know, a breakdown of the various elements of the contract and the consideration therefor.

Removing and conveying to the Public Mortuary, Bridgetown, dead bodies lying in the parish of St. Michael and in that part of Christ Church within the jurisdiction of District A – \$50.

Removing and conveying dead bodies lying elsewhere to the Mortuary or to the particular magisterial district in which they are or such other mortuary within the parish of St. Michael – \$70.

Moving and conveying dead bodies from the public mortuaries to the funeral home – \$50.

From the funeral home to the Public Mortuary – \$50.

Removing and conveying a dead body in urgent state of decomposition – \$106.

That is within St. Michael. Outside of St. Michael that figure goes to \$126.

Where the **dead** body is in an advanced state of decomposition - \$145.

That is in District A, Elsewhere, it is \$165.

Supplying of a body bag - \$85.

Keeping and **preserving** on a daily **basis** at the funeral home when the Public Mortuary is full - \$35.

That is the contract that was made on February 4, 1994 between the Ministry of **Home** Affairs acting on **behalf** of the Crown, and Two Sons' Funeral Home.

There have been outstanding bills due not only to Two Sons but other persons who supply this service from time to time. The other bills now amount to \$250 000 and we want to clear the arrears before the end of this financial year.

There are various allowances, **Mr.** Chairman, of which members should be aware. For example, the Government has to pay driving licences, not for Ministers or anybody so, but for police officers. A police officer will go and get his licence renewed. He will pay the \$50 and then claim a refund from the Government. Apparently, we are now paying drivers' licences for 1 000 policemen.

There are refunds of medical expenses which have to be paid where the policeman will pay up front - these are conditions of service, and I don't think that many of us were aware of these things - the doctor and then claims back a refund. Part of the funds wanted under 212 relates to medical cases to pay the various doctors who act on behalf of the police in various districts.

Witnesses' expenses we had to pay. Shoeing of horses - we need about \$10 000 to keep us going to the end of the financial year. I have already spoken of the washing allowances, the plain clothes allowance and the responsibility allowances and funds are also required to pay the Transport Board. One hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars of this money is for payment to the Transport Board in respect of **an agreement** that was made on March 23, 1984. The Police Department has to compensate the Transport Board for the free travel of policemen on the buses.

Those are some of the main ones, but also included in the request to supplement the operating expenses is the matter of the payment of allowances to police officers

who **served** in the multinational force in Haiti. Subsistence **allowance** was due to 10 police officers who **served as monitors** in Haiti during the **period** October 3, 1994 to March 27, 1995 and **the** allowance is at the rate of **US\$15** a day, **The** police officers, except for one sergeant, **were** in **Haiti** for the full period **from** October 3, 1994 to **March** 27, 1995 and they have not yet **received** payment for that period, So all **of** them will now **be** paid and the total bill for **those** allowances is \$21 420.

There is a sum of \$274 629 relating to the Regional Police **Training** Centre, There has been a gradual fall off in the numbers attending the Regional Police Training Centre for sometime, Perhaps I can give a little history on **this** matter because we are providing **funds** to pay severance and national insurance **arrears** and **various** bits and **pieces** to staff at **the** Regional Police Training Centre.

The Centre was opened in 1957. Catering was then **undertaken** by a private supplier and as a result of complaints about the quality of food a catering committee, as it was called, was set up in 1958 to oversee an in-house catering arrangement. That catering at the Regional Police Training Centre was financed from a fund which has been traditionally administered by the catering committee. For the last few years, except for 1993 when there was a small surplus, that fund administered by the catering committee has always recorded a deficit and it has been **represented** by the Commandant and the Commissioner that we should review the operation of the system.

The provision of meals to the student body at the Regional Police Training Centre **is** financed in 3 ways. First of all by the payment of the charges by the actual students, a proportion; payment by the British Development Division on behalf of students who come from the British dependent **territories** like Turks and Caicos and through sponsorship by the donor agencies, namely the United States of America and Canada. A recruit student officer pays \$25 a day while senior students pay \$40 a day. Barbadian recruit student officers are paid a meal allowance of \$9 a day and they therefore have to contribute the balance of \$16. The British Development Division, of course, pays for the entire cost of the students from the dependent territories in the region.

The catering staff at the Regional Police Training Centre comprise a mess officer and an assistant together with a senior supervisor, 2 supervisors, 4 cooks and 7 maids. The staff are all members of the Barbados Workers' Union. There is a collective agreement in force in respect of payment and working conditions.
11.55 a.m.

Now, when the **Regional Police** Training Centre was, in fact, training a large number of police officers from the region, it had a **student** body of well over 100 per session but **gradually** there has been a fall-off in that number because other territories which formerly sent their recruits to Barbados are now **doing** the training in their own territories so that between 1988 and 1990 the average **student** population at the Regional Training School per session was down to 75 **from** over 100. But, as I said, because the OECS countries in **particular** have decided to do their training, sometimes for a course we have as few recruits as 20, from over 100 down to 20 over the last couple of **years**.

We are trying various things, Sir, to make up on the deficit, as it were, in personnel. The emphasis has shifted to management training and refresher training for senior officers to the rank of Inspector. We still need the participation at that level from the OECS countries. We still need contributions from the donor agencies, but the Regional Police Training Centre is, in fact, operating on a very thin financial margin.

Now, the Catering Fund that I spoke of, Sir, has been in serious problems. At the end of **December** 1995, the Fund was indebted in the sum of \$135 205.74 as follows. It owed the National Insurance Scheme \$44 000, Inland Revenue \$21 000 - I am giving round figures - various and sundry suppliers \$54 000, the Workers' Union \$156.00, Auditors \$500.00. It had borrowed \$12 000 from the Police Welfare Fund. It owed vacation pay of \$2 500 but it did have a balance on current account of \$47 000 and receivables of \$10 000 so that the net deficit was not \$135 000. That was the gross. The net was \$77 462.62. That approach was taken with the interest of preserving jobs while, at the same time, seeking to cut the losses which the Fund is incurring.

Now, a consequence of the Fund not having paid National Insurance contributions was that the workers whom I detailed earlier could not claim unemployment benefits and that is not a desirable situation. We reviewed the options. There were three options, but we have decided, and the Government has accepted that the catering arrangement should be privatized. It would mean, however, that existing staff would have to be severed. If they are severed, they have to be properly compensated.

Mr. Chairman, representations were made to me by the Commandant, Mr. Momo of the Barbados Workers' Union and more recently by the Leader of the Opposition in his private capacity as an attorney-at-law on behalf of the workers at the Regional Police Training School to try

and sort out the situation. We gave it **very** careful **consideration**. The Commandant and the Commissioner are of the view that it is desirable that the present arrangements be reviewed,

During the past **three** to **four** months, the main **meals** of lunch and dinner have been **supplied** not by a catering committee but by a private operator. The kitchen **staff** has been reduced and a skeleton staff has been kept **on** after discussions and **arrangements** with the **Workers' Union**. We agreed that a skeleton staff could continue to **prepare** breakfast and clean up. We have had the computations done in the National Insurance Department and the severance payments' element comes to \$197 000. In **addition**, \$77 463 will be **required** to enable the Regional Police Training Centre to satisfy its outstanding **debts**.

In this Resolution we are doing two things in respect of the Regional Police Training Centre. We are clearing all the indebtedness, \$77 463, making sure that the National Insurance in particular gets its share so that the workers will be able to get their unemployment benefits. At the same time, we are paying severance payments for those workers of \$197 000. Those are the main features of Head **30**.

Under Object 211, Maintenance of Property, some of those funds which are required, **approximately** \$100 000 of those funds, go back to cover debts **incurred** between 1992, 1993 and 1994. They cover fiscal years 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95. As I said, we are cleaning up the arrears. At District "A" we are trying to establish the workshop. I will **talk** about that shortly. We found a large number of invoices which were just stored up at District "A" and were never brought to account. We are seeking to do that now and clear the debts.

Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General for some time now has been making very serious comments about the management of the funds assigned to the Police Department. When the Honourable Prime Minister was Leader of the Opposition and as such Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, he had indicated to the Committee that the comments of the Auditor General were so caustic and so persistent that it required the Committee to look into the financial management of the Police over time. Indeed, he made a similar comment about Parliament. The events of 1994, June to September, ensured that the Prime Minister was not able to push through the intentions of the Committee at the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am happy to report, Sir, that where the Auditor General was able to point out consistently that there were problems in the management, particularly in the workshop, I am going to say that we are seeing – I am being cautiously optimistic – a turnaround in things at the workshop. A new workshop manager has been appointed since November last year and whereas at the end of last year the workshop **could only** get 120 vehicles on the road per day, I am proud today to disclose to this House that we are turning out 162 vehicles a day.
12.05 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You would not find anything about that in the Manifesto but it is happening. I cannot say the same thing for the St. John Development Plan.

I also wish to have it publicly recorded that there is now a Financial Controller managing the funds of the Police Department. They call her the Iron Lady but she has done a fantastic job in bringing regularity and order to the accounts of the Police Department. I want to compliment the Financial Controller and the Senior officers in the police force for the fine work that they are doing in trying to bring, as I say, some regularity to the police accounts.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I therefore beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

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

HEAD 36 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH – \$4 268 971.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Ministry of Health seeks a substantial supplementary of its initial provision for the management and functioning of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In fact the documents before this Chamber would indicate that the sum sought, and I will give a breakdown, reflects \$2 285 845 under the Head, Personal Emoluments, \$83 126 under supplies and materials, \$1 800 000 under maintenance of property and under the Medical Aid Scheme \$2 321 175.

Mr. Chairman, this supplementary comes even after a supplementary for the hospital in the Government's mid-year financial review at which time we sought to do an analysis of expenditure throughout the Government service and at which time a similar exercise was conducted in relation to the Ministry of Health and the Environment and in particular the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. At that time the figures coming from the hospital did not indicate that there was any large deficiency under the various sub-programs carried out at the hospital. In January of this year we again undertook an exercise which involved the analysis of the

state of the vote of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As that exercise progressed over the last several weeks I sought to have the Permanent Secretary dig further and further into the state of affairs of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and to himself personally go over to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It took that, Mr. **Chairman**, Sir, for the Permanent **Secretary**, Ministry of Health to leave headquarters and physically go over to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and demand the books and seek to bring before me what the **state** of the vote at the hospital was. At the time that the directive to undertake that massive investigation was given, the hospital indicated to the Ministry that they needed a supplementary for addressing overtime allowances and **other** allowances in the sum of \$681 000. I suspected it and **asked** to have it further queried. The figure came back at \$891 000 for the doctors alone. The doctors are paid on-call and other allowances out of a Head called Other Personal Emoluments. I **asked** the question, if in relation to doctors you need a supplementary of \$891 000, what about the other items under this Head and what about the other votes **at** the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? When the analysis of the **other** items under that Head were undertaken that **analysis** demonstrated that the **hospital** needed \$2.2 million under that Head alone and that further moneys were needed in the sums I indicated this morning, to supplement almost every Head of expenditure.

This matter therefore engaged the attention of the Cabinet as indeed the whole hospital and had been doing for some months when we sought to ask the question, what really is wrong at the hospital? The fact that we could ask for figures and not be given accurate and correct figures and the fact that within the space of five days the hospital could **change** the request for supplementary from \$681 000 to \$891 000 to \$6 **million** suggests that either people did not know what they were doing or that there was no control or there was some major problem existing at the hospital in relation to the control of the budget and then we had to deal with the wider problem of what was wrong at **the** hospital.

It is now a matter of record that yesterday serious decisions were taken to remove the top management team of the hospital and I therefore want in that context to frame for this Chamber what **are** the major problems existing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which has engaged the **attention** of the media for the last several months and in particular the last three months. One of the things emerging **from** the analysis in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and resulting in yesterday's action was the absolute absence of direction and planning in relation to the hospital.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that we are **looking** at a supplementary for

a particular sum of money and I would like, if possible, that the Member direct her attention to the reasons for this money to be allocated as far as possible within the time allotted.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: **Mr.** Chairman, I really want to follow the Chair's ruling but I would urge the Chair to consider that if we are going to put the facts for why these figures are before the Chamber, I would need some latitude to deal with the circumstances.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do that ...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am not hearing the Chair, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that you have only half hour for your preliminary speech and I would appreciate it if you would just deal with it.

12.15 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: **Mr. Chairman,** let me observe the rule.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. I want to make a point on the ruling you are making since it may affect my privileges in speaking before this Chamber. The matter before the House, Sir, has to do with a supplementary for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am asking you, Sir, if you are ruling that Members of this House in this debate cannot advert to any of the problems facing the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the course of this debate. I am asking you, Sir, to sensitize me because I intend to exercise my privilege to speak in Parliament and I should not want to offend the Chair by speaking to an issue that the Chair says is beyond the province of this debate. I would ask you to be very clear in your representation of the ruling you are making.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is looking at Standing Order 28 (2) which says:

"A Member must confine his speech to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

So that if the Honourable Member perceives that what she is saying is relevant thereto she may do so. But I was just letting her know that she has to be guided by the money consideration in this matter because this is a Committee of Supply.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of privilege, Sir. I am asking you, Sir, to say what your ruling is. The Minister who is introducing this matter pertaining to the allocation of funds for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has sought to speak on the question of the problem facing the hospital. I am asking you, Sir, if you are saying that...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I am speaking in relation to my privilege in this debate. I am asking you, Sir, if your ruling is saying that no Member in speaking on this matter can speak to the question of the problems at the hospital.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, the Chair is clearly not saying that. The Chair is saying that any matter relevant to the debate can be introduced. But Members must be mindful that we are looking at a specific money Resolution in this Committee which is a Committee of Supply. Please proceed.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: **Mr. Chairman,** I note the direction and the intervention of the Chair and I will seek to move on. The fact that this supplementary is before the House in this way, **Mr. Chairman,** points to two problems – a problem with the management of the budgetary allocations for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, secondly, that speaks to the wider issue of the management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital itself. If, **Mr. Chairman,** you would wish me to go straight to the dollars and cents, I will focus on the dollars and cents. Over the years, **Mr. Chairman,** the hospital had a budgetary allocation from the Government which increased every year in terms of policy direction the programmes of respective Governments on stream and to keep those programmes funded. This changed however, **Mr. Chairman,** once the St. Joseph Hospital was opened and one saw over a four year period \$35 million being allocated to the St. Joseph Hospital while the programmes of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and its budget suffered. In that period, Sir, starting at 1991, the year that St. Joseph Hospital was opened, the budget went from \$67 508 362 to, in the following year, \$58 450 207 and that was the trend that you saw. So that one of the problems that existed at the hospital was that the budgetary allocation to meet the hospital programmes was cut during the period of the Democratic Labour Party's term of office as a result of structural adjustment firstly and, secondly, as a result of the St. Joseph Hospital being opened and money being poured into the St. Joseph Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital being starved of those allocations. When you analyze the budget year by year, you will see that it went from \$67 million in the year that the hospital was opened right down to a sum considerably less than that. I think that at one stage, **Mr. Chairman,** that it actually reached \$55 million which represented a drop of some \$12 million. It was not until the budget of last year that

that the hospital was restored to \$63 853 648 and the point must also be made that while the hospital budget was being cut the services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were being expanded to the high-tech and sophisticated including invasive cardiology and programmes of that sort at high cost while at the same time people were forced to go on long waiting lists to have basic operations on their eyes, hernia and other run-of-the-mill things, particularly the non-paying public patients. That is the first point about the budget that I want to make, Sir.

The second point that I want to make in relation M the budgetary allocation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the point of the budget shows, Mr. Chairman, how **the** QEHL deals with votes when it is given a vote. I am going to speak with reference to what happened in this year **and** what has been happening at the QEHL all the time that caused the Government to take the drastic steps yesterday of removing the top management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital pursuant to the request of this matter. Let us look, for instance, at **the Head** of Casual Staff. This vote pays some 366 workers and it is \$3 674 405. No allocation was made and request was made for the employment of additional staff but without money being provided in the Budget for it, without **making** a request to the Ministry, without **asking** the Minister of Finance, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital proceeded to employ Island Constables which occasioned a cost of \$140 666. Again, during the course of the year, the medical staff was expanded occasioning a cost of \$826 871.

There were problems in relation to the ways in which they dealt with the weekly paid and the monthly paid employees and that came out as a deficit of \$971 873. In fact, Mr. Chairman, when one analyzes the vote in relation to the Engineering Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, one realizes that it was allowed to go into a situation where despite a vote being given to them they were allowed to work on weekends and after hours to do work that should and could have been done during **working** hours. It got so bad that they moved from a situation where they started to put down a toilet bowl one Saturday and, of course **getting** paid overtime, they said, "**Skipper**, we are coming back next week Saturday to finish the toilet bowl." So nobody could use the bowl.

That was what was happening. That was the extent of the management or lack of management or lack of control going on at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. So that in overtime alone for one department, the Engineering Department, between April and December you saw people instead of doing their work during working hours the vote being taken up in overtime of \$39 000 in April, \$16 000 in May, \$19 000 in June, \$16 000 in July and there are other figures such as \$16 711, \$19 253, \$16 773, \$21 448 in August and in September \$29 826 until it reached \$213 966 as a total. That is the extent to which no control was placed, at the end of December, on the management of

the resources of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; \$213 966 to the end of December to pay people to do work that should have been done and could have been done if proper management was being exercised during 8.00 to 4.00. That is how the taxpayers' money was being spent.
12.25 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: That is overtime, that has nothing to do with **their** basic salary. That is why a **man** can come and put down a toilet bowl one week and then say: "**Skipper**, I am coming back next week Saturday". That is the extent of the lack of control that existed in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that a similar expenditure was also occasioned for the lab and **for** other departments of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because management did not seek to put in place the kind of control that would allow it to effectively and efficiently run the Hospital, so that when people should have been **doing** their work they were allowed to sit down and collect **overtime** pay out of the taxpayers' money. This is not new, this is a practice that has been going on at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for years.

The matter of junior doctors getting their on-call allowances is an aggrieved problem that had been going on all through the last administration, because there is no **fixing** of on-call allowances to salary. The method by which the forms are filled out is not conducive to rapid payment and there are no controls in the way the system is administered. Therefore, from one month to the next you have **all** of these budgets fluctuating and no systems being put in place to control them.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am speaking in relation to the finances, Mr. Chairman, as you have required me to do. These show a lack of management control at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. You have senior managers not speaking to one another; you have a Hospital Medical Committee that has not met for in **the** region of five years; that the Hospital's affairs must be carried out and administered by management, who don't speak to one another, and in a situation where the committee that is to run the Hospital's affairs has not met for five years.

We came to a situation where directives from the Ministry and attempts at controlling the matter were not being carried out, where in 1995 a directive was given that a preventive maintenance programme should be in place had not been done, and the absence of a preventive maintenance programme has resulted in money being asked for in the supplementary.

One reads in the newspapers of equipment breaking down constantly. I want to speak for just a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, because all of these, how you deploy staff, how you pay staff, what you do with your vote, how services are delivered, all have an impact on the budget. The extent to which equipment comes into the Hospital that people do not know anything about. There is now existing a situation where a container of air conditioning units has been approved for duty free concessions for installation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but on a directive from the Ministry the Comptroller of Customs carried out a check and asked the Hospital to show where a full container of air conditioning units was going to go and only 14 holes for air conditioning units existed. A whole container load of air conditioning units is sitting in the Port, approved for duty free concessions, as if the full container belongs to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is the highest level of racketeering, and that is a story that does not exist there alone, it has continued for years. When the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was the Minister, it existed. It existed when the former Honourable Member for St. George North was the Minister, it did not occur yesterday. The fact that no maintenance programme has been **carried** out on the life saving equipment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital did not start in September, 1994, it has existed for years, and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West knows that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to focus the attention of the Honourable Chamber on the kinds of stories that have engaged the attention of the media in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital over the last few years, because they tell a story of the absence of budgetary control and absence of management.

14/10/87 Staff shortage blamed for delays at the QEH. A & E doctors complain of staff shortage.

June 21, '90 A complaint about nurses

May 10, '90 A complaint about treatment at out-patients clinic and shortage of dressings at the Hospital.

Mr. Chairman, again this points to how the budget is being used. You provide money for equipment, for supplies and the supplies end up outside of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with the surgical caps being used at hairdressers, with gauze and other things **walking** away from the Hospital and on wards patients cannot get basic supplies. That is what is going on.

December, '86 Staff shortage at QEH. Staff shortage has reached crisis proportions, according to **BAMP**.

'91 Work to **rule** only benefiting QEH. QEH to work to rule by doctors because of non payment of emoluments.

'91 April A question of caring. **An** editorial on the lengthy waiting time at the QEH in A & E.

'90 Nurse shortage – President, BRNA.

'93 Doctors say all work and late pay – junior doctors non payment. **Administration** says funds are not available.

'87 **Taitt** promises to lift standard of health care. (It has not happened **yet**.)

Minister to cure problems which plague QEH. Quality assistance programmes hit a snag.

August '87 QEH to check on quality. (The check has not happened yet.)

'90 More nurses needed.

'90 Michael **Clarke**, the surgeon, speaking about bad practices of the medical profession. Don't care **docs**.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Is the Honourable Member reading extracts from a newspaper? Or is this on file?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am not reading from a newspaper, Sir.

Tain raps medical records keeping.

'89 Low morale haunts QEH. Nurses frustrated with lack of incentive and respect.

April '89 QEH A & E. Waiting it out at the QEH.

'90	On budgeting and finance, Taitt denies Ministry Guilty of squandermania .
'91	\$40 million QEH spruce up, (which did not happen.)
February 21, '90	Only one pot, one saucepan, so the QEH stops work.
1990	QEH debt headache.
1989	Plan for QEH
1990	Ailing health service. A report by a BAMP subcommittee
April 1990	Critical condition. QEH hard hit. Surgery delays A & E Sterilising equipment in the surgery breaking down, three out of six theatres, recurring problems with nimbles.

All of this has gone on and you must ask yourself why.

1988	Henry Forde raps the appalling staff shortage at QEH
1988	Nurses sick out over QEH shortages of staff, poor working conditions. Why nurses ran out of patients. Ambulance probe being arranged. Hospital worries.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note ... It appears to me as if you are reading headlines from the newspaper. According to Standing Order 28(1), "A Member may not **read** his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

If the Honourable Member is quoting from newspapers, it is not in **accordance** with the Standing Orders. Otherwise you can **proceed**.
12.15 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I made a note of what had **transferred** at Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I recall these things exceptionally well. I was simply refreshing my memory from my notes. I am sure that it is also the memory of all those Barbadians who went to get hernia operations and were told they had to go on a waiting list for 2 years, who went to get their eyes done and went on a waiting list for 18 months or for 1 year. I am sure it

is in the memory of all those nurses and all people who have **had problems** with **nursing**. It is in the memory of those Barbadians who have been into the QEH **and** found no toilet paper. It is **the** memory of all of us and it has been the recent memory of the whole nation of Barbados and our attention has been riveted by the media on the state of the Q.E.H.

Mr. Chairman, **the** critical question is, and that is the question that this Administration is seeking to address, what does all of this signify and what is to be done about it. In our view, Mr. **Chairman**, it has to do with the fact that though analyses have been done for years that there was never the political will to implement the recommendations of the consultant and reports sat on shelves.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a document of this House **today** Professor **Bannoob** of the University of Miami, Report on Institutional Strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital July 1990 paid \$1.4 million which deals with information systems, management, hospital infection control, manpower development, hospital supplies management. The supplies vote is \$1.7 million right now. This speaks to lack of management in the supplies vote that resulted constantly in it not being under control. **Medical** records and statistics, financial management, **all** of this dating back to 1990, sitting on shelves at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, \$1.7 million not implemented - 1990.

An Annex to the Report, July of 1990. April 1989, a consultant from **PAHO** by the name of Camacho. This is an inventory of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital equipment. Nothing ever done to repair or **fix** it or bring it up to date. There is a plant equipment and maintenance, September of 1989. Nothing done to implement the preventive maintenance programme. January of 1990, the programme for the maintenance of clinical care and laboratory equipment - nothing done to implement it. Professor **Mickey Waldron confirms** that. Nobody has repaired hospital maintenance equipment or put in a preventive maintenance programme for years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: 1989 - building plant and equipment and maintenance. **All** of this speaks to a lack of proper management and a lack of implementation of programmes.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to make every last one a document of this Honourable Chamber so that the people of Barbados can know that they date back to 1989.

There have been reports paid for by the taxpayers of Barbados that have not been implemented, that have done nothing. This one alone is \$1.7 million. I do not know. This is the Bannoob Report. I can go through and get the cost of the others.

I wish to say, too, Mr. Chairman, that it is indicative of this problem that when you look back that the internal hospital management committee, not the doctors, Sir, the internal hospital management committee, the senior managers of the hospital were in 5 and 7 years not meeting to deal with the problems of the QEH.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, they were asked to meet and given a directive to meet, and my hand on the file shows a directive to urgently deal with the problems of the QEH and put a plan in place to deal with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has the right to return again. Maybe you can do that when you come back.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, there is much documentation here and I intend to make all available today to the media and the public so that people know when we took that serious decision yesterday that it came after long and weighty consideration, that it was not reckless in relation to the treatment of civil servants, that it really was a situation where we had to rescue the hospital for the taxpayers of Barbados who pay all our salaries, both civil servants and ours. It is our way of ensuring that the taxpayers of Barbados get what they pay for and that people cannot mismanage the system. We will not shelve the Report, turn our eyes and allow the taxpayers to be raped like this.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the only acute general hospital in Barbados, despite all of the efforts of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to found another acute general hospital in the north of Barbados, which is the subject of another debate, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the only acute general hospital that we have in this country. It is also, Mr. Chairman a teaching hospital of the University of the West Indies. Don't let us forget that. It is the hospital to which doctors in training come to us to do internships and a whole host of other things as well.

What we are dealing with here in this debate today is the rot of ages and ages and ages. That is what we are dealing with here. It is clear to me, Sir, having listened to the Honourable Minister that those who were engaged in the so-called management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – there are some who say that there were no management systems in place there, and I do not detect any myself – but those who were in positions there and right through the system from the bottom to the top clearly had an interest in the status quo remaining.

Let me start off by making some observations about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The vote for the Ministry of Health in context of the total budget is running at the rate of \$225 million, but we only have to look and see what was voted last year for the Ministry of Health. Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that the hospital within the health budget has allotted to it a significant percentage. We are spending close to \$70 million on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I just want to go back a few years to give Honourable Members an idea of how expenditure on this Hospital has been running. Now, Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that the Hospital, within the health budget, has a significant percentage allotted to it. We spend and are spending in this year close to \$70 million on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I just want to go back a few years to give Honourable Members an idea of how expenditure on this Hospital has been running.
12.45 p.m.

In the 1993/94 Estimates, Sir, I have the Hansard for that debate in front of me in my hand, this House voted \$60.1 million for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In 1994/95 when the Honourable Member for St. John, who is not now in his seat, was the Minister of Finance, he cut it to \$58.4 million. This is the context in which we are dealing here. He cut the Queen Elizabeth vote in 1994/95 from \$60.1 million to \$58.4 million. That was the year when they cut the Child Care Board. That was the year when they cut the Police Vote, when they cut almost every social service in this country. That was the year when they were pouring millions into the St. Joseph Hospital. They spent \$26 million on the St. Joseph Hospital. They paid \$6 million for it which was a giveaway, and then spent in excess of \$20 million allegedly refurbishing it.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The Honourable Minister of Health is telling me it was \$35 million. When that money was pouring into the St. Joseph Hospital, I took part in the debate, Sir, I was in here and took part in the debate. When that money was being poured into the St. Joseph Hospital I was making the point in here that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, the then Minister of Health was starving the Queen Elizabeth

Hospital, I have the debate here, Sir, in my hand. I am quoting **from Hansard**, page 3469.

Aside,

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: B. A. Miller is speaking, the Honourable Member for the City of **Bridgetown** then and now.

"Do you know what is the cruelest blow, Sir? The cruelest blow is that when they are still pumping money, \$3.5 million in the coming financial year, in the St. Joseph Hospital they are cutting the vote at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?"

Do you know what they were **cutting**, Sir? Essential **services** like operating expenses, supplies and materials. We **are** in here today to supplement that but they came in here in 1993 to cut it. We were not talking about a few thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman. We were **talking** about hundreds of thousands of **dollars**. In 1993 they came in here two weeks before the debate of the Estimates of Expenditure and the then Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, came in here for a supplementary in excess of \$10 million. You know why? The hog share of that was for the National Insurance Scheme. The Hospital was one of the worst debtors. The Government as a whole under the Democratic Labour **Party** was the worst example they set in every single department of Government and in all of the statutory corporations. They would not pay National Insurance. The Transport Board had that problem. The National Conservation Commission had that problem. The Transport Board still has it, according to what the Minister is telling me. The National Conservation Commission still has it and that featured in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not finished. In 1994/95 it moved then from \$58.4 million, to which it had been cut by the Honourable Member for St. John, who is not now in his seat. It went to \$63.8 million and with all the supplementals to put things right, we are now in excess of \$70 million.

Now, I hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael West *sotto voce* saying it is par for the course. There are a lot of things that are par for the course. It is clear to me that too many people at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have an interest in the status quo **remaining**. It shocked me to hear the Minister say **all** the hundreds of thousands of dollars being paid in overtime. Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that the maintenance staff at the Hospital should have a system where they work 8 - 4 or 9 - 5 or whenever they are supposed to work and everything else is overtime? Nurses work in the shift. All the caregivers in the Queen

Elizabeth Hospital like the nurses, doctors, technicians **and** a whole host of other people work on the shift system. A hospital, and certainly an **acute** general hospital, is a 24-hour institution and it is not anything peculiar to Barbados. This is **so** in hospitals! everywhere in the world. It is not only in hospitals but in institutions that are regarded as other essential services. They are **all** 24-hour service so I do not understand why, and in light of **all** these studies this is what happens. It is not only in the Ministry of **Health**. It happens in every **area**.

When I went into the Ministry of Tourism the first thing I asked for was to bring all the studies of the past 25 years. Pull out all of the executive summaries and consolidate them for me. They were never implemented and we pay good money, hard-earned money, taxpayers' money for **these** studies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that the shift system must be the way to go with a whole host of what we call ancillary and non-medical services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. If you go to any decent hotel anywhere in the world and the light does not work, the maintenance man is at the door to fix it within 5 minutes, if it is a decent hotel. If it is not quite so decent he may take half an hour to come. Maintenance should be an ongoing thing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and it has to be. Not only maintenance but all of the other areas, non-medical areas as well need to fall under this.

But, let me say something about maintenance that I have said in this House before, and the chickens are now coming home to roost. We operate, not only the Ministry of Health but that is what we are on today, by crisis intervention. From the time the Honourable Minister of Health became Minister of Health in September of 1994, she has been driven from one crisis to the next, through no fault of her own, through no making of her own, but it is how the hospital and other **institutions** came to be run.

I am reliably informed that part of the problem, only part, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the fact that immediately former Ministers interfered, yes, with **day** to day systems in the management and running of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and so put them out of **kilter**, Mr. Chairman, that what you see now is what you get.

Now, the business of maintenance. We cannot - and again this applies right across the board in Government, not only in the **Ministry of Health**...It is highlighted today in the Ministry of Health - but we cannot continue to work and run a hospital or any other institution of Government by crisis intervention. There is something called preventive maintenance. But we have an attitude in Barbados that one has to wait until something breaks down before it is repaired.

When I was a Minister, I remember so clearly there was a man whose job all year long was just fixing windows at the QEH. He would start at the south end and work his way to the north end and then work his way back to the south end and you have to do that. Do you know how many there are in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? You know how much **floor** space there is to clean, how much square footage? There is need for constant preventive maintenance.

Now, there is a lot of very highly technical and sophisticated equipment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know of my own knowledge that a lot of it is still crated up down in the guts of the Hospital. I have asked the Minister of Health to have them show her this. There are crates that were never opened, hundreds of thousands of **dollars**. I **am** sorry that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not now in his seat because I **am** sure he can speak to that. They have never been opened. They have been there 10 years, not opened. Many years ago we sent more than one person abroad to Canada to train in this matter of maintenance of the highly technical and the highly sophisticated equipment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is a very rare and a very much sought after discipline, Mr. **Chairman**. Sir, do you know what happened? The Government paid to train this person and before he could get out of the University or the training institution some other hospital in that country snatched him up. I got so frustrated and so angry with it that I made them pay off the bond. Why should the Barbados taxpayers now be subsidizing people from other countries? **We** need to train these people, put them in the system, and **bring** them back here and hold them to the bonds. This equipment is very delicate. It is highly sophisticated and has to be kept in optimum conditions. That is why you have back-up systems at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.
12.55 p.m.

What **concerns** me in particular, Sir, about this supplementary is that it is to address the needs of junior **doctors**, the medical aid scheme and supplies and material. The Minister has spoken volubly about supplies and materials. But the medical aid scheme, I hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central **talking** about who is going to **run** from in here, but Mr. Chairman, Sir, this goes back to the days in the 1960s when he was alleged to be the second most important man in Barbados. He **bestrode** the corridors and the halls of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital dressed in pure driven white. In those days he used to be called "Snow White". He thinks we forgot about it. When the then Minister, one Rameses Caddle, sought to investigate this same sort of matter in the same way as the Honourable Minister of Health today, all these years later sought to investigate it, the Honourable

Member for St. Michael South Central **blocked** it. That is when **the** phrase was **born**. **He** said, do you not know that the **person** to whom you **speak** is the second **most** important man in Barbados.

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: Mr. Chairman, I have not entered this debate **as** yet.

Mr. **CHAIRMAN**: On what do you **rise**?

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: I am on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has just misled this House by stating that I blocked some **inquiry** at the hospital. I wish to make it clear that that statement is totally untrue. Secondly that I have never at any time held any position at the Queen **Elizabeth** Hospital other than as a professional doctor, or alternatively as an **adviser** to the Hospital Director on matters relating to doctors. That is what the Medical Staff Committee is all about. It is foolishness to think of the Medical Staff Committee as part of the administration of the hospital. The Medical **Staff** Committee simply advises the Hospital Director on medical matters and nothing more than that.

Hon. Miss B. A. **MILLER**: Mr. Chairman, Sir, that is the very point that affronted the then Minister of Health, that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had no post in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and yet was posing as the second most important man in the whole of Barbados. Everybody in Barbados knows **those** days.

Mr. **CHAIRMAN**: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up.

Hon. Miss B. A. **Miller**: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hope that when she gets up on a subsequent occasion that the Honourable Minister of Health will speak about the medical aid scheme which has been much abused and I leave it at that point.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the time being minutes past one, I beg to move that this House ...

Aside.

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

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

Mr. L. A. **WEEKES**: Sir, I have always tried to abide and to encourage Parliament to access very high

standards. It is customary in debates generally that the Opposition is given an opportunity to make its point. Having said that I am not questioning the Honourable Member who spoke last for having settled the resolution. What I am saying is that if we want Parliament to continue in a tradition that is appreciative, not only of those of us in here, Sir, but of those who come to the public gallery to understand that there is no manoeuvring by one side or the other and I rise to say to you, Sir, that I would want to speak first when the sitting resumes.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I want to speak to the motion before the House, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the House and we have not had a seconder for that motion yet. We had a point of privilege. Please let me make a ruling.

The House is asked to note that according to Standing Order 66.8

"A Member may speak for 15 minutes at any one time, provided that the time limit of the speech of the Minister when moving a Head of Expenditure, or replying to the debate on the Head, or of a Member when moving an amendment to reduce the sum to be allotted for any Head of Expenditure in respect of any sub-head or item thereof or replying to the debate on the amendment, shall not exceed 30 minutes."

This debate is 3 hours. Honourable Members will have their chance to reply.

The Honourable Member for the City has asked that we now report progress to the Speaker.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a seconder for that?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: It has been seconded already.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Sir, there are rules such as you have just read to the House and there are understandings which you expect, of all people, the Leader of the House should conform to and especially when you are dealing with money resolutions the understanding is that the Government presents its case by a Minister who is allowed to speak for half an hour and then the matter is handed over to the Opposition. This has been a tradition.

Sir, there is no rule that says it must be done that way. What I am saying is, there is a tradition in this House, especially when you are dealing with Estimates and money matters, that it be dealt with in that way. However, if the Barbados Labour Party wishes to go on the defence and hog the whole morning then you have already done it

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point of privilege is noted.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: This is a serious matter, Sir. Honourable Members should show greater concern for the traditions and the conventions of this House especially when we are dealing with money resolutions. I cannot remember the last time that I saw a Minister of the Crown rise in this House and introduce a motion followed by a speech immediately from a Member on that side. I am saying that it is the kind of thing that should not happen because it is understood that these are opportunities for the Opposition to scrutinize Government's expenditure and examine the Minister, I understand this public relations game that is going on here. But I am going out there right now and I am going to give my interview to the Press. You do not worry.

1.05 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman. I am rising to make a point very similar to the one made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. For those who do not understand what the tactic is as perceived by me, the tactic is that the Barbados Labour Party while speaking on this item would speak before 1 o'clock so that the, World At One and all of those radio programmes would carry forth whatever is said, true or false, good or bad and when we come back in after lunch the first 15 minutes there is no Press person here because of the arrangements they have...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:...and as a result...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, can I be heard?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Continue please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Press people will come back. They will not be in here promptly to hear the opening few minutes of whomever speaks whether over there or on this side. Mr. Chairman, I am saying that for those people who might not understand what the Honourable Member is raising the question about. It is a fact that during

the Estimates or Supplementary Estimates the Government Minister speaks first **and** it has been customary – It is not part of the rules – It has been customary for the House to then hear **someone** from the other side because presumably there is nothing to stop the seconder from **speaking**. But he just wish you to be aware and he wishes to help those who might not know to become aware of the tactic which is being used.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have fully 15 minutes. I **am speaking** on the motion.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have as much time as 15 minutes to speak if I wish to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now you are speaking on the motion.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will not be brow-beaten by anyone sitting down and when we come to speak about the substantive matter, we will deal with them. But this House has been functioning before and will continue to function long after Honourable Members on that side have gone. What the Honourable Member said is valid and imagine the Leader of the House of all people is participating in what can only be perceived over here as a matter of ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member must note that he is bordering on the decision of the Chair. The Chair took a decision that the Honourable Member for the City should have spoken. So that the comments that are being made seemingly impute that the Chairman did not use his judgment wisely.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With the greatest respect, Sir, I would wish you to bring yourself to the contemplation of the opening remarks which I made and to ignore any contamination which might have come toward you from anywhere else in that regard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will not allow any contamination.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member has every right to speak. The question of the Honourable Member's right to speak is not what we were disputing. We were disputing the tactic and we were disputing more

particularly that it was led by the Leader of the House whose responsibility includes mostly looking after the rights of the Members of the House. That is the point we are making.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I need to speak as well to the motion before this Parliament. I was going to draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 38 which says that – in these matters it is the relevant Standing Order – It really says that the ruling of the Chair is final and the Chair in this matter recognized the Member for the City and allowed her to speak. Any Member, Sir, seeking to question the Chair should bring a substantive motion.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I **am** on a point of order. Sir, I want to continue because the Press is here...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is indicating that we questioned by citing Standing Order 38. I did not question Your Honour's ruling or Your Honour's right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that is accepted.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters. One is whether the rule of the House has been broken and no Standing Order was broken, Sir, by the Member for the City. Secondly, Sir, the implication was made that a convention of this House was broken by a Member of the Government speaking...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West said did not reflect on the Chair.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I **am** going on to another point, Sir:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you are commenting on that, I do not think it is needed.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I have gone on to another point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what are you speaking, Sir?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I shall speak, Sir. The notion that there is a convention in here that the Government side cannot speak on the seconding is compounded by the experience between 1986 and 1994. Sir, I sat in this House...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the Honourable Member for St. Peter, we have made a ruling already. We really asked for the suspension of the House and I would appreciate if...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the motion before the House. I am speaking in the same capacity as the Member for St. Michael West and the Member for St. Michael South Central and I demand my rights in here.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, you have already allowed two Members to speak on this motion.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Peter, I am craving the indulgence of the House. We have asked for the suspension of the House and any comments should have been directed to the suspension. I would think that the only pertinent matter would be something of **earth-shattering** importance to be discussed, but we will have time to do that after lunch. I would really like for Members to let us take lunch as proposed and seconded and I want to go to that.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of privilege because I will have to report this matter to His Honour the Speaker that you have allowed two Members to speak in this debate on the motion before the House. I am requesting the same rights and privileges of all Members who you have allowed to speak on this motion. You cannot allow some Members to speak on the motion and deny the right to others. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you will have to put me out of the House today. Sir, I am demanding my rights as a Member of this House today calling for the same privileges as any other Honourable Member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will never deny you that right. Speak, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you, Sir. I just want to draw to the attention of this House that I sat in this House as spokesman for the Opposition on Finance. I had to wait until the Minister of Finance spoke and then a Mr. Harold **Blackman** spoke in response to a Dr. Richie Haynes before I was allowed by the Democratic Labour Party to speak in this House on matters pertaining to the Budget and that happened between 1989 and 1991. We had a tradition, Sir, where the Minister of Finance spoke, then the

Member for St. Michael South Central spoke and then Harold **Blackman** used **to** speak and I was only allowed to speak in this House after the Government had exercised its right to **speak**. That is a fact. I have sat in this House, Sir, in many a debate and have seen a Member of the DLP Government speak in introducing a matter **and** somebody seconding the matter on behalf of the DLP speak as well. So there is no convention agreed to by this House that a person seconding the Resolution cannot **speak**. A person may second a Resolution and reserve their right to speak. I just want the word to go forward, Sir, that no convention has been breached today.

1.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on a point of order. Members who **are addressing...**

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: There should be a measure of decorum and for your own control of this House you should not permit the Honourable Member for St. Peter...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is reflecting on the Chair. I would appreciate it if you did not go down that road.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: You should not permit any Member, least **of** all the Member for St. Peter, to get up and address you and this Chamber with his two hands in his pockets. You must not permit that in this House, I am just giving warning.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress and ask for leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour the SPEAKER, who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2.30 o'clock this afternoon.

Rt. 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.

1.20 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable Chamber reverts to Committee of Supply.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, this Head is Supplementary Estimates **1995-96** and I assume we are dealing with the year **1995-96**. As I look at the Estimates, Personal **Emoluments** is the one that catches my eye. The approved Estimates for **1995-96** is **\$16.54** million and then we had under Other Expenditure another **\$2.134** million and today **\$2,285** million. Any simple arithmetic will show that for that year these supplementary estimates for emoluments are approximately **25%** of the original budget. When one considers that after **1994** this was supposed to be the watershed era, the era in which **all** the bad things under the Democratic Labour Party ceased to be and we were in a new era, therefore when I listened to the Minister I understood her to be speaking for the year **1995-96**. If you take into consideration all the points she has made, I consider it an indictment not only against the Minister but against the whole Government. The Democratic Labour Party would have been accused of **all** sorts of things, but here is the new era in which the Barbados Labour Party in one year has increased the Estimates by **25%**, and **all** of this happens - don't forget that when the Prime Minister came into office he summoned all the Heads and he said that was an effort to bring about proper and efficient management. How can anybody who can increase their estimates by **25%** justify that as prudent and efficient? So I say that the Minister in this presentation, plus all the other things that have been said, surely condemned the Government for not being efficient and having proper management. It is in that context that we start to look at the effect of the whole procedure during these times.

Let me state one or two things, because we are dealing with the Hospital. The Democratic Labour **Party** managed the affairs of the Hospital to the extent that it had been given a very high rating in the Caribbean. We did not have to resort to the attacks on the civil servants, and I want to remind the Minister that civil servants cannot defend themselves and they relied very heavily on the Minister for their protection, not to encourage them in wrongdoing, but at least it is a very difficult thing to come

after the Prime Minister had brought them together and given the assurance that they would be **working** together as a team. Now the Minister is now putting them in **another** position in which **all** that has been said, it seems to me, not to have worked. Therefore, Sir, it is unfair in a sense to accuse the Democratic Labour Party of these problems that we have. It appears to me that the Minister **was** suggesting, because we are **dealing** with figures in Estimates, that some of the money is related to the Democratic Labour **Party** regime. If I am making a false statement then the Minister can correct me. As far as I know one set of Estimates at the end of one year completes that part of **the** expenditure and you hardly would get any expenditure going over to the next year unless in very unusual circumstances.
2.35 p.m.

I want to say something on behalf of the year **1990** before we get to **1996**. Every time the Minister gets the chance, she seems to feel that the Democratic Labour **Party** has put her in this position. It is not true, Sir. In those very hard years when we were under the adjustment programme a number of things still happened. Nurses trebled at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. A new Accident and Emergency Department was built. The Rehabilitation Centre was established and with the same limited funds this inefficient Democratic Labour Party was able to do those things.

I am **asking** the Minister for the **2** years that she has been there what has she to show that they have done in respect of the finances that they have. What have they done? She very often **tries** to find excuses and I say excuses from the point of view that it is her duty because it is the Minister who is ultimately **responsible** for all these things. Therefore, the Minister cannot expect to put the blame on those officers who can only operate within the finances that they hold. Therefore, Sir, it is in that context that the doctors may have struck. There were hardly any strikes in **1994** and **1991**. There may have been one or two little deficiencies which always happen in every circumstance, but that hospital maintained its balance and its semblance. It is now since this **Party** has taken over that we are hearing how bad the servants are, we are hearing how bad the Hospital is and we are hearing now that we spent more money than they did. That is not **true**.

The Minister made reference to a year in which the Estimates showed a decrease. The Minister knows very well that when you are in a programme with the IADB and you borrow their funds it appears in the Estimates, but as soon as that programme is finished then it will not appear **anymore** and you will see that decrease in the Estimates. It does not mean that there was a decrease in the expenditure on the items per se. If you look carefully

you will see there was hardly any decrease in some of the areas in that year in which the Government performed very well. No doubt about it, Sir, anyone who was in here at the time would have known that the then Government had a lot of problems in trying to balance its budget. It did so prudently. The Minister herself has not been able to find the energies and the foresight to complete some of those projects that were left and constantly blames it on funds being diverted somewhere.

As I said some time ago, if your argument is that you take money from one place and put it somewhere else, if you are not putting it there **anymore** it should show itself in the other place. Why is there this need within the past few months to be considering supplementary estimates? It is in that context then, Sir, that this Resolution before the House must be seen not as a pretence to get rid of anybody because I have to make the point, Sir, that this Government is developing a record as if there is no other device to deal with problems but to put people on special leave and special assignments and all that sort of thing. This is a pattern that is developing in our democracy that will spell evil. It will not help the morale of the civil servants because it is the civil servants... I heard from the time I was a boy from one of the Leaders of this House that without a proper civil service you hardly will succeed in anything.

I have worked with them and I have not in all cases been able to agree with them, but they have the expertise and the ability to help any Government and so when I see these things appearing I have to be concerned for our democratic system. Those out there see it as a threat, something hanging over their heads if when they don't do what is supposed to be done or expected to be done even though it may not be their fault they have to live in fear, and fear is man's greatest enemy. In a political sense, it is the greatest enemy that any person can have because it sends them into a state of not being able to initiate anything. Take the case of the junior doctors. The Minister had to threaten them. There is no pretence about that. That is why the strike came about, because where there is action there is bound to be reaction. That Hospital depends on the junior doctors. That is the lifeblood of the hospital. The consultants depend very much on them and it is no favour they are begging for. They are giving a service which should be truly appreciated.

I condemn any Minister who feels that he or she has the right to coerce or to make people bend into things that they want them to do. That is why this Resolution is here. It is not the first time that doctors have had grievances. It is not the first time that problems arose at the Hospital, but I am sure that a sensible and wise approach in some way

dissipated some of the difficulties and as a result the Hospital remained at a high standard. How do you think I feel as a – I don't want to say international person because I have visited all the Commonwealth countries in the world. I have spoken in some of them and people have given us high ratings for our democratic system. How do you think I feel when I see newspapers holding up an institution in such a way that its officers cannot be trusted? As some papers put it, they are thieves. How could I feel comfortable in a country which has had a very high profile. That is worst than **Stinkeroo**, Sir. That will send a signal. Make no mistake about it. Good health services has a lot to do with the development of tourism and once you send out a signal that your institution is like a hostel, the one we have is crumbling and in crisis, the one thing it will tell the people is to be careful.

I want to say, Sir, that these negative comments bear no relationship to the real true problem but the Minister herself. I have no apologies to make for it because that is how our democratic system functions. Cabinet system functions like that. If it were not so, we would not be supposed to have any Ministers. We could start to have all kinds of people acting. Because of that system, Sir, the Minister is ultimately responsible. It does not mean that she has done the things.
2.45 p.m.

In other countries – the Prime Minister may not want to accept it – that would be a clear case for a reshuffle. The mere fact that you have a Ministry that can ask for a 25 per cent increase is tantamount of saying that you are not Capable of handling the Ministry or, on the other hand, you do not care about the Ministry. Blaming the Democratic Labour Party or the last Government for all the ills in the Hospital will not help them because they are the people who are now ultimately responsible for the taxpayers' money.

I heard a lot of talk about taxpayers' money. Right now at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the ICU does not have a toilet, a simple toilet. How many thousand dollars can that cost? When the problems do arise, it must have been pressure on those nurses with bedpans, et cetera, when a simple toilet could be in place. Can the Minister justify that the Democratic Labour Party is responsible for that, or the last Government is responsible for that?

Added to that, Sir, when you have four shifts working and one lift is supposed to be transporting the patients, another bringing down the linens and all of these sorts of things, even if two were working, with the expenditure we have put in place toward that Hospital, we should get better service. Whether there is a problem of overtime, I am

sure the junior doctors are not unreasonable people. They will give and take because they are reasonable people in the **sense** that they know we may not have all the financial resources.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up,

Mr. L. A. **WEEKES**: Sir, if we behave in such a way as to lower the morale of those people, the nurses and doctors, the institution must sink. I am pleading with the Minister that when this supplementary is passed that at least — because we are not going to vote against it, we are not going to stop persons from getting their due but we **want** to see now that whatever management, and I am not so sure that this management thing is a big thing because this management thing goes back to the old colonial days. I may **speak** a bit more on that later on, Sir, but that is a thing of the past.

This system which was in place, and I just want to remind you, the Hospital Management Committee, the Medical Staff Committee, the Administrative Staff Committee, the Hospital Infection Control Committee, the Hospital Disaster Preparedness Committee, these are the committees that put us high in the eyes of the world and far above some of us in the Caribbean. I want to ask the Minister if she has found **time to take** a detailed look at the performances of these Committees rather than come to a sudden conclusion that they are no good. They have worked and they must have some merit but, at the same time, you ought not to cut off the heads of those who have been giving the best of their services.

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: Mr. Chairman, over the past few months the National Democratic Party has been **relentless** in bringing to the attention of the Government and the people of Barbados the rapidly developing crisis at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We did so without making public more than 1 per cent of all the information made available to us on a daily basis. Nevertheless, the Government, the Minister in particular, remained asleep, remained deep in a slumber **from** which I am advised, even a deeper form of slumber better known as suspended animation, until the Prime Minister was suddenly jolted in his capacity as Minister of Finance with evidence of increasing demands on the public treasury. So it seems to me that it is this money matter that has finally brought to the attention of the Government as a whole that there is a major problem that needs to be dealt with.

Now, where does the responsibility lie? There can be no doubt whatsoever, and I make no apologies for this, that

under each administration over the past **50** years or more health institutions, especially our principal acute care medical institution, have come under **fire** from time to time going back to the days of the 1950s when under a **previous** Barbados Labour **Party** administration rats were eating babies and things like that. That led to a conflict between the then **Premier** of Barbados and the then Superintendent under a Hospital Board, **Dr. Humby**, if many may recall,

The point I **am** trying to **make** is that the **Government** which is in power at the time must be held responsible for incidents that occur during their time on the watch, and many of the things complained of have **occurred** during the watch of the present Minister of Health. I therefore wish to start my presentation this evening by calling on the Minister, in the interest of the development of the health services of Barbados and in the interest of the people of Barbados, to do the very honourable thing and resign from office because the horrors which you have outlined to this House this morning ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to address the Chair.

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: Sorry. The **horrors** which the Minister has outlined to this House took place and has been taking place under her watch. By her own admission she says it has been going on for some time and has continued, and that is what she had to deal with. She was there since 1994. My 'call for her resignation, therefore, Mr. Chairman, stems not because of what she has done, not because of the sins of commission but because of the sins of omission by failure to take timely and appropriate action and to allow this crisis to develop to this point where it has clearly become an embarrassment to the Prime Minister in his capacity as Prime Minister and in his capacity ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that he is addressing the Chair.

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: I am still addressing you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are going a little bit off. Make **your** point to what is in the supplementary.

Dr. R. C. **HAYNES**: ...and in his capacity as Minister of Finance is faced with this problem here of this massive supplementary.

The second point I want to make, Sir, is that this fiscal problem which we see here today, which is an obvious embarrassment to the Government, is only

a symptom of a widespread and **fundamental** problem in the Hospital and this vote under Personal Emoluments covers every single department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I wish to make the point that the issues **there** are institutional, The problems **are** structural, The problems affect every single aspect of the operations of the hospital and it is my humble view that chopping off the heads of a few at the top will not solve the problem.
2.55 p.m.

I am not going to criticise the Government for identifying major problems in the central administration and elsewhere as contributing to the problem. It is not the only problem, I am calling on the Government again to look to the future, not the past. We in the NDP are concerned about hope for the people of Barbados, a better future, I think that what is required is the establishment of a commission of enquiry, not geared to finding people to fire and this kind of thing, but to look clearly and see where the QEH stands now and where it stands in the future in terms of the total health services in Barbados. To look at the operations of the medical aspect, medical staff, medical operations in the hospital; look at the levels of medical staffing; look at the levels of remuneration; look into fundamental issues of paying doctors overtime and whether or not they should be paid a better salary, with a different approach to institutional loyalty and loyalty in relation to patient care.

You need to look and see what is happening in nursing care and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is not a single complaint made about the nurses at the hospital that I saw in the press that was untrue. Get that straight. However **horrible** it may seem the reality is that those complaints were true and therefore ...

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have a file of them. One that I have is now with the Solicitor General's office. That is a fact. At least one. I know for a fact, at least one of them is with the Solicitor General now. There is a pile of them. Those things are attitudinal, those things need to be looked into and we need to find out what the problem is and how to deal with the entire matter. You have problems in terms of the hospital infrastructure, in terms of the laboratories services, the X-ray services. You have problems in relation to how various categories of doctors relate to the hospital in respect of their remuneration. There are lots of problems and the problems are so widespread that the same things so interlink that they need to be dealt with in a manner, after very careful thought is given to the subject.

I shall speak, Sir, with great feeling on this matter. A substantial slice of my life was spent at the Queen

Elizabeth Hospital and I believe I made some contribution to the development of that institution. **There was** a time when, **as** a single physician, I ran the entire medical department. On this **question** of my administering the hospital at some point in my life that **is** foolishness, I have never administered any hospital. I would not deal with that stupidity. Let me give you an example, Sir, I see a Resolution **here**, Sir, for a **substantial** amount of money **under** the Medical Aid Scheme, Now, I know for a fact that since last October people were being told that there was no money available under **the** Medical Aid Scheme, Only a week ago I got a copy of a letter from **another** specialist begging me to speak to the **Minister** to see if anything could be done about a patient that has a tumour at the angle **between** the ponds in her brain and the cerebellum, since October. She is an old lady, an agricultural lady, Six months sitting on that. It bothers me, It is in the: Constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George South.

Aside,

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Because they know I would do something about it. I will speak to the Minister **tomorrow** on the matter.

Anyhow, Sir, one could only be fairly schematic on this, so I have done two things. I have called for a commission of enquiry because I believe that the problems are so deep seated and widespread that they cannot be dealt with on an **ad hoc** basis and if you attempt to deal with it on an **ad hoc** basis you are going to have more and more problems.

The third problem I want to deal with is a conceptualisation of how a hospital can be properly run in the context of Barbados. It is important for us all to understand that every hospital is fundamentally a hotel and therefore the kind of management skills you need are people who are trained to run hotels. When I listened to the Minister this morning 90% of the things she talked about really relate to effective management of the hotel plant of the hospital and these are the people you have today. That is only one side.

The second thing you have to recognise is that you will never get a perfect administration because unlike a hotel you have several other principals in that institution who operate in areas where the administrator would have no expertise and has to rely on them to function. It is for this reason that hospital management is considered internationally as **the** most difficult management. You have to train longest to become a hospital director in the

United States and the highest pay goes to people who are **trained** in hospital management because of the complexity of the basic management profile of a hospital. It is not only a hotel but a hotel that has to provide specialised services. Unlike Sandy Lane hotel

You know the Member for the City **used** to call the QEH the Richie Haynes **Hilton** on all **platforms** all over the island, because it was run so well at that **time**, although I had nothing to do with the **administration**, that she used to call it the Richie Haynes **Hilton**. That is a fact.

Anyhow, if I may revert back to what I am saying, that unlike Sandy Lane Hotel - everybody **tries** to do pleasurable things to the people at Sandy Lane - when patients go into hospital some of the things that are done to them **are** pleasurable and some **are** not. Some are painful. It requires a very special kind of relationship between the various managers of the various departments of the hospital in order to make things work. I say this, Sir, because if there were isolated incidents of the kind that I have heard about I would not be surprised that we get isolated complaints at any hospital. When they start coming with the kind of fury with which they were coming and when there was evidence of spite being shown towards patients and when there was no evidence whatsoever that complaints were being acted **upon**, and then when I saw attempts to try to muzzle and to criticize doctors who have to act from time to time in accordance with the **Hippocratic** Oath which must supersede any administrative dictum in terms of protecting and advancing the interest of their patients. No one can muzzle any doctor and say that he is bound by any civil **orders** if he has to come out and speak in defence of his patients. It cannot be done and it is unheard of. That is the kind of muzzle that the Nazis put on their doctors and prevented them from exposing what was going on in concentration camps and it was only a few doctors that spoke out and brought to the outside world what was going on. We cannot have that kind of behaviour in relation to the medical profession.

3.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in 15 minutes it is impossible to deal with the whole range of problems. But if anything has emerged from what I have said, there should be an underlying feeling that there is hope and that the situation can be turned around but it needs someone in charge who has a broad view and who can focus on the particular problems. I was disappointed indeed that I heard a recitation of a number of ills by the Minister today but I am still waiting to hear what her diagnosis of the problem is and still waiting to hear her view of where the hospital stands in relation to the health care facilities. I want to see where she stands in relation to dealing with these

fundamental problems that can make the **difference** for the **future**. By the way and finally, Mr. **Chairman**, a Board will only be helpful if it takes into consideration the kind of **management** issues which I have raised today. Remember, **the** present administration of the QEH was a reaction to a failed Board **under** the old Barbados General Hospital. Remember that and remember the **horrors** when the old Barbados **General** Hospital was run by a Board. I am not condemning a Board in itself. All I am saying that there must be a clear understanding and that is why I feel that **we need** a **Commission** of Inquiry to set out the ground **work** so that when a Board is put in place there are clear objectives as to what needs to be achieved in respect of every aspect of the hospital's operations. Otherwise, we can run into a continuing problem down the road.

Mr. **Chairman**, I will **be** back to **make** a further contribution on this matter later. **Thank** you very much.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is an important debate **and** I **think** we will do ourselves no good and the public interest no good if we were to **trivialize** this debate in any way either by attempting to sweep the problems under the carpet as has been suggested by the shadow spokesman for the Opposition on Health or if we indulge too much in blame distribution. I think that certainly our constituents are all consumers of the service which is offered by the **Queen** Elizabeth Hospital. We are ourselves actual or potential consumers. It is the only general and acute care hospital in the country and I think that we all have a major interest in ensuring that it works to maximum efficiency.

In addition to that, Sir, the health services have been consuming an increasingly large share of our public finances. There was a time when education was easily the premier consumer but there have been times when it has been threatened to be overtaken by health and the hospital itself consumes a large share of those resources of some \$70 million. So that as guardians of the public interest we have a large responsibility to ensure that the hospital functions efficiently and effectively. One does not have to be an expert in the discipline of hospital administration to recognize that for a long time now that all was not well at the hospital and only to approach it gives the clear impression that there is need for the physical dimension of the plant to be kept in repair. It has not been properly maintained. But if you have a lot to do with it or you listen to your constituents, you would in recent years have heard a great deal more. For example, the wait at the Accident and Emergency is still far too long and there has been

a high incidence of hospital infection and there has been an unreasonably high incidence of patients falling off the bed, and that there has been a serious decline of morale among the nursing staff and in particular on many weekends the absenteeism **rate** is so high that a lot of the wards are **undermanned**.

Now many of those **matters** have been spoken about in this House certainly by me in the period 1991 to 1994 and it is either that the then Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for **St. Michael West** did not know of the problems or he was misadvised as to the existence. Because he told this Parliament repeatedly that I myself was mistaken and that those problems did not exist even in circumstances in which I had a letter that I displayed from the Matron of the Hospital at the time appealing to the nurses to recognize their responsibility to the patients and to ensure that on weekends they do not absent themselves from their duties to the extent that they were,

So that without trying to distribute any blame it must be said that it has not always been a frank recognition of the existence of these problems by every Minister of Health and it must be said in **fairness** to the present Minister that at least she has exposed what I have every reason to believe has been concealed in part if not in whole by some of her predecessors in office.

I support the measures in relation to the short **term**, but I share the view of the Honourable Member who preceded me in his intervention in this debate when he called for a Commission of Inquiry. In recent years in this country, that has been an instrument that has been far too often used and in my respectful view in many instances abused. But if ever there was an irrefutable case for the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry, it is now in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I share his emphasis. It is not so much to expose anybody but the solution must by definition be a complex one and it calls for a high powered Commission, properly constituted, that will look at all of the multiple factors involved and try to chart a path for the future, a path of increased efficiency, a path of increased accountability but a path such as would put us all at ease in our beds when the night comes that our one general acute care hospital is in good stead and is delivering good services with efficiency and with speed. That is what we should be concerned about. It will have one other advantage. It will give those who have been suspended **from** office and sent on special leave the opportunity too to appear and to give their side of the story, because as of now they have not been heard and they too need to sell their side of the story.

Now let me address one or two matters that concern me deeply. I was a member of the 1981-86 Cabinet that in

1985 took the decision that poverty must **never be** a bar to fellow **Barbadians** accessing health care. Now that was an **important** point of principle that we adopted in this country. What we meant to say then, **particularly** in relation to those who needed overseas care, that once a doctor certified that **your** case was one that could not adequately or at **all** be handled in Barbados that the taxpayers would support your being sent overseas and be given that care, that you must not suffer or die simply because we do not have the facilities here in Barbados, I was proud of that decision and the way in which it was implemented. Ever since we left office in 1986, there was a development which I **spoke** about as a member of Rotary, for example, where I had frequent approaches from people. They come to me in my chambers with a soiled piece of paper saying, "Skipper, I come begging for help. Could you sign your name here and give me \$50.00." In anger almost I would say, what for? Only to be told, "I need an operation and they say I have to raise money to go overseas and get it done." I said: "But I was part of a Cabinet in this country that made another decision, to the effect that your poverty must not stand in your way, must never be a bar to your getting health care." I have to report that only last week I was approached by the family of a constituent complaining that they needed urgent neurological care and they have been told that the money has run out, this is the end of the financial year, in circumstances in which the judgment of an attending specialist was that if she did not get the care soon she would perish. I took the matter to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and I must say that he responded with great compassion and with despatch. He told me that he would get his **P.S.** the next day to call me to make sure that the money is raised at all costs, I believe that she is part of the **supplementary** here today.
3.15 p.m.

What has been happening ought not to be happening, because we have reached a point in this country, and you are dealing with a sovereign government, where we should be entering into relations with health care institutions overseas in orthopedics, in heart, in neurology and neuro-surgical matters where, if we cannot provide the care here, we can send people routinely overseas and settle the accounts every **90** days. So that when we are approaching the end of the financial **year** and funds have run out, that should not be a problem, because we should have relations with institutions abroad structured on such a basis that the accounts are settled from time to time rather than on an individual basis, but in another respect poverty has been becoming a bar to speedy and efficient health care in this country. Again, I spoke about this in this Parliament on several occasions in the 1991-94 period.

I have had complaints from many constituents and I know many people who have told me that they have

had the harrowing and agonising experience. These are people who have, because of their poverty, to go on the public wards and they have been given a two year wait, a three year wait, for routine abdominal operations. I am **talking** about **hernia**, gall bladder, gall stones – and in the cases of ladies, fibroids – routine eye operations and often they go to the hospital on three occasions, are prepared for **surgery**, with all the anxiety and agony that that entails, only to be told at the last minute that the theatre has broken down and as a result they have to go and come back, I contrast that with a situation obtaining in Barbados tonight where, if you can pay and your doctor indicates that you need on Monday an operation of some urgency, once the operation is available here you **can** get it by the **succeeding Friday**.

What sort of country is this? We have passed that. So I thought! Where those who have money and those who are without were treated almost equally in this country. I was proud to be practising that as far as my own profession was concerned. Peter pays for Paul, but everybody must get treatment of a certain efficiency. It is that sort of problem we have to address very seriously. But if there is one thing I will warn this Barbados Labour Party administration about is this. They must never retreat from the principle that poverty must not be a bar to accessing health care in this country. There can be no retreat at **all** from that principle, otherwise we are just stepping back. We are betraying the trust the people have put in us, we are just stepping back.

The solutions to the problems at the Hospital are not easy. It is operating in a particularly difficult culture in which we give an unreasonably high, some may say, regard and esteem to doctors in this community. Because they can always claim that a situation is one of emergency, they can easily undermine existing administrative systems. Administrators do not **know** how to say no to the doctors, our doctors are always right and they must get what they want, especially when they are in a position to add: "and it is urgent, the patient may die". That is the culture in which we have to operate. But, more than that, as has been said by the Honourable Member who spoke before me in this debate, it has become recognised everywhere that the management of health institutions and health care systems is a very complex speciality. The idea, therefore, that anyone by virtue of being in the department for 20 years or more can without more emerge as the Hospital Director, or that just merely being in the system for a long **time** qualifies you to be a manager at the hospital, is completely wrong. You need special training and, above all, a point that is often forgotten in this country, you need special personality attributes in order to hold certain jobs.

I want to say one **thing** in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, and it has to do with a mistaken view in this country – and

the Hospital has been the victim of it, the National Insurance is also another victim, also the Water Authority – that you cannot **have** anyone in a department under a Ministry that gets as much money or more money than the Permanent Secretary. The Hospital is so important, it is so complex a service, it is so demanding that there is no reason why a Hospital Director should not, though answerable to the Minister and that must always be, get as much as the Permanent Secretary. There is no reason why the Director or the Chief of the National Insurance should not get as much as, or the Water Authority. These are important institutions where those who man them should be properly rewarded.

There is much more I would like **to** say, Mr. Chairman, but I have taken your signal that **time** has run out. In particular, I would have liked to have made my contribution as to the whole question as to whether or not we should have a Board. In many respects we are only going backward. There was a crisis in 1937 at the Hospital where you had two doctors, house surgeons at the time, one from **Roebuck** Street who is now dead, Dr. Stuart, and I forget the name of the other one who resigned, so we had a Board in the past, but that is not the answer necessarily and we must not just be going round in a circle and applying old instruments that have failed us in the past. The issue is much more complex than that. That would have one advantage and one disadvantage only, that the Minister could insulate herself, or himself as the case may **be**, from blame and say blame the Board. But who would that help? I wish I could get the opportunity to speak again within the time frame that we have.

I am much obliged, **Mr.** Chairman.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: **Mr.** Chairman, the honourable gentleman who just sat down clearly senses that there is an imminent shuffle and is declaring his hand in a very eloquent manner, finding himself between whether to attack or to defend. I think I would take a cue from where he started and indicate frankly that his last point in reference to the provision of a Board and I agree with him that that will not solve the problem. This debate today, Mr. Chairman, is affecting many people in Barbados and it is a serious debate and it gives us an opportunity to correct a lot of bad statements and bad positioning by both political administrations over the years and it gives us an opportunity to speak the truth with regard to health services in this country once and for all.
3.25 p.m.

The new Barbados Labour Party Administration under the Rt. Honourable Owen Arthur, member for St. Peter,

unfortunately took vicious swipes at the Democratic Labour Party Administration with regard to the provision of health care in this country and senior Members of that Party singlehandedly set out to cut off the heads of members of this Administration to score **cheap** political points and to ensure that prominent persons within the Democratic Labour Party structure were severely damaged, to the extent that they would not be political heavy weights in the future.

This debate today is a very serious debate from the point of view that the Rt. Honourable **Prime** Minister has gone on record as saying that he is an efficient forecaster, efficient budgeter. He spoke in glowing terms about when he was the director and analyst in terms of coming within one cent in forecasting the price of bauxite per pound and he put his record at the disposal of this House. So we trusted that the great economist was a good forecaster and a **good** planner. Yet, today in this House, we are at Supplementary No. 14 with more to come. I have not totalled the figures but I believe they are significant enough to dismiss the Minister of Finance once and for all as an individual who is a poor economist, a poor planner and a disgraceful manager.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to withdraw the word disgraceful.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I will withdraw "disgraceful". Inept. Last week, in this Honourable House, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General sought to defend him and he said that the honourable gentleman from St. Peter was against supplementaries only if they represented a significant portion of the original vote; but we have the Medical Aid Scheme as an example in these Estimates which is more than the original vote - \$2 317 000. The original vote was \$1.5 million, The operating expenses and emoluments at the Hospital which have already had increases - \$2 million and another \$2 million included in this particular supplementary. Another \$4 million.

We have a situation where yesterday evening 4 persons from the public sector were sent home. I am submitting that those 4 persons had nothing to do with the approval that was given for patients under the Medical Aid Scheme. All of the approvals are done by the Minister personally. Yet 4 people got sent home on special leave. The budget was blown not because of those 4 people; but they were sent home on special leave.

The money that was owed to junior doctors was as a result of a policy position by the Minister to hire doctors. The 4 persons who were sent on special leave could not decide that they were going to suspend those persons.

Additional revenue occurred as a result of that. That had nothing to do with those 4 gentlemen. That **was** not a decision of the hospital administration which **made** it clear that **there** were only so many vacancies and no more. Why are you sending those persons **on** special leave? It has nothing to do with them in terms of the policy determination.

When the Minister decided to pay amounts owed to junior doctors, I **am** telling you, **Sir**, that the unions in this country stepped in. The unions stepped in and demanded that if they are paying them they would have to pay all the other workers too at the hospital. I challenge the Minister to get up and deny it. Yet **the** persons who were sent home had nothing to do with that. If you are paying the doctors, you have to pay everybody the overtime.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, I do have to intervene. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The tenor of what the Honourable Member is suggesting is that there was some attempt at withholding people's money and then when we **purported** to pay the junior doctors we were **pressured** into paying **other** people because of pressure from the unions. This is totally untrue. The facts **are** that the figures were not brought to the Ministry by the administrators of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, that having known the full state of the thing, everybody would have been dealt with; but they were never brought. Even when the vote for the junior doctors was supplemented at October, they did not ask the hospital administrators for the full amount of money that would have allowed the doctors to be paid **their** on-call allowances and their salaries. Nothing to do with the Government withholding peoples' monies and being pressured to pay by the unions.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I never said anything about the Government withholding anybody's money. I am dealing with the fact that this Administration of planners and budgeters made no provision whatsoever for the total provision within the system. They took a reactionary position because the newspapers lambasted them and said that the junior doctors were going to strike. As a result they ran quick and said, "Okay, hold on we will pay you."

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Michael East is misleading the House. The Hospital administrators did not send to the Ministry for us to forward to the Ministry of Finance the quantum needed for the vote for the doctors. We did not send home people as a result of that.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am submitting that the Ministry had no plan and no provision for

payment in total for the decisions that they made during this Minister's administration and as a reaction to public pressure they quickly sought to address the problem to do some damage control.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East is misleading the House, A policy decision was taken that doctors who were in the system, junior doctors who were coming on, would not be disadvantaged by being asked to work without pay since there were no posts to facilitate them. A policy decision was therefore taken that posts would be created for everybody. The Ministry asked the advice of the Hospital administrators as to the sums needed to employ the interns who were taken on and the other doctors, The money the Hospital administrators requested was, in fact, inadequate and therefore it is now being further supplemented. It has nothing to do with the policy decision being taken and no provision being made because, consequent on the policy decision, we took steps to find the funding necessary to accommodate it.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point. The Honourable Minister can stand up in this House today and brag about making decisions to spend money that had not been approved by Parliament. Yet the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance said very clearly that he would not stand for it where any officer in any Ministry would be spending money or making decisions about expenditure without the money having first been appropriated by Parliament. The Honourable Prime Minister is on record in this House as far as that is concerned.

Now, the Honourable Minister has been seeking to heap blame on public servants throughout this whole system. She talks about the amount of money that was spent at the St. Joseph Hospital. She said that over \$20 million was spent in four or five years. In four days she spent \$6 million and it is enough grounds to make sure that she is dismissed from the system because if you allow her to continue ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. One struggled very hard to teach some "A" Level Economics to the member for St. Michael East but the record must really show that no Minister of the Crown spends money. No Minister of the Crown is an accounting officer and to have the record of this Parliament polluted with the notion that a Minister spends money is really a gross misrepresentation of the process. I ask that those remarks not only be withdrawn, but be struck from the records. I am asking you, Sir, to rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the comment made by the Honourable Member. The Honourable Minister said that the persons in the Hospital administration at the QEH so mismanaged the Hospital affairs that they were at a total loss as to what was going on, and within the last three or four days they brought supplementary after supplementary totalling \$6.5 million. The Honourable Minister said that today but this administration has pomposetted in this country about the maladministration of the Democratic Labour Party, that this was not available and that was not available. Under the Democratic Labour Party as our spokesman on Health quite admirably articulated, there was significant progress in the health services of this country,

The argument was that they would shut down the St. Joseph Hospital, that they would not open the Eye Care Hospital so that they would have enough funds available for the other health services in this country. That was the agenda. I would say this, Mr. Chairman, the draft that was taken to the Minister of Finance in 1994 was significantly cut by this present Minister of Finance and the intention was to show to the Democratic Labour Party that they could have provided health care in this country by closing the St. Joseph Hospital, not opening the Eye Care Centre and getting through the system.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. A member cannot so grossly mislead the House or misrepresent the facts. The allocation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the 1995 Estimates of Expenditure is higher than those provided in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1994-95. That is a matter of public record. I am asking therefore that the reference just made by the member not only be withdrawn to the extent that it is totally false, but that it be expunged from the record. It is deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member referred to a draft.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am submitting that if there is a policy in place by the Barbados Labour Party administration that there must be some cost attached to it, that they must know beforehand before the year what are their requirements. I am submitting that this is about the fourth or fifth supplementary on the Ministry of Health. We have just had one on the Drug Service for some \$4 million. There is another one now for \$6 million. It is a significant increase which I have no difficulty with but you have to tie it to a programme or policy. I am submitting that there

is no such programme within this present administration. That is what I am saying.

We have a situation that unless the Barbados Labour Party stands up and takes the appropriate blame for the mismanagement and disorder they have brought to the health services in this country, we are going to go nowhere. If they are going to accuse the Democratic Labour Party as they did about bad administration and everything that happened that the Minister over here was responsible, by extension the same thing should happen today under the new Minister. I cannot even say a new Minister.

We had a situation, Mr. Chairman, where a Minister in this country some time during last year was held responsible for the actions of the Chairman of a Board and the Minister ended up having to resign because he felt he was accountable. The Honourable Member for St. Joseph felt that he was accountable or he was told that he was accountable and he resigned, yet we have a situation where we had a debate last week where the Honourable Minister accused public servants of thieving the material at the Psychiatric Hospital yet not one single person was sent on special leave. I ask the question. What was the rationale for sending the people on special leave? Were they responsible for all the over expenditure? I am submitting that there is no policy in place by the Barbados Labour Party. I am submitting that their policy decisions and the confusion they have created have landed the Government in serious hot water and most of all, the pride of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has been dented because his bragging that he was the best forecaster available to this region has been totally shattered. We are now satisfied that he is a poor planner, a poor budgeter and a person who needs help and one who should take immediate action and do what is right instead of passing the buck. He should fire the Minister of Health immediately.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up. The Honourable Member has one more minute.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when this Honourable gentleman came in here

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which gentleman are you speaking about?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The Honourable Member for St. Peter spoke in those Russian words, glasnost and perestroika. You remember, Sir. Transparent. Everything

would be open. I remember the words and I wrote them down. But that stopped with the Honourable Prime Minister and the Minister is no longer responsible for her Ministry. She is not to be blamed for anything. We have to **understand** this debate, Mr. Chairman, is an embarrassment to the Government. It is a significant embarrassment to them. It completely shatters the Minister of Finance and he must never once again get up in this House of Assembly and speak about his being any good planner or budgeter. The public of Barbados must be totally satisfied that he is a poor planner. He has no policy and gives no direction to his Ministers. The Minister should take significant blame for all of the ills.

(Certain remarks made by Mr. J. O. TUDOR were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. CHAIRMAN.)

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I always travel with it, Mr. Chairman. I will deal with it in another debate. We have been warning the country to take action against the Minister.
3.45 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member has made a very serious charge, that he has a document in his bag which proves that the Minister is not a person worthy of belief. I am not repeating what was expunged. The Honourable Member has a duty to prove to this House that the document he has itself proves conclusively that the Minister is not a truthful person. Produce it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The remarks about lies and untruths are unparliamentary and have been expunged from the record. Members can bring facts but Members are not to impute evil motives against other Members.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The Honourable Minister said publicly that there is a high court injunction against the use of Mangrove as a **landfill** and that the Government **was** in fact operating illegally and that should stop. I have a copy of the video **tape**. I have a copy of everything that they said.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In fact, in 1993, acting on behalf of all the people of Arch Hall and **Bennetts**, the Chief Justice of this country gave an injunction against the Sanitation Service Authority from dumping and leaving the place polluted at Mangrove.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes to wind up.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am quoting from a certified and a true copy in the High Court of Justice, Civil Division, an Injunction between Peter Ramsey an infant suing Reginald Ramsey, Fiona **Gooding**, Averil Cadogan, Carlisle Greaves etc. and the Sanitation Service Authority. The Order stated precisely as follows: "That the Defendant by its **Directors**, Managers, Servants **and/or** agents or otherwise howsoever be restrained and that the said defendant is hereby **restrained** from permitting or further permitting the dumping of solid waste on that part of the sanitary **landfill** site now properly known as Mount **Stinkeroo** and situated south and west of a **landfill** site formerly used by the Defendants."

That is precisely the point. The Minister said that there is a High Court injunction which prohibits the dumping at Mangrove. That is what the Minister said. I **have** it on tape.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. The injunction was drawn prohibiting the Sanitation Authority from dumping on that part of **Mangrove** called Mount Stinkeroo. I put in the words myself.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must explain that what the Honourable Attorney General is saying is **true** but the point is that the Minister took a different position to what the Honourable Attorney General is saying. The Minister said that it was a High Court injunction that prohibited dumping at Mangrove and that the Government was in fact operating illegally.

Loud asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, for somebody to say that there **was** an injunction which **restrained** the authorities from dumping at Mangrove to be **called** a liar because she did not say "from dumping on a part of Mangrove", is the most outrageous argument. It is consistent with the Honourable Member. Your tradition is that of a joker. I expect that foolish argument from you.

Loud asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please wind up your speech.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The point is that today we have a Minister in place who has on more than one occasion misled this country and we are suggesting that the Minister of Finance and the Honourable Prime Minister should take the appropriate action and relieve **this** country from the Minister of Health. That is what the Prime Minister should do and we should use the Westminster approach and spare this country the horror of the present Minister of Health. I believe I will have enough time to come back.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised at the sanctimonious attitude of speakers on the Opposition Bench in relation to this supplementary. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it requires colossal gall for them to make the kind of criticisms in here **today** on the Minister of Health. A lot of new things have not happened, Sir. The whole list of complaints about what is wrong with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have been mentioned by this side. In the last session of Parliament, I, myself, spoke as shadow Minister of Health and I dealt with every single aspect of the difficulties that I am now hearing falling from the lips of the Opposition. I heard the Minister of Health, this **morning**, give a story that was fairly **dread**. All Barbadians know things are bad. But we did not realize until recently how bad the legacy was that we took from the Democratic Labour Party.

We have a legacy, Mr. **Chairman**, of the hospital of waste, inefficiency, mismanagement, disarray and **corruption**. We heard all of that. We have heard about the low morale. All of these things we took over from the Democratic Labour Party Administration and, as I said, it requires colossal gall of the Members of the Opposition to get up in here today and talk in the manner in which they have spoken. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central spoke. He knows as well as anyone else that at some point he was the Medical Chief of Staff. When the Democratic Labour Party Government at the time was fighting among itself, there was a Dr. Caddle who at the time said that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South and I cannot remember exactly but he was touted as or whether he touted himself, as the second most important man in Barbados. At that time it had to do with the administration of the hospital. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will know that he engineered a coup when he was still quite a young member of staff at the hospital against the then Chief of Staff, Dr. Harold Forde, and then installed himself as one of the heads of a series of...

3.55 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what coup the Honourable Member is talking about. As far as I know, the Chairman of the Medical Staff at that time was elected democratically by the existing heads of departments who were then public servants and by nobody else. So I do not know what coup he could be talking about to my becoming Chief of Staff. I do not know.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not **resile** from my comment. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central became Chief of Staff at the hospital as a result of a coup and he set about to set up a dynasty and that set things in trend for the **kind** of mismanagement and inefficiency that developed in the hospital over a period of time.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I also want to say that I am saluting the Minister of Health for her real courage in finally biting the bullet. It is not easy, Sir. As I have said, we have had these problems over and over again. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West who keeps nodding his head knew that these problems existed. I have stood on that side of the Chamber and talked about a lot of them — things concerning the labs. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West got on this side and nodded his head in agreement. So he knows the problems, The Honourable Member for St. James South, the Minister of Health, has had the courage for the first time to bite the bullet and to say that we are going to make the kind of structural overhaul at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and that we will not continue to have this constant list of complaints by the public of Barbados in relation to all aspects of the hospital. All what the Honourable Member for St. James South has done as Minister of Health is to put into effect a provision in the manifesto of the Barbados **Labour Party**. We said in our manifesto, Sir, that we would **improve the efficiency** of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital **and eliminate waste** throughout the whole health care **system** and more particularly in all of the institutions.

Now those Honourable Members who have made their criticisms earlier today about the fact that the **Minister** of Health has been Minister for 70 days should **realize** that it takes a period of **time** before you can get the officers in your departments to look at the problem and **make** recommendations before any action can be taken. I applaud her for going about it in as systematic a fashion as she has done after she had some clear idea of what the problems are and to make the decision that she has done over the last few days.

Sir, I want also to say that criticisms coming from **the** Honourable Members saying that these things happened under the Minister's watch is a misrepresentation of the true facts of the situation. The question about staff morale was raised by this Government when we were in Opposition two years ago. The question of the physical structure of the hospital was raised. The finances were raised. The **question** of drugs was raised. The question of the consultants was raised. The question of the junior hospital doctors pay was raised. The question of the non-existing posts for young medical graduates who are **working** as interns was raised. Every single problem to which they made reference has

been raised by this party when we were sitting in Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. James South has now sought to correct the problems that all of Barbados was talking about for a long time and her action is timely and appropriate.

There are those of us, Sir, who feel that Ministers of Government must not have any direct say in the management of departments. I have heard from the Opposition side in this very debate two points of view. One **is** that the Minister is responsible. I think it was the **Honourable** Member for St. Michael North West who holds the view that the Minister has a responsibility for what amounts to day to day operations at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. So she gets the blame for that. That is the gravamen of part of the submission of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West. On the other hand, we have arguments coming from others that would suggest that there is a measure of political interference when Ministers take decisions that are of a micro nature. The **Minister** has stayed away from the operation of micro managing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, as a result of that, she cannot now be held **accountable** for things that have gone wrong at that level.

I **want**, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to make it **absolutely** clear ...

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, will you protect me from the Honourable Member for **St. John**? **The** Honourable Member **for St. James South**, the Minister of Health, has been blamed for not sweeping the problems under the carpet. That was suggested by my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, that you must not **talk** about problems. When **you** have problems, you must **keep** them quiet because you have a constituency called a tourist and people who live overseas, so hide your problems so that they do not affect them. We cannot run a **Government** like that. When there are problems, they **must** be identified. They must be ventilated and they must be dealt with. I applaud the Government, **the** Prime Minister and **Minister** of Health for coming out yesterday and taking the **decisions** that have **been** taken as a first step towards bringing about good management at the hospital.

Sir, I want to make it absolutely clear that I myself as a **representative** of a constituency have persons who go into **the** hospital and make all these complaints to me. I heard the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say that one of my constituents took her problem to him and, rather than refer the person who he suggested needed urgent medical **attention**, he told her to go to the **Minister**. You told her to go to the Minister.
4.05 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, what I said was that it was brought to my attention that this person needed urgent medical attention overseas, by way of a copy of a letter, and the doctor who was involved in the **case** spoke to me and asked me if I could speak to the Minister about it. That is what I said.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, there **are** three or four things I will say quickly, since the time is short. I will deal first with the Medical Aid Scheme just raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. We have had this Medical Aid Scheme and I really would like, since we are in Committee of Supply, to find out who in recent times have been the beneficiaries of the largesse of this Medical Aid Scheme. I ask, Sir, because in consonance with what the Honourable Member has just said, I have at least one person in my constituency who has been **injured** very badly in an accident the last time they had racing at the Bushy Park circuit, and who has had to go overseas for medical attention, who has applied for assistance under the Medical Aid Scheme and despite the fact that almost a year has passed there has not been any favourable response. Therefore, my constituent's mother is now in danger of losing her home to meet the cost of medical expenses. I am asking because I understand that some big up friends of the Opposition Democratic Labour Party have secured hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Medical Aid Scheme. Persons who are in high income brackets but who are friends of the Democratic Labour Party have had money from the Medical Aid Scheme, outright grants. No wonder this Scheme is in the deficit of \$2.3 million, because I understand that this money that is owed to the Scheme, the deficit, does not relate only to the present financial year but has gone back to at least two or three years. I want to know what **are** the principles of equity that govern the operation of this Medical Aid Scheme.

I want to make one point in relation to the question of this special leave. I myself am not a great fan of putting public officers on special leave, but if the need arises then the need must be met, and it does not fit well in the mouths of the Opposition to talk about it. People on special leave maintain their pay and their perks. The Democratic Labour Party in Government used another device, the device of abolition of posts, and a number of public officers during the incumbency of the last Democratic Labour Party administration did not benefit from the more benign practice of being put on special leave; they had their posts abolished and the people were put on the breadline. Therefore, it does not fit well in their mouths today to come in and make a criticism of this, particularly in this important circumstance.

I also want to make one quick point about the statement made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael

South Central, who equates — and I am not reflecting on the Chair, Sir — the actions of the Minister of Health as equivalent to that of the Nazi Government. I didn't get up, Sir.....

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: That is what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said. He said that this question of not allowing under the General Orders of the Public Service, which were not written by the Minister of Health and which had been around for a long time, which do not allow public officers to come out and make statements in public. ...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. First of **all**, I never **attributed** any action of muzzling anybody to the Minister of Health. I was defending doctors' rights to speak out irrespective of what General Orders might say in situations where people's lives **are** involved. In other words, you cannot muzzle a doctor in that situation. And that was one of the problems in people not being able to get the message out as to what was going on in the concentration camps and so on because of the muzzle which German doctors allowed to be imposed on them. I never associated any such action with the Minister of Health.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, who else is he talking about other than the Government? If the doctors in the Hospital are required by the General Orders not to make public statements in certain areas, and he is complaining about it and talking **about** muzzling, who is he talking about? He must not believe that people who sit over here **are** incapable of comprehending the mumbo jumbo that comes from him. That is what he is saying, Sir, that people on this side, meaning the Minister of Health — and that is my interpretation — a **strong** and courageous woman, is muzzling doctors from speaking out in relation to the problems relating to their patients. They tell me you cannot use the word "sophistry" in here. I don't know why not, but if I cannot say "sophistry" I will find a word that is roughly equal to it.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, what is in fact happening is that the Honourable Member is making out a case for people to operate in violation of the General Orders, not speaking out on behalf of their patients. The statements such as he is referring to were general statements not referring to any specific patient.

I want, Sir, to deal very quickly with corruption, and perhaps this is a good point to leave. There are, to my certain knowledge, persons who are on the pay sheet of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who do not work at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I will tell you how that happens. You got a job as a temporary worker, temporary orderly, temporary general worker and so on, you were laid off – many of them were laid off during the hard times in the past few years of the structural adjustment programme – but the names remain on the pay sheet and cheques were written out and up to now are still written out on behalf of some of them, and they themselves are not the ones who are drawing the money. Other people are drawing the money.

There is the further question briefly alluded to by the Honourable Member for St. James South this morning about the supplies. We have had a number of supplies coming in from overseas for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, duty free goods, air conditioners and other equipment that have been brought in and then when they have landed at the Customs and they are checked, it is found out that these things were not intended for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at all. This is one of the areas of corruption that perhaps makes it necessary for us to come before Parliament for a supplementary of this order.

4.15 p.m.

In my final parting shot, I would say that I cannot understand how anyone, on any side, since all of us on both sides and all across the country have been complaining for years about the mismanagement and the efficiency at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, can today take a position hostile to this Resolution when this is the first major step in addressing the problems that many of us have been concerned about.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

EXTENSION OF DEBATE

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a consensus, I believe, on the Floor that this debate be extended by agreement between the Government and the Opposition for one hour and I would so move.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: This House will now revert to Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to make a few comments in this debate. This is the first time in my political career that a member of the Opposition has sought to stop me from speaking. The Honourable Member is quarrelling that...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is giving the impression that we were quarrelling because he is about to speak. It is no offence to the Chair, Sir, that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has been trying to speak for some considerable time and I thought that the Government would wish to hear the constructive views of the Opposition.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I resent any implication whatsoever that any member on this side has tried to stop the Honourable Member from speaking. The reason is because I know that by tomorrow he will be telling the public that he was only making sport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, we will allow that bit of levity to pass and dismiss it. My position is to deal with the period of time when the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was Minister in 1992.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the problems at the QEH have exercised the patience of members of both major parties for as long as I have been in here. I recall about 1979 when Mr. Errol Barrow was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and we were going through the Auditor General's Report in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and he threw his hands in the air and said, "I can't deal with these. I have been dealing with these since 1961 and I can't get them in order." His solution was, apart

from resignation, that it was apparent that little could be done to straighten out the accounts of the Hospital but I call the senior staff of the Hospital to a meeting. He called them and he read the riot act to them and told them that **they** needed to have better control and better management.

Despite those strictures, nothing **improved**, to the point, Sir, where we have to be concerned in this debate. Even though the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West may not appreciate the excursion into history, it is **important**, because it sets the scene for what **transpired** yesterday afternoon.

I have here a copy of the relevant pages of the Auditor General's Report for 1992, page 43. These are some of the comments. Under Ministry of Health, code 360301, **actual** expenditure of \$64 488 151.50 exceeded the amount of \$63 177 254 approved by finance **warrants** by \$1 310 897.50. The excess represents unauthorised expenditure. Lower down, Sir, Item 3158 – payments totalling \$373 049.69 were not supported by the relevant **contracts/agreements**, neither was a register of contracts kept. That is 1992.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You would know, if you looked at this. You would have asked the question and you would have been given the answer.

In 1993, Sir, at page 64 of the Auditor General's Report under Queen Elizabeth Hospital it says:

"No formal arrangements are in place for authorising journeys and checking the **reasonableness** of claims for travelling allowances. Payments of travelling allowances were made on pay vouchers on which no details of distances were shown. Distances recorded or Statements of Travelling in some cases were unreasonably high. **Claims** were made for travelling from home to work for every **day** of the month by the same claimant in some instances as many as five times a **day**."

A man claimed travelling allowance 5 times in one day. That is only **part**.

I go to page 65.

"The system of recording transactions of the Medical Aid Scheme is unsatisfactory. Expenditure for the year in respect of the Medical Aid Scheme was \$2 606 577.85 but it 'was not possible to

ascertain what portion of that expenditure represented grants or loans to individuals. Consequently whether all loans were fully recorded in the accounts could not be determined. Vouchers for the period November 1, 1992 to February 28, 1993 in respect of Maintenance of Property were not made available for audit."

4.25 p.m.

"The cash books were not kept in a manner to facilitate verification of total actual receipts for **the** year. The Actual Receipts shown in the Revenue Account as \$2 460 798.43 did not **correspond** with the amount ascertained from recordings in the cash book. In addition to the absence of cumulative totals, the cash books were not properly posted and some of the amounts received were incorrectly recorded,

"Ledger accounts of loans **under** the Medical Aid Scheme were not satisfactorily kept."

It concludes:

"The internal control system in the department was on the whole ineffective."

That was 1993. I now go to 1994, page 73. It gives a whole list, Sir.

"**Bank** reconciliation statements were not prepared.

A statement of arrears of revenue was not prepared.

The revenue statement from April 1993 to March 1994 was \$92 749.00 less than the amount recorded in the cash book.

The cash book was not properly kept nor properly posted.

Control accounts were not kept for accounts of paying patients.

Accounts of the Medical Aid Scheme were unsatisfactory. Advances and receipts were not all recorded. There was no control account. The amount due Government under the Medical **Aid** Scheme could not be readily determined."

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of elucidation. The Honourable Attorney General is indicating to this Honourable House a position that I referred to when I was speaking about accountability and forecasting et **cetera** within the Ministries. The point that must be made is that the kinds of breaches that are reported in the Ministry

of Health are common throughout the entire public service and if the Honourable Attorney General is seeking to justify why action was taken against members at the Hospital, then that action must be taken against the entire public service because ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You are now making a speech. You have made your point.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I told him last week that from the time he cut off the **little** bit of hair he had on his head he was talking less sense and more foolishness.

Mr. Chairman, I have started there with the financial aspects of the Hospital's administration because it seems to me that for years and virtually **from** time immemorial the Hospital was **not** functioning efficiently, that **the** Government's auditors drew it to the attention of the relevant Ministry that there were problems in the accounts. Nothing appeared to have been done to rectify the situation. That is on the side of finance. So we have had a history of financial mismanagement, financial indiscipline.

Now, on the side of administration, there have **been** weaknesses too in a department that is spending approximately \$70 million.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Since September 2, 1994, before the elections, Sir, the Hospital Director said that he was not happy and he wanted to leave. On September 2, 1994, he wanted to move out from there and go somewhere else so that you had a Hospital Director in a position for 18 months where he had been demotivated and people on this side only became aware of that on Saturday morning.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in any situation where the Head is not motivated and worse, **where** the Head and the Deputy Head are not on speaking terms for over two years, there has to be a breakdown in **the** administration. So you have financial mismanagement **and** you have a deadlock in the administrative management leading to near collapse in the administration of the Hospital. Now, what is a Government supposed to do? In my submission, Sir, once the Government is aware of the seriousness of the matter, and we became aware last week when there were several requests for more and more money, it is clear that even now the financial management of the Hospital, notwithstanding anything the Auditor

General said, had not been able to correct the system. It was incumbent upon the Government to take some kind of **corrective** action otherwise we could continue and let the system play itself the same way year after year.

Every Minister of Finance, including the Honourable Member for St. Michael South, had in his time to grant supplementary provision to the Hospital late in the financial **year**. You had a choice. You could continue to give them the money, do not **ask** any questions and let the whole system collapse or...

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a **point of** order. I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas may be misleading the **House**. It is part of the **arrangements** of this House that if a department falls short of funds that they may have recourse by way of **supplementaries**. All of us understand that and, as Minister of **Finance** and a Minister of Health also that is how we operated. But we have a Minister of Finance now who said that there would **be** no more supplementaries and he has **come** here with 14 supplementaries. That is the great forecaster!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: **Okay**, you can leave that for your speech.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I thought he was rising on a **point** of order, Sir, because I was saying that once you **accept** that there is such a breakdown in the financial **management** that the system cannot continue you are now **compelled** to take corrective action.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government has said it is time that this stops. Those who have been responsible for the general administration, the financial administration and the **mechanical/engineering** administration, have been functioning poorly, let us take them out. They can be sent elsewhere. They **are** not to lose any emoluments and let us **bring** in a new **team on** an interim basis to deal with the problems of the Hospital.

Mr. Chairman: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I hope, Sir, that the team that comes in will have the good sense to consult widely. I do not believe that there should be my Commission of **Enquiry**. I feel that we can have a departmental

arrangement where persons in the Hospital who have the interest of the Hospital at heart can inform the new management team of the areas to look for and what are the problem areas. I would expect the **team** would identify the areas of problems and then when the Board of Management that is being contemplated comes into being, there will be a situation where they ought to have a document saying "These are the problems. These are the recommendations or a solution. Over to you as the Board."

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not mind them having a Board but if you do not restrain the Board the Board will run riot too and break the Government.

Sir, you said my time is up?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, just a brief intervention in this debate.

Aside.

4.35 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am not seeking to wind up. I just really want to make a brief intervention so I can put some documents available to the House.

Mr. Chairman, the point that I want to address in particular in this intervention arises out of some of the questions raised by Honourable Members during their speeches and it deals with specifically why the officers were sent on leave and whether the problems were problems within the system. I want to indicate, Sir, that there are systemic problems which must be dealt with. I said a 10-minute intervention, or a very brief intervention, so I would not be able to deal with the host.

I want to refer to a memo of 1st March 1994 which I intend to make a document of the House which shows the entire collapse of the system. This is to the Hospital Director.

"We have discussed on numerous occasions the need ..." The date is March 1st.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member. The Honourable

Member says she is willing to make it a document of the House. I am just reminding the Committee that if it is a document from a file, it cannot be made a document of the House. The Honourable Member can read from it. I am not hying to **interrupt**. Please do not make it a document of the House. If it is a document from a file it cannot be made a document of the House.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I wish to thank the Honourable Member. I will make reference to it. This is written to the Hospital Director by the then Permanent Secretary. March 1, 1994. This is the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Health, then Mrs. Athlene Haynes, writing to the Hospital Director who is now on special leave or will be, about the state of the hospital and the absence of structures in the system and the way the problems are not being dealt with.

I want to read it. It is a 4 page document and I want to read extensively **from** it because it speaks to all of the questions about every head of the Q.E.H. vote and the way the system was not being properly managed. It begins:

"We have discussed on numerous occasions the need for having the matters at the hospital dealt with in an expeditious manner. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital spends a major portion of the Ministry of Health's budget and has a significant impact on the Ministry's funding. Despite repeated meetings and calls for action, it continues to take excessive periods of time for critical matters, with the potential to seriously affect the efficiency of the institution's operations to be addressed.

2. It is a major embarrassment for me to have to ask again about the restructuring of the Engineering Department. This was first promised by you in 1990." (It goes on to say things I would not want to say here)

"At a meeting in February, 1993 there were promises of a quick response ... It was then agreed that at the end of that period all necessary action would have been taken. It is now March 1994 but the proposed recommendations have not yet reached the Ministry".

This has now brought us to the point where we are supplementing in excess of \$200 000 the restructuring of the Engineering Department promised since 1990.

"3. At a monthly meeting held in January of 1994 the question of the lack of cleanliness in the hospital was addressed. As you know, we

had two walk-throughs in 1993 which included the Minister, the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Medical Officer et al after which a cleaning programme was put in place. It is clear that the schedules put in place are no longer being followed and some areas of the hospital are once again unacceptably dirty. We have discussed the need to have the recommendations for an Executive Housekeeper renewed and the argument made for an additional supervisor if necessary. Where is the promised report and the request for the Executive **Housekeeper/additional** staff?

4. Again the question of the hospital Pharmacy and the Drug Service were brought up at the meeting in February 1993. I invited the Director, Barbados **Drug** Service to attend that meeting and you were to follow up the required institutional changes with him. Since then, a directive has been issued.."

It goes on: "Meetings were held...", etc. Several months have passed but I have received no report on the arrangements that were to be put in place.

5. The situation with the Central Admissions Department is **completely** unacceptable. This matter was discussed on several occasions during monthly meetings. Its establishment was included in your 1993 Work Plan, and as I understand it during the preparation of the plan all necessary activities for its implementation were discussed. The need for this unit is critical and the Ministry recruited..."

It goes on and then it makes the point:

"Despite all this the Department is still not in place."

I am showing how it deals with every area of the hospital where the plan for implementing systems to change and restructure the hospital and improve the service were not implemented with **the** effect that the budget was continuously thrown out of **kilter** as it has continued to do now pending our action.

"7. Equally critical is the question of fees. We know the high expenditure which would be incurred with the undertaking of the cardiac surgery - human resources, drugs, medical supplies, equipment etc. The Barbados Drug Service has already reported that according to the information which it only recently received, \$80 000 is expected to be spent on drugs alone as a direct result of heart surgery."

Then it goes on to say that despite that the hospital had not sent the information to the Ministry, because it was the Government's intention at that time to charge fees for this service.

"How then is it to be funded? How much are you charging for the procedure? What will you charge for the first surgical procedure in March?

8. I have **asked** for a review and a rationalisation of the Consultants' posts for several months. This has implications for the posts asked for - Cardiac Surgery among other things. Where is the information?

9. Yesterday afternoon on the 28th February, I received from you a memorandum setting out the situation with the hospital's Other Personal Emoluments Vote."

One of the very Heads that we are supplementing **today**. She gives details and then it comes back. I do not want to go into all of the details. She complains about the way in which it was handled, about the fact that, and it is the same thing I am saying here today, the hospital never informed the Ministry of the **amount** of money that was needed for the vote.

"...a supplementary **vote** is received before the House today but when I received your information yesterday, two weeks after our discussion, there was no possibility of any discussion with Finance as to how this matter could be handled..."

So once again the Personal Emoluments Vote was burst, completely over expended and exhausted and the Ministry not informed. This is back in March 1994.

- "10. I have cited these matters specifically but there are numerous verbal and written complaints which I have **made** about the time taken to put things in motion or to respond to queries from the Ministry and complaints from the public. There are outstanding complaints over 1 year old to which to-date I have received no response. The latest is the complaint ..."

Details are given and then it goes on.

- "12. You are fully aware of the complaints of the planners that despite their assignment..."

That is, planners were actually assigned to **work** with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to ensure that there was a relationship between the budget and the programmes and service offered by the Hospital and the administration ostracised the planners so that the Budget was not dealt with

4.45 p.m.

"You are fully aware of the complaints of the planners that, despite their assignment to the QEH, they are not involved. They have complained of not being able to have a meeting set up to review the **1993-94** Queen Elizabeth Hospital Plan. I said that the Management Committee was not meeting. These complaints were brought to your attention in a meeting in November 1993 with the Permanent **Secretary**, C. M. O...", et *cetera*. As far as I know, that review of the 1993 Plan is still outstanding while the 1994 Plan remains unfinished. Remember this is March 1994. So **they** are asked to give them a work plan to show how you are going to spend the money, and what budgetary things they were going to put in place. They ignored it for 1993. In March 1994 not only have they ignored 1993 they have not done 1994 **as** yet and the **P.S.** continues:

"It is not possible to continue to function in this haphazard and unplanned way. It does no good for the image of the hospital or the Ministry. The hospital has three fully trained Hospital Administrators in place. While it is a complex institution, it cannot be beyond our capability to have it function at an acceptable level. There are obstacles but there are always obstacles in any enterprise. If this was a private institution, we could not exist with the level of complaints which we leave **unaddressed** and the inertia which prevents us from taking action to solve the problems which we face."

I want to take you to her requirement and I quote:

"In future, I wish to receive a monthly written submission in point form on any important matters which are in train. This should include any problems being experienced and the proposed solutions. When we agree on this time schedule, notification should be sent with an amended schedule if the original proposal cannot be met. **In this** way, it will be easy to know exactly what is happening and where the bottlenecks are."

The hospital never complied with this directive and, when I came and asked them to do a 1995 to 1996 Plan, they photo-copied the Plan for two preceding years and brought it back **verbatim**. That was the level of

administration with which we were dealing and she concludes, and as I said that the top level managers were not speaking to one another and were not meeting to deal with the hospital budget or programmes:

"**Finally**, I expect that you will meet with the Deputy and Assistant Hospital Directors to review the problems which are being experienced and that together you will work out a strategy which will enable the hospital to be managed effectively and efficiently. - March 1, 1994."

This is a memo from the P.S. that **points** to a total breakdown in the system that affected not only the delivery of service and health care in Barbados but had adverse impacts for the budget of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital under the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. D. St. E. **KELLMAN**: Thank you very much, Sir. I appreciate it. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here today and I have listened to a lot of speeches. But I would like to say that after listening to all of these speeches I am convinced in my mind that we need to resort to the accrual system of accounting. That is, Sir, the system of receipts and payments in Government must stop and I do not think that Government should wait until they take advice **from** the accounting **firm** downtown **and** pay them a wash of money to admit that this system that we have today is the wrong system. **Anytime**, Sir, that you have a system where you only account for expenditure and revenue when the money is paid, that system has a problem. I am saying, Sir, that we have a situation where there are Government Departments, and it was admitted here **today**, that commit expenditure and because they have not paid the bills that these expenditures are not recorded in the accounts. I am saying that **as** soon as we adopt the accrual system where once the commitment is made the expenditure is accounted for, we will go a long way because nobody will be able to hide behind figures. Nobody can delay payments to make sure that the auditor is not aware of what is going on. We also have a system where it **womes** me, Sir. There is a charge today, Sir, that a container load of **air** conditioners is in the Port and the impression is that the number of **air** conditioners in that container cannot be for the particular institution. As far as I know, those air conditioners should be regarded as capital expenditure. There should have been some plan for capital expenditure. There should have been a budget prepared and I am saying that something is wrong if a Government **Department** can order a container load of air conditioners and the Auditor General cannot pick up this information. It means that there is a

possibility that there might be some system that is being operated where it is slipping us and there could be many more items that have been slipping us before.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious charge because the Auditor General in his accounts next year will have to report this in this report which will be dated 1995-96. I expect, Sir, that when I pick up the 1995-96 Report next year that I will see that charge.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, it is a serious charge. Because if someone can just go and order a container load of air conditioners just like that, it is a serious charge.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. James South said that she had in her department from March 1, 1994 a letter from the Permanent Secretary to the Director of the Hospital outlining certain things that should have been done since March 1, 1994. That is about 18 months, Sir, and to date nothing has been done. The only time something has been done is when the Honourable Member for St. Peter stepped in and made sure he put the necessary measures in place to correct these problems, and I must compliment him for that. But I am saying that the Honourable Member for St. James South was warned in November 1994 that you cannot allow senior members in your Ministry to commit you to go to the Ministry of Finance for more money without giving the necessary explanation to account for the money requested.

She is aware that there was a problem at the Sanitation Service Authority with overtime. She cannot deny that, Mr. Chairman. Now we are hearing that even though she saw when the problem was solved at the Sanitation Service Authority that she has allowed it at the Q.E.H. I am saying that there were examples at the Sanitation Service Authority that she should have used at the Q.E.H. 18 months ago and it would have saved the taxpayers a lot of money. I go back to that same point, about overtime, Sir, and the problem in the Public Service. If you are going to correct the problem of overtime, you will have to stop senior members from getting overtime. As long as you allow senior members in any business to get overtime, the junior members will always get overtime because they need the junior members to be on the job so that they can get overtime. You just cannot blame the junior members. You must look at it that the senior members will have to be the ones encouraging the overtime.

Mr. Chairman, there is another problem with this debate. If we only had the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, we would not be discussing this problem today. But just

because we have Bayview and certain people in this country can afford to pay at Bayview, that is why we have these problems at the Q.E.H. If we only had the Q.E.H. and they had to go there, they would have put pressure on Government already to bring a supplementary or increase the vote for the Q.E.H. just like how when they wanted money for sugar and when they wanted money for manufacturing and tourism the money was given to them up front. But now we are dealing with the problem of the small man and the small man has to wait 11 months in a year to make sure that he is getting medicine and all those different things. I am saying that I want to hear more from the people on the back bench about these things, because the small man's interest must be represented and we are the ones that must put the case for the small man.
4.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it pains me that when the St. Joseph Hospital in the north was closed down I did not hear the voices of that special group, but if the St. Joseph Hospital was a special hospital for that special group they would have, had the poor people marching up and down in this country, but once the St. Joseph Hospital was purchased for the small people in this country you would not get them marching on their behalf. They need not fear, I will put the case all the time, because the point is that whenever there are complaints from people in Rose Hill, St. Peter or Crab Hill, St. Lucy, I will come in here and defend them, because the Q.E.H. must provide a service for my small people. They cannot afford to go to Bayview and the necessary money must be voted for the Q.E.H., or I will come in here and deal with those who are stopping them from getting the necessary funds and services needed.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the Director of the Hospital, he can defend his own case. I am interested in the poor man who will catch a bus at 6 o'clock in the morning, go to the Q.E.H. and then cannot get medicine. I have to worry about that man. The other guys who have their cars can afford to drive to Bayview and demand services, but the small man cannot afford to do that, he has to be at the mercy of other people. If this vote means improving the interest of the small man, I will support it, but I am not going to support it 11 months after, I want the support up front for the small man. I want to see that medicine and things like that will be a priority in any future budget.

Let me tell you something. Don't believe that the experts in the Ministry of Finance will get away with this, because after listening to the Honourable Member for St. James South, I say it is a factor that every year the same problems are recurring. You cannot have a problem

where people every year are looking at the same figures and allowing the same problem to occur. It is regrettable. There is a system where I can openly state that none of the budgets in the Public Service is correct, and it is not because of the civil servants, it is because of the system. I will tell you why. Every year they prepare budgets for 12 months and the deficit is not included in those budgets. I have challenged that for eight years, because there is no way the vote will be right if the deficit cannot be included in the Current Expenditure. You are always going to have a problem. That is why we need to resort to the accrual system in accounting in Barbados.

I hope that this time next year I will not have to deal with this problem again, because the Q.E.H. is too important to the interest of the small man. We have to watch it. The gun is loaded against the small man and there are people who will make sure that the Q.E.H. is turf to suppress the interest of the **small** man.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Chamber has just over 15 minutes for this matter to be wound up. The Minister would normally have half an hour, she has taken 10 minutes and now the Right Honourable Prime Minister will wind up the debate.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to wind up this debate on behalf of the Government.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. **Chairman**, any Minister can wind up a debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet before the Honourable Member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But the ruling was that the time had just about expired. Normally the wind up speech is half an hour and we have only about 15 minutes left.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With the greatest respect, Sir, when it comes to the question of the guillotine, the wind up speech is not a half hour, the wind up speech happens.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But it could be up to half hour. If the Honourable Member wants to give you five minutes, I think that is his prerogative.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not understand the Prime Minister to be winding up, I want to make just one point, if the **Prime Minister** will give way.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the Government is allowed the right, under the Standing Orders, to wind up a debate. Any Minister can wind up on behalf of the Government and I want to exercise that right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Right Honourable Prime Minister is winding up the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He can exercise the right, Sir, but I exercise a higher right, the right to speak. I have not spoken in this debate and I was on my feet, so there is no question of his winding up. He can say he wants to wind, but when it comes to my speaking that comes before any winding.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Chair has ruled that it is about time for us to be winding up this presentation. If the Honourable Member wanted to give way he would have done so. Clearly he is not doing that. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, if you don't mind, sit please. The Honourable Member is winding up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I ~~do~~ not **normally** behave in a manner that would question the Chair, but I do not understand this ruling, Sir, with all due respect. The Clerks at the Table should inform the Chair that what they are letting the Chair do is contrary to the system.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has ruled that the Honourable Member is winding up. Would you please take your seat?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I rise to close this debate on behalf of the Government. The debate has been extended by an hour.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. There is no prime ministerial privilege in **this** Committee or in this House. There is no pre-eminence of any Prime Minister, we are all Members of the House. We don't have any prime ministerial pre-eminence. I thought that we were sharing the time. We conceded and gave way to the Minister. The Minister did not wind up, and we had no difficulty giving way because she said that she wanted to make an important point. Then the Prime Minister stands

up and then they give you advice about winding up. What foolishness is this?
5.05 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I want to talk now. I do not like fighting the Chair, but I do not like foolishness and I don't like when it is couched in some kind of rule when I know the Rules.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member for St. Peter. Will you give the Honourable Member 5 minutes so that we can conclude this debate?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is clear that in this debate one would need much more time to make a statement, but the point I wanted to make concerns the Minister's presentation of documents, which have now become, as I understand it, documents of the House. One of those documents, Sir, is the final Report on the Institutional Strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Barbados. That Report, Sir, was the final in a series for the strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which was the result of a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank of \$40 million, and the Pan American Health Organization was responsible for implementing the institutional strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, included in that Report which is now a document of the House and therefore will be available to the public at large to get an opportunity, and certainly the Press, to look at it and they will see in fact that the Democratic Labour Party spent, and I spent 8 years of my life, making sure that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's *modus operandi* would move from where it was to a level where eventually we were recognised as having the best health care system in the Caribbean, if not the western hemisphere.

Sir, I am not going to get involved in, and I have not become involved in the "he say. Dem say". The persons who have just been put on leave are *all* persons who have been beneficiaries of substantial training. The Deputy Hospital Administrator has a Master's *degree in* Business Administration, apart from a Bachelor's degree, and then he received training with a Master's degree in Hospital Administration. When the Prime Minister made his public statement yesterday he said that administering a hospital is a very intricate and delicate situation, and I want to make the point so that the public becomes aware, that all three of the persons, that is, the hospital director, the deputy director and the assistant director were beneficiaries of

substantial specialist training along with almost everyone including the engineer who was put on leave. All of *them* were given specialist training and the point made by the Honourable Member who when she read the letter indicated that substantial steps were taken to improve the quality of the management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. One of the things which the presentation of all of this documentation will confirm is that the last thing that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital needs is another dose of inputs from persons outside of Barbados who are going to come in and who will first of all have to learn the system.

It was the Pan *American* Health Organization, under Paul *Ellis*, which was responsible for this definitive, institutional strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and this Report was presented, in 1990, that the Hospital was unable in all of its particulars to implement all *of* the training and is a matter which the Honourable Minister will have to answer to. Here, Sir, the Minister said that nothing was done, and this is the point. The Minister said that nothing was done. This *Sir*, is a schedule Updated Plan of Action for Institutional Strengthening of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

There was a woman called *Ana-Rita* Gonzales who was brought here to implement this programme and spent a year as a PAHO consultant helping the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to implement these programmes. There are things that have happened and which will be articulated subsequently in another debate on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the point I am making is that the impression of gloom, doom and danger at the Hospital, at the management level, is not indicative at all of *all* that there is at the Hospital.

The nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the quality *and* the quantity of the Hospital nurses have been improved beyond all measure and secondly the doctors at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, including Professor *Walrond*, are between the nurses and the doctors, among the most dedicated health care professionals you will find anywhere in the western hemisphere. I do not like the idea of their being demeaned and dehumanised and humiliated in the manner which the Barbados Labour Party has allowed them to be humiliated in the context of the information which has been put forward. I believe that there is more information which has to be put forward and I await the Government's information on what is going to happen before I make any further statement.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all members of the House generally who have contributed to this debate. This debate could have been an historic debate in the annals of this Parliament

insofar as it allowed the Parliament to reflect on a number of precepts which are important in the matters pertaining to the administration of public affairs. It has to do with the accountability of public officers. It has to do with the exercise of the powers of Ministers. At the centre of it is a request by a public department namely, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, for supplementary vote of \$6½ million which represents more than 10 per cent of its total vote for the year. That \$6½ million is not on the specific line items in the Ministry of Health, namely, supplies and materials, other personnel emoluments, maintenance of property and medical aid, and it has to be understood that while it represents 10 per cent of the overall budget of the hospital for the year, it represents, in many instances, more than 100 per cent of the line items of the particular heads involved.

This Parliament must in every instance be scrupulous in the exercise of its prerogative to protect the public purse. We are here invested with the power of protection of the public purse and this debate allows the House to adjudicate on the issue as to what happens in instances where people at the level of public officers are not scrupulous in the discharge of their responsibilities and what we do as legislators to remedy the situation.

Sir, I want before I say anything else to compliment my Minister of Health. No Minister of the Crown is responsible for the day-to-day administration nor the financial management of any department under his or her control. The Permanent Secretaries are the principal accounting officers; but a Minister has a responsibility if there is a deficiency in the administration of the affairs of the department, particularly the financial affairs, to have this deficiency brought to light at an early stage and have an appropriate remedy brought to bear in order to have the deficiency corrected.

5.15 p.m.

Sir, I can say to this House that I repose the fullest confidence in the Minister of Health in the manner in which she has behaved in this matter because I have had to restrain her precisely because there is a procedure by which persons who have a day-to-day responsibility must be held responsible and if they do not behave in a responsible manner, there is a procedure by which they should be disciplined. Were I always to follow the tempestuous nature of the Minister, perhaps action not in keeping within the bounds of propriety might have been taken, so anxious was she to have the affairs and the mismanagement of the Hospital redressed. I want to enter that into the records of the House.

The House has to understand, Sir, that all of us who are invested with power by the people and serve in this

House as legislators that we cannot dismiss public servants. Although they are responsible for the day-to-day expenditure of public funds, you have to build a case. A recommendation has to come from the Permanent Secretary in instances where the Permanent Secretary is not the officer at risk and the matter has to go to the Services Commission. So, Sir, you can have a situation where malfeasance and infelicities are taking place in a public department but a Minister, him or herself, cannot intervene until a substantial report is prepared, the errors, mistakes, corruption, whatever infelicities are documented and the matter referred to the relevant authority for decisions to be taken.

I just want to say, Sir, that the Minister of Health was scrupulous in the discharge of her responsibilities in this matter and I have the fullest confidence in the manner in which she has sought to exercise power and responsibility in relation to that vested in the accounting officers of her Ministry.

Sir, I have said on the floor of this House, and I have said that this could have been an historic debate. We are going to be, in the final analysis, held responsible by the public whether taxpayers' funds are wasted or not, although whether we are Ministers or individual legislators we are not responsible for the day-to-day management of the expenditure of those funds.

I have said, Sir, that I do not believe that supplementaries should be easily brought to this Parliament. I feel so strongly. We have mechanisms in Government for the allocation of public funds in advance of the fact. It is called the Estimates Committee. It meets and through that, funds are allocated to the various Government Departments. I believe the Government has the obligation to honour all its contractual obligations. If the Government has people on establishment, it has a responsibility to put funds in the Estimates to pay them. The Government has to put funds in the Estimates to meet utilities and run Government Departments. A lot of Government expenditure is discretionary expenditure that is determined not so much by the action of Ministers but by the action of people who have the responsibility as accounting officers in various departments.

I am sure, Sir, that almost every previous Minister of Finance has set out to honour the contractual and known obligations of Government. We allow discretionary expenditure in line with what the growth of revenue would permit us and we ask Government Departments to stay within the limits. There are times when the Minister of Finance has to tell Government Departments, you may want to spend X on these new programmes but we

cannot afford it. The request you are making is too large in relation to our total ceilings. Go back to your Ministry and live with Y.

It should become the responsibility of Government Ministries and Departments that when a Minister of Finance says he cannot afford it they are going to honour Government commitments. We are going to pay all we are employing. We are going to pay our bills but in relation to the new programmes you want to bring on, do not spend without the approval of the Ministry of Finance and without the authority of Parliament. That has to be respected.

Mr. Chairman, if you pick up the Auditor General's Reports since 1968 you will see replete in those reports instances of Government Departments engaging in unauthorized expenditure and making a mockery of this Parliament. I strongly believe the time has come when this Parliament, as a Parliament, must say that unauthorized expenditures by public officers without the approval of Parliament must come to an end.

The other side may berate me, Sir, for saying that I do not support supplementaries coming here for expenditures that were not approved by the Minister of Finance during the Estimates Committee and you tell a Ministry do not spend for X but they proceed and spend it nonetheless and then send you a bill after the fact in the knowledge that if only because by that time a public crisis has arisen. The House has a responsibility thereafter to rubber stamp something that the Minister of Finance has said he is not going to allow because it is discretionary expenditure and not a necessity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, there are too many instances of such action by public officers stampeding decisions by the Ministry of Finance, and taking over the responsibility of this Parliament whose privileges we are all here required to protect. It has to stop. It has to stop if only because all of us must be scrupulous in how we appraise supplementaries and it is not me who is trying to stop them. All of us who are lambasted by the public for being wasteful politicians have a responsibility to be sure that we are authorising as legislators what the public officer can spend. That, Mr. Chairman, is the process I have embarked on as Minister of Finance.

I allow, Sir, Ministries to submit estimates between January and February for appraisal. We allocate

expenditures and then I equally allow Ministries in September to come back and I do a complete review in September of each Ministry's expenditure pattern, line by line to see if what we have provided in March is adequate for the purpose or if we had made a miscalculation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up. Your time has expired.

Asides.

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

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: By a motion? I am much obliged to Your Honour.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, in March last year I agreed as Minister of Finance that the allocation for the Hospital should have been \$64 million which represented a substantial increase. This represented a significant increase over the provision for last year. I think some \$6 million more than last year. In September I invited the officers of the Ministry of Health responsible for the preparation of public accounts to come to what I call a fiscal review to evaluate the expenditure patterns of the Hospital to determine whether they were in line or not in line and whether supplementaries were warranted. They asked for an amount then for Other Personal Emoluments of some \$860 000 of which \$141 000 were for posts which had not yet been approved. They received everything they asked for except for the posts which had not been approved.

Sir, this \$6 million of expenditure we are now being asked to approve as a Parliament arises precisely because public officers who had a responsibility to provide information to the Minister of Finance and through them to the Ministers so that we could either say "aye" or "nay" did not provide the information that would allow us to make decisions putting us in a position, if we did not ask, where what has been recorded in the Auditor General's Report from time immemorial would become involved in excess expenditure without the authority of Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, it became a crisis because when Cabinet eventually was alerted that there were outstanding amounts to be paid to the junior doctors, we asked for

the full amount because we believed as a Government that any expenditure incurred in one year must be met from the resources of the Government in that year and should not be carried forward. It was only when the question of the payment to the junior doctors became an issue that we realised that despite the efforts of the Minister to be informed, and despite the best efforts of the Government to be informed, there were large sums of money payable by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that had not been brought to account and those pertained to bills that have been concealed for years including bills in the Medical Aid Scheme. They include, Mr. Speaker, Sir, matters pertaining to the provision of funds for supplies and materials.

5.25 p.m.

I want to say, Sir, that there are some items of expenditure in the Estimates of Barbados that my experience, as a Member of the Opposition first of all, and now as a Minister of Finance, cause me to pay particular attention to, because it has been referenced more than any other items in all of the Auditor General's report. Supplies and materials for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a line item in our Estimates that is routinely abused and the Auditor General's Report speaks voluminously of this abuse. The supplies and materials at the Psychiatric Hospital is an item that has been routinely abused.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, a Minister of Finance looks for these things and in this particular matter the House is being asked to vote a supplementary at this late hour in the Financial Year because the Minister and the Government were not provided, appropriately so, with early information on the request for spending to allow us to say yeah or nay, which is our prerogative under the law.

I want to say, Sir, that putting persons on special leave as, not the Government, but as the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health has recommended and as Services Commissions has agreed will now allow a full investigation to take place into the circumstances under which those persons have had to be put on special leave. There will be no need, Sir, for a separate enquiry because once a person has had, on the recommendation of a Permanent Secretary, and with the approval of Services Commission, been put on special leave, a full investigation has to take place in relation to the circumstances thereof with a view to a determination as to whether the persons put on special leave should resume their posts or should be asked to meet some other more strict disciplinary action by Services Commission. Those persons therefore, Sir, who

are calling for an enquiry can be sure that what has been done in the course of the last few days is in itself an enquiry into the affairs of the hospital.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just one minute, Sir. I am not talking about a commission of inquiry of that nature. I was talking about a positive one relating to the health services, looking critically at the various problems in the hospital.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I am coming to that. Sir, I am in the midst of a long paragraph that may take me 5 minutes to finish.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is making a case for discipline of public officers and even as he makes that case he seeks to make the same mistake which he is accusing the public officers of in relation to the Rules of this House.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the Government of Barbados is now paying for a health rationalisation study, on the basis of a grant, that is going to enquire not only into the administration of all of the affairs of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but all of the affairs of the health sector of Barbados. Mr. Chairman, Sir, arising out of the putting of people on special leave the circumstances surrounding the drastic action that has had to be taken will have to arise.

I also strongly believe and support, Sir, the call for a thorough investigation into the expenditure and other aspects of the administration of not only the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but all other sections of the Ministry of Health and the health centres in general over the course of the last few years, including the Medical Aid Scheme, including, Sir, the polyclinics, including the St. Joseph Hospital. Sir, I welcome a comprehensive investigation into it.

I want to end on this point, Sir, and you will notice I have not troubled anybody and I have not troubled the Member for St. Michael East but there are Members on the other side, particularly the Member for St. Michael East, who called for Commissions of Inquiry and then when the commissions of inquiry are set up, they carry matters to the High Court to see if they can stop the commission of inquiry. I want all Members to understand ...

Loud Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. As Leader of the Opposition I was consulted about extending a courtesy to the Prime Minister to conclude &bate relative to the Head.

Now, the first point I want to make, **Mr. Speaker**, is that I withdraw any further consent to participate in a charade **like** this. I therefore am saying to you, **Mr. Chairman**, I believe you would be best advised at this stage, so that the rules are not breached, to do what is necessary to bring these proceedings to an end because, **Mr. Chairman**, I do not think it is fair.

The second point I want to make, **Mr. Chairman**, is that it is entirely wrong within the Rules of the House for the Honourable Member to reflect on any matter which is presently engaging the attention of the judiciary and the courts in Barbados.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not even going down that road because as I have said this side has withdrawn its consent to participate any further.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will now make a ruling. In the first place the rules state clearly that matters relating to the courts should not be brought to this Honourable Chamber. Secondly the time is up and I would like now to put the question for the Head 30 to stand part.

Loud asides.

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

ITEM 5 (b) – SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES
1995–96, No. 12 – \$7 469 733

HEAD 10 – GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Resolution before Parliament is a **Resolution** that is intended to provide supplies to meet the cost of the wage increase that has been the subject of discussion in this Parliament through a Resolution introduced in Parliament. A lot of the issues raised, Sir, have already been fully canvassed and thoroughly discussed in Parliament and I beg to move that Head 10 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not rise to debate this Head but to draw to Your Honour's attention

a **matter** which normally I would have drawn to the attention of Mr. Speaker for reference to the Committee of Privileges but I do not wish it to go to the Committee of Privileges. I say it just so it would be a word to the wise. If you peruse one of the local dailies of yesterday which purported to report on this Head on the last **occasion** it came before this Committee or the House certain decisions were made, you will find that after a report of what had occurred it was then stated that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said **that** he would not participate and he went out. Then it said that the Opposition Members abstained one after **the** other and in the final paragraph reported that the Resolution was passed 15 to 6.

Now I feel that coverage of the affairs of this Committee or the House ought to be accurate and, as I said, I did not think it was a matter that I wanted to send to the Committee of Privileges. But, Sir, in that same publication, the headline said: "Pandemonium In The **House**". My recollection was that there was no pandemonium but I recognized that the problem **was** that whoever wrote the headline or edited did not know the meaning of the word "pandemonium". I think it is unfair for the House's reports to reflect to the rest of the community a state of affairs that did not exist. Pandemonium, Sir, suggests that I was pelting something at me or that we were rushing to get out of the House and somebody got crushed. Pandemonium does not mean what was reported. Normally, Sir, you know this is a matter that we would refer to the Committee of Privileges but such reports should reflect that the Governor-General's Head was not debated or whatever. But I **do** not think that we should have an inaccurate report because I had constituents who called me to ask me what was the pandemonium in the House and how come we abstained but still voted on the **Resolution**. It is only because my constituents were concerned that I have raised the matter, Sir.

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

HEAD 13 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I beg to move that the funds voted under Head 13 to pay increases to persons employed under the Head of the Prime Minister's Office do now stand part.

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

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am even more confused now as I stand here to participate in this exercise. I did not want to rise, **Mr. Chairman**,

when we were dealing with Head 10 **because** of the Convention, But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, Sir, that I thought that **there was** a Convention which would obtain, particularly **where this** is **likely** to be one of the last **supplementaries** in the fiscal year I assume, that the **Minister of Finance** would have brought a supplementary as large **as** this by way of a Bill. We have had this discussion on **several** occasions, I do not wish to go into.,

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I rise on a point of order, Sir, since the Member might unwittingly mislead the House. Last week Friday **the House discussed** the Bill to amend **the** Civil Establishment Order and other Orders to **give** effect to the increase being paid to public servants. What we are discussing here now, Sir, is the Resolution to **ask** for **supplementary** funds to be voted to ensure that the public servants can **be paid** the increase. This is just the personal emoluments arising out of the increase, This is how it has **been** done, Sir, **from** time immemorial. We have brought the Bill last week to discuss the rate of increase. Now we **are** bringing a separate supplementary Resolution to vote the funds to pay the increase. There is no issue **about** whether it is a Bill or not. It should only be brought as it has been in this form.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not any two-year member of this Chamber or any 18 months **novice**. I am a **former** Minister of Finance and the Honourable Member must understand that I was a Minister of Finance before he was a Minister of Finance. Therefore, the Honourable Member cannot get up in here **grandstanding** on minor points like this and giving the impression that he has remade and recast the entire financial picture of Government, the rules of the House and the way in which matters of this sort are brought. I was speaking about what I believe to be my preference. I am not asking anybody to correct or to talk about I am misleading the House. I am entitled to say what my view is about the approach that should be adopted by a Minister of Finance in bringing a supplementary like this. There is nobody in here who can question **my** preference for that approach.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The only reason why there is a difficulty with this matter is because the Member for St. John as a Minister of Finance has never known what it is to bring to this House any Resolution or Bill asking for an increase in wages for the public officers. So he has **no** experience on which to draw, only cuts and freezes.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not going to let the Honourable Member side track me with

his partisanship and his trivia today. I would like this **debate** to reach a higher standard. I **have** brought Bills in this House to reduce and remove from the **backs** of the poor in **this** country levies which **amount** to more than the net effect of the paltry wage increase which the Honourable Member has **offered** public officers in the debate last week. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I do not judge my competence against the Honourable **Member** for St. Peter. All that has gone on in the past few days in Barbados demonstrates to me that **there** are other Ministers of Finance of this country against whom I should judge my competence and that the present Minister of Finance apparently does not want to judge his competence against any **other** competent Minister of Finance. He has decided that what he says on one day can be **changed** if he gets up another morning and feels otherwise, **That** is the kind of fiscal management which this **country** is now enduring.

Mr. Chairman, you could have a ludicrous situation in which yesterday the Honourable Member could be on TV saying that sending public workers on special leave is not punitive but today this House today may end up being punitive because it is now going to be investigated. I don't trust anything the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter says to this House or **outside** of it. I don't care what he tells the people of this country.
5.45 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. It is standard practice, not a punitive exercise. It is a standard **practice**, not by the Government but by the Services Commissions, that whenever any officer is put on special leave an investigation is undertaken. It has nothing to do with whether that is a punitive exercise or not, it does not reflect nor prejudice the result of the investigation, but it is a standard practice and we are now being titillated. We have no choice in the matter, we have no option, and we are now being titillated by the inexperience and the ignorance of the Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the only person who did not know yesterday what the Right Honourable Prime Minister is saying today to this House is the Right Honourable Prime Minister. That is all he is proving to this House, that what he told the people of Barbados on television is the complete opposite to what he is saying today and that he now understands what it is all about. I never sent anybody on special leave in my life, but I know of a Prime Minister who sent a public officer on special leave...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I rise again on a point of order. The Honourable Member wants to impute and make implications about punitive behaviour

by Government that are incorrect. When a member of the public service goes on special leave, ordinarily he should revert to his substantive post. The fact of the matter is simply this, that in putting persons on special leave with the agreement of the Government and on the insistence of the Government, the persons who will go on special leave will continue to draw the salary equivalent to the post in which they had been acting. There are some persons who will go on special leave who have been in acting appointments. They should ordinarily go down to a lower salary while they are on special leave, but we have determined that they should continue to draw the same salary as they had been paid, precisely because when the investigation is in process, as I said, we do not want to create the impression that we have prejudged people while the investigation is taking place.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with personal emoluments and I want to deal with the public servants of this country and the present reign of terror which is being visited upon them by this Barbados Labour Party administration.

While it is quite possible for a Prime Minister to effectively dismiss a Minister by taking over the portfolio and doing everything the Minister should have been doing, and that is quite legitimate, and that has happened in the past 24 hours in Barbados, I think that it is unworthy...

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is grossly unparliamentary. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition cannot say that the Prime Minister is involved in a reign of terror, such emotive language. I am asking for that highly emotive language...

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in this context "reign of terror" is highly unparliamentary and ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not recognise it at that point.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: What I am therefore saying is that based on the present trend, what we are seeing in Barbados today...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not dealing with what is happening in the Health Ministry. I have seen this

scenario throughout the public service. It is a technique which is being employed relative to public officers in this country, and while it is true that there may be occasions of incompetence, while it is **true** that there may be occasions when action needs to be **taken** by Government Ministers and others to bring a Ministry under control prudently, what you are having is a scenario in Barbados today in which public officers – even though the Right Honourable Prime Minister promises them a new dispensation – are functioning in Barbados under what I describe as a reign of terror. They have to answer to many people. What is happening is that you are getting directions from higher up which are undermining the confidence of public officers in Barbados. You cannot go in any Ministry in Barbados today, after what was paraded before the country yesterday as an act of solving administrative problems, which previous Ministers in this country have had to solve by way of supplementaries. I doubt there has ever been a Minister of Finance in Barbados who has not had to look at the Hospital and at a whole range of other Government Departments and provide them with supplementaries. It never attracted television cameras and all of the theatrics and the drama of yesterday's exercise. I have never heard of the Director of a Government Department in this country being paraded before the country during a Press Conference and being sent on special leave by a Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There are Standing Orders governing this House in relation to the manner in which money Resolutions before this House and supplementaries should be debated. I want to draw to your attention that we are debating Head 13, the Prime Minister's Office, the Prime Minister's Official Residence and the House is being called upon to vote funds to pay the salary increases to persons presently employed in the Prime Minister's Office and at the Prime Minister's Official Residence. Ordinarily, Sir, in Committee – and we are in Committee – Members would be discussing the specifics rather than making **Second Reading** speeches. I want to say that what the Honourable Member for St. John is raising are matters of irrelevance in relation to the wage increases for the Prime Minister's Office and the Prime Minister's Official Residence. If the debate is widened, I shall get into it in its fullest latitude.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Further to that point of order, Sir...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am asking you to rule in **relation** to the rules governing the House about the relevance of debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will deal with that when he speaks again.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I think the power is going to his head, Sir, but in here we have no public officers. You cannot have any Press Conference and send me out. You cannot make me move until I am ready.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Speak to the Chair, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry, Sir. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing personal emoluments. It is perfectly proper in this Committee under personal emoluments to discuss the morale of personnel, the methodology for engaging personnel, the methodology for dismissing personnel, the decapitation of personnel, any aspect of personnel would form a proper discussion of personnel where under this Head the Prime Minister is the Minister with responsibility for the personnel function in this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to connect his point.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, so, Mr. Chairman, Sir, what I am saying is that what we are dealing with today is an increase in personal emoluments to reflect the arrangements which have recently been made by the Prime Minister of Barbados and the Minister of Finance. I am saying that this can be no palliative to the public officers of Barbados, this pay increase which is reflected in these supplementaries can be no palliative to the thousands of persons working in the public sector in Barbados today who would feel under siege by the antics of an administration which cannot sit down, Mr. Chairman, they could do it at Ilaro Court – the Honourable Member wants me to deal with the Prime Minister's residence. He has had Cabinet meetings at Ilaro Court from time to time, or he could summon his Ministers there and seek to grapple with those major problems which affect Barbados without parading before the people of Barbados...
5.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I beg again, Sir, because once latitude is allowed, I will take the latitude. I beg to ask you to adjudicate on the Rules of this House which require that a matter before the Committee on a money resolution to deal with the matter at hand cannot be a second reading speech. I will make a second reading speech on this matter; but I am asking you, Sir, to recognise that the House is being asked to say yea or nay to the payment of those increases to the persons presently employed at the Prime Minister's Office and persons employed in the Prime Minister's residence.

If we go into a wider discussion on matters of morale, I will move either that everything that has been said be

expunged or I will exercise my rights to respond precisely to the matters that have been raised. And it is going to be war in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will let Honourable Members know when they are off target and this is the ruling of the Chair. When members are off target, I will let them know and let them come back to the point.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I am trying to impress upon this Chamber, that however good the intentions of the Minister of Finance may have been in granting the salary increase which is reflected in this supplementary provision and which will be reflected in back pay in the hands of public officers in Barbados shortly, what cannot be glossed over are the other antics of this Barbados Labour Party Administration relative to the public service in Barbados, relative to the thousands of persons, some of whom work within the department which come under the sub-program which has been identified here in these supplementary estimates.

I believe it is about time that that level of public debate about the performance of public service operatives needs to be taken out of the public arena in the way that the Honourable Member for St. Peter has constantly been putting it. Mr. Chairman, Sir, here we have the opportunity to reflect, and I hope that the Honourable Prime Minister as I have said already instead of attaching great importance to these theatrical moments when he can parade his superiority over his Ministers and parade the fact that he has full command of the state apparatus of this country and can use the entire state apparatus against persons who are sometimes entirely defenceless because they are bound not to respond to the kinds of allegations which are made against them in public.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that he is going off this particular Head.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: All they can do is go to their union representatives and perhaps haggle over the nature of the increase which is reflected in this supplementary today.

Mr. Chairman, they have no other recourse in the environment in which they are required to function. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe that there is a need for a new dispensation and those who are goading on the Honourable Member for St. Peter and making him

believe that these righteous attacks on the public servants and these actions **against** the public servants of Barbados in the way in which he is presently touting them, I believe that wiser heads should intervene shortly and explain **not** that his life as a politician is limited because he doesn't believe that and most politicians when they are in office don't believe that themselves and that the public officers will remain and there is an institution which does not bend to those vicissitudes and is not going to bend to the erratic nature of individual ministers or ministers of **the** civil service,

Mr. Chairman, I want to say **that** the Democratic Labour Party is going to give its full support **to** this Resolution. We are not going to stand in the way of the payment of those increased **salaries** or the back pay to public officers, but we feel very strongly about the attitude which is being observed and the practices which are being carried out by this Government against individual public officers who **are** being paraded before the public without having the **opportunity** themselves **to** defend their actions or to demonstrate that they themselves have done something in the interest of the **departments** which they administer,

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, my first intervention in what I hope to be a large number of interventions on this and other matters. Head 13 subprogram 2 deals with the Prime Minister's official residence and the House is being invited to approve the wage increases for persons employed at the Prime Minister's residence.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John **has** couched this debate in terms of the conduct by me of a reign of terror. I will have to **speak** to that.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have never in the course of this debate or otherwise accused the Honourable Member for St. Peter of a reign of terror. I said the public servants of Barbados are **operating** under a reign of terror. If the Honourable Member for St. Peter wishes to accept responsibility for that reign of terror he can do so, but I have levelled no accusation at the Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was **scrupulous** in pointing out to this Parliament that we are dealing with Head 13, Prime Minister's Office and words regarding a reign of terror were used in the process of the House being called upon to vote increases for persons employed at the Prime Minister's official residence.

Mr. Chairman, **Sir**, I can only therefore respond to what has **been** said, If there is a reign of terror in relation to anybody employed at the Prime Minister's official residence, I did not **start** it. It started when a **Prime** Minister under a previous Administration came in and saw somebody **employed** as a housekeeper, well known to the **member** for St. John, and dismissed them **unceremoniously** - very **well known** to the member for St. John, His mother, Sir - and sent a Permanent **Secretary** to give **her** a letter of **dismissal**. He was a guppy.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Peter wants to take the debate to whatever level he wishes. The first point I want to make is that my mother has never been employed as a housekeeper anywhere in her entire life, Mr. Chairman, my mother started to work as Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition and continued to work as Secretary to the **Prime** Minister of Barbados until October 1991; not as a housekeeper anywhere, She reached the age of 60 and I never begged for any job for my family anywhere in Barbados, least of all in the Government of Barbados. I was very happy when she was no longer employed in the Government so that nobody could level any accusations at me about the employment of members of my family.

6.05 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, it is a matter of public record that the person who was Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition before 1986 was engaged on the staff of Ilaro Court when Prime Minister **Errol** Barrow was Prime Minister of Barbados and **when** the Prime Ministers changed ...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The person who the Honourable Member is referring to who was employed by then Prime Minister Errol Barrow was his Personal Secretary at Government Headquarters. When he died, she continued to work from June 1, 1987 up until October 1991 with his successor, the Honourable Member **for** St. Michael South at Ilaro Court, but not as any housekeeper.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, Subprogramme 2 deals with all the posts including those that were previously held by the mother of the member for St. John. I want to say, Sir, that if a reign of terror has started, it started when another Prime Minister succeeded **Errol Barrow** and unceremoniously and without reference to the Honourable Member for St. John sent home his mother.

I want to say to this House, Sir, that I have established standards at Ilaro Court. I came **as**

in this country and I found persons on the staff. Obviously a Prime Minister's staff is a personal matter. I made sure that most of the persons who were employed there were given appointments elsewhere in the public service but I established a new standard. I have retained two persons whom I found on the staff of Ilaro Court, including one who was in the post held by the member for St. John's mother, including one who is a member of St. Michael South because she is an excellent worker. I feel that Prime Ministers must not allow persons who happen to find themselves employed at Ilaro Court to have to go home, as happened in 1986 when the Government changed, to suck salt as if they do not have children to support.

Sir, I deeply, deeply, deeply resent any notion of any reign of terror by me under this Head being discussed when I made sure that every person whom I found working at Ilaro Court I said they must work because a previous Prime Minister said they were deserving of working and they are now working elsewhere in the bureaucracy but I retained two.

I do not hope, Sir, to be in this post forever and ever but I hope that when I leave it and there is a new Prime Minister that he would feel that the persons who are now there working have been chosen because they are Barbadians who deserve to work and you do not put them on the road again to suck salt.

I deeply resent this House this evening speaking in terms of a reign of terror under the official Prime Minister's residence because the person who succeeded the member for St. John's mother continued to work at Ilaro Court.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is entitled to say whatever he feels about what he thinks I said. This Head relates to the Prime Minister's Office, the Prime Minister's residence, National Defence and Security, the Barbados Defence Force, the Barbados Cadet Corp., the Barbados Defence Force Sports Programme, Information and Media Relations, Application of Modern Technology, Government Printing Services, Land Use Regulation and Certification Programme and the Honourable Member seems to believe that somebody is dealing with Ilaro Court. I know nothing about Ilaro Court. I am talking about your conduct as Prime Minister of Barbados ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ...and the way you have treated public officers throughout the public service by

sending them on special leave and making them parade before the public of Barbados constantly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the notion of a reign of terror arose under Head 13 which deals with the Prime Minister's Office and he said so. We are dealing with Head 13. We are in committee so I can only believe that the debate is taking place because there is evidence of a reign of terror in relation to the public servants under Head 13, the Prime Minister's Office. Therefore, Sir, I want to be relevant because what happens in the Prime Minister's Office falls to my responsibility.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that far from being involved in a reign of terror in the Prime Minister's Office and his staff, I have bent over backwards to make sure that persons who are employed in the Prime Minister's Office, whether at Ilaro Court or elsewhere, have not been put in the same condition as they were put in 1986 when a Government changed. I would like to see a convention in relation to this matter established.

I want to say to the member for St. John, Sir, that despite what he is saying this evening, persons who are familiar with the facts in relation to his reaction to the manner in which during 1987 people were removed at Ilaro Court, regarded him as being lower than pond water for not having risen in defence of those who were unceremoniously dismissed from employment at Ilaro Court. They cannot believe that he can be serious in standing up for other public servants when he could not stand up for his mother. How could a man who could not stand up for his mother stand up for other public servants in Barbados?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An Honourable Member is on a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really am saddened that I have to get up on a point of order. The Honourable Member said, and then followed it by a long line of statements that the Honourable Member for St. John is regarded by persons as "lower than pond water." I wish to suggest that is unparliamentary and all that subsequently followed should be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to withdraw the statement about pond water. It is deemed to be offensive.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I withdraw the remark. But I want to make a general point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I ask that it be struck from the record. The Honourable Member states, "I withdraw." If that remains on the record, I submit that it helps to lower ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member was just asked to withdraw the remarks and he has done that. The Chair uses its judgment in that matter.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the records that I have absolutely no respect for any man who could allow his mother to be so unceremoniously dismissed by a Prime Minister from the staff of Ilaro Court in 1987, and the opinion is widely shared by all Barbadians who love their mothers. There is no public servant in Barbados, Sir, who believes that they can depend on the Member for St. John to stop anybody from carrying out a reign of terror against any public servant when he would not stop a reign of terror from being carried out against his mother.
6.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated on previous occasions that I was not speaking on Ilaro Court because of some of the comments that were made which I believe were uncalled for. Quite frankly, Sir ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you making a speech or are you on a point of order?

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Make your point of order,

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am being accused in 1987 of dismissing someone unceremoniously. He said a Prime Minister and that could be referring to me. I wish to indicate, Sir, that in 1987, in fact I was not even occupying the premises at Ilaro Court at that time. I was not responsible for placing any staff at Ilaro Court at that time. As far as I can recall I moved into Ilaro Court in 1989 and it is basically untrue for any one to indicate that I dismissed any one or dismissed them unceremoniously from Ilaro Court in 1987. That is a point I wish to make.

I am really not getting into any quarrel in that way because I believe that all Prime Ministers should behave in a manner that is entirely different. This is not a good display of how our Prime Minister should be behaving.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Barrow did not live at Ilaro Court. The Court included the Member for St. ...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, of order, the records are there. The Honourable Member does not have to lie to this House. I believe the level to which this debate must rise but the support that. In 1987 my mother was Secretary to the Prime Minister of Barbados in that post until some time in early 1991. Sir, she reached the age of 60 on the 21st of 1991. There was a structural adjustment programme. All temporary officers who reached the age of 60 were required to terminate or go home. I could not put a case for my mother if I could not put it for the rest of the public servants and if everybody else who was age 60 was going home then my mother, regrettably, would have to go too. My mother is not begging on the streets.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. John were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, you should have let that stay in the record because I want to respond to him. This Head concerns the Prime Minister's Office and if she was the Prime Minister's personal secretary, Sir, this is under subprogram 1 and she was dismissed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I want to say, Sir, that I did not institute the 8% pay cut and that was a reign of terror. I did not freeze public servants salaries and that was part of the reign of terror. I did not ask people to pay for their own severance and that was part of the reign of terror. I did not send home 3 000 public servants, including the mother of the Member for St. John and that was part of the reign of terror. All I have sought to do is to show consideration for them, expand the numbers employed, put back those who were on a 3-day week, on a 5-day week. Sir, I have granted them increments in circumstances where the Member for St. John went to Washington, and it is already on the record of this House, and agreed with the IMF that he was not going to pay them any increment as part of his stewardship.

Sir, I plead innocent to all of the actions that have been entered into and the misadventures of a previous administration in mashing up the morale of the public service of this country. I want to say for the record that I am not the man who cut by 8%, I did not freeze, I did not withdraw increments, Sir, I did not send home people.

But more to the point, and I want to stress this, in 1986 staff went and I have kept two members of staff that I found at Ilaro Court and where others were concerned, Sir, I insisted that temporary posts had to be found for them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member is asked to wind up his presentation.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, this Head has nothing to do with reign of terror that entered this debate and I will come back into this **debate**, if the House cannot understand that when we are dealing with matters in Committee that second reading speeches cannot be the order of the day, It has to do with whether we agree or not agree to pay the increase to public servants as **has** already been ratified by the Orders that have passed this House last week.

All we are involved in here is a simple Resolution to provide supplies to pay the wage increase. If Members on the other side want to **talk** about reign of terror, destruction of the morale of public servants and so on, I am ready to tangle. I am obliged to you, Sir.

The question that Head 13 do now standpart was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 – CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that sums in the amount appropriate to pay the wage increases to Members of the Cabinet Office do now stand part.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not moved by what language the Minister uses to say he wishes this Head to stand part. He is free to use whatever language. I want to raise a matter under the Electoral and Boundaries Commission Programme 02: Constitutional and Statutory Authorities Subprogram 01: Electoral and Boundaries Commission – \$31 980. I want to raise a matter, Sir, that is of grave concern to me and it seems to me that the only place I can raise it and get any satisfaction would be here in this committee. Sometime ago when there was an enumeration in Barbados, I wrote a letter to the Chief Electoral Officer about a person in my constituency who abuses or used to abuse me on sight and who subsequently attacked me physically. This is a female person – so the Prime Minister will be able to keep quiet, Sir – who was appointed an enumerator, She is a well known canvasser for the Barbados Labour Party. Sir, on

that occasion I allowed it to pass. But I noticed, Sir, from my information in my constituency that the same person has **been** appointed apparently an enumerator **again**. I feel that there is something infinitely unfair that an enumerator in the constituency should be a known canvasser for my various opponents over the years and there have been many and varied. She is appointed as an enumerator. I do not mind her making a few dollars. I am one of those persons who believe that all persons in my constituency should work. But I would prefer if the Prime Minister would find a little something for her at **Ilaro** Court or somewhere like that or wherever he can and not have her appointed as an electoral enumerator. It is frightening to my constituents. 6.25 p.m.

Aside,

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It does not cause me any stress, but I always speak for the constituents. **Anytime** you hear me expressing this kind of view it is on behalf of my constituents. I personally do not mind the lady, Sir, because I understand that she is slightly demented but she is an active canvasser. I feel that before someone is appointed an enumerator and I think the Honourable Member for the City will agree with me...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: **Are** you getting up to agree with me? All right. The Honourable Member for the City will agree with me that she is a known canvasser. I do not mind if she is a Labour Party supporter. As a matter of fact, Sir, half the Labour Party supporters in my constituency are my friends.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is not true. He is misleading the House. All my Cabinet colleagues are my friends and even Members of the present Cabinet are my friends. Well, the Prime Minister is in a good position to know who is a good friend and who is not. So I accept his word. I mean the Honourable Member for St. **Andrew** has a toss up as to who he is going to make his Personal Assistant. I do not think you are aware of that. As soon as he advertises the job, it is going to get some serious applications. So do not push the issue. But quite seriously, Sir, I do not believe that a person who is an active canvasser should be an enumerator. That is the point I am making.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I can share the view of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. I found it passing strange that the person who is appointed to be the Registration Officer in the City of

Bridgetown lives in St. John and rents to the Honourable Member for St. John constituency office space in his residence. Yes, that is a fact.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can elucidate that because I do not want the Honourable Member to put it as bold as that. I rent a flat in a building which is owned by that person. He lives upstairs. But St. John does not have commercial buildings. It was the only building available.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON. Well, you will **not** find many **BLPs** in St. John anyway. That is why you all cannot get a branch office up there nor branch **meetings**. But you should not penalize the person because he is an excellent public officer and he was assigned there since the **BLP was** in office. He was my Returning Officer in St. John, **That** needs to be clarified. I cannot allow the **Honourable Member** to tarnish the man in that way.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to me that this gentleman from St. John and **I have** nothing against him as a person from St. John, but he would not know San Domingo Alley in the **City of** Bridgetown. He would not know where to find **Cats Castle**. He would not know where Fitts Gap is. He **would** not know these **things**. The Honourable Member should **make** representation to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West **knows** that is what he should do. There is no point making representations in here. Make representations to the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: How could the Minister say **that** I should know when I started off by saying that I **wrote** a letter to the Electoral Office and got no satisfaction? The only ones who would understand my plight would be **the** people in here. Nobody else, not even the Electoral Office cares and the Honourable Members over there I **believe** should be brought up to date about something that happened as I was coming out of **church**.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If it were not for my constituents who had also gone to the same funeral, they **immediately** sprang to my defence and I of course was very afraid of her since she assaulted me. I recovered and I passed by the other side because I was so afraid. To hear that she is an enumerator, do you think that my constituents **feel** comfortable about that?

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, we are on the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. This is the end of February. At some point this year or sometime during the course of this year, there has been a dispute relative to the status of the persons employed at that Department. I believe that careful attention needs to be paid to the status of those persons employed as rent officers at the Electoral and Boundaries Commission.

The Electoral and Boundaries Commission functions under a hybrid clause which needs to be removed from the Constitution in which their actions cannot be questioned in a Court of Law. Therefore, the position which exists at the Boundaries Commission in the Public **Service** together with the actual terms and conditions need to be reviewed. But in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, review standards need to be established relative to these registering officers. Because the point which the Honourable Member for the City **raised** is applicable to the point which I understand is taken further concerning the proceedings of the Commission. I want to say something about the particular officer's conduct in leasing **premises** to a candidate - I am not any candidate. I am the **MP** for St. John and his leasing premises to me **cannot pose** any conflict of interest. What I am saying **is** that a **poll** need to be identified for these people and I will **give** you a particular example.

The **particular** individual is also very active in community work in **the** constituency which again has to bring him into **contact** with the sitting MP and sometimes people **interpret that** against the registering officer for the City. Let us **say**, far example, the Community Council where one would have to work with you as the MP. This has been **interpreted** in many **cases** as being a conflict of interest on **persons** who work on the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. I believe, Sir, in discussing the personal emoluments and the terms and conditions of those officers **as** to **exactly** what is their position in the Service together with a **code** for the work in which they do, other **kinds** of services which they provide should be addressed, and it needs **to be** addressed in particular because, as I have said, **the work** of the Electoral Boundaries Commission **and those** persons who are appointed to act on their behalf **cannot** be inquired into in a court of law. That is something I **believe** the Attorney General, when he is doing the **constitutional** review, needs to examine because I think it is not a desirable **ouster** clause. Which brings me to the second **point**, Mr. Chairman. I assume there is no provision in **here** for it, but a lot of song and dance was made about the establishment of a Constitution Review Commission.

6.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir. The rules of **the** House require us to be relevant. The Constitution Review Commission falls under the

Office of the Prime Minister. Supplementary provision was voted **under** the Office of the Prime Minister during the course of this financial year for the Constitution Review Commission, funds will be voted in the next financial year. That is Head 13, we are on Head 15, let us respect this House. We cannot now revert to Head 13, having approved it. What the Honourable Member is seeking to debate is entirely irrelevant in relation to Head **15**. It cannot arise under Head 15, having already been dealt with under Head 13.

Mr. Chairman, it falls under the **Prime** Minister's Office and supplementary funds were voted under that Head. I **am** begging the Honourable Member to let us proceed.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the Honourable Member is so testy about today, he does not seem to want the Leader of the Opposition to speak. At the same time he is declaring war against a person who he wants to remain defenceless and silent. What foolishness is going on in here today?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am asking you to rule.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under Head 15, **Program 02**: Constitutional and Statutory Authorities. The Honourable Member cannot tell me what I must say in this Chamber. He is not going to direct what I say inside here.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Head **15**, Constitutional and Statutory Authorities has to do with the Electoral and Boundaries Commission that is established and enshrined in the Constitution and that gives it its independence. That is the title that the Democratic Labour Party attached to the broad functioning of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the Constitution Review Commission. The Electoral and Boundaries Commission is enshrined in the Constitution of Barbados and therefore in the way in which the former administration has recast the title of Heads, that was one of the things it treated as under statutory authority. I want to repeat that **supplementary** funds for the Constitution Review Commission were voted under Head 13 and more funds will be voted under Head 13 in the next financial year for the Constitution Review Commission. We are now on Head 15 and I am asking you to rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to address the Head.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member cannot tell me what I must speak on in here, only you can do that. I was going on to make the point that under the Head – Constitutional and Statutory Authorities, the precise point which the Honourable Member has made, that there is an Electoral and Boundaries Commission established by the Constitution, which has and derives its power and its funding under this. I was going on to make the point that the Government has made a big song and dance about the Constitutional Commission and that in my view it would be a good idea if the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter would give consideration to bringing the operations of a Standing Constitutional Review Committee under the same kinds of **terms** which the Electoral and Boundaries Commission enjoys. That is **all** I was going to say. The Honourable Member does not want anybody to make any points inside here, and it is a point that should assist him, because I **am** saying that constitutional review is an exercise which we have to go through on an ongoing basis. Just as we have to have elections every five years, just as we have a Law Commission, I am saying that consideration could be given by Government instead of making a lump sum payment to members of a Commission, under the chairmanship of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, to the establishment of an impartial 12 months a year functioning Standing Constitutional Review Commission of Barbados. I was only suggesting that to him.

Mr. Chairman, the Right Honourable Member does not want anybody to discuss anything and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South called it prime ministerial arrogance. We had a whole day of this prime ministerial arrogance in here. Rudeness, testiness and offensiveness, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to withdraw the word "rudeness".

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: ... intemperate reaction to everything everybody says. Let us get to a sane moment in the debate, Mr. Chairman. I believe that it would be a more effective device...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I would have to appeal to the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. It is only when you talk you make sport, but when you listen you will make a sensible decision, it is when you talk that you turn around then and say you were making sport, so I only want you to listen for now, don't talk.

I think it would be a useful suggestion if the Constitutional Review Commission could be established as a Constitutional and Statutory Authority and funded out of the Cabinet Office vote and established similarly to how the Electoral and Boundaries Commission is established in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. **Chairman**, the notion of a **Standing** Commission on the Constitution would **seem** to imply that we have to have **people** involved on a **permanent** basis to continue to review the Constitution of Barbados and to change it. The idiocy in the suggestion is simply this, that the Constitution of Barbados will be subject to review periodically. We have had a Constitution in place now for 29 years and we are reviewing it now, I would imagine that the Constitution of Barbados will be subject to review in its generality perhaps once every generation, Specific parts of the Constitution may change from time to time, but the notion of having a permanent bureaucracy in place to review a constitution after you have had a thorough overhaul of it would seem to me to be something that is a **knee** jerk reaction, The fact that it is a knee jerk reaction is to be borne out in the fact that if you were to check the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto there is no policy position taken by the Democratic Labour Party in its Manifesto as far as I am aware, and I am speaking from memory, that there should be a permanent Commission established in Barbados to review the Constitution of this country. In addition, Sir, there is no provision in the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto that a permanent bureaucracy in this country should be established and set down in place for the purpose of continuously reviewing the Constitution.

You cannot just keep reviewing and changing the constitution of a country every day. Coming from a lawyer it would seem to me to be a completely vapid suggestion arising on the spur of the moment, that you can have a permanent bureaucracy in place just continuously to change the Constitution of a country. It is not something that is represented in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party and I am saying that in so far as the DLP Manifesto should be a representation of its policy, obviously what is being proposed to us is something for which there is no mandate. It is not something that is in our manifesto. Our manifesto commits us to establish a commission to review the Constitution of this country.
6.45 p.m.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ... I am well on the way to do that. I am going to make sure, Sir, that one of the 30 ought to extend to people in St. Michael West, the General of St. Michael West.

Sir, members come to this House and make statements off the **top** that has a superficial kind of **attractiveness**. Think about it, Sir, After we have established a commission now to review the Constitution, to overhaul it, why should we put in place a new, **permanent** bureaucracy to just keep changing and changing the Constitution of Barbados? As far **as** I know, Sir, there is no policy commitment on **any side** for it. I heard the member, but my initial reaction is that insofar **as** it is not a policy enunciated in our manifesto, insofar as it is not a policy enunciated in **the** DLP manifesto, I would have to treat it in the same capacity **as** the St. John Development Plan. It **has** the same status in my mind **as** the **fictional** St. John Development Plan, something drawn out of thin air, by the **member** for St. John and paraded for what it was worth,

Sir, why should we establish a permanent bureaucracy under the Cabinet Office for that purpose? From time to time, it will suit the **purposes** of this country as in other countries to establish commissions to review the Constitution and to change it. Another generation of Barbadians may want to review what their constitution includes, in much the same way that we feel that after 30 years we can now review what Enrol Barrow and the drafters of the initial constitution put in the Constitution. But why should we now have commissioners and a permanent staff and the same members who are going to propose it will then come to the House and lambaste the Government for increasing expenditure.

I really want to say, Sir, that the House has to be governed by Rules **and** the provision for the Commission for the Review of the Constitution is under Head 13. The House has already considered Head 13 and passed Head 13. I want to say as well that I have heard the member for St. Michael West and have taken note of the points he has made. No proposal has been submitted to me as Minister responsible for electoral matters pertaining to any changes in the present operation of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission. Periodically, as the Member for St. Michael South knows...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One second, please. I need to clear up something, please. I am being advised by the Honourable Member for St. Peter that the House should be governed by Rules. The relevant Standing Order found on page 84 of the Standing Orders, Item 66(7) says as follows:

"On the motion ... "That the sum of \$... for Head... stand part, the debate shall be confined to the policy of the service for which the money is to be provided and not deal with the details of expenditure, but

may refer to the details of revenue **or** funds for which that service is responsible."

The Chair will therefore use its judgment to make that determination and I will hope that members would allow the Chair to make that judgement,

Rt. Hon. O. S. **ARTHUR**: The Rules of the **House** also say, Sir, that the House cannot **reflect** on a previous **vote of** the House in the same session. The House has already voted on Head 13 and we **are** now reflecting on Head 13 and that is all I am seeking to bring to the attention of the House.

Mr, **CHAIRMAN**: The **Chair** wishes to advise the Honourable Member for St. Peter that the Chair was of the view that the point made by the Honourable Member for St. John was just a supporting point for the Head and not a substantive point. It may be incorrect but that is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. B. M. **TAITT**: The Honourable Member has given way, Sir. I want to draw to his attention that the Electoral and Boundaries Commission has in fact sent out advertisements for enumerators and alternates, and applications were made and, from what I understand, people have been appointed. If these matters may not have to be drawn to the Minister's attention because **as** he said it is an independent body but persons have been appointed and therefore there might not be anything he can do but I feel that I have to draw it to the attention of the public.

Rt. Hon. O. S. **ARTHUR**: Sir, all I have said today is **that** the Electoral and Boundaries Commission is an independent commission established under the Constitution of Barbados. I just want to reiterate that if they have proceeded in the manner that is being now brought to the attention of the House by the member for St. Michael West they would have done so by appointing people as a commission without reference to the Minister who has general responsibility for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission, subject to the independence of the Commission under the Constitution of Barbados.

Sir, all I can do is take note of the point that is being made by the Member for St. Michael West, but I recall in the last Sitting of Parliament, perhaps it was in 1990, the only time I remember a Minister responsible for the Electoral and Boundaries Commission bringing anything to Parliament is when the Electoral and Boundaries Commission makes representations to the Minister under

the Law as regards **any** changes in the boundaries and then the Minister brings it to the House for the approbation **a** the disapproval of the House; but the day-to-day running **of** the affairs of the Commission falls entirely within the province of the Commission **as** an independent commission,

Therefore Sir, I can tell the Member that I take note of his concerns but I cannot give assurances that would collide with the independence of the Commission **as** set out **under** the Constitution of Barbados,

Hon. D. A. C. **SIMMONS**: Mr. Chairman, it seems as though under this Resolution we are somehow in Estimates. I thought we were waiting until March 18, Since we are doing it like that, Sir, we **are** going to debate each Head, I just want to make one point on Cabinet Office **for** general public **information**. It really **distressed** me last night to hear on the call-in programme, the second or the third call, a man calling in to say **what** a **disgraceful** thing it was that the personal **assistants** were to be paid **\$58 000** a year, That went all around Barbados. The moderator didn't have the facts, didn't seek to correct the man, and only Friday evening in here we went through this and you would have thought that the Press of Barbados would have carried it and informed public opinion.

Aside,

Hon. D. A. C. **SIMMONS**: Let me finish, I am not giving way. I want to make one point and then I can go home. Two minutes.

All that we have done, Sir, as recently as Friday, was to approve that the personal assistants will **be** paid in the scale 23 - **\$37 073.68** per year. Could that give you **\$58 000** a year? I don't want any more confusion again and misleading of the public and lying.

6.55 p.m.

Mr. B. M. **TAITT**: Mr. Chairman, I only want to explain to the Honourable Member I did not raise this question when I spoke about the inaccuracy of the report from the House but if the Honourable Member peruses the newspaper that **carried** the debate on that issue he will see that it was categorically stated in the newspaper that they are getting over **\$50 000** which would be higher than the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister. That is what was carried. I came in here and raised the issue because every week there is something which you could bring back. It happens every week.

Mr. D. J. H. **THOMPSON**: Mr. Chairman, I am still on this Head. It surprises me that a very simple

suggestion which was being made by me could have attracted the criticism which the Honourable Member for St. Peter gave it. Here we have a government that employs a Social Justice Commission and pays over 10 people something like \$200 per meeting. They do not have any finite life on their work. They are just appointed to advise the Prime Minister up in the air. They have a list of terms and references. They are not meeting for a year. They have an infinite period in which to continue to meet and the Prime Minister can object to a suggestion that I made about the establishment of a Constitutional Commission.

There are countries which have established standing law commissions and there are some countries - the Honourable Member for St. Joseph is disputing it but I know he would not get on his feet and dispute it because I can give him the information. There are countries which have established standing commissions on the Constitution, commissions that meet because the concept is that there are issues which arise in relation to the operation even of amendments which are made by an *ad hoc* commission for which citizens must have the right from time to time to make representations. The Social Justice Commission was not appointed for a year. Mr. Chairman, nobody knows when their work will end. The Prime Minister does not worry about that. Provision is made, and I do not even know if the work has begun, but he is objecting to the establishment of an independent standing constitutional commission to examine issues.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I think it is necessary is because from Government to Government there are some very key issues that have been affecting the citizens of this country which have not been given the attention they require simply because Governments like this Government will say let us not deal with this issue. Let us refer it to a Constitutional Commission, and there are some very simple amendments.

Mr. Speaker, there is the amendment relative to Barbadian women and the rights of foreign husbands who cannot receive citizenship and you know every time that comes up an Attorney General tells you, "We are not dealing with that yet. That is going to a commission." That does not need to go to any commission. What I am saying is that if you had some kind of standing body which could examine those kinds of problems which affect the rights of citizens that consideration could be given to the amendment.

Now, the Honourable Member for St. Peter said the Democratic Labour Party never promised to set up any Constitutional Commission but that does not mean that we would not review the Constitution. Anybody would think

that the only way you can review the Constitution is if you set up a commission. What I was trying to say is that in view of the fact that this Government has said that it would set up a commission that maybe it could give consideration to the establishment of an independent standing constitutional committee. That is all I am suggesting.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Peter who is so loose to pay out money to people who have never reported yet to the public of Barbados ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hold a minute, please. The language is **unparliamentary**. Please withdraw the word "loose" please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I apologize. Whose loose financial management..

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have to withdraw the word "loose."

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON:... his untight financial management, Mr. Chairman, of his Ministry that he could pay people to sit down and advise him, not the people of Barbados, not this Parliament, a Social Justice Commission, and those commissions could draw money month after month from the Consolidated Fund and he has not told them that they must conclude their deliberations in two years, six weeks or eight months but he is against the establishment of a Constitutional Commission which citizens could report to and raise valid constitutional concerns as foolishness from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman at this point it does not make sense participating in debate. The Honourable Member is so caught up in attacks against me that he cannot even see the justice of undoing some of the folly which has been foisted on the people of Barbados by the kind of actions that have been taken by him in the most recent past. How could you justify the existence of a Social Justice Commission and yet tell people in here that the establishment of a Standing Constitutional Commission, unless you put a finite life on it, that you only need to review the Constitution as a one shot measure. That is not true.

Mr. Chairman, elections are held every five years and the Electoral and Boundaries Commission does not carry out an enumeration every two years. There is a whole host of other things which they have to do in the intervening period as an Electoral and Boundaries Commission. All I am suggesting is that a Standing Commission brought into existence under similar provisions to those which exist in the Constitution of Barbados with independent and

impartial people may be a useful way for the members to discharge the mandate which they have set out in their Manifesto. **Mr.** Chairman, if that is not being charitable at the extreme, I do not know what it is, but it has evoked the ire and consternation of the Honourable Member for St. Peter who obviously does not understand that simple point.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: **Mr.** Chairman, the Barbados **Labour** Party **took** positions in its Manifesto that it **needs** to carry into practice. I have taken the opportunity of quickly asking for the DLP Manifesto and the Constitution, and this matter was so important to the Democratic Labour Party during the course of the last election campaign that there is no reference whatsoever in their Manifesto to any matter pertaining to the review of the Constitution. But be that as it may, Sir, it is entirely within the realm and province of the DLP to suggest new policy and new initiatives in the same way as there was never any St. John Development Plan but one was created out of thin air.

I want to say, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party is under an obligation to **carry** out its Manifesto pledge as precisely stated in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. We have determined to establish a Constitutional Commission to review the Constitution, to make recommendations about exchange and once that Constitutional Review Committee's work is concluded that Committee will cease to exist in the same way that, contrary to what the DLP did, we established a Commission to advise on the question of gambling. Once that had made its recommendations it went out of existence. We do not have a policy mandate to establish a permanent bureaucracy to just review and keep on reviewing and changing the Constitution of Barbados.

Sir, since this matter will go abroad I just want to say we have already taken advice about the creation of a Constitutional Review Commission. I am speaking not with a view of being vexatious. The Government intends to establish a Constitutional Review Commission that will have a finite structure and will have a finite life. After it has reviewed the Constitution and it has made its recommendations about the proposed changes for the Constitution, that Constitutional Review Commission will go out of existence. But we do not propose to establish a permanent bureaucracy in this country to every year trifle with the Constitution and change here, there and everywhere. I do not know, Sir, of any country anywhere in the world, contrary to the impression that has been cast by the Member for St. John, that has a permanent Standing Committee on the Constitution that every year is trifling with the constitution of a country. A constitution, Sir, is a country's supreme law. It has to have certain features, Sir, and what is represented clearly in our Manifesto is the

policy that we propose to **carry** out. I am saying that funds have already **been** voted and additional funds will be voted to support a constitutional review commission that will exist for a period of time and thereafter cease to exist.
7.05 p.m.

It is the policy of this Barbados Labour Party that we will pursue the policy as outlined in our Manifesto rather than the policy that **has** now been invented by the Member for St. John without reference to his own party. I am sure, Sir, that no proposal for any permanent commission on the Constitution has ever been considered by a DLP Parliamentary Group or its General Council and it is not DLP policy and if it is not DLP policy I think it is quite unfortunate that it should now be here being impressed upon this Parliament. It is fiction arising out of the mind of the Member for St. John that has the same standing among all fictions as the St. John Development Plan.

Sir, the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto also speaks about a Social Justice Commission. We have committed ourselves in our Manifesto to creating that and we have created one. That Social Justice Commission has been participating with the office of the Prime Minister on matters that have to do with constitutional review. It was **the** Commission that advised the Prime Minister on the establishment of the Casino Gambling Commission. It is the Commission that has been advising the Prime Minister's Office on questions pertaining to National Heroes Day. And since, Sir, the question of the Social Justice Commission has been raised I just want to say that it is proposed that in April a National Forum will be convened by the Social Justice Commission and the Office of the Prime Minister to allow all entities in Barbados, who wish to make a contribution to the question of the definition of national heroes and the date for national heroes, to do so.

The social Justice Commission has sought to get the views of the Opposition parties on the question of national heroes. The Barbados Labour Party is committed, as a matter of Manifesto policy, to introducing the notion of national heroes to this country. I would like, Sir, to speak to page 18 of our Manifesto which has already been made a document of the House.

"We know that our country was built by persons whom we commonly refer to as our heroes. As a people, we need to know who these people are. When we set aside a single day to celebrate them we seek to inculcate in our young people respect for important values and for the achievements that have helped to shape the lives of us all.

We will establish a non-partisan committee to identify our national heroes and will set aside a day in

the annual calendar to be a public holiday in celebration of all our national heroes."

Sir, the functioning of the Social Justice Commission has been brought into this disapprobation by the strictures of the Member for St. John. They have been trying their best, Sir, to solicit non partisan views of a Manifesto position the Barbados Labour Party has said it will pursue in a non partisan way. It has asked the Democratic Labour Party for their views. The Democratic Labour Party sent someone who said that he was **speaking** in his own capacity and was not qualified to speak on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party. Therefore we feel that the same way that people who are non partisan can have a contribution on the question of national heroes day, also people who are partisan. There is nothing wrong with political parties and we have to stop treating ourselves as the pariahs of the society.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with a political party making an input into the national heroes day in the same way that you would expect teachers and all of the other interest groups in the society to do so but a political party invited to send a representative to make a representation on behalf of a party on national heroes day says they are sending somebody who is non partisan. That is the lack of direction that exemplifies the erratic leadership of the Democratic Labour Party that its representatives are now claiming that they are non partisan. When a Party's representatives are now claiming they are non partisan a party has lost its way.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not really wish to expose the incompetence of the Honourable Member for St. Peter and those who work in his office but I received a letter from the Social Justice Commission asking me to nominate a representative. Not the Democratic Labour Party. If the incompetence of the Prime Minister's office was not detected by the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to intervene. I therefore chose my representative and sent him to discuss his perspective. He is a Professor of History at the University of the West Indies and I sent him to put his perspectives and he did so. The Democratic Labour Party has not been asked to send anybody to any Social Justice Commission and if the Honourable Member for St. Peter would take the same care and precision in writing letters to me and having his officials write letters to me, under the laws of Barbados which would require me to do precisely what he wants and not what the letter says should happen, then he would not have had a problem, because had the letter been properly framed I would have taken it to the Party's Councils and nominated a party representative. The letter asked me to send my representative and I did.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Now, Sir, when the Member for St. John is written in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition and he believes that the letter is referred to him in his own personal capacity, Sir, then I must say that I truly cannot help him. I really feel that when a letter is referred to a person in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, Sir, it is not referred to him in his capacity as a person. I certainly, Sir, distinguish between myself as the Prime Minister of Barbados and myself as Owen Arthur. It is up to him, Sir, if he feels that he cannot make that distinction then I am really sorry for him because he is going to have problems that are more **fundamental** than responding to a simple courtesy from a group of persons who represent a broad range of experience in this country, he is going to have very significant problems.

The fact is, Sir, the letter was referred to him, not as David Thompson, but in his capacity as the Leader of the Opposition and it is up to him as to how he would treat letters written to him in that capacity. I just want to say, Sir, that if anybody writes to me in my capacity as Prime Minister of Barbados I will not give Owen Arthur's opinion.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He can send for the file. I am not even going to bother to correct him and tell him why he is misleading the House. But, Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Chairman of the Commission and I have corresponded at length on this issue. The Commission does not advise me. It does not advise the public. It is a partisan Commission to advise the Prime Minister of Barbados and it is a matter of discretion. The NDP says they do not want anything to do with any hand-picked commission that is advising the Prime Minister. I tried to cooperate and the Commissioners were on the radio attacking the Democratic Labour Party even before they wrote the report. Members of the Social Justice Committee were on the radio, one of whom is on every week, attacking the Democratic Labour Party before the Social Justice Committee had even come to a conclusion on the matter. If you put jokers in those positions and then expect me to accord them a level of respect which is going to transcend the level of respect they are showing me and showing the Democratic Labour Party as the party who brought the Constitution of Barbados to life in this country, then you will have to wield and come again.

7.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I am glad that the Honourable Member for St. John has brought this to my attention because I was not aware that Mr. Oliver Jackman, Mr. Woodie Blackman or Mr. Val McComie were now attacking the Democratic Labour Party. But I will investigate the matter and I will give the Member

the assurance that if persons of that quality who I truly believe have now reached the fullness of being above partisan politics...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Prime Minister must know that, if he is going to refer to a person who is a companion, he cannot just call him **Oliver Jackman**. He has to refer to him properly. The Prime Minister of all people should know that, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Those men I thought I could put on a Social Justice Commission because I thought they were above partisan issues. If these people have been lambasting the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, I would not be surprised but I would be disappointed in them because that is not the intention.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I just want to let the Honourable Member for St. Peter know that he has not yet called the name of the joker.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, you must forgive me if I have not referred to a Mr. **David** Thompson because he is not a member of the Commission. But I really want to say that, if he wants by reason of his qualifications to be a member of the Commission on those grounds, I will be glad to include him on the Commission. He will feel entirely at home.

Sir, the Member for the City wants to move a motion and I will give leave for that motion to be moved.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Sir, I beg to move that this House be suspended until **8:15 p.m.** this evening.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that this Honourable House be suspended until 8:15 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

7.20 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Heads 15, 16, 17, and 18 were called and passed.

Head 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

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

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

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

Head 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to move that Head 25 stand part.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: 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.

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

The question that Head 28 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.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: 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. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: 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 AND CULTURE

Hon. Miss R. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 34 stand part.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: 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 AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

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

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: 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.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: 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 AND SPORTS

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: 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. R. C. EASTMOND: 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. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 42 stand part, Sir.

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

The question that Head 43 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 50 – POST OFFICE

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that Head 50 stand part.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: 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. R. C. EASTMOND, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until March 12, 1996 at 11 o'clock in the morning. On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, the Government proposes to proceed with Item No. 1 on the Order Paper, the debate on the Amendment to the Income Tax Act. It is also proposed that on that date the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1996-97 will be laid. 8.25 p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and I should like to bring to the House's attention that there are a number of Private Members' motions that have already commenced and some that affect the Ministry of Finance that I should be anxious for debate either to proceed on or to commence upon. These matters apparently have to be subject to consultation between the various sections of the House. For my own part and my own preparation, since many of them border upon the administration of the affairs of the Ministry of Finance, I would be grateful if in the same way in which the House is being advised as to the matters that will engage the

attention of the House in its future sittings we could be advised when some of these Private Members' Resolutions could be brought, so that we could proceed expeditiously and harmoniously to have them discussed. I should certainly like some that have been started to be resumed, in which case I would like to make an input into them.

One in particular which has been brought by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has to do with the putting in place of mechanisms to ensure the integrity of the process of public accounting that I surely, desperately want to speak about, and there are others that have to do with land tax and others brought by the Leader of the Opposition that bear upon the management of the affairs of the Ministry of Finance which I feel should really be debated, and I would like to urge you to use your very good offices to make sure that those persons responsible for consultation in these matters give the House the benefit of a timetable so that I could be freely prepared to participate in all of those debates.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, March 12, 1996 at 11.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
8.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2521

Deferral of Minutes of the meeting of Friday,
February 23, 1996.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2521

Charter for Returning and Overseas Nationals.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2522

Resolution to congratulate the Government on
the creation of the Charter and the
establishment of the Facilitation Unit for
Returning Nationals.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2522

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 -
THE GRANT OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR
THE SERVICE OF BARBADOS 2522

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2522; Rt. Hon. L. E.
Sandiford, 2522, 2523; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur,
2522, 2523; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 2523;
Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2524; Dr. R. C.
Haynes, 2524.

ORDER NO. 5(c) - SUPPLEMENTARY
ESTIMATES 1995-96, NO. 13

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL 2525

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2525.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH -
S4 268 971 2528

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 2528, 2555; Rt.
Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2529, 2559, 2560; Hon.
Miss B. A. Miller, 2533; Dr. R. C. Haynes,
2535, 2541; Mr. L. A. Weekes, 2535, 2539;

Mr. B. M. Taitt, 2536, 2560; Rt. Hon. L. E.
Sandiford, 2538; Dr. R. L. **Cheltenham**, 2543;
Mr. J. O. Tudor, 2545; **Mr. L. R. Tull**, 2549;
Mr. D. St. E. **Kellman**, 2557; Mr. D. J. H.
Thompson, 2564.

ITEM 5(b) - SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES
1995-96, NO. 12 - \$7 469 733

HEAD 10 - GOVERNOR GENERAL 2564

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2564; Mr. B. **M. Taitt**,
2564.

HEAD 13 - PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE . 2564

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2564, 2568, 2570; Mr.
D. J. H. Thompson, 2564; **Mr. B. M. Taitt**,
2566; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 2570.

HEAD 15 - **CABINET** OFFICE 2571

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 2571, 2573, 2577; **Mr.**
B. M. Taitt, 2571; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson,
2572, 2575, 2578; Hon. D. **A. C. Simmons**,
2575.

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS 2579

Hon. Miss B. **A. Miller**, 2579.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT 2579

Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 2579.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME
AFFAIRS 2579

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2579.

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC
PROSECUTIONS 2579

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2579.

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2580.

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
YOUTH AFFAIRS AND **CULTURE** 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2580.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS, FOREIGN TRADE AND INTER-
NATIONAL BUSINESS 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2580.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH 2580

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, **2580**.

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SPORTS 2580

Hon. R. N. Greenidge, **2580**.

HEAD 40 - MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY, COMMERCE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, **2580**.

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORT AND HOUSING 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, **2580**.

HEAD 43 - MINISTRY OF TOURISM, INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT AND THE ENVIRONMENT, ... 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, **2580**,

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE 2580

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, **2580**.

SUSPENSIONS 2538,2579**ADJOURNMENT 2581**

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, **2581**; Rt. Hon. **O. S. Arthur**, **2581**.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, **Rt.** Hon. **O. S.** (St. Peter)
 CHELTENHAM, Dr. R. L. (St. Joseph)
 EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St. James North)
 HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
 KELLMAN, Mr. D. **St. E.** (**St. Lucy**)
 MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
 SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
 SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. **Thomas**)
 TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St. Michael West)
 THOMPSON, Mr. D. **J. H.** (**St. John**)
 THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (**St. James South**)
 TUDOR, Mr. **J. O.** (St. Michael East)
 TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South)
 WEEKES, Mr. L. A. (St. Michael North West)