THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1999 - 2004

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 08, 1998

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Tuesday, December 08, 1998. 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.

Hon. Sir Henry FORDE, K.A., Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

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

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, K.A., Q.C., LL.B.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. D. CARTER (Chairman of Committees)

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

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

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

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, J.P., B.A., Dip. Ed., B.Sc.

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)

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL, B.Sc. (Econ.) (Hons.), M.A. (Public Finance)

Prayers were led by Rev. Canon Ivan Harewood. Mr.

SPEAKER: This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Minutes of Tuesday, November 24, 1998 and Tuesday, December 01, 1998.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Minutes of the proceedings of the Honourable the House of Assembly for its meetings of Tuesday, 24th day of November, 1998 and Tuesday 1st day of December, 1998 which minutes have been circulated be taken as read.

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

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

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay:

1. The National Insurance and Social Security (Miscellaneous Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1998.

2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 19) Order, 1998.

3. The Value Added Tax (Refund) (No. 6) Order, 1998.

4. Insurance (Form and Fees) Regulations, 1998 (re-corrected copy).

5. The Annual Report of the National Insurance Board for the year 1997.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report of the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation for the year 1997.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the Penal System Reform Bill 1998 was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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 remainder of this day's Sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 9 - SECOND READING OF THE MONEY LAUNDERING (PREVENTION AND CONTROL) BELL, 1998

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Right Honourable Prime Minister has asked me to move the second reading of this Bill. It stands in his name and when enacted the responsibilities for the Bill will involve the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, when I first read criminal law in 1960/61, the leading text book at the time was Kenny's Outlines of Criminal Law. Cross also had an introductory book. The research work was Russell on Crime in two volumes and I revisited Kenny some months ago, Sir, just out of curiosity. Thirty-eight years ago when I first read criminal law, the vocabulary of money laundering was not known to text book writers, or indeed the law. There may have been in the eighteenth century types of crime similar to money laundering. But money laundering is an offence of the twentieth century and more particularly an offence of the last 10 to 15 years. It has never been known to the common law as money laundering, but it has become a new legal and indeed financial phenonenon but the law, Sir, being the dynamic social science that it is must adapt to the changing social and economic environment as important machinery in the process of social engineering.

Rules of law and their evolution must be seen therefore, Sir, not only as a logical and historical sequence, but also as a response for social and economic pressures. Since we first read Kenny and indeed the early Smith and Hogan and some of those well-known text books, Sir, new forms of crime have emerged and indeed all forms of crime have assumed new dimensions. And these new forms of crime are rooted in the proliferation of illicit narcotics, drugs and psychotrophic substances.

Similarly, as the evolution of crime continues and changes, organised crime was a phrase that was used almost exclusively in relation to Sicilian/American crime groups in North America. In the Caribbean we have not been accustomed to speaking about organised crime. But the march of time has enabled the development of criminal organisations to take root in the Caribbean and we are the recipients of the fall-out from the international traffic in illegal drugs.

We ought not to be surprise because across the world transnational organised crime is spreading and it now embraces all countries with all continents. It is a world problem and was so described by the UN at a Special Session on Drugs, June 8-10, this year, Sir.

Sir, illicit narcotic drugs are a world phenomenon as the U.N. documentation now calls them, then surely the response to a world phenomenon must be a global response relying heavily upon international corporations for any success to be achieved.

The Vienna Convention of 1988 properly known as the U.N. Convention against illicit narcotic drugs and phychotrophic substances was the global response 10 years ago to averting drug problems. All states which ratify that international treaty, committed themselves on a continuing basis to act on a variety of fronts to reduce the incidence of narco traffic incidences and money laundering. Barbados was one of those States. Barbados acceded to the Vienna Convention and in 1990 passed two pieces of legislation, very tough legislation, the Drug Abuse (Prevention and Control) Act, Cap. 131 and the Proceeds of Crime Act, Cap. 143. 11.30a.m.

The Proceeds of Crime Act in eight years, Sir, has proven to be deficient, having regard to the vagaries of

money laundering internationally and the Bill today, the Money Laundering (Prevention and Control) Bill is to supplement the Proceeds of Crime Act and ensure that Barbados has a statutory framework to combat money laundering that is contemporary and accords with international standards.

We are not repealing the whole of the Proceeds of Crime Act. There are certain provisions which are mentioned in the Schedule, sections 61-64, which are being repealed. Others are being left in, and the whole of the Act virtually remains apart from those that are being repealed.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot properly deal with money laundering on a second reading speech unless I deal with the macro-economic environment. One has to speak to the macro-economic impact of money laundering and the implications of money laundering for us in this region.

Let me begin first with the International Monetary Fund. The International Monetary Fund, Sir, estimates that the present scale of money laundering transactions is almost unbelievable. It is something like two to five per cent of global GDP. On that level, Sir, the potentiality for destabilisation of economies and the engendering disequilibrium in an economic system is obvious.

What happens is that clean and dirty money become intermixed, intermingled and some countries or regions may first appear to prosper, but in the end, there is the risk that only the corrupt financiers remain. Permanent damage can be done to markets and economies, not only to institutions. But the experiences of the Bank of Commerce and Credit International should be enough to warn us of the dangers of money laundering.

The Bank of Commerce and Credit International had a branch in Barbados and many people lost substantially. We tried to salvage some of the hard earned cash of customers of the Bank and a group of us who were engaged in that matter before the courts on behalf of the customers I think did very well for our times, but worldwide, the collapse of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International caused disequilibrium in many financial markets in the world. The Bank of Credit and Commerce International was supported, to a large extent, by dirty money laundered through the international banking systems.

The recent events in South East Asia, Sir, have given rise in some quarters to a concern that the impact of money laundering in South East Asia should not be discounted. It therefore behoves us, and I speak in a Caribbean sense, in this region where there are several jurisdictions which have developed offering offshore financial services to make sure that our legislative and regulatory regimes are of such a quality as to reduce the potentiality for money laundering in our societies and therefore the probability of financial instability over time.

The real difficulty with money laundering, Sir, is that tainted transaction must, in the final analysis, appear to be plausible and legitimate. Money laundering for those members who are not familiar with the ways of money laundering, is a three-stage process. The funds arise from crime and the first stagie is that they must be moved and dissociated from crime.

The second stage is that the trail of those funds must be disguised so that one never knows that the origin was criminal. In order to disguise the trail the funds then have to be available to the criminal in apparently clean transactions so that there are many apparently legitimate businesses which have sprung up throughout the world, and to all intents and purposes there is nothing that is immediately obvious about them that suggest that they are tainted, but the root of their existence was criminal.

The author, Geoffrey Robinson, Sir, who has written a little book called "The Laundry Men" explains that through the metaphor of the washing machine there are three stages in money laundering, what is called emersion, then layering and then spin drying. All of this is very big international financial business.

It is said, Sir, by "Time Magazine" that dirty money freely mingles with the lifeblood of the world economy like a virus in the blood stream and the types of persons engaged in money laundering are not your traditional obvious thugs but well-dressed, well-suited gentlemen in three pieces with attache cases.

George Schultz when he was the U.S. Secretary of State made the famous quote, Sir, that, today's criminals make the Capone crowd and the Mafia look like small time crooks.

Sir, I have said that the world community in June at the U.N. condemned every state which attended - I think they were 183 or 185 - condemned drugs and warned against money laundering. The U.N. resolved in this political declaration, I will make a copy available to the House, that by the year 2003 all countries of the world must enact contemporary anti-money laundering legislation. The Bill today is Barbados' response to that political declaration of the United Nations. 11.40a.m.

I want to read something from that. The political declaration and the action plan against money laundering of the U.N. spoke inter alia in the following terms. We, meaning the States of the world must:

"(1) Strongly condemn the laundering of money derived from illicit drug trafficking and other serious crimes, as well as the use of the financial systems of States for that purpose;

(2) Urge all States to implement the provisions against money laundering that are contained in the United Nations Convention against Illicit Trafficking in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 and the other relevant international instruments on money laundering, in accordance with the fundamental constitutional principles, by applying the following principles:

(a) Establishment of a legislative framework to criminalise the laundering of money derived from serious crimes in order to provide for the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of the crime of money laundering.

(b) Establishment of an effective financial and regulatory regime to deny criminals and their illicit funds access to national and international financial systems.

(c) Implementation of law enforcement measures to provide for effective detection, investigation, prosecution and conviction of criminals engaging in money-laundering activity."

It also spoke about customer identification and I will come to that in due course.

Those principles were adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in June this year. I want to focus on the establishment and effective financial and regulatory regime and the establishment of a legislative framework to criminalise the laundering of money derived from serious crime because that is really what this Bill is about.

We have had the Proceeds of Crime Act in Barbados since 1990. In addition to that, in 1995, this Government set up the National Anti-Money Laundering Commission which is a voluntary grouping of persons representing various interests who meet regularly to discuss approaches to money laundering, to discuss the adequacy of regulation in the banking system and so on, Sir. It comprises persons like the Solicitor General, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Commissioner of Police, the Comptroller of Customs, two representatives of the commercial banking community and a representative from the Central Bank of Barbados. That is voluntary and non-executive and it has no statutory basis. It has helped greatly, however, in the development of this legislation.

What we had after the Act of 1990 was five years later the National Anti-Money Laundering Bill provisions. More importantly, the Central Bank of Barbados issued anti-money laundering guidelines for licensed financial institutions to all of the financial institutions in Barbados. These anti-money laundering guidelines have been used as a model since 1996 in the OECS. I think we need to put these in the record. I am not going to give every single word but I will indicate the areas that these guidelines cover:

1. (a) financial institutions should develop programmes against money laundering. These should include as a minimum adequate internal policies, procedures and controls including the designation of compliance officers at management level and adequate screening procedures to ensure high standard not only when hiring employees but on an on-going basis.

   (b) an on-going employee training programme and audit function to test the above system.

2. financial institutions should not keep anonymous accounts or accounts in obviously fictitious names. They are required to identify on the basis on an official or other reliable identifying document and record the identity of their clients when establishing business relations or conducting transactions.

3. financial institutions should take reasonable measures to obtain information about the true identity of persons on whose behalf an account is opened or transaction is conducted.

4. financial institutions should maintain for a minimum of five years all necessary records on transactions both domestic and international to enable them to comply strictly with information requested from competent authorities.

5. financial institutions should keep records of customer identification or records of official identification documents like passports, I.D. card, driver licenses *etcetera.*

6. financial institutions should review and properly document the background and purpose of all complex, unusual qr large transactions and all unusual patterns of transactions.

7. If financial institutions suspect that any transaction by a customer may form part of a criminal activity or otherwise constitute a suspicious activity, they should report the suspicion to the law enforcement authority forthwith.

Those are the first seven. There are twelve guidelines that have been issued by the Central Bank of Barbados to all financial institutions in Barbados. Those guidelines arise out of something else. In 1989, the G7 countries established what is known as the Financial Action Task Force which is a group primarily of European countries but Japan is also on the Financial Action Task Force, to develop strategies and programmes to combat money laundering.

The Financial Action Task Force promulgated forty recommendations. There are known as the 40 recommendations of FATF. In 1992 at Kingston an affiliate of the Financial Action Task Force namely the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force was established with similar goals as the Financial Action Task Force but particularly to strategise and monitor the monetary transactions in the Caribbean to ensure a reduction in money laundering in this region.

Barbados is a member of the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force. It is headed by a council of Ministers and the council meets once a year. I was the last Chairman and my term finished last month in the Cayman Islands. The Secretariat is headquartered in Trinidad ... and four times a year typology exercises are done to sensitise people in the financial sector in the region about money laundering and what is the latest technique that is being used. For example, last year we looked at in Trinidad the use of cyberspace and cybertechnology for money laundering and gambling on the Internet. These were two of the things that were studied last year, Sir. 11.50a.m.

We have as organisations committed to dealing with money laundering, we have in the North, the Financial Action Task Force and their 40 recommendations and in the South the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force and the 19 recommendations that we developed in CFATF to add to the 40 FATF. So there are now 50 recommendations.

There has been a revision recently but that is not germane to this debate. Fundamentally there are 59 recommendations between the two organisations which aim to set up principles to prevent money laundering north and south.

Mr. Speaker, why it is important for Barbados to have this legislation is not only because of the international obligations imposed by accessing the Vienna Convention in 1988 but more especially at this time and I mean at the close of the 20th Century, great pressure is being exerted from the north on countries like Barbados which have offshore financial sectors.

For the U.N. meeting that I spoke of in June, Sir, the U.N. commissioned a study on bank secrecy, tax havens and offshore jurisdictions by a group of international academics and the thrust of that document is that there are a number of offshore financial sectors worldwide whose continued existence could imperil the international financial community.

On the 10th February this year, Sir, the Managing Director of the I.M.F., Mr. Camdessus went to the Financial Action Task Force meeting in Paris and among other things, Sir, he asked the question. He said, the question is whether the international community can continue to tolerate these weak links in its organisation. He was referring to countries .which have offshore sectors. Now, Sir, that is a very serious thing because countries like ours have a strong need to attract investment and resources from abroad in order to strengthen our economies and finance programmes for growth and development. The same I.M.F. would be the type of organisation that would encourage countries in this region to diversify our economies away from a monoculture and we have followed that advice as far back as 1979 and set up an offshore financial services sector which I believe at the recent global conference that they had here, it is said that it is estimated to contribute something like $350 million to the economy. There is no doubt that the offshore financial services sector is growing, is doing well and that Barbados has a high reputation for integrity in this area and we certainly would not wish that reputation to be sullied by a proliferation of money laundering scams.

U.N. documents continually say that in Barbados there is no evidence of money laundering. Now, Sir, that is not something that should cause us to become complacent or apathetic because it only takes the push of a button to transfer millions of dollars from a jurisdiction to Barbados. So we cannot be complacent even though we have a reputation for clean business and a reputation for integrity. We must always be on our guard, Sir, of the potentiality for abuse and it is therefore important that we do not only have guidelines issued by the Central Bank which have no statutory basis or a national anti-money laundering committee set up in my ministry which has no statutory basis. We have to move to the next step and ensure first of all that our laws are compliant with international obligations and are contemporary so that this Bill tries to bring up-to-date the legislation in the area of money laundering and the Bill incorporates the principles set out in the 59 recommendations that I spoke of that have been promulgated by the FATF and the CFATF, both this Bill and the Proceeds of Crime Bill.

Now this Bill is based on a model that has been developed by the Commonwealth Secretariat and sent to all Commonwealth countries., The Commonwealth Heads of Government, and subject to correction, I think the Commonwealth Finance Ministers mandated the Secretariat to develop model anti-money laundering legislation. That legislation was first shown to Commonwealth Law Ministers at our meeting in Malaysia in April 1996 and broadly it was accepted. It has been refined since and it has been circulated throughout the Commonwealth so what we have today represents, with the necessary adaptations to suit our own peculiar circumstances, a Bill that has found wide acceptance throughout the Commonwealth and now brings Barbados' legislation fully up to mark as it were in the world.

Mr. Speaker, that is the general background to the Bill. If I turn to the specifics of the Bill, Sir, you will see that whereas the Proceeds of Crime Act just speaks about three types of financial institutions, this Bill has a long list of financial institutions and that is to say you just cannot read it in its dry state. The Bill is meant to bring within its ambit all financial vehicles operating as financial institutions under domestic legislation or offshore legislation so that the provisions of this Bill will apply to any institution that takes deposits, credit unions, building societies, friendly societies, insurance companies, offshore banks, exempt insurance companies, international business companies, ... societies with restricted liability, foreign sales corporations, international trusts, and we anticipate in the legislation the coming into effect of the Mutual Funds legislation shortly. That was only held up because there was this conference here two to three weeks ago and the organisers asked us not to proceed with it because apparently the experts who were asked to study it were very satisfied with the quality of that legislation and they have made very little recommendations. 12.00 noon.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, they always put out something about me coming to the elections. The latest one they put out is that I was not running in St. Thomas, that it is Senator Forde who is running. I was endorsed a long time ago.

The first point I want to make, Sir, is that the Bill applies both to domestic financing institutions and those operating under the offshore legislation. We have a new definition of money laundering in that this legislation now applies to all serious crimes. That is a very important advancement. The Proceeds of Crime Act only apply to trusts. This money laundering Bill applies to all serious crimes so that if somebody robs a bank of $100 000 or a supermarket of $100 000 and took some of that money and bought land and bought a car and we can identify it, that car and that land which was bought out of the proceeds of the bank robbery or the supermarket robbery would be liable to freezing, seizure and confiscation under this legislation. It is not limited to drugs. It embraces all serious crimes including drugs.

The framework is that the Minister of Finance will appoint a body known as the anti-money laundering authority to supervise financial institutions. There is no limitation on the number of persons who can be appointed. It is up to the Minister but the Act mandates that as distinct from what is happening in another Caribbean jurisdiction now, the persons appointed to the Authority will be persons who have a strong knowledge in banking, financial and legal matters. So you have in your anti-money laundering authority persons of competence, experience, ability and expertise in these fields.

What the Government plans is, having established that non-executive, anti-money laundering authority, there will be an executive arm which will be engaged in day-to-day monitoring of financial transactions and that will be called the financial investigations unit. Realistically, Sir, we made no provisions for it in this year's estimates. I expect that it will be set up from the next financial year. In the meantime, we have offers from many countries to assist us in setting up the Financial Investigations Unit and, indeed, through the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force of which I was Chairman I made contact for that kind of technical assistance as soon as we are ready. I envisage, Sir, that you would have somebody like a very highly trained police officer, perhaps a lawyer, an accountant. These are the kinds of people who will work and, of course, the secretarial staff with computers and other aids, which I will not speak of publicly, in the Financial Investigations Unit to monitor these transactions.

The Authority will have very strong powers. The Money Laundering Authority will establish training schemes for financial institutions to compile statistics and records, conduct investigations into money laundering - not the Authority itself, but the people working on behalf of the Authority, the agents of the Authority will carry out investigations into money laundering, receive reports from financial institutions and if they have reason to believe that a business transaction involves the proceeds of crime then the Money Laundering Authority must report that to the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. Speaker, when I read the Central Bank's guidelines that have been issued it would have been fairly clear that one of the principles that the Central Bank sent out to financial institutions was that banks and financial institutions should operate on the basis of know your customers. If you know your customers, and you know who you are dealing with and the kinds of transactions you have been accustomed expecting from this person, fine. If you do not know your customers you are put on guard and you are required to ask questions. If it looks suspicious, then you must report suspicious transactions.

Clause 7 says:

> "A financial institution shall take reasonable measures to satisfy itself as to the true identity of any applicant seeking to enter into a business relationship with it, or to carry out a transaction or series of transactions with it by requiring the applicant to produce the applicant's identification record."

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I do not do business with CCB but if I went into CCB and tried to do business they do not know me. They are required to ask me to show some proof and where I got the money from and so on. 12.10p.m.

Sir, so the provisions for customer identity are set out in clause 7 and every financial institution is required now to establish and keep for five years records on all business transactions exceeding $ 10,000. Anytime you go into a bank, a credit union or where ever and you are going to deposit more than $10,000 the bank or organisation has to keep a record of that transaction for five years.

In the United States it is U$750. If you deposit more than $750 in America you have to fill out forms and establish where the money came from. We discussed this fully with the banking community and we agreed that US$5,000 or BDS$ 10,000 was the threshold that was convenient and they could live with. Anything less than that would be too burdensome and would result in too much paper work. So we settled for $10,000.

Jamaica, Dominica and Trinidad also have their limit at $10,000. But the point is that anything over $10,000 must be explained and the financial institution must keep the business record.

We provide internal reporting procedures, Sir, at clause 9,

> "Financial institutions shall establish and maintain internal reporting procedures to identify persons to enable persons to have reason of access to information."

We have also asked the financial institutions in the legislation to make sure that their employees are properly trained and understand about money laundering and the procedures and related policies that have been established.

Sir, Part 3 of the Bill deals with the freezing and forfeiture of assets in relation to money laundering. This procedure is activated by the Director of Public Prosecution. If he applies to the court in respect of a person charged with a money laundering offence, the court may grant an order freezing the property of that person.

So that if a person is charged with a money laundering offence and it is known that he has $200,000 in a bank account in Barbados which it is believed to be the proceeds of criminal activity, the Director of Public Prosecutions will apply to the court and ask that that bank account be frozen. The court will give various directions as to the duration of the freezing order, allowing some of the money to be paid out for the maintenance of the person and his family, or to pay debts that might have been incurred before the criminal activity and to pay the lawyer's fees and so on. The bank can freeze the surplus, but then allow a part of it to be used for some of those purposes that I mentioned, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: When a person is charged, that can happen. Their account can be frozen. It is up to the court. The court has the decision. We do not say, "the court must..." We say, "the court may ..."

But, when you have been convicted of a money laundering offence, then the court again, on the application of the DPP may forfeit, not freeze now - we have gone to the next stage - any property that was the subject of the frozen order.

So the first step, you freeze the money in the bank, except for that which the person has to use for necessary expenditures. You have the trial and the person is convicted. When he is convicted then the court forfeits the remainder. So that is the effect of section 14, Sir. Those are some of the main features of the Bill.

The financial institutions must comply with and if they do not comply, the law or directors of the money laundering authorities, they will be dealt with.

There is a definition of money laundering which speaks for itself, Sir, and it is that a person can be liable for $200,000 or imprisonment for five years or both if found guilty of money laundering by a magistrate. If found guilty of money laundering by a judge and jury, the fine can be up to $2 million or 25 years, or both for judge and jury trial.

Sir, those are the main features of the Bill. A small amendment in clause 23 to add the word "are" when we get to it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to outline for the benefit of Honourable Members the need for this legislation to ensure that Barbados' offshore financial sector is properly regulated in our own national self interest, but also to ensure that we keep compliant with our international obligations under the Vienna Convention of 1988, Sir.

This Bill has been the subject of wide consultation. All the banks, through their representatives on the national committee have studied it. They have made recommendations. We have accepted some of the recommendations. Others we did not feel we could accept for various reasons and as I say, the Bill is in harmony with the model draft prepared and circulated by the Commonwealth Secretariat.

I therefore beg to move that this Bill be read a second time. I have much pleasure in so moving the second reading, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have no problem in giving our support to this legislation. I think the Honourable Member for St. Thomas put it in context, except for one very important factor which is that we, as

small countries are extremely vulnerable to the movement of large sums of money, particularly foreign currency, whether it is from legitimate sources or illegitimate sources.

There are some countries in the world in which as a result of the introduction of more stringent measures on the face of it in relation to money laundering and so on* have suffered significant outflows of foreign currency. I am not saying this to suggest that this legislation is not desirable.

In fact, I am saying the opposite that in fact what we need in the world system is some control over international financiers who have the ability to move large sums of capital, whether illegally or otherwise obtained around the world. And therefore they have the ability to precipitate major economic crises in small countries.

The Malaysian Prime Minister, Mr. Mahatir is alleging that the problems that he faces and that are faced in South East Asia are as a result of a prevention by these international financiers. People like, George Soros and others who can sit in a room in New York or on the Concord or an office in London and who can so manipulate capital flows.

Worst than that is that the International Monetary Fund in 1999 has shifted its focus from supporting problems that may occur in individual countries as a result of balance of payment crises and so on precipitated by short-term changes in trade flow ... or as a result of the inability to earn foreign exchange or whatever to a new scenario where they are coming in to bail out situations where large private banking institutions in developing countries face problems in meeting their obligations, as happened in Brazil and so on. 12.20p.m.

There is really no entity which stands above these international financiers to monitor or control in any way the kind of things that they do. This concern goes outside of the parameters and the issue of money laundering per *se* because what we are interested in essentially is in the proceeds of crime and how the proceeds of crime find themselves mixed up with legitimate money or in some way can be isolated and dealt with so we have no problem in supporting the legislation.

We give the strongest possible support to it, particularly from the point of view that it may well have the impact of stemming international drug trading. Barbados should not be seen as one of those countries which either directly or indirectly facilitates the proceeds of crime and particularly the proceeds of the sale of illegal drugs so we will give our support to it.

I think what the Government needs to do first is to focus on the resources that it has available to actually deal with issues of money laundering. I hope that this piece of legislation would not require us to devote considerable resources, like many of the others that we have passed; Intellectual Property, even the Proceeds of Crime Bill and the other piece of legislation, I do not remember what it was called, to meet the international obligations which we as a country would be required to make in good faith.

I think the Government needs to outline in a very frank way what are the limits of the resources available to Government, the extent to which it sees this as a priority in relation to other calls on expenditure and whether it is realistic to assume that one is going to get the cooperation of local banking institutions and financial institutions because even before one passes money laundering legislation, you are always alarmed at some of the very simple ways in which fraud can take place in the banks in Barbados and how a web of corruption can be traced from the bank teller right up into the highest levels of management.

Many of these schemes are extremely simple schemes which may go undetected for a long period of time and which might involve significant sums of money, and even within the structure of the existing banks in Barbados sometimes it has taken a long time for them to detect these very simple schemes which may not involve money laundering *per se* but may be internal fraud within the bank itself or may be other kinds of corruption within the institution, as I say, which go undetected for a long time.

To what extent does the Government expect that it is going to receive the cooperation and what measures are the banks in Barbados going to be taking to involve themselves in this process? That is at the level of banks but then the Attorney General, to my mind, should also tell us a little bit about how in Barbados we are going to deal with other intermediaries, accountants, lawyers, stockbrokers even, real estate agents. How is it proposed that Government is going to be able to deal with the existing regulations which may permit attorneys-at-law and other professionals to avoid disclosure and to break a chain of information which could lead to the prosecution of a client or a third party who may in some way be involved in that intermediary in money laundering.

I think that needs to be dealt with because there are countries in the world which have sought in compliance with these international obligations to require amendments to the professional code of conduct of these professionals, like as I say, lawyers, accountants, real estate agents, stock brokers, fund managers and other kinds of intermediaries to ensure that they assist in the process of detecting money laundering.

I think that is going to be very important. I think that is something that it would be good to hear the Attorney General

respond to because when the other pieces of legislation came up, as he would remember as he was on this Side in those days, the Bar Association did make some submissions.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not saying you opposed it but I am saying, is there any proposal to find a way to incorporate or involve these professionals in this process of identifying or in divulging information which would assist in the identification of a scheme which may involve money laundering and the establishment of the identity of the persons who may be involved in the process. Are there any proposals to do that because this may be one of the weakest links in the chain.

There are some of these examples of money laundering which I recently came across and which, for example, one can see how impactful they could be if applied in a situation in Barbados assuming they are not presently being applied. In one case an individual involved in the trafficking of controlled drugs laundered the proceeds from the sales by depositing cash into numerous banks and building society accounts held in his own name. Additionally funds were deposited into accounts held by his wife. Funds were then transferred to Jamaica where the proceeds were used to purchase three properties, among other assets.

There is always the question in Barbados, and it may not be a legitimate question, and that is not something I can answer, about the purchases of significant properties on the west coast and what the origin of those purchases may very well be, and not only on the west coast. A lot of people come to Barbados, as I say, with a suitcase in their hand who may never have been here before who show interest in the purchase of the old plantation houses and curtilages and so on and are able to set up a web of transactions which may involve local attorneys and real estate agents and because of professional code of conduct or professional rules those persons are not required to disclose their source of those funds or assuming they know, or the identity of the persons involved in them.

There are a whole series. I think since the report I was reading has been published there has been a whole series of identifiable transactions which have taken place which have been documented and which should assist banking institutions and others in putting them on guard so that the true impact of money laundering can be determined and attempts can be made to stamp it out. 12.30p.m.

The third point that I want to make is one we have made constantly to the Attorney General and it still remains a concern of mine. That is the role of the magistracy. Under the present terms and conditions and methods of appointments of magistrates they do not enjoy judicial independence. Therefore, to give them jurisdiction in relation to a matter like money laundering ...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: We have identified many other areas, the almost unlimited jurisdiction in relation to drug cases and so on without commensurate independence akin to that enjoyed by judges open the loophole for influence to be brought to bear on those judicial officers. I am not saying that that has happened in Barbados but it has happened in Trinidad. The Attorney General can tell you that it has happened in Guyana. I think there is a magistrate presently on trial in one of those territories in respect of...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: It was in Jamaica. You are going to give magistrates additional responsibilities and additional jurisdiction which in many cases now would cover most of the kinds of cases which would come before the court. I am not opposed to that because I think that in summary jurisdiction the process is much quicker and you can dispose of the matter much easier but if we are going in that direction then let us have a review of the terms and conditions of appointment of magistrates, their independence as judicial officers and let us do that as soon as possible.

I think we have called for it before and it has been one of the areas of major concern every time legislation has come to this Chamber in which magistrates are going to play a key role. In this legislation as far as I recall the magistrates enjoy pretty significant jurisdiction, which. to my mind, in Barbados, if one were even to take a look at normal foreign exchange transactions which take place in Barbados on a daily basis, this to my mind would cover most of the kinds of transactions which would come to light in relation to money laundering.

I appeal again and I think it is a matter to which we need to agree on both Sides that in the process of the Constitution Review Commission work, that in the process of looking at more speedy ways to deal with matters such as this, that magistrates be given a level of judicial independence by virtue of their appointment and so on which would make both prosecutors, persons who have to come before the court to give evidence and those charged with offences the same kind of confidence that they would enjoy in relation to judges of the High Court. I think that is something that we need to deal with as soon as possible.

I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Thomas that this is an important piece of legislation in relation to the offshore sector and I caution practitioners that it is very easy for your firm...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Andrew who will shortly be back in private practice, win, lose or draw, would like to know this. I have had an experience like this where a man was arrested in an airport on the west coast of the United States in possession of some documents which were called, I think, the State of Vietnam bearer bond, of billions of dollars and on the face of the document was the name of a local firm, which of course had nothing to do with it. There have been many examples of situations like that where you have a good clean jurisdiction being drawn into a transaction and where the use of that jurisdiction because of its high reputation facilitates and lends some weight to the transaction.

We have seen what happened in Nigeria with all of those scams and all of the people who have been affected by that. Countries like Vietnam now are being used for the same reason with all of these state international bearer bonds. Men are walking around with brief cases holding themselves out and forming IBCs in otherwise clean jurisdiction and using these companies and the links those companies have with professional firms to add some weight to the transactions; otherwise unlawful transactions that they might be involved in.

In a country like Barbados, not just the offshore sector but because we have a tourism sector and because there is a lot of exchange of foreign currency, this is one of the key areas in which money is laundered, through a series of transactions using CAMBIOS or various kinds of exchange bureaus to launder money. It is not just the offshore sector. We often stress the offshore sector but we also have to understand that what we are also involved in, is the tourism sector and the services sector as a whole, in which one hopes that Barbadians are going to be going out into other parts of the world and that we are truly in the age of globalisation, and that we are going to be involved in international transaction, some of which may be very small but some of which have the potential to be very large.

Because of that, the exchange of foreign currency provides one of the easiest loopholes for a series of transactions which may involve money laundering. I was amazed the other day to be watching this Channel Mundo in which they bring the ABC New Night Line or whatever they call it on mornings ...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I was at home. Very much so. I was not overseas and what they were carrying was a report that most US currency has traces of cocaine on it. They did a test, they got a whole set of currency from various places and scraped it and did these test and almost every bill that was produced in that test had traces of cocaine on it. Which tells you again that drug dealers have to find a way of getting that cash into the formal banking system and that almost every US dollar that we touch has passed through the hand of a person involved in a street transaction with illegal drugs.

We have to understand the nature of that. That was just one very powerful message sent to me because I had not thought about that before, that in a transaction that I may be involved in while travelling with US currency that I am in possession of a Bill which would have at some point passed through the hands of a drug dealer. It shows how close we all are to the impact of illegal drugs, how close we all are to money laundering and to transactions which relate very much to money laundering schemes.

Another area in which, again, it is important to understand that money laundering plays a key role other than tourism and the offshore sector is the purchase of property. One of the most effective ways and I give the example of the Jamaican scenario, but that was in which they were depositing money into the formal system and then buying properties but there have been several examples of the establishment of bogus property owning companies which have been involved in the process of money laundering. 12.40p.m.

One example here, as the result of the arrest of a large number of persons in connection with the importation of cannabis from West Africa, a financial investigation revealed that part of the proceeds had been laundered through a bogus property company which had been set up by them in the United Kingdom. In order to facilitate the laundering process the traffickers employed a solicitor who set up a client account and deposited £500 000 received from them and then later transferred these funds into his firm's bank account and then subsequently, acting on instructions, he withdrew the funds from an account and used them to purchase a number of properties on behalf of the defendant.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am reading from the Joint Money Laundering Steering Group Report which was endorsed by Crown Agents who have had a very key role in money laundering and these were guidance notes for mainstream banking, lending and deposit taking activities. They have already put out a manual in the United Kingdom for everybody who is involved in banking, from the teller right up to the bank manager, telling each of them what their individual responsibility is.

In Barbados, if you deposit $10 001 in cash they give you a sheet of paper and you sign your name to it and you do not even know what happens to it. I do not remember why it was I had that sum of money. Sometimes you know, older people when they are buying land may go and get it.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No. I have never done a cocaine case. I used to do a few of those small cases, as you would know, but I have never done a major drug case and as a matter of policy I just avoided them. But carrying $12 000 into the bank one day with a client who was buying land or something in cash, they required you to sign a small sheet of paper and nobody knows what happened to that paper after you signed it. The teller did not know.

In Barbados we have a habit of putting systems in place without telling people what the system is all about. So you tell a teller if somebody brings in more than $10 000 they have to sign this form. But nobody knows why this is being done, what process they are involved in and to my mind it takes a high level of training at all levels in the system and management to deal with issues such as money laundering because there is no set format for money laundering. It is a matter of psychology, of reading the person, of looking at the series of transactions involved, looking at how many bank accounts they have, how many transfers they may be doing from bank account to bank account. This in itself is not just a job for the police. It is a job for people working in everyday banking transactions and as I say if a teller in Barbados can gouge out of people's accounts thousands of dollars for two or three years before being detected, as has happened, you can imagine that big money laundering cases in Barbados, involving large sums of money could be occurring without any detection or anybody' s knowledge that they are supposed to monitor these kinds of transactions.

There has been a lot of bank complicity in money laundering throughout the world. Bank Managers who themselves know about these transactions and who have been very much involved, BCCI was a good case even though there are those who view the collapse of BCCI as an international conspiracy against an emerging third world bank, but beyond that there is no doubt about it that much of what BCCI had holding in deposits came from illegal activities and particularly illegal arms trading, drug trading in South East Asia, heroin and other related illegal activities. So we need to be aware in Barbados that the potential exists on the format of these smaller transactions for money laundering to be taking place on a daily basis without us even knowing much about it.

I think that as with the Copyright legislation, as with other legislation which we have enforced into obligations arising out of international conventions that we must not continue to find ourselves in a position where we are doing more on a ratio of our population to resources spent than countries like the United States of America, than places like London which has always been an offshore financial centre but pretends that it is not, like other parts of the world in which it is clear that money laundering is taking place. This is one of the things that concern me that we go out there and commit ourselves to these conventions and we know that we have to do it because if we want to have an offshore sector which is not tainted that for the purposes even of appearances only there are some obligations that you have accede to and I accept that.

We also vote more resources *per capita,* enforced by some of these obligations under international conventions, than countries which have more resources and more clout in the world community than Barbados and we have to make sure that whenever we appear in these international fora, and I urge the Honourable Member for the City when she is using her international voice and accents that she appeals to the larger countries in the world to devote an adequate proportion of their resources to the implementation of guidelines which they are forcing on other developing countries. One has to understand that it is part of the world, I do not want to call it a conspiracy because it is right before us. If it was a conspiracy we would not know about it. The thing is before us. We know what is happening in the world and therefore because we know that a lot of what we have to do is only for the purposes of being able to have a foot in the door in some of the larger arrangements which would otherwise be signed, sealed and delivered without us being even present it means that we have to demand that other countries in the world and particularly those which are most vociferous in dealing with issues like money laundering and illegal drugs and so on are rendering the kind of assistance that is necessary.

Beyond that I have noticed that some countries in the Caribbean have returned to the practice and it is a very desirable practice of tying their accession to international obligations like this to more favourable terms of trade. For example, I have seen that the Prime Minister of St. Lucia as Chairman of C ARICOM has pointed out that the relationship of St. Lucia to the United States through the Shiprider agreement is to some extent contingent on the attitude the United States has to the issue of bananas and preferential treatment for bananas by European countries. 12.50p.m.

We must not be afraid as small countries to continue that approach because, in fact, it is one of the only points of leverage that we enjoy. You want us to do these things, we believe morally that these things are right but we also believe that there are some other obligations that you have to us to ensure our survival. It is pointless making us accede to obligations under international conventions if at the same time somebody is taking bread and food from the mouths of our citizens or is acting economically against our better interest.

Therefore it is very important for solidarity to exist within the Caribbean region and for small countries in the

Caribbean region to stand together in extracting from the world community, and particularly those countries which are pushing for legislation like this to be in place in our territory, to have more favourable terms of trade and certainly for a more sympathetic ear on issues which relate to the economies of small countries like ours.

I think, Sir, that I have dealt with the key issues. Let me reiterate them very quickly so that hopefully the Attorney General could respond to them. The first point relates to the role of the international financiers and whether the Government in its discussion at meetings in which these conventions are thrashed have been considering the extent to which you need an institution which is going to exert some control over the ability of these current speculators and international financiers to move large sums of capital from one region of the world to another simply by pressing a button. What is being done about that? The more barriers we remove in Barbados in relation to exchange control and the more barriers to trade that we remove the more vulnerable we become to the movement of capital out of Barbados.

There are several international conventions in the area of trade and services and so on which almost all of the guarantees that are being given are guarantees in favour of investors and none in favour of the protection of small states. In other words, we are now under the provisions of the recent article of the IMF we acceded, under WIPO requirements and under other legislation.

We are essentially agreeing to a situation where people who invest in Barbados in foreign exchange should have no impediment put in their way of removing that investment whenever they want to do so. In fact, one of the most potentially damaging development in the world was that multilateral agreement on investment which would have seen private sector investors having the right to sue governments if governments took any step which compromised their investment.

For example, where Government introduced an oil embargo against another country which causes the private sector company, the owner of the oil company or whatever, a loss, they could sue the government to recover compensation for loss as a result of a policy decision which that government took. That was brought to an end in the negotiations on that a couple of months ago but that was viewed as the companion treaty or agreement to the WIPO. Now we have to be careful about this because we are allowing ourselves at the international level to become more and more vulnerable while at the same time we are accepting international obligations which though morally correct carry with them *no quid pro quo* to ensure our survival as small states. This is the first point.

The second point I want to make is the second basis on which we support, it is because we believe firmly that the impact of illegal drugs in Barbados *has* been extremely severe and we need to deal with it in every way possible.

The third point is that resources made available for detection of money laundering both in terms of manpower at the level of Government and training of persons in the private sector, how you are going to get the banks to comply and so on.

The fourth point relates to the role of magistrates and the fact that they do not right now enjoy the kind of constitutional independence that judges enjoy meanwhile we are extending their jurisdiction.

The fifth point relates to the fact that money laundering is not just relevant to the offshore sector but is more relevant to our largest industry which is the tourism sector and it is very relevant to the area of purchasing real estate through the use of laundered funds. I think those are the key areas.

The last point relates to what steps is the Government going to take to ensure that you can require professionals normally protected by a code of conduct or a code of professional conduct which would stop them from disclosing the names of their clients or the identity of their clients or the source of funds, how you are going to get those professionals to comply with money laundering legislation to the extent that they are required to provide information if they have it which would assist in the detection of money laundering.

On those bases we give our support to this legislation.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 2.00 o'clock in the afternoon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 1.00p.m.

RESUMPTION

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to wind up the second reading of this Bill. I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for the support which he gave the Government on this Bill and for the comments that he made and some of the insights that were shared with the House. He asked me to respond to a few points that he made and I will do that briefly and seriatim.

The first one is the question of the terms and conditions of magistrates. All of us have made the call over the years, certainly the last ten years, perhaps even before for the terms and conditions of magistrates to be revisited with a view of not only improving those terms and conditions, but contributing to the independence of the judiciary as a fundamental principle and bulwark of a democratic system..

The Barbados Labour Party in its Manifesto of 1994 said that,

> "We will review the conditions of appointment of judges and magistrates to ensure impartiality in appointment and the greater independence of the judiciary";

That appears at page 36.

Now, there has been some movement on this matter since 1994.1 met with the Magistrates twice last year, Sir, and my Ministry made representation to the Ministry of the Civil Service for improved terms and conditions for the Magistrates. The matter has been delayed. I know that there is willingness on the part of the Government to improve those terms and conditions. I am not talking about physical conditions of the court rooms and so on, but their emoluments and allowances.

But, there are two difficulties which will need time to resolve and those difficulties are, first of all that the Constitution Review Commission has been meeting and has had representation certainly from the Barbados Labour Party. I do not know if the Democratic Labour Party made representation to the Constitution Review Commission, but the Barbados Labour Party has drawn to the Constitution Review Commission's attention in a paper which we submitted last year that the terms and conditions should be improved and we went further.

We would like to see an independent commission to settle the terms and conditions of the Judiciary and take that matter out of the political process and out of the Civil Service streams. So that we cannot really do much at this stage It would be wrong in fact to try to deal with this matter before the Constitution Review Commission has reported, because it will probably mean, if they accede to our recommendations, as the Barbados Labour Party, not the Government, it will probably mean that they have to be constitutional amendments similar to the constitution provision that now gives security to the Judges. For example, prevents the alternations for the terms and conditions of the Judges. See what the Constitutional Review Commission report.

Secondly, of course there is a protocol in place and I do not believe that the social partners would wish us to pull out one section of the service for special treatment and to the detriment of dealing with the service as a whole.

The same considerations indeed affect the Police. We have made recommendations for improved terms and conditions for members of the Force, particularly in terms of upgrading the salaries and allowances of police officers and I know that the Government is favourably disposed to that.

I believe on Sunday the Right Honourable Prime Minister himself adverted to it, Sir, and we would like to see better allowances, perhaps a flat allowance rather than the piece meal allowances that they get, as a kind of duty allowance, plus a better basic pay. But again, I think it would be preferable to do a regrading and a reclassification of the Police at the same time as there is a general regrading and reclassification for the Public Service as a whole. But these matters are being actively dealt with.

The only thing that we were able to do for the Magistrates is to give the right to charge fees for performing marriages, that was recently agreed and the legislation is ready, because, Magistrates are called upon to perform marriages at all kinds of places. For example on boats out in the sea, on beaches, private residences, in their own chamber and wherever, Sir.

Now, other people who are marriage officers have been charging people and it is discriminatory to deny magistrates the right to charge these, so we have agreed that the rates have been published in the Statutory Instruments. And that is a small improvement, but the general terms and conditions, Sir, as I say we have to await agreement by the Social Partners and the recommendations of the Constitution Review Commission.

The Leader of the Opposition quite rightly pointed out, Sir, that among the very, very many hippologies of money laundering, perhaps the most usual has been the use of proceeds of crime for the purpose of real property. The one hard case that I have come across in Barbados related to a company. I forget the n#me of it. It was a New York company that was set up by the tarots in Barbados in 1987. One of our late departed brethren was one of the lawyers who dealt with this. That company bought two properties here on the West Coast. Land in Maxwell and a property at Coverley. Two years ago the Italian Government requested my assistance as the central authority under the True Legal Assistance Act in trying to find out if these people had any property in Barbados. And when we did the search, we found those properties that I identified and the principals of the company were wanted back in Italy for high crimes. It is generally believed that they were involved in money laundering and bought these properties in Barbados in 1987.

I have not heard what has been the conclusion of the case, but we sent all the information, copies of the title deeds that we were able to get from the Registry. That is one, Sir, but of course it manifests itself in several other forms.

Mr. Speaker, in the Bill we have not dealt specifically with professions holding money on behalf of clients. The legislation introduced by the past administration was in 1990. I think it would catch professions who, knowingly assist in the laundering of money, but not withstanding that, I think once we set up the Financial Investigations unit which would be a full time group of persons doing financial investigations, if they are in receipt of information - let us say that a particular attorney has been placing large sums of money at different banks, the banking institution in the first place would.have a responsibility under the Act to report.

If he reports to the anti money laundering authority, they can then give the investigators the authority to pursue that. And in the usual way you might come across a bank account for which there can be no proper explanation and then the onus would shift to the lawyer to explain the source of funds. Or you may get information through international contacts. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition would know what I am talking about, I mean in law enforcement, I would not disclose it, which may point you in the direction as Trinidad has got assistance with some of their money laundering. I think they have recovered or have proceedings in place to recover about $20 million that have been laundered through various professions.

When you get information then the investigations unit will pursue that in the normal way. If they have to come against your account that will be the usual practice. 2.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, before I finish, I am very glad that the Leader of the Opposition has recognised that the developed countries put a lot of pressure on small countries to put all these structures in place, legislative or regulatory, counter drugs, counter money laundering and so on while, at the same time, money laundering is big in Miami, New York, London and major capitals of the developed world.

We do not introduce the legislation as a response to any pressure but rather in recognition of our obligations under, for example, the Vienna Convention of 1988. At the same time, Sir, we have been very careful to negotiate, particularly in the UNDCP Plan of Action of 1996 and the Clinton Plan of Action last year for reciprocity - the Honourable Member spoke of a *quid pro quo* - precisely, for reciprocity on the part of developed countries to assist those of us who may need financial assistance and some of the smaller territories of the region, those of us who need technical assistance and, for example, Barbados can do with technical assistance to establish the financial investigations, and that is being offered from different quarters.

We have also insisted that our people be trained, not through attendance at the CFATF regional meetings four times a year. That training is exposed to a limited number of persons from my Ministry, the Central Bank and the Police Department. We have got them to agree, for example, to set up a school of continuing legal education at the University of the West Indies, specifically over a period of time, to train our people in the ways of money laundering. We have worked on it during my last year as Chairman of CFATF and the project should start with the cooperation of the UWI in the year 1999.

In addition to that, I have made representation for UNDCP, as distinct from CFATF, to be involved with the UWI in the second phase of training for persons in law enforcement. Two weeks ago we sent four magistrates to Jamaica for a training course of a week under that project. In August we had a conference here specifically to train 54 Caribbean judges in money laundering, the Judicial Symposium at the Sherbourne Centre, August 4.

What we are doing systematically is to ensure that the junior judiciary and the senior judiciary are trained in this new developing area of criminal law which none of us was trained in or knew anything about when we were students. It just was not part of the vocabulary with the criminal law at the time, so we are getting some assistance.

I am pleased to inform the House that our Judiciary is being trained on a regular basis and exposed or sensitised to these phenomena as well as persons who are directly involved in law enforcement. Policemen go on seminars and courses four and five times a year to different parts of the world, and more and more these seminars and symposia are going to come particularly to Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I beg to move that this Bill be now read the second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, seconded by Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, the House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable House is now in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Part I, Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

Part 77, Clauses 5-72 were called and passed.

Part HI Clauses 13 and 14, were called.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from the Attorney General, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, what happens in a situation, because we are now passing this Bill, where we come across cases where people are, as we might say, guilty of money laundering prior to this Bill. What will happen in situations like that?

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it will be dealt with under the Proceeds of Crime Act.

The question that Part HI stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part IV, Clauses 15-25 were called.
2.30 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, in moving that Part IV stand part, I wish to draw to the attention of the House, Clause 23. The letter *r* is missing from the word Minister in Clause 23 of page 19 of the Bill. I beg to move that the 'r' be added to the word Minister to make it complete in Line 1 of Clause 23.

Part IV was passed.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move that the Schedule becomes The Schedule to the Bill.

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

On the motion of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the SPEAKER, the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Money Laundering Prevention and Control Act, 1998.

ORDER NO. 12 - TO MOVE THAT THE HOUSE RESOLVE ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY TO CONSIDER THE GRANT OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE SERVICE OF BARBADOS

On the motion of Hon. Miss B.A. MILLER the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

ORDER NO. 12 (a) - RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF $45,845,250 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AS SET OUT IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1998 - 1999, NO. 4

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe that as a result of an amendment that has been circulated before the Honourable House that the supplementary is in the amount of $47,140,605. I wish in presenting this supplementary to set it in the context of the most recently available fiscal accounts and to speak briefly, Mr. Chairman, on where this supplementary will leave us in relation to the meeting of the fiscal target. We are asking the House to approve what is in essence a very large supplementary in circumstances where the Government has indicated a determination to cap its capital programme at $280 million for this fiscal year. The cap that we propose to put on our capital expenditure will not be changed and you will be aware, Mr. Chairman, that a number of decisions have already been taken to slow the rate of acceleration of Government's capital expenditure. A number of projects have in fact been deferred until the next fiscal year.

When last I spoke, Mr. Chairman, it was in the context of the presentation of the Budgetary Proposals at the end September and I spoke then of a fiscal situation that was tightening in so far that revenue up to the end of September was 9.7% more than revenue for the same period of the previous fiscal year. After the end of September expenditure was less than the target but higher than the year before and that the overall fiscal deficit up to the end of September was $17 million more than for the corresponding period in the previous year.

Sir, as you know, in every very robust economy there is both an upside and a downside to economic event. The downside of a very robust economy such as we are having, of course, has been a tremendous growth in demand for imports with some dip in foreign reserves. I must stress to the House and to the country that the reserves of Barbados are still very healthy, I think it is about $550 million as we go into the high season for reserves. The upside to it, of course, is that the growth in imports, as a result in the tremendous surge in Government's activities has also lead to a strong growth in revenue. That Government's financial position has somewhat improved over the course of the last two months.

The numbers for October and November, provisional numbers, Sir, would suggest that Government's revenue

was about $59 million more than the corresponding period. In October and November, the Government revenue was about $59 million more than for the previous two months last month. That for the same period, Sir,-and this is important, that our total expenditure in October and November was about $13.7 million more than for the corresponding period and that indeed the revenue for October and November was almost enough to cover both current and capital expenditures, a deficit of only $16.6 million for the period as compared to a deficit of $45.6 million for the two months in the previous year.

I stress that point because the intention to control expenditure is still uppermost in the minds of this Administration. We have really kept expenditure in check. Expenditure for the period between October and November of this year was $5.4 million. It was $263.8 million, both current and capital and when you take into account that that would include the bringing to account of wage increases, there has been a very firm hold kept on public expenditures.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The revenue is reflecting as I have said, a buoyant economy and we are paying a price for it in terms of the reserves. You have both the upside and the downside of excessive growth and that is why we have to bring the economy, Mr. Chairman, back into a more sustainable path of growth.

The implication, Mr. Chairman, is that the capping of capital expenditure at $280 million together with the bringing to account of these supplementaries, given the trend in revenue would still allow us, in fact, to have an overall fiscal deficit for this fiscal year that would be even within the limit of the 1.5% of GDP that we had set ourselves.

Sir, these supplementaries before the House are not in fact, Mr. Chairman, to start any major new projects. There are for us to bring to account a number of obligations that the Government have had to contract itself to, since the Estimates were presented to Parliament in March of this year. I hope that we have the opportunity to go through the Estimates as systematically and as rigorously as we should. I want to reiterate, Sir, that the cap on capital expenditure will be enforced because despite a healthy fiscal situation, Mr. Chairman, our determination to cap public investment spending has to do with the fact that it is our judgement that the economy would over extend itself in terms of its domestic absorptive capacity and that you would have strong cost push inflation if we were now to add a lot of new capital projects to the existing already strained reserves situation in the country. 2.40 p.m.

These supplementaries are also, Mr. Speaker, being presented within a framework where we are effecting savings of expenditure in many Ministries in relation to the amounts approved by Parliament in March of this year. So that in many instances, Sir, Ministries have all been able to demonstrate that the amounts being sought can now be brought to account in place of, rather than in addition to, but in place of expenditures that the House would have approved in the course of its deliberations in March.

Mr. Chairman I would like to commend these supplementaries which constitute the core of the supplementaries that Government will be bringing to the House. There might be a few other small ones but these will constitute the core of the supplementaries that the Government would be bringing to the House before Parliament rises for the Christmas recess.

Sir, I stress that the Estimates do not reflect our starting major new projects but our making sure that enough resources are...

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Can I just be heard in silence, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, if I were to say that I just went to the Governor-General and told the Governor-General, Sir, to dissolve this House, Sir, a lot of them would start having all kinds of fits and cold sweats.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, can I be allowed to proceed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I am really stretching the point that we are trying to bring to account, not new projects, but to settle a number of things that happened between March and now that were not anticipated. I would therefore begin with the Prime Minister's Office, Sir.

The House is aware that during the course of this year, Barbados celebrated its first National Heroes Day. At the time of the Estimates, Sir, provision for this had not been made. The Prime Minister's Office incuired $315 000 in expenditure and I want to stress that point, Sir. $315 000 in expenditure as its contribution to the sponsorship of the National Heroes Day celebrations. I have heard fanciful figures of $7 million being bandied about, Sir, and $315 000 as we are here seeking in supplementary for that particular purpose.

As regards the Prime Minister's Office, Sir, the largest...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: It comes to more than $315 000 but the Prime Minister's Office contribution to it is $315 000. It comes to about $700 000 in total.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, as regards the Prime Minister's Office the largest increase is for us to bring to account the provisions for the Pan-African Commission which has come into existence on the 2nd November. I want to speak to this issue, Sir, because it has an importance that has come to be vulgarised in the society and vulgarised for reasons that are not wholesome.

Barbados, Sir, has economic political, cultural, social relationships with entities in every continent except Africa. We have relationships, economic, political, cultural, with North America. We have relationships with Asia, with Europe, with South America as well but we do not have a diplomatic presence in Africa, Sir. We have absolutely or hardly any trading relationships. We have student exchanges between ourselves for some considerable time, between ourselves and North America and Europe but no relationship whatsoever with Africa and that is a shameful condition which needs to be redressed.

I am also of the view, as many people are, and I have said it already, Sir, that just as this Century ending has come to be termed the American Century that there is a great reawakening in Africa, the symbolic vanguard of which has been the liberation of South Africa and that it behoves us as a nation of predominantly black people, without apology, to adopt Pan-Africanism and build all kinds of relationships, political, economic, cultural and whatever else with the nations of Africa and promote, Mr. Chairman, respect for things that connote blackness and have to do with the projection of things African is part and parcel of our way of life.

I have no apologies to saying, Sir, that a Pan-African Commission to promote black cause, but more especially so, Sir, to begin the long process of building relationships with black people everywhere is an historic necessity. This matter was first put by the person who will Chair the Commission about three years ago at a meeting of the Organisation of African Unity. The notion of building an African Commission has been accepted as something that should become a state function and, Sir, I am proud that Barbados has become the first country in our hemisphere to establish a Pan-African Commission to deal with this matter, Sir, that is so crucial to the future of black people.

I support it, Sir, and commend this supplementary that is here being sought as an investment in the future development of this country within my Ministry Head 13 under Data Processing Unit the amount of $86 443 is being sought to attend to the vexatious problems of providing air conditioning at the National Insurance Building at Fairchild Street, I think the House will agree that the people who work at the National Insurance Building have had a long time to operate under the most deplorable circumstances. We have voted over and over again funds to have the whole place properly air conditioned and this $86 000 I hope will be sufficient to have the air conditioning at the National Insurance Building on Fairchild Street put behind us as a matter of priority. 2.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the Data Processing Department is under the Ministry of the Prime Minister's Office but when it comes to Finance, and I do not want to anticipate the debate, funds are being provided in these supplementaries for us to be able to deal properly with the millennium bug problem.

I hope that I can come to that in the course of the presentation because I think that the House needs to be given a status report as to what plan of action has been conceived of and is being carried out in order to satisfy ourselves that at the turn of the century the problem of computers being able to recognise "00" and not to confuse it with 1900 would not be a problem that confronts Barbados.

At this stage, Sir, just let me say that from as far back as May 1997 a technical committee had been established, spearheaded by the Data Processing Department whose first responsibility was to develop an awareness of the problem. A plan of action was conceived for all Government departments where an inventory of the situation was taken and an assessment was made to determine which department and which unit of the department was year 2000 compliant or not. We now have the results of the assessment to hand and we know what remedies have to be undertaken in order for us to ensure that the millennium bug does not frustrate the workings of the Government.

Very shortly, Sir, an important institutional adjustment will be made subject of course to the approval of Cabinet with the setting up of a Y2K project office to which we are going to commit resources to engage a full-time staff along with the necessary equipment and tools for people to do the conversion and the testing in all Government departments where a problem of non-compliance still obtains.

I just want to say that within the framework of this supplementary $1.7 million is being sought to enable a number of critical Government departments and the CBC to make the conversion from outdated computer hardware and software to make themselves compliant. I also want to use this opportunity to say that the House can be sure that in the next Estimates of Expenditure such resources as would be necessary to satisfy us that all government departments that have millennium bug problems make the conversion, that such resources that are necessary will have to be provided during the course of the next financial year.

As regards Head 13, the Prime Minister's Office as I said the principal reason for this supplementary is that we are replenishing die operating expenses vote by $315 000 to cover expenses incurred in celebrating National Heroes Day. We are also providing for the full funding of a Pan-African Commission. We are under Data Processing providing resources to carry out the full air conditioning of the old National Insurance Building and one final issue, Sir, the Government of Barbados committed itself to assisting the West Indies Cricketers Association with a secretariat at the Sir Garfield Sobers Gymnasium. We believe that that is a commitment to West Indies cricket that is worthwhile and among the other personal emoluments and other operating expenses are also provisions to make sure that our commitment to the West Indies Players' Association for the rest of the financial year can be honoured.

I say that, Sir, to stress the point that it was therefore a matter of great disappointment to me that we could have had an issue affecting West Indies cricket and you have a situation where both the players and the association now have functioning headquarters in the region and the region had to be exposed to the ridicule of a problem affecting West Indies cricket having to be solved in a hotel room in London.

I spoke, Sir, about the symbolic deficiencies of that gesture at the University but the fact is that Caribbean people must feel confident that within the Caribbean we have the capacity to solve our problems and that we also have the capacity to bring and invite people here from South Africa if necessary to act if they wish to supplement what we have. I really feel that the West Indies Association Secretariat in Barbados must become a serious place of business that can function as a forum that will improve the relationship between the Board and the players in the interest of the development of one of the most precious icons of West Indian unity.

There are other items that will engage the interest of the House within this supplementary of $47.1 million. The Prime Minister's Office accounts for $797 000. The big ones are the usual ones: Public Works - $ 17.6 million, Health and the Environment - $9.5 million; Education - $6 million. Within Finance $8.9 million is being sought and within that $8.9 million we are providing for $5.1 million to pay the increase in old age pensions that we brought to the House, $1.8 million is to deal with the millennium problem.

Barbados has made a decision to subscribe to the World Bank window through which loans are provided to the poorest countries in the world, The International Development Agency, (IDA), and we are making provision of about $75 000 as our contribution to that window. On that matter, Sir, I just want to say to the House that the officials of the World Bank have indicated that there is a possibility that the issue of Barbados' graduation will be revisited in the context of the new initiatives being taken to have the World Bank focussed on the probability of small states as considerations to be taken into account in determining lending policy and that while it was envisioned that a lending relationship between the Bank and Barbados would end in December with the conclusion of the world project there is a possibility that this is subject to further discussion and negotiation. It is a possibility that there could be some kind of relationship in the future.

I commend these supplementaries in full, Sir, to the House because in large measure we are not starting major new projects. We are just carrying on what we are doing. They can fit easily within the contours of our overall fiscal ceiling. I would imagine that as we move to control overall domestic expenditure that there will be a tapering down in the demand for imports during the course of the next year and that the surge in revenue realised in October and November will not necessarily run ahead because as I said there are two sides to this.

Of course we are glad that revenues are boosted by strong imports but we pay a price for it in terms of the reserves and we have to strike the happy balance between encouraging token revenues arising from consumption imports and managing the reserves within sensible limits. Sir, I commend these supplementaries to the House and in particular I will give justification for the expenditure Head 13: Prime Minister's Office. I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think that this $47 million supplementary is another one of those supplementaries which is a testimony to the forecasting skills which we heard so much about prior to 1994 and which were alleged to reside within the abilities of the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter. I think having had the presentation which he just gave that we can now truly agree with him when he said that at the beginning of his term in office that supplementaries are now a thing of the past. 3.00p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get too much into the details of today's supplementary. I think, however, that it is very important for us to point out that this $47 million supplementary deals with a lot of housekeeping items, some items which one might identify as Government's new priorities. For example, the National Heroes Day activities, the Commission on African Affairs, overseas travel for conferences and the payment of allowances to the Constitution Commission.

Our view, Sir, is that if the Government at this time can find $47 million to pay for these items which are outlined in this supplementary, we will be quite happy to cooperate with the Government in moving in the $59 million in additional revenue which has been realised in the last two months to repay the public servants as a matter of urgency.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this would not be an unusual procedure. I remember in the 1996 Estimates Debate that when it was determined that the subvention for political parties was a priority and when it was determined that increased allowances for Parliamentarians was a priority, the three Leaders met in the well of this House and agreed to move in the sum of $400 000 at the eleventh hour to facilitate those payments.

But a matter which is supposed to have been such a heinous chapter in the history of Barbados, an act which is described as so odious which in itself did not even get or elicit from the Barbados Labour Party a pledge of repayment in its Manifesto. It did not even elicit that and which, unlike the increase in pensions that was promised in the Budget and the $350 which was paid to assist the poor which was announced in the Budget and the %500 VAT rebate which was announced in the Budget, we now have from the Honourable Member for St. Peter an opportunistic pledge at the eleventh hour to repay the Public Officers.

We are saying that we want them repaid. Let us move in the $60 million this evening, extend this Supplementary to include the sums necessary to start paying the public servants the 8% pay cut before Christmas. We would facilitate that, Mr. Chairman. I would take my seat now if the Honourable Member for St. Peter is willing to back up the pledges that he made and which others have subsequently contradicted that he had concluded negotiations for the repayment of the 8%.

Let us see whether the Honourable Member for St. Peter is going, to put the money that he now has at his disposal, the additional $59 million in revenue, which has been realised in the past two months whether he is going to get up in this Chamber today and to move in that $59 million so that the public servants can be repaid the additional sum.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need for further negotiations on it. The Unions agree to it. We agree to it and the Government, even at this eleventh hour, assuming that it is not a gimmick, has said it agrees to repaying them. So let us move the necessary Resolution. I will move it from my seat because the Honourable Member for St. George South did not hesitate when he heard it was Parliamentarians allowances to jump up immediately at the slightest hint that there was going to be an increase and move from his seat on the back bench that an additional $400 000 should be made available in the 1996 Estimates. There was no hesitation then, but now the opportunity presents itself because we have a Supplementary for $45 million, the Government already has the money for that. And the Honourable Member for St. Peter said that he has realised an additional $59 million in revenue in two months as a result of his prudent economic management. He could have the audacity, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to be speaking at a meeting this weekend promising that he has concluded negotiations, which others say have not even taken place yet.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, he obviously has been reading *the Advocate, and* if the *Advocate* has said so, I never said anything of the kind. I said that we are serious about the people's business and we are dealing with serious matters in a serious way, but I have not said at all that any package has been negotiated to date. I have said that to date the matter of the 8% pay cut was removed from the table as a legal issue, because the law court said that the Government has no obligation to pay but that we want to pay it. That was decided in the court of law.

As it affects the Central Government, that it has ceased being a legal issue and we are putting it back on the table, Sir, but we are dealing with it in due course, today too.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, one thing about the Honourable Member for St. Peter he is so conscious about how the media might report the Opposition that he never misses an opportunity to get up to clarify an issue and in so doing, reveals that his speeches represent the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau. He said one thing at meetings but really means something else. And I think other Members of that Side who are just as alarmed at the announcement as we are, and people who have now heard the Honourable Member explained it would understand that repayment on the 8% apparently is not a priority. It is conditional on a number of other things.

The first of which is that he would have to be re-elected. The first impression he wants to create in the minds of people that he would have to be re-elected because elections are going to be before those negotiations are concluded. You and I know that, Sir. The fact is I told you today, but there are people who know better than you. The ones who he fraternises with know and are announcing the date.

But, Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me go on to make this point. Having said that the 8% will be paid back it is now conditional on a whole regrading exercise which would involve regrading police officers, nurses and other officers within the public sector which would involve a whole analysis which has to be done. Because the Trade Union Movement is not gesturing now. When they were asking for it to be repaid before, it was not attached to regrading. But the Honourable Member for St. Peter who has not yet, according to the General Secretary of the NUPW this morning on television has not yet discussed it with him and he knows of no proposal and in fact he has to send an objection to the ILO about the fact that the Honourable Member for St. Peter concluded negotiations on a salary increase for public workers without negotiating to the end

with the principal public sector union. All of that was said this morning. But the Honourable Member for St. Peter is now telling us that it is only on the table.

We are saying there is no need for that, Mr. Chairman. As far as we are concerned we do not need the matter to be negotiated anymore. We believe the public officers in Barbados should be paid back. We are ready four years after the new Government was elected to give it die fullest possible support and... we have been saying so consistently from the time of the pay cut amendment. At that time the Honourable Member for St. Peter was saying: "Wunna carry way the money, so wait 'til wunna get back in to pay it back." That is what the Honourable Member for St. Peter was saying at that time. 3.10p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are in a debate and we can see who the true jesters are, those who are really joking around with the people's business. As I say, "the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau." That is how you can characterise, Mr. Chairman, this pledge about the repayment of the eight per cent to public officers.

I just want to make our point very clear. We are ready to test the genuineness of the Government. If the Honourable Member for St. Peter can stand up in his place, no flowery language, and move that an additional $59 million be added to this supplementary of $45 million today on the basis that the resources are available, he will have the full and unequivocal support. I will bring anybody who is on their sick bed back into this Chamber to vote in favour of that, so if that is so the Honourable Member for St. Peter would have our full compliance. We are not going into any big debate over a lot of shoddy housekeeping for matters which could have been dealt with a long time ago, money that has already been spent on National Heroes Day, money that has already been spent on a whole host of other things and we are now getting a supplementary before this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South many years ago made it very clear in here that he is not voting for any supplementaries for expenditure that has already been incurred so I want him as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I have the utmost faith in him and I hope that if there is a divide that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South will demonstrate that he is sticking by his principles.

This is money spent already and it means it must have been spent contrary to the Laws of Barbados because National Heroes Day has passed and the $350 000 is money already spent for which they are now coming to the House for a supplementary contrary to the Laws of Barbados, and contrary to the great forecasting skills of the Honourable Member for St. Peter. This is what this debate is about.

We are willing to cooperate, Mr. Chairman, not in debating these nit-picking issues. Put the $59 million onto this and you will have the full support of the Democratic Labour Party in this matter.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Honourable Member for St. John has risen to join in a debate on the question of payment to public servants because it has to be entered into the record, Sir, that the salaries of the public servants of Barbados should not have been cut in the first place, that in the very year when the Honourable Member for St. John and his crew agreed to cut public servants' salaries, he as Minister of Finance, over the objection of public officers in this country agreed to give one company, and one company alone, $53 million in tax concessions, so when they were telling the taxpayers that the salaries had to be cut by eight per cent he was giving one company and one company alone $53 million in tax concessions. That is not to speak about the other concessions he gave to other companies at the same time which, when added together, would have put the Government of the day in a position where it could have paid the eight per cent over and over again if the revenue was being collected.

I go further, Sir. At a time when the Democratic Labour Party was cutting public servants' salaries, they could find $35 million to splurge at the St. Joseph Hospital to buy 23 acres of carpet, to buy 270 bundles of shingles when 25 would have done, to pay people over and over again for the same work, and that is why I say, Sir, that the salaries need not have been cut in the first instance if financial prudence was obtaining in the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. Chairman, this matter will not be approached as a matter of gesturing. There is a process of continuing relationship between the unions representing the public workers and the Government of Barbados.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Perhaps, if I cannot talk about the St. Joseph Hospital, Sir, I should talk about the Geriatric Hospital which started as a $10 000 project but ended up costing between $15 million and $20 million without contracts being awarded either. That is what I am talking about, Sir, and at a time when the civil servants' salaries were being cut by eight per cent.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, if the Honourable Member would give way. Last week the Honourable Member in this House made the same statement and it did not make the newspapers so he wants to make the statement this week to make the newspapers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You all can talk until the cows come home. That is exactly what he said last week in here, the exact words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member, what is your point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member, Sir, is misleading the House. He spoke and said the same identical words last week in here. He is now speaking for the Press. That is all he is doing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point of order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, there is a third point, Sir. The agreements entered into between the Democratic Labour Party and the IMF and the circulars sent by the Democratic Labour Party to the public servants told them that the eight per cent was not going to be restored, and I will repeat that, Sir. When the Democratic Labour Party now wants to speak in terms of their wanting to restore the eight per cent, the agreements entered into between the Democratic Labour Party and the International Monetary Fund, and the circulars sent to the public officers of this country was to the effect that the eight per cent was not going to be restored and now we are hearing this nonsense.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. This-Honourable Member continues to come in here as Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and makes statements that are not accurate. Let the Honourable Member produce the document.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You come in here and do it all the time and you are playing on the minds of people who believe that when you speak you are telling the truth. It is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is sufficient.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Member, please. Order, order.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member sit?

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please sit.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the Honourable Member for St. John wisely would not do what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West did because the Democratic Labour Party was not in a position to draw off the last draw-down from the International Monetary Fund and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West might want to ask why. It had everything to do with the eight per cent. 3.20 p.m.

Asides.

It had everything to do with the sending of the signal that contrary to what had been agreed to with the International Monetary Fund that there was pressure being put on Sandiford to restore the 8%. The agreement between the Government of Barbados and the International Monetary Fund required that there be no restoration of the 8% pay cut. That is a matter of fact.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is saying that there were circulars which said there would be no restoration. Let the Honourable Member present his circulars. I want to see them. Let the Honourable Member produce them or he cannot go on telling this Committee about circulars. I went and told the people about the 8% cut.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, when we came to this House, I remember an election campaign when a candidate who was then a Minister in the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet speaking on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party said that they did not only cut the public servants salary by 8% but if they had to do it, they would do it again. That is a matter of historical record in this country. Then when we put that Side to the test to invite them to join us in a Constitution amendment to put that beyond the power of any Government in this country....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member himself in the last Budget came in here and corrupted the same law which he had passed by insisting on a cut of 1.5% of public officers salaries. The Honourable Member did it himself in here and is making a rubbish of this House by coining in here and talking about how he passed law. The Honourable Member knows that the Constitution of Barbados says that if for good governance the Government has to do anything, it will do it.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He does not fool anybody. He can fool who does not understand.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, you better get some air-conditioning for him because he is going to run hot today.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: When a person who parades of having 27 years in public life would equate an increase in a contribution to a person's pension to the National Insurance Fund to a cut in salary, he is lost. He is sick.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I admit that I am sick because I have had to put up with him talking rubbish in here and I have sat and listened. Only a sick person could listen to the rubbish ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, no. Please sit. Please, please, you cannot use such language in here.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: Sir, he said that I was sick and you said nothing, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please have a seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, he said that I was sick and you said nothing so I have to get up and defend myself against all the 'charlatans' like him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. I am aware that there is something big coming up soon and it would appear to me that everybody is playing to the public gallery. I would like all Members to please speak to the subject. I will not tolerate when you go off line any further. Please stick to the subject and let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the greatest shame of all is that the Democratic Labour Party found $35 million to lick out at the St. Joseph Hospital.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: They found $35 million to lick out.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: And then $15 million at the Geriatric Hospital at a time when they were cutting people's salaries. Now they want to come and talk. You do not speak in this issue with any moral authority and you have to be told so. You do not speak with any moral authority because we came to this House and invited you to change the Constitution and the Democratic Labour Party's position was that they were not going to be part of any institutional amendment...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please be quiet, Honourable Member.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, they cannot hold any lashes.

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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I have to make up my time for the time lost.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, as regards the question of jesting. The Government of Barbados has ongoing relationships and negotiations with the trade unions among which is the question of the consideration of regrading for a large number of different sections of the public service whose condition of service has been distorted by the nature of the 1988/89 regrading exercise. We are involved in structured relationships. Improved terms and conditions and regrading exercise are already on the Table. They are not to be made conditions of any re-settlement. All we are saying, Sir, is simply this. That those structured relationships will continue in the future. That we will put on the Table a wage increase for the future. We have already on the Table the issue of the regrading of the public sector of Barbados in its entirety. Because one of the most wicked things that have every happened in this country was that in 1989/90, just prior to an election, and you talk about gesturing, that $33 million was paid to some public servants at the top as part of a regrading exercise but only the people at the top benefitted and we are now in the process of trying to redress that disgraceful anomaly.

What we are also saying is this. That as of now the question of reparations for the wage increase, the law courts have already judged that in relation to central government employees that there was no lawful requirement of the Government of Barbados to repay. That matter has already been determined in a court of law and as a result, therefore, Sir, it was not therefore a matter on the Tables.

What we have told the unions is that in addition to putting the wage increase on the Table, in addition to having the regrading to continue on the Table because the regrading exercise, Sir, can perhaps cost as much as $60 million too. Those on the Other Side are speaking about jesting but they will not come with the same facility and say let us do the regrading willy-nilly because if you are going to have a structured relationship, Sir, you have to plan the thing properly, work out all of the details and bring the matter to account within a framework that would allow you to simultaneously, pay increase wages, pay for the cost of re-grading and also make reparations to the public officers. All that we are saying is that those three things will be dealt with as part of the same package and that is the point. All three will have to be dealt with as part of the same package.

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. He will not be a happy man at all, Sir. Because these patterns of structural relationship is something that he does not understand. He understands the haphazardness of just say, you take that and you do that, you take that and you do that. That is his way of Government but there must be a structured relationship as to how to conduct the public affairs of this country. The putting in place simultaneously of arrangements

for paying wage increases, meeting the cost of regrading and making reparation are something that have properly to be planned.

The public has already discounted the Democratic Labour Party on this particular issue. The public has already determined that the most shameful thing in all this, that between 1990 and 1994 the only people paid out of the Consolidated Fund, who got any increase whatsoever were the Members of the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet who immediately after the 1990 election gave themselves a 10% increase and insulated themselves from the 8% cut that all other public servants had to endure after the 1990 election.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: That is a fact. They gave themselves 10% and then cut everybody else by 8%. They now want to come and talk to serious people about an 8% pay cut.

Asides.

3.30p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: So that, Sir, this sanctimony, this nonsense from the Democratic Labour Party about putting it back now. This is how the St. Joseph Hospital was planned. This is how Sherbourne was planned. You just spend some money. You do not plan for it. You do not sit down and have a structure to deal with it, just spend money on Sherbourne. They set out not knowing what they are about. This is the DLP's way. I have said only that the matter was not legitimately on the Table because it had been settled as a legal issue in the Courts. It is now to go on the Table and it will be dealt with, Sir, in a structured way. All the details of it have to be worked out, Sir, but I am not going to commit this country to the kind of fiscal disorder of the kind that caused a Government to set out on a $ 10 000 project and ended up spending $15 million as at the Geriatric Hospital, nor am I going to commit us again, Sir, to the kind of financial disorder as has happened at the St. Joseph Hospital where untold millions were spent because of an unstructured approach, nor are we going to go back, Sir, to the old bad days, Sir, of Sherbourne and the proposal given, Sir, to repay the Public Servants. The people of Barbados know that my word is my bond.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this point I will ask the Honourable Member to wind up.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: They know it will be paid.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I really have to rise because I am truly amazed that in the context of the same people, not different people. It is not a next generation of Democratic Labour Party people speaking but the same people who could sit around a table and take decisions to adversely affect and cut public servants salaries in this country can seek to speak today with the level of sanctimony that they are speaking as if they have no shame, as if they have no compunction about the fact that people do not have short memories.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, what is even more is that they feel that the public of Barbados will continue to take from them whatever they do, whenever they do it and however they do it and still vote for them.

Mr. Chairman, I really just want to say something. I do not understand how people can stand up and expect the public to believe that in one fell swoop you can come in here and try to seek to move in a Resolution. You do not know the state of the economy. You do not know what is happening outside of Barbados that may impact on the country and the revenues that are to come in, but you want us to engage in reckless and irresponsible behaviour simply to satisfy your ego because having put it on the Table during the Budget debate some three months ago, for the first time having put it on the Table, because they never had any intention of giving them back, that they are now trying to suggest that we should move it in and that we should seek to have a process completed instantaneously, that they themselves went through lengthy negotiations as to what options possibly could have been available when the public service union said to them that they wanted back bonds. They had lengthy negotiations with the union as to whether bonds was an option or not.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this circular a document of the House, dated 5th September, 1991 from the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Civil Service to All Permanent Secretaries and Department Heads. Subject: Agreement for the withholding of part of the emoluments of permanent and temporary staff in the public service. We have nothing to hide.

"As you may also be aware considerable discussion...," not instantaneous decisions, "considerable discussion has taken place between representatives of the various unions and staff associations which represent public employees on matters relating to conditions of service on whether an alternative course of action could have been possible. Those discussions gave long and earnest consideration..."

Mr. Chairman, they want to have long and earnest consideration but want us to take a decision instantaneously just to satisfy the ego of the Honourable Member for St. John.

Lou d asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if my back was up against the wall too I would be getting on like them too.

Those discussions gave long and earnest consideration to the feasibility of structured arrangement for treating any part of the emoluments withheld from employees as a deferred payment which could have been secured by the issue of bonds.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, they said that they spent a long time discussing with the public service unions whether they should not treat the withholding of the salaries as part of a deferred payment to be guaranteed by the issue of a bond.

You understand what is going on here, Mr. Chairman? Regrettably. Listen to the next sentence. "Regrettably the size of the deferred payment...". They want to say the size of the deferred payment which would have been necessary under such other arrangements to achieve the desired savings would have resulted in an impracticable scheme which would have been complicated to administer and unattractive to the participants.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: It goes on and I want you to listen, Mr. Chairman, because they can continue to talk from their seats but whenever they continue to talk from their seats it does not heal the cuts that the public servants had to take. It does not heal them.

Aside.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: What I know about them? I know that when I go to represent constituencies in St. Michael North East that I have people who had to suffer, who had to pull children out of schools, out of university. I know about people who could not feed their children and you, the Member for St. Michael West, who has been in Parliament for 25 years got people living from Rotten Town to the Garden in the most shameful conditions. 3.40p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, so that the Honourable Member will not bring herself to unnecessary harm. Most of those people had been admitted from the Park where they used to be invited to come for a little cod liver oil or stuff like that. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East would probably have preferred me to carry them in the Park to give them some food out of a cup, some hot soup. The Honourable Member wants us to discuss that so we will discuss it. The Honourable Member is on record of the most disrespectful regard for the public officers over whom she has regard now. Let her get up and talk about that. 'Mottleyism' and the...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Please have a seat.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am happy that at least when they were going into the Park their health needs and their employment needs and their food needs were at least being serviced but when they were in Rotten Town and the Garden they have not even gotten from that Member of Parliament who purports to represent them not even 10% of what was spent on St. Joseph's Hospital.

I want to say to you that they can continue to talk but, at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, when they cut the public servants' salaries, when they ensured that they did not give them access to mortgages and favourable conditions for loans to be able to fix their houses, when they ensured that in addition to cutting their salaries they were letting five companies do work over and over frisking the taxpayers of this country, and you want to tell me that you have the gall to come into this Chamber and tell me now about bringing a resolution for $59 million. You spent months trying to determine whether to give the people a bond. You told the IMF that you were not giving them back their money.

Aside.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: You can talk until the cows come home because the people of Barbados will be on you for the two-facedness which has led you ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! I would just like to say something. I want you to maintain very high standards in here. I do not want you to go to the gutter at all. Please maintain high standards in here.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not possible for the Honourable Member for St. John to maintain a high standard. It is beyond his capacity.

I want to say, Sir, we keep trifling with people's lives in this country and we seem to feel that as politicians it is a game of monopoly or a game that we play on the side of the road. You have people with only one member of the house working who budget down to the last dollar and who therefore when their budget could not be able to withstand an 8% pay cut, the suffering that that paycut has caused the people of this country is legendary. These same people have the gall to come in here not even ashamed to hear about the 230 acres of carpet, not even ashamed to hear about the 270 plus bundles of shingles. They are not even ashamed to hear about the five companies that were formed to do it. They are not even ashamed to hear abut the air conditioners ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please keep to the subject! I want to be fair.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I want you to see that at the same time when they made the decision to refuse to give people bonds that they were taking decisions that allowed money to be spent for the benefit of nobody. How many patients did the St. Joseph Hospital ever see? If they were spending it at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and people were benefitting I could understand. They never saw anybody there and we have to reach a stage in the public affairs of our country where we must understand that people are not fools and people can see for themselves and in the context where

we have said in good faith to them that we have looked at the situation we know the law courts say they are not entitled to it but we believe that there is a process of reparation that must take place and that that process of reparation will cause us to put it back on the Table to be discussed with other matters that we have put on the table before hand to improve the lot of the public servants.

When they were regraded they were not concerned that the people at the bottom were to be dealt with. All of the top was what they dealt with - $33 million to a few officers at the top. They can talk about cod liver oil and khaki and all of that. All it is doing is ensuring that people understand why it is necessary that we have poverty alleviation programmes to empower people.

They can continue to talk about it because the same Member for St. Michael West knows the sentiments of those who had to fight and who could get nothing from nowhere. I maintain that the state of St. Michael West constituency does.not reflect that they have had the benefit of a senior member of Government representing it for the last 25 years. It is deplorable.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that there can be no doubt that we have issued and signalled an intention to treat with good faith the return of the 8%. There can be no doubt as well, Sir, that it must be in the context of ensuring that we do not catapult this economy into any sort of reckless behaviour as they did in 1989 and 1990 when they claimed the economy was batting better than Gary Sobers.

I only want to say, Sir, that the same responsible mature judgement that the Prime Minister exercised in the Budget debate when he put a ceiling on the capital expenditures to ensure that the economy did not overheat would be the same judgement that we as Members of Cabinet would expect of him as Minister of Finance in ensuring that whatever agreements are reached by this Government with the unions, are ones that we can honour because we do not believe that we should give people our word and then withdraw it or break it for anybody, not even to appease the ego of the Honourable Member for St. John who has found himself with no other option, his back to the wall, and still does not know how to deal with this issue.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I feel compelled to speak in this debate again because when I made reference to a circular the Member for St. Michael West challenged me and even used words that I was lying. The circular to which I speak, Sir, was a circular issued on September 5, 1991. It was signed by the Permanent Secretary, L.A. Moe and at paragraph 10 - I want to establish not only the authenticity but the high office that attached to this circular that the Prime Minister has directed that this circular be reproduced by your Ministry for each individual member of staff.

So the decision embodied was to be made known to every possible officer in the civil service of Barbados and what this circular says is simply that the Democratic Labour Party had before it the option put and a number of discussions to treat the pay cut as a matter that should be treated as a deferred payment. You are not going to pay .today but you defer payment for some time in the future and you secure that by the issue of a bond. 3.50p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading this Committee. In his last dispensation when he spoke on the same matter in the same debate he said the Democratic Labour Party Government by some arrangement with the international agency did not intend to pay, that it was not restorable.

The Honourable Member is now saying that there is some circular in which they were discussing the very payment. The two things are not reconcilable. Either one is wrong or the other is correct. The Honourable Member cannot take both positions.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, his role is to try to disrupt my flow, but I know what my purpose is. I said that it was agreed with the International Monetary Fund and it was also represented in a circular that went to all public servants in this country to the effect that discussions had been undertaken to treat the emoluments as something that can be handled in this way, 'we cut you today, but we agree to pay you back sometime in the future and that we issue a bond to you securing that arrangement.'

The Democratic Labour Party Government of the day said that no way, can we have this matter treated as a matter of deferred payment. Sir, you cannot therefore get back anything from this in the future once they have anything to do with it. So that they rejected in 1991 the notion of giving back the public servants the 8% when they agreed that it should not be treated as a matter of deferred payment secured by a bond. Had that been done, Sir, we would not have to be where we are today having the matter now raised again.

Sir, as you may be aware, considerable discussion has taken place between representatives of the various unions and staff associations which represent employees on matters relating to conditions of service on whether an alternative course of action could have been possible. Those discussions gave long and earnest consideration to the feasibility and structuring of arrangement for treating any part of the emoluments withheld from employees as a deferred payment which would have been secured by the issue of a bond.

Regrettably the size of the deferred payment which would have been necessary under such arrangements to achieve the desired savings would have resulted in an impracticable scheme which would have been complicated

to administer and unattractive to the parties; namely, you tell people we are going to cut your salary today but hold a bond we are going to give you back your salary at some time in the future with interest on it.

In the circumstances of the required numbers of expended reduction any further attempt to improve the attractiveness of the bond to prospective holders would have compromised the attainment of the savings target. The proposals cannot be effectively implemented and is no longer being pursued. So that the Democratic Labour Party categorically rejected the proposal to tell public servants to take a cut today, you will get paid back in the future.

Mr. B. M. TAUT: On a point of order the Honourable Member is misleading the Committee, Sir. What the circular said is that that particular option has been agreeably rejected by Both Sides.

The Honourable Member cannot bring only the circular which was a conclusive document I recall, Sir, but it had been part of the discussion and negotiation that had been going on between the exercise. On the one hand was the Government battling to save the dollar and on the other was the discussion with the union.

The Honourable Member is now concluding out of that paragraph a conclusion that is not possible and the Honourable Member is saying that the Democratic Labour Party Government had reached a particular position. The Honourable Member knows that the subsequent conclusion and decision following this circular which had been lifted contrary to the system of Government which we have from the files were brought to this Committee. Contrary to what is correct the Honourable Member knows that subsequent to that there were further discussions and further conclusions.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, that was a speech. It was not a point of order, but the point is that a scheme to get public officers to have pay cuts in 1991 on the understanding that they would be allowed bonds in lieu of the income that they were being deprived of, as a way of treating the pay cut as a form of deferred payment. A cut of salary today, but I am going to pay you sometime in the future, that was categorically ruled by the Democratic Labour Party as not being an option that they were prepared to pursue.

The issue of opportunism, Sir, therefore when arrived at within this debate clearly can only be said to exist on the part of those, who at one period categorically rejected the notion of repaying the public servants the 8% pay cut and now would want to come today, and shed these false tears on behalf of those same public servants, that they should be paid now.

Sir, they had the opportunity in 1991 to have given the public officers the security of a bond between the Government and the public servant that the 8% would have been repaid. A bond issued in the name of the Government of Barbados is stronger than the word of any politician. It carries with it the good faith of the Government and the commitment of the Government resources. And the issue of a bond would have told the public servants that we are cutting today, but we acknowledge as we cut it that at sometime in the future we are going to pay you back and hold his bond as security. And that, Sir, is the serious implications of the decision taken then, so that we cannot now, Mr. Chairman, tolerate the charge of opportunism. We also have to set this in the context of what has happened since 1994. Because it is not like we have been idle in attending to the needs of the public servants of Barbados, Sir.

We have inherited an economy that had not, Mr. Chairman, fully recovered from recession. An economy where public servants had not been paid an increase for four years, an economy in which the only persons, I have said who have received any increase from the Consolidated Fund in the four-year period were the Members of the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet. And immediately in 1995 we gave not only increases at a higher rate of inflation, but in 1995 we also gave the first productivity bonus. We started the process of making amends.

We went further, Sir, and said we understood you have gone through a process of financial drought and we are going to make your livelihood easier. We therefore expanded the car loans from $20 000 to $35 000. We said, let us also touch up your pensions. For a long period in this country, public servants would act in positions or function in temporary posts and the time spent acting in those positions were not counted in the composition of their income for the purposes of calculating their pensions. We said that given what you have gone through let us also start making amends again by allowing time spent by so many thousands of them acting to count in the computation of their incomes for the purposes of determining the pension to its entirety, Sir, substantially improving their livelihood, not on a one-shot basis but for as long as they are due a pension for the rest of their lives, Sir, they are benefiting from that one act.

Then, Sir, we took the Police and a whole range of other public officers whose allowances for washing, travelling, entertainment, telephones and all the little things that add to the improvement of their lives, we said to let us also increase disposable income by increasing their allowances.

Then, Sir, what did we do? We said, let us also deal with the casual workers who have been treated as the bastards in the system. And, we even went further, in the last wage increases. Sir, the $6^{1}A\%$ was arrived at. There was a movement toward a 5% settlement with a productivity bonus.

We converted the productivity bonus and added it to the wage increase so that it would not be a one-off payment, that it would be a continuing improvement in the service, and,... 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the last increase alone to the public officers cost the Treasury over $100 million so that our corning to this issue now is after a long sequence of activities designed to improve the terms and conditions under which the public officers of Barbados function. They have all been the subject of discussions with the trade unions because a framework of consultations with the trade unions of this country has been established and it is functioning.

Our particular proposal in this matter is, as I have said, that the eight per cent pay back is not now legally before us because it was already determined by the courts.

Our position has always been that once the economy reached a stage where it could afford those persons who were called upon to shoulder the greatest proportion of the burden of adjustment, that amends should be made to those, whether there was a lawful requirement to do it or not, and I stress that point, Sir, that we came into office and a Privy Council determined, the matter having been carried by the Democratic Labour Party that there was no lawful reason to give back the 8%, but we had always judged, let us do ...

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: That is a fact.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, a long series of actions have been taken by this Administration, working within a structured set of relationships of negotiations with the public servants of this country, to address improvements in their terms and conditions of service.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: This now, Sir, is to add to it and I was putting it in context, that there is no lawful requirement that it has to be done, but there is a moral obligation, we think, that that small section of the Barbadian public that carried the largest part of the burden should once our economic circumstances allow us, be entitled to something that is in the nature of a reparation and that is what this is about.

The unions and the Government negotiators will sit down and work out the details. Fifty-nine million dollars is a ballpark amount. There are some public servants who would have died since then, and the question will arise, are they entitled. That is a matter that has to be dealt with. As I said Sir, we cannot speak to this in isolation from the fact that there are other matters on the Table being discussed now.

The Democratic Labour Party cannot both approbate and reprobate at the same time. They have come to this House to charge this Government with unilateral action in relation to settlement of matters that should be dealt with by the collective bargaining process and we have before us weighty and substantive matters relating to regrading. What is coming from the Other Side is, ignore them. Do not put everything within the context of negotiation and discussion. Just put what you have on the Table and just deal with this and deal with it in precisely the way of using the format that you have criticised us for, by acting unilaterally.

Sir, I say in this particular matter, the Democratic Labour Party speaks from no position of moral sanctity, that they had the option before them and they said "No" to the option of repaying the public servants, that this is part of a process of improvement and it will be done in a structured way.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the Honourable Member says do not waste time on this that he will speak on the outside where he cannot be responded to but it will be dealt with in a structured way because we saw, as I said, what happened when they set up a building at Sherbourne, but they did not have a structured approach. We saw what happened when they set out to build the St. Joseph Hospital and there was no structured approach, that they do things haphazardly and it will not prevail in this instance, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 13 stand part.

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

The question that Head 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, under Cabinet Office $80 000 is being provided for us to bring the work of the Constitution Review Commission to a satisfactory conclusion. I am advised that the Report of the Constitution Review Commission is virtually finished.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Of course, Sir, you know that the Constitution Review Commission is made up of representatives of all parties and I have no doubt that in trying to have a report that reflects the input of all parties that the Chairman is trying to put the inputs together properly.

Sir, I am advised that the report is with the printers and that there will be a presentation of the report very shortly. It has been long in coming and, therefore, it will obviously have to be extremely outstanding. 4.10p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR! Sir, I sense that the House is not in the mood to debate these matters and I beg to move that Head 15 stand part.

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

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF CIVIL SERVICE

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

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

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE & ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to move that Head 19 stand part.

The question 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.

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

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 28 stand part I just wish to deal with the Object No. 212.

Sir, I wish to speak to CERO. Mr. Chairman, we have had some days this year where the weather has been particularly inclement. We have not had a lot of damage but we have had some damage and included in the vote for CERO is a request of the House for $67 000 to assist residents who were affected by weather systems on October 23rd, September 8th and October 20th. In addition to those, regionally we have had Hurricane Georges and Hurricane Mitch which have devastated many parts of the north western Caribbean and Central America.

I was quite shocked and disgusted a few weeks ago on a Friday morning as I was coming to work and I heard a former High Court Judge, a former Court of Appeal Judge, on a call in programme abusing the Barbados Labour Party very badly for lighting up Barbados at Independence time, lighting up the roundabouts and highways and so on.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: He was attacking this Party for trying to bring some life to Independence and saying what a horrible thing it was and a waste of money that we should be lighting up Barbados and we have given no money to people who have been affected by the hurricane.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: This Government and *I* daresay the previous Government, neither Government as far as I can see has failed in situations of emergency to fellow Caribbean people or neigbouring States to render assistance when there has been a disaster. We have done it every year for Montserrat, Antigua, Jamaica and wherever there were hurricanes. It was mean and silly and stupid of a man who had such high office in Barbados to criticise a Government when we always come for money every year to help out after the hurricane season.

It upsets me to see a man who has reached that eminence talking foolishness and casting criticism....

Mr. B.M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member's time will come when he will be at a certain stage...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: In respect of Hurricane Georges, we are giving Antigua $10 000; Cuba $10 000; Dominican Republic $10 000; Haiti $10 000 and St. Kitts/ Nevis $50 000. In Central America as a result of Hurricane Mitch, we are splitting between Honduras, Nicaragua and Guatemala $100 000. For Bangladesh in respect of their flooding we are giving $6 000. We have already given Guyana money this year.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, the $67 000 that is budgetted for local residents represents welfare assistance, replacement of household and personal effects. This does not include repairs to houses or to roads and infrastructure.

Sir, in moving that Head 28 stand part, I hope that we have set to rest the Government's commitment on humanitarian grounds to assist countries of the region which have suffered disaster - natural disaster in particular.

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

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTION

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to move that Head 29 stand part.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4,20 p.m.

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Head 30, as amended, stand part. The addendum sets out all the important contributions. A lot of this, Sir, relates to Other Personal Emoluments and National Insurance Contributions, for example the creation of additional posts of Marshal. Thirteen new Marshals were appointed this year after April 1 and as a consequence we had to provide for payment of them and necessary deductions as well as travelling allowances that would attach to the posts.

I wish to inform the House, Sir, that the work that is going on at the Registry in Coleridge Street, the physical works have been completed, are now computerising the Vital Statistics section of the Registry and the hope is that by the end of February, whereas it takes a few days now to get a Birth Certificate, by the end of February after completing that computerisation you should be able to get a Birth Certificate in 10 minutes. The longest thing that will delay the Birth Certificate would be the signature of the Registrar or Deputy Registrar.

We have scanned a whole set of the records, births, deaths and marriages from 1940,1 think, and they are almost up-to-date. They are going back before that. All of this is on computer and it is part of the modernisation of the Registration Department so by the end of the Financial Year that system would be fully in place. You can get a Birth Certificate in 10 minutes. They said five when they had the meeting with me more than two weeks ago. I said, when I have to tell the public I will say 10. They are telling me five minutes. That will be a vast improvement. It is part of my Ministry's contribution to public sector reform and the customer service rendering these departments a little more user friendly.

I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH AFFAIRS AND CULTURE

Hon. Miss M, A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the provision in this supplementary relates to a number of matters some of them pertaining to matters such as the need for the upgrading of contracts for photocopiers and broken down vehicles and hence the sum in the general Ministry for $25 000 to relieve that shortfall that will accrue as a result.

Issues such as travel to officers for the Education Project Implementation Unit, issues such as moneys to finish securing the provision of instructional materials for the new schools that have been built and also funds to be able to acquire equipment for the equipping of a basement in the new All Saints Primary School, for us to establish a satellite centre at the Barbados Community College Hospitality Institute in the basement.

When we started to dig the foundation we realised that we had enough room underneath there to build an entire basement and a decision was taken at the same time, given that the Barbados Community College Hospitality Institute was in fact looking for a place to establish a training centre to the North of the Island, that we would use the basement of the All Saints School to provide that training centre. It meant therefore that we have now to be able to provide the equipment for it so that we can start to train persons in tourism and hospitality management in the Northern part of the island.

Equally the Edna Nicholls School, there is a sum of $3 000 to complete the payment of the contract for the refurbishment of the old Boscobel School for the establishment of the Edna Nicholls School which will act as an out of school suspension centre, where persons once suspended pursuant to the amendments made to the Education Act in this Parliament earlier, would be able to attend and receive special treatment rather than those children staying at home and not having to submit themselves to any sort of counselling or special programming to be able to deal with the difficulties.

Equally the sum $80 000 was inadvertently placed under another head in the Estimates and therefore this sum must now be corrected in order to allow us to purchase plant, furniture and equipment.

There are also other sums required for us to be able to settle outstanding contracts under the existing World Bank projects and those invoices have now come in. Equally we have had an increase in the number of people sitting exams in Barbados and as a result it means therefore that we will have to be able to face increased invoices pursuant to the increased costs for those additional people to sit exams.

Equally there are sums for the Library and the National Cultural Foundation and the general Ministry of Youth Affairs and Culture to be able to allow us to meet certain expenses that have accrued, some in terms of travel and other areas and in the circumstances I beg to move, Sir, that Head 34 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TOURISM AND INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT

Head 35 was called and passed.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Head 36 was called and passed.

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORT AND HOUSING

Head 42 was called and passed.

HEAD 50 - POST OFFICE

Head 50 was called and passed.
4.30 p.m.

On the motion ofRt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. Chairman reported the passing, of the Resolution in Committee of Supply and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ORDER NO. 10 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF LAND AT LEARS PLANTATION IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, we have already had a full debate in this House when this property was acquired by the Crown. This Resolution seeks to vest the property in the National Housing Corporation for the purposes of disposition to those tenants presently on the land. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. Speaking on the Resolution I really just want to say a few words. I would not have been here when they did the acquisition but this acquisition has become necessary as a result of the displacement or the likely displacement of a number of residents in the Lewis Gap/Storey Gap area who have been unable to get water between 1989 and now, largely because the Barbados Water Authority took the decision that since the houses were in the Zone 1 area that they would be unable to get it even though there are other houses in both Lewis Gap and Storey Gap with access to water.

The reality is that in the circumstances it would be unconscionable on our part to allow those persons to remain in those conditions where they have had to benefit from their neighbour's generosity in order to be able to access running water and in order to be able to execute their normal household chores and other chores with any reasonable comfort levels.

We hope that we will be able to adequately resite these residents and at the same time be able to meet the needs that were not being met by them even before 1994 where their circumstances were never looked upon with a favourable eye.

The National Housing Corporation has also agreed that it would help them meet some of the cost of relocation and in the circumstances I strongly welcome this Resolution and look forward to the speedy relocation of these residents who have had to endure difficult and hard circumstances, some for nearly 10 years, some for 4 to 5 years. In the circumstances, Sir, I strongly support the Resolution before us in this Chamber.

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

ORDER NO. 11 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT WALKERS, ST. ANDREW

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a similar Resolution. This land has already been acquired by the Crown. In this case, the land will be disposed of for the purpose of enabling the National Housing Corporation to get on with its capital works programme.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 14 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT SIX MENS, ST. PETER

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, again this land has already been acquired by the Crown. We have had a full debate in this House on this particular Resolution on more than one occasion and it is hoped that we will be able through the National Housing Corporation to dispose of these lands to those persons presently residing thereon.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Rt.

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

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions to ask the Minister. I would like to know, Sir, in light of the prevailing prices of land in Barbados, where there is a mad rush for land that is inland and people are prepared to pay over $12 a square foot for land, I would like to know from the Minister how much money he is prepared to pay for this beachland that is situated in one of the best parishes in the north of the island and whether the compensation that has been offered is greater than the amount that is now being received by a private company in inland Barbados.

I honestly believe, Sir, as I have said in this Parliament, that any land to the north of Barbados which happens to be the head of Barbados must be precious land and should be treated in that way. I would like to know from the Minister what price he is prepared to pay for this land.

I would also like to know from the Minister in acquiring this land if he is prepared to treat the tenants on the land, if they have to remain, in the same way as if they were removed, because I believe that these tenants on this land, if they have to remain on this land, that their properties should be repaired to such a level as if their houses were removed from the land. If not, Sir, it is my opinion that these tenants would not be treated fairly, Sir. I am suggesting, Sir, that the Minister should repair the houses and make sure that the location of the houses is such that people can easily get access to them. 4.40 p.m.

I already made a suggestion to the Government, Sir, that the Government should go ahead and I will support them in any way of acquiring an alternative piece of land, so that these houses could be properly relocated and placed on adequate lots.

Sir, in making this suggestion, I believe that Barbados is a small country and that we should be looking at the long-term benefit of the country. It might be short-term wise to make this decision at the present moment. But I honestly believe that in the long term, Sir, the people at Six Mens, and also the landlord of this land will not gain. That is, Sir, this land is such that these tenants will find themselves being bombarded by the neighbours who are near to them.

And when you consider, Sir, that to the North of this land you are going to have a development in Shermans and to the South you are having the Port Charles, Paradise Heights, *et cetera*, we are going to find ourselves in a situation where people who should be settling and able to appreciate the piece of land they have, they will be bombarded by the land sharks of Barbados who feel that money is the factor to decide everything in this country. And they are going to bombard these poor people every day, as soon as the five years are up, to sell them that piece of land and I feel that we should protect these people from situations like this.

That is why I am calling on the Honourable Member for St. Peter to consider the suggestion that I have made to him where these people can be removed and given a good piece of land. I am not talking about any 2 500 square feet, or 3 500 square feet, but a piece of land that these people can easily work and they can grow their agricultural produce *et cetera.*

But I do not believe, Sir, that we should leave these people as threats to themselves. I mean this is not a political speech, Sir. This is a speech that ten years from now, when everything is considered, people will recognise that what I said should have been accepted.

I can understand the Right Honourable Prime Minister needing these people because to be quite honest with you, Sir, Six Mens is an area that can be appreciated. And, one would understand why any Parliamentary representative would want people to remain in that particular area. But sometimes we need to look a little further on and recognise that the same thing that happened in Mount Stanfast, *et cetera*, will happen to these same people and we need to make sure that we do what we think is right and protect these people. It is a good short-term plan, Sir, but I am not sure that it is a good long-term plan in the interest of the tenants at Six Mens.

I am also calling on the Minister to make sure that the landlord be fairly compensated for his land because there are a lot of people who sometimes feel that land does not have a particular value because it is not being used at the particular time for what someone plans to use it for in the future. But once one considers what is going on in the country at the present moment, Sir, one can understand and appreciate the value of the land at Six Mens. The same way that the owners of the land at Shermans can appreciate the value of their land, and the owners at Paradise Heights and

the owners at Port St. Charles, and the Barbados Mutual which is inland, one can only understand the feeling of the landlord who owns this land. If this land was mine, I would regard it as a pot of gold and I would treasure it as a pot of gold.

Thank you very much.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I really had wished not to have to speak in this debate, but the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is such an appalling representative of his own constituency that I cannot afford to allow the records of this Parliament to show that he misrepresented the interest of the constituents whom I have a duty to represent in this House.

This matter, Sir, is not just about Six Mens. It is about the perfidy of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Right Honourable Prime Minister is misleading the House by giving the impression that I am a poor representative.

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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the Democratic Labour Party has made or tried to make a cause out of the notion that small black people in Barbados are being deprived of the opportunity to live near the sea coast of this country. And that there is a plan in place to move them from living near the sea coast and let that land be occupied for the purposes of private development particularly coming from abroad. That is the charge they are putting, Sir.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: In Six Mens, Sir, you have a case of a community that has been a settled community for 300 years. It was always a tenantry attached to a plantation.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He indicated that the Democratic Labour Party is making certain charges against his Administration. Sir, it is not the Democratic Labour Party, it is the whole of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point or order, please! That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Six Mens is a test. The crucial test of the Democratic Labour Party's seriousness on this issue, 200 black families, Sir ...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member is saying that the Six Mens issue is a test and he went on, Sir. I do not wish to repeat what he said.

The fact is that Your Honour is fully aware that the Six Mens -1 do not know what to call it - a tenantry, an estate or whatever - was acquired by one Government, abandoned by another and reacquired by another Government. This is an area of Barbados in which, if there is any test it would be about a single individual, black, small person trying to make his way and being thwarted at every point along the way by a Government. That is what the test is about, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, Six Mens is a tenantry, not designated as a tenantry for the purpose of the Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act, but it is a tenantry and has existed as a settlement for over 300 years. It has not been designated as a tenantry for the Freehold Purchase Act, because that says that land on the fore-shore cannot be designated for purchase under the Act. But Six Mens is a place where people have lived, worked and small Barbadians worshipped for 300 years.

The dangerous notion being put by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is that 200 small, black, Barbadian families, living close to a beach should be carted from where they are working, living, worshipping ...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I never said that and the Honourable Member knows that the land is owned by a poor black man.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Again, Sir, this challenges the Democratic Labour Party to pick who they will support. The man who owns the plantation and the 29 acres is the small black man. But the 200 families, Sir, are the people who are unfairing the small black man.

Sir, I have to set the record clear. Six Mens has been an established community for 200 years. There are churches in Six Mens and there are people in Six Mens who depend on being in Six Mens for their livelihood. There are fishermen there, but the biggest boat building industry in Barbados is in Six Mens. 4.50 p.m.

The notion of carting Six Mens community from where they are, from where people are living, from where people are worshipping, from where people are making a living, and carting them somewhere in the country, that is the Honourable Member for St. .Lucy's view. The owner of this land was not the original owner of Six Mens.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The, Honourable Member is misleading the House on two points. (1) he said that Six Mens is the largest boat building area in the north, which is wrong, because it is Shermans; and (2) the suggestion that I want somebody to cart somebody in some outland is wrong. The land that I speak of where the

people should be resited is right next door to where the people were removed from the beach and placed, so there is no outland or somewhere in the back.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right. You have made your point, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the history of this matter has properly to be told. The now owner of Six Mens was not the owner long ago. But sometime in the 80s, Sif, he bought the land. He came and found an established tenantry but because of the nature of Six Mens as land near the foreshore, those tenants did not enjoy any security of tenure under the Freehold Purchase Act and his first response to them was not let me try to put things right with you but I am going to go abroad and bring a group of foreign investors and I am going to throw you off the land....

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Prime Minister is behaving, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please! You have to state your point of order.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, and you know I always do that, Sir.

The Honourable Prime Minister is misleading the House by giving the impression that Six Mens was the only piece of land in Barbados that carried those certain characters. I am saying that is wrong that in St. James by Sand Piper the same thing happened.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, as I said, it has a history. The landowner came and bought the land, found that because the land was not designated as a tenantry for the purpose of the Freehold Purchase Act that the tenants could not buy, nor did they have security of tenure and his first act was to issue letters and tell all to move.

What we did in 1985, recognising the deficiency, we sought to acquire the land at Six Mens by compulsory acquisition to put things right with the tenants because the owner had this big plan to dispose of people and put foreign investors on the land. The reaction of the Democratic Labour Party in 1987 was to abandon the acquisition where upon this same owner put all of those people in court.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, when in Opposition I brought a resolution to this House that was never debated, bringing to the Government's attention the plight of those tenants and asked that they be allowed to continue to live, work and worship in places even where their grandfathers had lived. You had a process of continued harassment by those persons for the period 1986 to 1994 because there was the perception that the then Administration might have given, although it never did to its credit, planning permission to the developer to bring in foreign investors to throw the people of Six Mens off the land and convert that into some sort of investment by religious entrepreneurs.

Sir, it is my Government's policy that where you have an established community, that has been an established community for 300 years, a person who has just come and acquired rights of land and become a landlord just cannot dispossess persons whose stake in that land go back for generations.

We have insisted that the land has to be reacquired for us to put things right with the tenants. If the argument has to be that the value of the land should relate more to be established as foreshore land rather than plantation tenantry because it really was a plantation tenantry, then so be. Six Mens Plantation was a plantation and the persons living at Six Mens were the agricultural workers working at Six Mens Plantation and living in the Six Mens Tenantry. It is called Six Mens Tenantry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because the Democratic Labour Party abandoned the acquisition between 1987 and 1994, a large number of people went on the land. I wrote letters over and over again to the Town Planner begging him to act because it was putting an enormous pressure on me because the Light and Power and the Water Authority refused to give them services because they were not in legal possession of the land and they were coming to me as the MP.

There are letters in the office of the Town Planner begging him to stop the squatting taking place in Six Mens because we were having a situation where people were putting houses cheek and jowl on each other. In that period people built houses in the watercourse. People have built houses at Six Mens between 1987 and 1994 in the alignment where the road is supposed to run and the real problem has been that the squatters have not been able to get services provided for them.

Our reacquisition of the land at Six Mens is not intended to unfair any small black man, Sir. It is, in our judgment, to recognise the superior rights of an established community to continue to function as a community, and that is the point.

I feel, Sir, that the question of how much a man is paid is a legitimate issue but you just cannot take 200 householders and cart them away from where they were living. You just cannot.

I am saying, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has on more than one occasion put before this House the notion that we are unfairing the landowner because there are people who want to come from the United States of America and invest and build a marina at Six Mens.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I have never questioned the landowner at Port St. Charles owning his land. What I have questioned ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, you have not heard my point yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: You just made your point that you have never questioned it. That was your point of order. Take your seat, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, if there was abandoned land at Six Mens and a landowner wanted to develop the land, and we found a way of blocking him, then I would feel that we unfaired the landowner, but the landowner bought a plantation on which there was a pre-existing tenantry. He threw the tenants off the land.

Sir, I had to engage the services of lawyers to take that landowner off the backs of the 200 families at Six Mens. I am really saying, Sir, that when you analyse it, there is no Member in this House faced with a situation where you have an established community, and a landowner is going to tell you cart 200 Barbadian families, some of whose only livelihood is either fishing or boat building, and carry them somewhere else and let that land be used for some church group from America to come and put up a hotel and so on, that is utter madness. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Peter is misleading this House. Faced with a similar situation in Checker Hall and Broomefield, I have called on the Honourable Member for St. Peter to re-site the people from Checker Hall, Maycocks and Broomefield so that they would not continue to be affected by the cement plant.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the proper issue in this case is proper compensation to the land owner for the land. I acknowledge that as a valid issue. Those persons who constituted Six Mens as an established Barbadian community, I feel, also have a stake in this country which should not be ridden roughshod on by anybody whether it be Government or any landlord, particularly a landlord who is interested in developing with some group from the United States of America of dubious origin.

Sir, I will say to the Democratic Labour Party that I remember in 1986...

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The project was put to the Democratic Labour Party as a project in 1986 and late in 1986 Errol Barrow and the whole Democratic Labour Party went down to Six Mens and between 1986 and 1994 there has never been any Planning Commission for what the landlord wants for Six Mens. Nobody has ever drawn any serious project, no financing has ever been put down because the project is just a fiction. I challenge the Democratic Labour Party to show me any plans submitted to them between 1986 and 1994 that they have ever approved in the nature of what the Honourable Member for St. Lucy wants us now to approve.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: As for the jetty, Sir. Edghill Construction has drawn two sets of money for jetties in St. Peter. One for a jetty that was never built. When we left office in 1986 there were plans for building a jetty in Speightstown and Edghill held the contract. The Democratic Labour Party came and cancelled the contract and Edghill was paid a large sum of money for not building a jetty in Speightstown under the Democratic Labour Party.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The jetty in Speightstown was built and the jetty in Oistins was built for eight hundred dollars and something thousand dollars in 1981.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. Let me hear the point that is being made.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, the hundreds of Barbadians living at Six Mens and working in Six Mens ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one minute. The Honourable Member, please, let me hear the Honourable Member please. I am just begging you, please. Please address the Chair properly. Please let us hear the Honourable Member, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get back my time that has been surrendered by the interruptions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John. Is there something that you want to say? First of all, if you are speaking to the Chair, you will have to stand up.

Proceed please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, in four years, the only thing that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has ever asked for St. Lucy, is an airport.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Peter is misleading the House. He said that the only thing that I have ever asked for in St. Lucy is an airport which means that everything that I have said to you and this House that you have not listened to and I will have to report to the people of St. Lucy.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, the Government has compulsorily acquired all the land at Six Mens to put things right with the long established tenants and to put things right as well with the squatters. The squatters have now been on Six Mens some going back now as far as 1987. Between 1987 and 1994 that squatting situation was allowed to fester. Also Six Mens has now evolved as one of the most important fish landing sites on the west coast of Barbados and without landing facilities. Many people will know that Six Mens people, in their own way, have evolved a kind of arrangement for selling foods at night that bears a relationship and comparison with Oistins but not on the same scale. What is now happening is that a study is being done to design a fish landing facility and other vending facilities at Six Mens because it is the most important fish landing site on the west coast....

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Braddie said that he did not kill Pele.

Sir, the facts are that there is now a plan for the rational development of Six Mens as a Barbadian community that will see the situation put right for the squatters. The tenants whose families have been there for generations will not only be given security. Also fish landing and marketing facilities will be put in at Six Mens as soon as the designs have been completed. The feasibility study of it has already been carried out and we have commissioned designs for the improved facilities at Six Mens. 5.10p.m.

As regards Skeete Bay and Consett Bay, Sir, the plans and designs for both have been drawn. The expenditure has been approved in this year's estimates. The works for both Consett Bay and Skeete Bay will shortly be undertaken, Sir, but those are already in the programme.

May I say, Sir, that it is a very sad thing when a whole debate has to be entered into to impress upon the Democratic Labour Party that the people of Six Mens deserve to live in a settled community like any other people in this country.

I commend this Resolution to the House and beg that it do so pass, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I sat in amazement and listened to the Honourable Member, the Prime Minister and representative for St. Peter as he spoke in this matter. I sat in amazement because, Sir, I do not purport to understand how he represents his constituents. The Prime Minister in another capacity has had quite a lot to say about how other people represent their constituencies but I am not going to try to discuss him in terms of his representation. I did that once before and I have never recovered from it. I suffer as a result of having discussed the Prime Minister and St. Peter a very long time ago, in 1984 or thereabouts. He never will allow me so long as he has power in this country to forget that.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, I do not get a chance to speak politically at the ^{4}O' Level Institute. But, Sir, I hold the 'O' Level Institute in high regard. As the Speaker knows I have always done. I go to funerals and cry because I have soul and heart. I am not like those who, because they hold their position and have no idea at all about how they should treat people and feel that when people die they do not have to cry. I will recommend to those who do not know how to cry that they get a course in how to cry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member want to tell us where you can get such a course?

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

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. You could not get that at the 'O' Level Institute. You can find other things at the 'O' Level Institute but not how to cry. It starts a lot earlier, Sir. Your Honour is too far gone to benefit but younger people who worship at the feet of compassion and understanding will have the capacity to benefit from the course on how to cry. I cannot teach either Your Honour or the representative for St. Peter, or indeed many of the persons on the Other Side on how to cry but, Sir, at another time and another place, outside of this Chamber, Sir, I will give Your Honour some instructions on how to learn how to cry. It would not be long, Sir. By the middle of January or February or thereabouts we would be able to discuss that in full. But I was really disappointed to hear the Honourable Member in his presentation seeking to denigrate the owner of the Six Mens property.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I said denigrate. No bald head person is going to come and tell me what language to use.

I beg your pardon, Sir. I withdraw bald head, Sir. But I did not say short bald head either.

Mr. Speaker, I was really very disappointed. The Honourable Member for St. Peter spoke in terms of Mr. Broomes' property as if Mr. Broomes was a multi-headed monster who had come from somewhere.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, I never mentioned anything of the kind, Sir. All I said was that the matter as it pertains to Six Mens concerns how we treat the interest of people who have lived there for a generation and a person who had purchased a plantation on which there is a tenantry. I drew no qualitative judgements about whether Mr. Broomes was a multi-headed or single headed monster. I stated the facts that it has to do with how we balance the interest of the landlord and balance the interest of the tenants. I stand, Sir, in this matter squarely on the side of the tenants. That is all I am saying.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish that to be a point of order. Do not prevent the Prime Minister from getting up, Sir, because he is going to be getting up quite a lot, Sir. I may not always understand what he is saying and how he is saying it but I understood him to be putting Mr. Broomes in a different position from those investors who come from elsewhere. It is interesting to hear the Prime Minister in the language which he uses as he describes the entrepreneur who was trying to develop a project in Six Mens and anyone who has ever heard the Prime Minister speak about the entrepreneur, the type who developed a project on the other side of the road, just across the street, as the crow flies. If you hear the language which the Prime Minister uses when he is describing them, it is an entirely different language.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There are no other investors in St. Peter who have moved 200 households in order to carry out an investment in St. Peter. As far as I am aware and these are the facts, people have developed land in St. Peter that has been in bush for years and if the Member for St. Michael West cannot draw a distinction between investors developing land that is in bush and developers coming and taking a community with 200 households and moving them, then, Sir, he has a problem, not me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I have a problem. I have always had a problem of that kind and I will always have a problem when we have Barbadians who emerge from a certain level of society and who could take positions in regard to one set of people, some of whom they have never seen as compared with somebody like Mr. Broomes who comes from St. Peter, who comes from the country, who comes from the North, who is somebody whom the Prime Minister would have known and ought to have known as compared with the people he has never seen. I am always amazed, Sir. I have a problem. This is a Prime Minister who said that he wants to see a small black man with $200 million in his pocket.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the only action I have ever had to take against Mr. Broomes is that I have had to engage lawyers to help the householders of Six Mens whom Mr. Broomes put in court to try to get them ejected from lands where their forefathers have lived for almost 300 years. If that condemns me, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand condemned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as I said, Sir, he would be up and down like a jackdaw. They will not put me out, Sir. I have nothing but time and to the extent that he wishes to jump up, he can jump up.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am concerned that the Prime Minister in putting the case ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member is misleading the House about my attitude towards the landlord, Sir. The Member is misleading the House, Sir. I have the same regard for Mr. Broomes' rights as a landlord, Sir, as I have for any landlord in St. Michael West who may be leasing a house to a tenant, Sir, and then have the house burnt down under conditions that are said to be arson. 5.20 p.m.

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

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has directed me to withdraw the remarks and in deference to the House and the Chair I withdraw those remarks. I go on to say...

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute please! Could we have some order? I asked the Honourable Member to withdraw the remarks and the Honourable Member has withdrawn the remarks.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has withdrawn the remarks. Let us proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour knows, just before Your Honour ruled, the Honourable Member in doing a point of order gave inference to if a certain person was a tenant of a landlord whose house was burnt down and I am the only person in this Chamber who over the last year has

had an unfortunate circumstance which was in fact a fire. It is a reasonable inference that the Honourable Member was making reference to my fire since I was the speaker, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order. I have said, Sir, that I have the same sympathy with the tenants of Six Mens who faced pressure from landlords as I do with any tenant whose house or office is burnt down and then that tenant charges that there is a scent of arson about it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member continues to leave in the air as if... Mr. Speaker, I am now giving you as a matter of fact that the General Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party at a function at the Hilton Hotel went on the stage and left the public with the impression that the General Secretary of the Barbados Labour Party was making reference to suggest that the fire which had occurred in St. Michael West was a fire of which the Member for St. Michael West had importance ...

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this House. The calypso king of Barbados, 'Red Plastic Bag* in singing his song "Material" asked a question as to who should get locked up for St. Joseph Hospital. He called me on stage and asked me again, who should get locked up for the St. Joseph Hospital. I said I did not know. As I was leaving he said something and I said, "What, whose house burnt down?" That is all that I said.

I have never accused anybody of burning down any house. I have never said that I know who burnt down the house. I happen to know that the house was to have been rented to another person and because the other person could not get into the house because the Honourable Member refused to vacate the house and said that over his dead body would he ever leave that house. That is all I know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, order, please! We are debating the Resolution relating to the vesting of land. We are not going to hear anything else. The Chair will not permit any further discussion on matters that are in no way connected.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am saying that this Chair will not allow any further discussion on matters that do not relate to this Resolution. Sir, if you are continuing, we are continuing with this Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with the greatest respect the Honourable Member just said that she knows and was making reference to my person. Sir, she was attacking my integrity and giving information to your Honour. I first of all state categorically that I did not... 5.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we go any further you are making sure that we know what the Honourable Member has said. I just said that we are not going to permit that anymore. The Honourable Member has made some accusation. Is this what you were trying to say?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was very clear. I have never accused ...

Aside.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No. Mr. Speaker, and I explain. I have never accused the Honourable Member of arson. Not here or anywhere.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I said that I know that the landlord wanted the house for another purpose and he refused to vacate the premises.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Order. Proceed please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West has .said on this Floor that I have said things out of this House that defame him. There are laws in this country that allow a citizen who believes that he has been defamed to seek redress in a court of law.

I am saying, Sir, that I have never said anything out of this House to defame the Honourable Member and I am asking for those remarks to be withdra"wn. In proof of it, if I were to say anything outside of this House to defame the Honourable Member, Sir, I am confident that he will seek his damages and redress in a court of law. Sir, I am asking that those remarks to me alleging that I have defamed him outside of the House, Sir, be withdrawn and be struck from the record.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Wh3t words I said? I want to hear the words I said. I stand by what I said, Sir. I do not know what it is I said that he said that I said, but whatever I said, I stand by.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just proceed, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would say this in passing that even if the Honourable Member has defamed me outside, it is a waste of time putting him in court because he has it on record in this House that he was incapable of sustaining himself. So I do not see that it would be any point putting him in court.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we get on with the Resolution now, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am glad to see that in the short time he has been Prime Minister, he has reached a point where he would be able pay and therefore I would know now that if he opens his mouth outside of here in the 4O' Level Institute or anywhere else, I would put him in court. I promise him faithfully, but when it comes to the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please, just get back to the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But the Honourable Member for St. Peter is central to Six Mens, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And that is what I am trying to do, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You are not central to Six Mens. The Honourable Member for St. Peter feels that he can continue to get up in here and outside and cast aspersions and whenever the time comes that he has to be in reception, he is unable to take it.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do you hear what he is saying, Sir, that your right side does not hear as well as your left side?

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And all I have ever said is that it is clear to me from the *Asides* and the other statements which they make, that prominent Members of the Barbados Labour Party apparently have knowledge about what happened to my house.

It is clear to me from what they have said outside and inside that there are persons in the Barbados Labour Party high in the hierarchy excluding the Deputy Prime Minister who know about how my office got burnt down.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West has referred to people in the hierarchy of the Barbados Labour Party. I am the chairman of the Barbados Labour Party and I suggest to you that he is misleading the House, because I have no knowledge of the circumstances under which his office was burnt down. The only person whom I have heard comment on this matter in public as regards the causes is the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who said that he believes it is arson. I believe also, Sir, that he knows the circumstances that give him the confidence to say in public that it was arson even before it was burnt and I can only accept his word, but I have no proof.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The Honourable Member once again is deceiving the House by making an allegation about the members of the hierarchy of the Barbados Labour Party. As General Secretary, I have no knowledge either special or peculiar and I do not know other than what I have read in the newspaper as a statement from the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who would seem to have some special knowledge before the investigation that it was arson.

And I have to take his words, Sir, because I have absolutely no other knowledge. 5.40 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, so we can put their minds at rest, on the morning when I had the interview of which they speak...

Aside.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, how could I have two minutes? I was the first speaker, Sir, how could I have two minutes?

Mr. SPEAKER: I know what I am doing. Please proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, Sir, the firemen who were investigating the fire told me that it started in the front and it appeared to them to be arson. That is where I got it from. Subsequently the Labour Party people and their agents have been making statements which lead me to believe, and I verily believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Labour Party has knowledge of how the fire was started.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will say so outside. I will go outside and say I verily believe, especially the general secretary, based on her behaviour and demeanour at the Hilton Hotel suggesting that she knows how the fire was started.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, you will have to withdraw those remarks. According to the Rules of this Chamber...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The general secretary is in here, Sir?

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has referred to a general secretary knowing about arson. The only general secretary that knows about arson would have to be someone of another political party because I know nothing. Whether it is the general secretary of the Democratic Labour Party who happens to be the Honourable Member for St. Michael West or any other general secretary, I do not know, but this general secretary knows nothing about arson.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, but the general secretary of the Democratic Labour Party or the general secretary of the NDP was not on the stage at the Hilton discussing whose house burned down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your time has expired. Take your seat.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ORDER NO. 15 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THE WHIM, ST. PETER, FOR THE PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR USE BY THE PUBLIC

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to acquire 1.765 hectares of land at the Whim, St. Peter for recreational purposes. This is an area of land that will go a long way toward alleviating the pleadings of the residents in The Whim who, for some time, did not have adequate recreational facilities. It will certainly add to the existing facilities in that area.

It is also in keeping with Government's policy of ensuring that such facilities are at present both in existing developments and in new developments being planned by Government through the National Housing Corporation and also through the Ministry of Housing.

The Honourable Member for St. Peter will speak to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this resolution, I must say that it is a great pleasure to have this particular measure before Parliament. Like Six Mens, the Whim is a long established St. Peter community that has a heritage that goes back hundreds of years and it needs to have about it all of the aspects of a community, including the provision of proper community facilities.

The Whim has, in its time, Sir, produced a number of outstanding citizens, among them at least two candidates on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party. Mr. Leacock and Mrs. Leacock have both been residents of the Whim. It is a good'rural community, hardy people.

I am pleased to be able to represent their interest in this House on this occasion and to say that this land which is intended for the use of the residents as a playing field will greatly add to the sense of community in a village that has desperately needed facilities for a very long time.

Sir, I do not have to make any secret of the fact that in my constituency there is only one box that I do not win and it is in this box, and I do not have to win it to win an election either, but it is a large community and this Government is committed to a policy that all settled communities in Barbados must have proper facilities. We are doing it bit by bit and we are going to get there one day. We are doing it in St. Joseph. We are doing it in Arch Hall. We are doing it in St. Philip. We are doing it in areas that support the BLP, NDP, and the DLP because it is the correct thing to do and I commend this resolution.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will be supporting this resolution. The Whim is an area, not as described earlier. It is not a very large district but one must appreciate that the talents and the athletic skills of the residents in that particular area are such that the residents of the Whim deserve this particular playing field, It should also be recognised, Sir, that the people living on the Rock Development, should be able to benefit from this particular playing field and also Bakers.

I want to say, Sir, that I am very grateful to the Prime Minister for stating that his Government...

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Honourable Member for St. Peter has just declared a policy which I appreciate. He said that he is quite prepared to treat Barbados as a whole and put those amenities where they are needed.

As he said, Sir, they have done it with the playing field so I would appreciate if he would also do it with the roads in St. Lucy because for the last 4/z years, Sir, St. Lucy has not seen one single tenantry road and I would like to believe that that nice policy enunciated by the Prime Minister will be implemented in St. Lucy too, unless he is implying that St. Lucy is not part of Barbados. I hope that is not what he is implying because if that policy is correct, then we wfculd have had some tenantry roads also in St. Lucy.

I want to show the Prime Minister, Sir, that I am quite prepared...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. The resolution clearly states that it relates to recreational facilities. Please, do not let us get into any debate now relating to roads. 5.50p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, a road is a recreational facility. Road tennis is played on roads, Sir. We would like to have some in St. Lucy so that we can play some road tennis.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on the Right Honourable Prime Minister to make the necessary resources available to the Ministry of Transport & Works so that we can get some roads in St. Lucy also.

I thank you very much.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am heartened every time I see a resolution come to this House dealing with providing sporting facilities for areas such as the areas that we are talking about in St. Peter. I believe that sports should be used as a means for the development of the youth of this country and also for bringing our communities together. I will never object to a sporting facility being provided for any area in Barbados.

Sir, I am becoming increasingly concerned about a recent trend where there is violence around playing facilities. You hear about violence around the playing facility in Eden Lodge...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member please. I am not going to allow you to proceed along that line because that is going to take you into a completely different area. The resolution clearly states that it is about acquisition of land for recreational facilities. This is not that kind of debate this afternoon.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not want you to insult my intelligence and indeed I will not insult yours.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, your inference on the Chair, you will have to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: I will withdraw the remarks but please let me make my point, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Make your point.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: I am making the point that there is no use acquiring facilities to have them there without going a little further than that. What is so difficult to understand. I do not understand what is the problem. If we have facilities being organised, how can you have facilities in a vacuum without looking at the other things that are necessary. I am talking, Sir, specifically about providing security to areas where we have these sporting facilities.

While you can talk about acquiring land for sporting facilities, if we do not have effective surveillance of these facilities by the police ...

Asides.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, if this continues, I can go home for the rest of the Sitting. We are coming in here to discuss the nation's business and I am trying to make a serious point about the protection of facilities and I am hearing murmurs from people who are prepared to come in here and make sport. People are talking about burning down houses and all of that foolishness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please, the Honourable Member.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: I am making a developmental point about playing fields where people can be killed...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member please. Order, please. Could you continue, please.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Last Sunday, the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, he was present when a gentleman ran across a field with a gun, on a playing field...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR? On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, there are rules of this House governing the relevance. I have sat in this House as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West knows where the debate comes pertaining to land acquisition in Six Mens or Speightstown and that you cannot vary a debate to bring in such circumstances. I am urging you to rule and to keep this debate within the four quarters of the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Continue, please or are you finished?

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: I am not finished. I have to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before you proceed, just let me say that there are rules in this House. All Honourable Members will abide by the Rules. According to the Rules of this House, Honourable Member, you are supposed to stick to the resolution and the Chair will direct you as it sees fit. Please proceed.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, I am making the point that our playing fields need to be protected against violence. I saw for myself where the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central could have been shot last Sunday evening on a playing field while in St. Patricks, where a gentleman ran across a field with a big gun and shouted at another fellow and passed right beside the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central. I was next to him and I had to ask him to move out of the road. I am saying that our fields need to be protected and instead of police charging people for their use at these community events, policemen should routinely be supervising and surveilling these areas where there are large crowds of people at these facilities.

If we are going to talk about facilities, we have to talk about the protection of people who are there because soon from now, people are not going anywhere around a playing facility or else they are going to get gunned down. I personally will not feel safe. I will have to walk about with some kind of vest. People running across playing fields and shooting at one another and all of that foolishness going on and people are talking about people burning down houses. That is nonsense.

Asides.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: We need to have community development such that the police is integrally involved and start charging people and protect the patrons at these events. You have to look at the development of the community in a holistic way where sports is just an integral part of the activity at the community level.

I cannot speak of sports in a vacuum. Sports is connected to the society and the police are part of the protection of the society. I am telling you that those other people who were there last Sunday, I am sure that they will not be inclined to come back and I am sure that the matured people are not coming back because they are not coming back for anybody to shoot them down when they are watching football or anything like that. You go to the Stadium for recreation and it is the same thing. People throw rocks at you and all that foolishness. We have to look seriously at societal development and that is what we are in here about. I will not stand up here again and beg for a facility for Inch Marlowe. I have begged for that enough. 6.00 p.m.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church East were ordered to be struck from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: So, Sir, I support anything to do with providing sporting facilities. You have to look at the protection of the patrons who go around these sporting facilities as well. This is a modern age. Marcelle Boyce had to pay $400 for police on Independence Day in St. Patricks. How are people going to have these events at these sporting facilities if they have to pay this money up front for the police? We have to have a subsidy or something so that the area can be provided or it has to be part of the system where the police have to protect these areas. These poor communities cannot afford $400 a day for security, for a free event. It is a free event.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member ...

Asides.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Not violence. Violence is caused by one or two people who are on the loose, not the general public who come here to enjoy themselves and the general public has to be protected from the one or two who are doing foolishness. That is the point I am making, Sir.

Sir, I thank you very much.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was very moved by the insights which the Honourable Member for Christ Church East brought to this acquisition. In a place as peaceful as the Whim, where perhaps the most sensible people in St. Peter reside, and I say perhaps. I said the most sensible people.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAJTT: The Honourable Member for St. Peter is an economist but English is not his favourite subject so he might not...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, proceed. Let us proceed please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know you would hear me, Sir, and you would not listen to these matters which are not important. Quite seriously the Honourable Member for St. Peter on more than one occasion has alluded to the fact that he has a special responsibility to bring facilities to his constituency and if he would leave his remarks at that point, more times than not he would get applause from all the rest

of us because certainly those of us who visited St. Peter in the early 1980s cannot help but love the distinguished and dear people of St. Peter.

We have so many fond memories of that constituency that every time we hear that something nice is happening to St. Peter we wish to applaud, but the Honourable Member in his quest to remember only St. Peter while making comments about his wide and varied approach to providing facilities, ought really not to take the opportunity to cast aspersions on or make remarks about people in other constituencies.

I do not accept, Sir, that it is fair that a constituency like St. Michael Central or St. Michael West which might have been starved, in the case of St. Michael West definitely would have been starved of facilities such as this one in the Whim, starved of any opportunity to have these facilities when the Government of the day decides not to provide those facilities and then the Leader of the Government takes the opportunity to say to the people in that constituency that the representation over time has not brought them any facilities.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as Your Honour knows it is only when the Government of the day brings something to St. Michael Central that the Speaker is able to say with impunity that something has been brought to St. Michael Central. I read in a newspaper that the Speaker was very appreciative of the effort of the Prime Minister to bring some facilities to St. Michael Central.

I wish however, Sir, that the Government could bring some facilities instead of casting aspersions on the efforts of those who represent certain constituencies. I wish that the Prime Minister and his Government would desist from trying to give the impression that it is possible for an Honourable Member on this Side to acquire land for recreational purposes. There is no Honourable Member on this Side who can acquire land for recreational purposes. If land has not been acquired in a constituency for recreational purposes during the time of a Government then the only person to be blamed for that would be the Government because the Government would have demonstrated poor planning capacity. The Government would have demonstrated disinterest in a particular group or they would have demonstrated a certain prejudice toward a certain group. And so to the extent that there are no facilities in a constituency like St. Michael South it does not fall well from the mouth of any Prime Minister or any representative who is attached to the Government to be casting aspersions on say, St. Michael South because they have not been able to acquire certain facilities because the Government is at fault.

I recall, Sir, that the constituency of St. Michael South together with the constituency of St. Michael South West which became St. Michael West, for 12 years under the Tom Adams administration was deliberately starved of any facilities. We have had no difficulty. Immediately after 1986 ...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am coming to that. It is even worse. The Honourable Member is saying St. John was starved under Barrow, to use his words. But you see, Sir, that is precisely the point I am making. It takes a very high quality and visionary leader to be able to neglect his own constituency and allow other constituencies to benefit and the Honourable Member who is saying from time to time that he does not intend to leave anything in his will for his successors ... 6.10p.m.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The only reference I have made to St. Michael West is that I greatly regretted that the $35 million that the Member for St. Michael West...

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ... He should have spent on his constituency. That is all I have said. Rather than spend $35 million on the St. Joseph Hospital he should have spent some money on drainage at Headley's Land and so on to help poor people.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the first place, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance knows that no Minister spends money anywhere. I have heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church South make that point in here on many occasions. Secondly, the Honourable Member must know in his capacity as Chairman of the Cabinet that the only effort that was ever made by a Government to drain Headley's Land and make it palatable and livable was made during the time of the Democratic Labour Party. There are no engineers in the Cabinet although after the next election there might be one or two or three.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, could you get back to the Resolution!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter was making a point of order. I was making the point about facilities and if Your Honour is familiar with Headley's Land as I thought he was then he would know that at the bottom of Headley's Land where there is an alluvial plain there is an area, that had the Government been interested in recreational facilities for the people of Headley's Land that would provide a good opportunity.

Instead the engineers who put in the drainage at Headley's Land obviously made an error and when the representative of St. Michael West drew to their attention there was an error they said that the representative was not an engineer, and as a result the flooding will not allow for recreation at all in Headley's Land and surrounding areas.

Sir, at the back of the Trade Union there is an area that is about to be turned into a park and that area ...

Mr. SPEAKER: What has this to do with the Resolution?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am recommending that the Government acquires part of that land in the same way that it is acquiring The Whim.

If Your Honour will allow me to develop the point...

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not really want to get into discussion about Headleys Land at this point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the only reason I am not discussing land in Bush Hall is because the Honourable Member triggered my mind by raising Headleys Land. If I wanted to deal with an area I would probably have chosen the area of St. Michael Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: Connect it to the Resolution in some way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is connected to the Resolution. We are discussing recreation. This land is being acquired for recreational purposes. Therefore we could discuss the policy of the Government in its relation to recreational facilities. This is a property for recreational facilities. That is the basis on which I do comparative analysis between what they are doing at The Whim and what they are not doing in St. Michael West. That is the only reason that I would stray from the geographical area of the Whim.

The policy surrounding acquisition of land at the Whim ought to be a policy that is applied across-the-board and hence what applies to The Whim ought to apply in St. Michael Central, St. Michael West, St. Michael South and if in fact the Government applied such a policy then the Prime Minister or any other Minister would find it impossible to make the kind of remarks which they make.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is saying from her seat, from 25 years. That is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please. Could we proceed with the Resolution? We are not going to go down that line again. I suggest that you try not to hear *Asides.* I am not hearing anything.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, you have on two things to stop your ears from hearing. I wear no wig and I cannot not hear. The Honourable Member is in the constituency next door and knows that I fought almost single handedly to get a pavilion and a recreational area in St. Michael West in Passage Road which is used more by the people in Passage Gardens and the people in the City than it is used by the people in the constituency. Therefore when the Honourable Member from her seat talks about hypocrisy it is the height of hypocrisy for a person who utilises the facilities at Passage Garden which is akin to the kind of thing which they should have at The Whim when it is acquired. It is the height of hypocrisy for a representative for the City whose constituents use the Passage Road property and facility more than the people in St. Michael West.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The people in St. Michael West and the people in the City of Bridgetown know that that project was conceptualised by the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it was conceptualised as a housing project and the record will show that this representative fought the Barbados Labour Party in this House to get that land for recreational purposes. The Barbados Labour Party had made a decision on the basis of a gift from the Government of Nigeria that they were going to put a housing project on that property. The record will show...

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is absolutely no truth in that. It was once conceptualised at a skills training facility and the Democratic Labour Party when it came into Government shoved that off.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The record will show and Your Honour can check the record that we fought in here tooth and nail when the Minister of Housing of the Barbados Labour Party had designated Passage Road to be a housing project. The Democratic Labour Party acquired that property in exchange.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please. Just let me stop you there again. I think we are going a bit far. I would like you to focus on the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was discussing recreational facilities. With respect, Sir, I did it with the acquisition of The Whim. Do you wish me to talk about St. Peter? The Whim is one road up to the top. I am discussing the problems in my constituency in relation to this.

I am saying that the Honourable Member got up on a point of order and misled Your Honour and the rest of this House. I was going on to give you the history. That land was acquired ...

Mr. SPEAKER: You will not go on this afternoon to give us the history. The history does not relate to this Resolution.

Mr B. M. TAITT: You can decide that. It is your right. It was an acquisition and is related to this Resolution. The land was exchanged with land that is now at Spring Garden Highway with Plantations Limited. That land of Plantations Limited was exchanged for the seven acres of land in Passage Road and the land in Passage Road was acquired for the same reason that the Whim is being acquired.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, your facts are stated but they are not relevant to this debate. I would like you to get back to this Resolution before the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is about the acquisition of a piece of land. Is that correct, Sir?

This is about an acquisition of land for the purposes of recreation. Your Honour allowed a point of order which said that I was misleading the House and was telling lies in essence. Your Honour now says that if I seek to show the relationship between the acquisition of land at Passage Road, seven acres to be exact, for the purpose of a pavilion and playing field that it is not relevant to the acquisition of land at the Whim; but I am entitled to speak in my own way and tone. I cannot speak the way you speak.

I speak on the Resolution as I see fit. As I have said before, Your Honour can tell me that you are not entertaining me but Your Honour cannot tell me how to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I direct you according to the Rules. Proceed, please!

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking within the Rules as I understand them. But I am not going to be opposed in here. He could strike you from the record. As a matter of fact every time I see you ... 6.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. But what does that have to do with the Resolution?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You do not know what I was going to say, Sir. I was going to discuss retroactive birth control, Sir. I was going to suggest that retroactive birth control would have been helpful if it had been available for the Honourable Member.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the Whim in St. Peter?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: At The Whim in St. Peter, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed, please,

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Anyhow, Sir, let us leave it where it is. The Honourable Member for St. Peter and to a lesser extent the Honourable Member for St. Thomas in the early days of their four years made sure that whatever was available went to their constituencies.

The Honourable Member for the City then got a look in. Constituencies like St. Michael West have not benefited from the same policy that is being applied to the acquisition of properties like The Whim in St. Peter ...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order to bring to your attention that this is an Honourable House governed by rules. And again, Sir, in this debate I really must insist that the rules be observed and if the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is uncomfortable about locating in St. Peter, I can understand, because he would go down in history of having presided over the waste of $35 million in St. Peter in a matter that had nothing to do with St. Peter at all.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now, no doubt you will leave that to the record.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, the Honourable Member, the latter part of your point of order is not relevant to the first part of your point of order.

Please, just proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: This playing field is up and down. It is not level.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is because you have made it so wide.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well if you say so, Sir, but I like to play on a level playing field. And you see, the area of which the Honourable Member talks has about 22 acres and provided tremendous capacity.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please, I am not going to allow that. The Resolution, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I do not understand, Mr. Speaker. I hear you. I wish to obey you. But, Mr. Speaker it just seems tome ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just proceed on the Resolution, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I hope that the Right Honourable Prime Minister will be able to do at the Whim what he has been able to do at other parts of St. Peter. I hope that his stewardship will be able to be as successful at The Whim as it has been in other parts of St. Peter. I will leave him to ponder that for the time being. In due course we will probably be able to expand on that and discuss it in a little more detail and I am sure that all of us will be the better for his wiser counsel.

The Honourable Member seems able from time to time to jump up on a point of order and make comments that he and his Government have been trying to put into the minds of people. I am merely saying, Sir, as I am going to sit down now that this acquisition at The Whim is one more acquisition for St. Peter.

I am saying that the Right Honourable Prime Minister has shown an unbalanced approach to the development of the country especially as it relates to his own constituency in comparison with other constituencies. And the people of Barbados are not blind or blinded and cannot be blinded by any amount of rhetoric which would come from them.

If one looks at the skewed nature of the amount of development which has occurred in St. Peter, it does not fall well from the mouths of the Right Honourable Prime Minister to get up and say that somebody has represented a constituency and has done nothing.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I suggest to you that if the records are clearly stated that this administration has not spent nearly as much on St. Peter as in previous Democratic Labour Party Administrations. This is the first acquisition coming for St. Peter for recreation. It is the first and coming at the end of this administration. He had the opportunity to tell to the people of St. Peter that he spent $35 million in St. Peter and all I want to say is that if I had the opportunity to spend that $35 million in St. Peter, it would have been very well spent.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But the young women of St. Peter would still be wanting care as they are now. They still have a level of health care that is unacceptable in the 20th century to say nothing of the 21st century. I am not ashamed and would not be ashamed of the policy which sought to give the people in the North the same capacity and ability for health care as the people elsewhere.

And to the extent...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please? If you are going to continue your speech, I want you to stick to the Resolution, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not able it is clear to have the same facility as the Right Honourable Prime Minister. In those circumstances it would be better for me not to continue. I wish Your Honour to be aware that whether my time is up or not I am going to stop here because I do not feel that I am able to develop my points in the way that I wish to.

I am grateful to Your Honour.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, just briefly in winding up this Resolution, I would just like to say that it is somewhat unfair to suggest that the area of St. Peter as the Honourable Member for St. Peter has indicated has benefited from acquisitions coming to this House. Very early in this administration we gave Members on that Side the opportunity of making representations to the Division of Housing. Not only for areas to be acquired for housing in keeping with the new policy of Government of developing houses on the periphery of existing villages which was extended later to include large tracks of land but also for recreational facilities in existing villages.

And I recall that Members on that Side said that they would not cooperate. In fact the only person...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, I have said before when the Honourable Member sought to make a similar point that I had written as the Member of Parliament of St. Michael West and identified the areas to the Chief Technical Officer in the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. I also recall indicating to the Government that they should not acquire land from Members who are seeking to have a church and the Government ignored my request and took away the land from the church members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please? The Honourable Member, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am just responding. Sir that they took away the land. They paid me no attention. I pleaded and they took away the land from the Members who wanted to erect a church.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please?

Asides.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West may have made certain request to the Chief Technical Officer where roads are concerned. I do not recall any other Member making that request.

Mr. F. J. STUART: On a point of order. The Honourable Member for Andrew is misleading the House. The Honourable Memfrer for St. Andrew is in possession, he has acknowledged to me personally that he is in possession of correspondence from me which I informed him of a parcel of land at the Crane, St. Philip, containing 12 acres. Nine of which have already been approved for housing development and the other three of which are now the subject of a Town Planning application.

I informed him that the owner is Mr. Carol Fields and that Mr. Fields is agreeable to selling the land to the Government for low income housing development at the Crane in St. Philip.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Andrew is misleading the House, Sir. The Honourable Member is aware that there is land at Harrison's, that has been there for almost five years. And I have told the Honourable Member that I am not prepared to suggest any more spots in St. Lucy to the Honourable Member until the lots at Harrison's are allocated and until all the lots of Hope Road are allocated as well. So I cannot understand, Sir, how these lots are not allocated. So would you please ask the Honourable Member to withdraw the remarks, Sir?

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: On a point of order. I have been pleading for the longest time for a playing field at...

Asides.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members are obviously grandstanding.

Asides.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted and was about to say when the Honourable Member for St. Philip North got up that except for the Honourable Member for St. Philip South who, the day after the declaration of the candidature of a gentleman by the name of Mr. Anthony Wood, a few weeks ago, sent me a letter the day after, by then Mr. Wood had already communicated to me. Prior to that, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any letters from the Honourable Member for St. Philip South about any recreational facilities, about any roads, about any houses or anything. 6.30 p.m.

Mr. F. J. STUART: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know the gentleman Mr. Wood to whom he refers but I know this. I believe that at the beginning of the year, 1995, I submitted to the Chief Technical Officer at his request a list of roads in the constituency of St. Philip South to be repaired. Not one of those roads has been repaired. I was asked to prioritise the order in which I wanted them repaired. Not one has been repaired.

On one occasion, as I have told this House already, when the barbergreen machine came into St. Philip the Honourable Member for St. Andrew called the depot at Six Roads and told them he has work to do in St. Andrew and St. Peter he wants the machine.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I must say that I am alarmed by the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Andrew.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am speaking to the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard you.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Precisely. I am speaking to you because I am not interested in that. I cannot distort the record in the way that I am hearing it being distorted in here today. That is why I am speaking to you, Sir, because I have implicit faith that you will understand what I am saying.

When this Government came to office, not only did I write to the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, or his Permanent Secretary, about a project at Clifton Hall in St. John, but you will recall, Sir, that on several occasions in this Chamber I spoke about that project.

I am not finished, Sir, because allegations were made about recreational facilities. I have written to the Ministry of Lands about the acquisition of land at Kendal for replacement of playing fields. I wrote in response to a letter written to me by some planning entity which was going around Barbados assessing poverty and which met at Gall Hill in St. John. I identified land projects and initiatives which had been started by the previous Government which should be continued by this Administration.

I will go further, Sir. The Ministry of Public Works, and I believe the Honourable Member was Minister at that time, got the Permanent Secretary, or an officer in that Ministry, to write to every single Member of Parliament and I was asked to prioritise tenantry roads in St. John based on a 1991 Tenantry Road Programme.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote back and said all the roads I have identified are priority. Therefore, I believe it is unfair, it is unreasonable but it is also untrue to make an allegation in this Chamber that Members on this Side, and I assume other individuals who may not be in here, did not respond or write to the Minister to point out to him projects that need to be undertaken and I am not going .to stand for that because I consider that it is an attempt...

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point of order. You cannot make a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I suggest to the House that the House has been misled by the Honourable Member for St. John when he said that in 1994 he would have written about roads in St. John because I feel, Sir, that he would have been too embarrassed.

Aside.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why Honourable Members on that Side ...

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since you allowed that point of order. In October 1994, after the heavy rains which ushered in the Barbados Labour Party Administration, a road collapsed at Foster Hall in St. John. To this day that road has remained collapsed. It is a main artery between Bathsheba and St. John.

I wrote to the Minister at that time and pointed out to him that the entire road had collapsed. To this day, Sir, no action whatsoever has been taken by the Honourable Member for St. Andrew or any officers under his responsibility and people's houses are coming off the foundation in St. Margaret's in St. John because the buses are going through a village which does not even have a main road. That is the level of neglect we are talking about.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a matter pertaining to recreational facilities and the Honourable Members on that Side are using the opportunity to twist what I said with respect to what I can recall seeing.

I still repeat what I said with respect to what I can recall seeing coming from Honourable Members on that Side. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, in this House when we were debating matters pertaining to the earlier housing acquisitions when we were outlining Government's policy calling on Members of Parliament to identify areas for housing when Honourable Members on that Side got up and said, and some from their seats said openly that they will not be submitting any sites. To this day, Mr. Speaker, there is only one Member on that Side who has submitted any names of sites for housing, and I repeat - the Honourable Member for St. Philip South submitted a list to me the day after he heard that Anthony Wood was a candidate, nobody else.

Mr. B, M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. If the Honourable Member is saying that meeting with him and having a discussion does not constitute communication, then the Honourable Member is right. I have had numerous discussions with the Honourable Member concerning land on President Kennedy Drive. The Honourable Member has made fun of it in here.

I have discussed the acquisition of land owned by a Mr. Watkins in Headley's Land, Deacons Road with the Honourable Member. The Honourable Member now stands up in here and says he has no recollection. It leaves one to feel that communication with that Minister is futile.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would not be part of the point of order, please. 6.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order. I heard the Minister say that only one Member from over here made any submissions to him on a matter. Sir, for the clarification and enlightenment of this House, it would be good if he would tell the House what happened to the submission from the Member from over here, I think he said the Member for St. Philip South. Would he tell the House what action was taken on the submissions from the lone Member from over here. Has anything been done on that submission?

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: This request was made few weeks ago. When I became the Minister I held meetings every Wednesday. I have passed the letter on to the Permanent Secretary and I had a meeting with him on it and I told him that it is a request that has come from a Member of Parliament and I want him to take it seriously and that if he thinks that it is land that could be acquired, we definitely will acquire the land. I also spoke to the Honourable Member in the corridor and I assured the Honourable Member that the land was acquired. As a matter of fact, I believe that that particular request for acquisition will come to Cabinet some time in February.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have said before and I have said on many occasions in this House, Sir, that the lots at Harrises must be given to the people of St. Lucy and I would like to know from the Minister what action he has taken. There is no need to write a letter. It has been acquired and one person has been allocated already and I want to know when the other people will get their lots.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point of order.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. John. I do not think that I can allow his statement to go without a response with respect to Foster Hall. Foster Hall, as you know, that terrain is a very difficult terrain. It is the type of terrain that has confounded engineers as far as Scotland. No wonder the term Scotland District is borrowed from a certain village in Scotland that has similar soil. We have done an investigation based after the representations from the Honourable Member for St. John and as the officers in the Ministry of Public Works can tell you and the Chief Technical Officer can attest to that and as I have said in this House already whenever I get a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, I treat it very seriously because I always tell them that the Leader of the Opposition, as long as he behaves himself will be Prime Minister of Barbados or should be at some point in time. I gave them all the correspondence. The preliminary estimate for that road is $30 million and rising. It is on our programme and we are hoping that we will be able to find the funding for it but we have not neglected it because that is a major link between the east of Barbados and my own constituency.

I think I should also mention the point which has been made with respect to Headleys Land. Headleys Land has been a problem for some time. I would not want to blame the Honourable Member for St. Michael West for the problems encountered in Headleys Land. It is a drainage problem. At the time when the drainage work was done in that particular area, it was not anticipated that people who presently live in Headleys Land would be living there. We have realised the drainage problems in that area and it is all part of the Bridgetown Bypass Project. What has happened is that we were hoping that when the project started up that we would be able to include that aspect of the drainage works in the project but tne Bridgetown road project was delayed by the last Administration of which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is part and that is the reason why we have not had a solution to this problem.

What we have done because of the request that has been made by the residents in the area, I must say that since I was Minister, I have not received any request from the Honourable Member for St. Michael West about Headleys Land.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I draw to the Honourable Member's attention that communication on Headleys Land has been with the Chief Technical Officer. I do not feel for a Minister, he is saying what he has not received but the impression would be that the representative for the area has taken no interest in the area. I have been in constant touch with the Chief Technical Officer, I have had a site visit with the officer from his Ministry and I have tried as best I can to get the project off the ground but we are in the Opposition and we do not do projects.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: I would also like to say that we did a site visit of the area and while I would not challenge what the Honourable Member said about communication, we tried very hard a week before that site visit to get in touch with the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and we were told by someone from his constituency office that he had another engagement for that day. We went ahead with the tour and the Honourable Member ...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member must be aware that on the occasion when they made the site visit I was out on official business for the Government of Barbados and I think it is disingenuous for the Honourable Member to say that he was told that I was not available when I was outside of the country working for the people of Barbados. I think it is disingenuous.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: He mentioned Headleys Land and he made it appear as though we were not doing anything for Headleys Land, as though ...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. When I mentioned Headleys Land it was because the Right Honourable Prime Minister had stated in his speech that had I spent money on Headleys Land, it would have been better. I was responding to that. I think that the problem with the Minister is that he does not retain very well.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what business he is referring to. I am not saying that he was in the island or out of the island. I was told by someone from his constituency office that he had another appointment on that day.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. My Constituency Secretary has never spoken to the Minister of Transport and Works because I know for a fact that she does not like him.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 5 - TO MOVE THE SECOND READING OF THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT BILL, 1998

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that further consideration of the second reading of the Coastal Zone Management Bill, 1998 be resumed at this time.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion that we were before this Chamber there was extensive debate. I therefore beg that the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: I beg to second that.
6.50 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.

Part 1 was called.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I beg to move that Part 1 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not intend to delay the House, Sir, but since last we debated this matter... I believe I raised in second reading a question in a related Bill to this whole question of the preservation of the shore at Brandons and Brighton and since then representation has been made to me that the effluent from at least two entities on that shore is damaging the shoal about one mile out from the coast.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into contention with anybody. Neither one of the two persons speaking is in a position to advise me on what I can and cannot say. Honourable Members must know that you can discuss the policy of a clause. You are doing it in parts. You wish me to cite a clause within the part when this part includes the definitions? I do not expect the Prime Minister to understand this.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am quarrelling about what is happening to the coastal zone which this Bill is supposed to be dealing with and I am going on to give information to this committee.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, I did and I started off by saying I was talking to ...

Asides.

Mr. B. M: TAITT: If you all have to go home, go home. You get paid substantial sums of money to do the people's business.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is your business. We can come back and do it next week. Do not confuse me. I am in here to talk about what is happening on the coastal zone down by where you live and you do not even know about.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The rules do not stop me from speaking about the coastal zone. I am saying, Sir, that since then one of the companies has announced that they are putting out a new outfall and that it is going to head North. They say it is going to go farther out. A local fisherman on that coast, who has been fishing for the last 30 years, has drawn to my attention that the area is dying and he said that what they said does not make sense.

Now, Sir, very often in the past we have listened to experts and we have ignored the locals who have been observing these matters for a long time and I promised him that I would raise the matter again.

The second thing is that this makes provision for some kind of policing. I have noticed that we, having given a lease to some people on Brandons Beach that they are now driving vehicles on the beach. There is nothing in here as I see it which allows any officer to prevent them from driving on the beach and I draw to the Minister's attention because I do not believe that the Minister has any interest in anybody driving any four-wheel vehicle on the beach at Brandons. If the Minister wishes to go and look for herself or send her officers she might do so. She would see that people are using gasolene vehicles on the beach. They are using them to bring up boats which in itself is not a major problem but they are also driving from one and of the beach to the other.

We have also passed laws in here to preclude horses from being on the beach. There are people who are riding horses on Brandons and Brighton Beach between the Pot and the Flour Mill and are putting bathers at risk.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member would give way. We are not trying to restrict the Member, Sir, but there are various sections of this Bill that would allow for discussing clauses, Sir. Those precise points pertaining to the clause 3 and

clause 4. These deal with definitions, Sir. Let us follow the rules. We are not trying to restrict him, Sir, but follow the rules.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Unless I misunderstand what is happening here, you just showed me Part 1. Clause 4(1) is in Part 1. Isn't it?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. I wish to help the Honourable Member and to help the House. Part 3 of the Bill has a subsection within it, clauses 28 to 32 which deal with beach protection. There is a clause which deals with the forfeiture of vehicles used in the commission of offences which deals with fouling of the foreshore. This is the Bill on Coastal Zone Management, No. 5 on the Order Paper. Mr. Chairman, there are three Bills connected with this. I am reading from documents which are not mine... 7.00 p.m.

Asides.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not mad. The Deputy Clerk and I are having the same problem with the thing here. On the front it says Part 1 and as I turn it over Part 2...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think at this point I will report progress to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What I am speaking about is of no importance to you but what is important to you is that you report progress. Report progress!

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and asked leave to sit again.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of privilege. I was on my feet in Committee in this House during the course of that. The next thing I heard was that the Chairman was going to report progress. At that time, Sir, I was on my feet and I thought I was addressing the Chair. I had not been told or informed that my speech would be curtailed or that I had come to the end of it.

It is very well for Honourable Members to make fun but I am really concerned that we may, while attempting to hurry the procedures of the House have inadvertently trammelled the Rules of the House. I draw it to Your Honour's attention because I should not like it to happen to another Honourable Member.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 8 o'clock this evening.

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

Hon. L. E. S ANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order.

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 8.00 o'clock in the evening was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 7.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee. To that, it should now revert.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable House is in Committee.

Parts I to 6 were called and passed.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I beg to move that the Schedules be the Schedules to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 4 - SECOND READING TO AMEND THE MARINE AREAS (PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT) ACT, 1985

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Marine Areas (Preservation and Enhancement) Act be read a second time.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 8.10p.m.

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Bill was read a second time, passed and so cited.

COMMITTEE

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER the House resolved itself into Committee, Mr. DUNCAN CARTER in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Honourable House is now in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 were called and passed..

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, the SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour, the SPEAKER, the passing of one BUI in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Bill was read a third time, passed and so cited.

ORDER NO. 6 - TO MOVE THE SECOND READING OF THE MARINE POLLUTION CONTROL BILL, 1998

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Bill was read a second time.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House gives me an opportunity to indicate that we have finally in this Assembly been able to put together three pieces of Legislation which had their origin under the last Administration where the groundwork was laid for the preparation of these three very vital pieces of Legislation.

The particular Bill which deals with the preservation, reduction and control of pollution of the marine environment must be of some significant concern to us in Barbados since our marine environment is one of the rich resources that we possess; and clearly with the advent of our tourism growth, we would certainly need to preserve the marine environment to ensure that nothing disrupts the natural growth of the tourism product in our country and I think it is important to put this piece of Legislation on the statute books.

Now, there are a number of different aspects that we can look at this Bill from. We have a cursor to look at the impact of the natural pollution to our waters by cruise ships. We have to look at the natural environment and the damage that is being done by sea bathers and divers, *et cetera*, submarine, cruise boats and pleasure crafts. We have to look at the fall-out that is likely to occur with the non-finalisation of the south coast sewerage project. We have to look at the proper collection of our disposable garbage. We have to look at the impact that that is likely to have when the Greenland landfill which is expected to be opened in January under a cloud of doubt, where there are certain detected leaks which apparently will find their way into the east coast marine environment.

We will have to, Sir, understand that if we are going to protect the marine environment that some degree of management has to take place at a governmental level to ensure that this Bill will make sense. And I am a little concerned that we are introducing this piece of Legislation and we have pending in this country, a situation where the Government of the day clearly must understand the desperate need of Barbados to protect our environment. But yet by their actions or their lack of actions, we have seen the almost complete abandonment of a south coast sewerage project which was also conceived under the previous Democratic Labour Party Administration. And which is vital to the preservation of the marine environment particularly on the south and south western coasts of Barbados.

In addition, Sir, we have ...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The south coast sewerage project has not been abandoned. It is ongoing. Several contracts in respect of that have been signed. Of the 3 500 properties in the project area about 2 000 are now connected to the project ahead of schedule, I might add. So that does not signal abandonment or almost abandonment. In fact the project is ongoing and all Barbadians who use the south coast, because of the diversions caused by the project know that it is ongoing. And it really is ridiculous at this time for the Honourable Member to be trying to mislead the House.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I object to the Honourable Member speaking about anything I say being ridiculous. I am speaking in this House on behalf of the people who sent me in here and I am seeking to represent their interest. It is a fact, Sir, that the south coast sewerage project has come to almost complete halt. And there is a very worrying concern in that the Government will have to look for in excess of $100 000 to have this project completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, of course you are aware of the substantive Bill before the House and while I do appreciate that you might have to make a reference to a particular point, you really would not want to go into any detailed discussion on any particular point.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my understanding is that I have unlimited time and I intend on this occasion now to speak for about six or seven hours in detail. I have unlimited time and if I cannot speak in detail why give me unlimited time? I have to speak in complete detail, I have unlimited time and I am being told that I cannot speak in detail.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please it seems as if today is a day where the rules of this House as they relate to debate seem to have a different kind of interpretation.

The Honourable Member, please, we are addressing a Bill that is clearly worthy. What I am suggesting to you is that while I appreciate the fact that as you discuss this Bill, you will want to make some kind of reference as you have been doing to the particular area, I am saying that I will not allow any full scale debate on that particular point. And, that is according to the rules of the House.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am guided by your comments and I certainly have no intention of offending the Chair. I am making the point that I have unlimited time. So if you have unlimited time, you are expected to speak in detail. And I am saying that the failure to complete the south coast sewerage project will have a significant impact on the marine environment in Barbados. Right now all of the Members of Parliament are aware of the - I do not even want to go into that - present problem that we have on the south coast and in certain areas around Barbados. It is not a joke. Our livelihood depends on it, so you cannot take for granted the completion of the south coast sewerage project or the west coast sewerage project. It is a matter of priority.

And I am saying, that the Government has failed to manage the project effectively to the extent now that the taxpayers will have to be called to fork out at least an additional $100 million because of the mismanagement. Failure to do that will mean that the marine environment, which is necessary to protect our own livelihood will be contaminated. This is not a Bill that we can just simply pass without understanding the implications of it. 8.20 p.m.

The Minister would not want me to indicate that she said in an earlier debate that the project would have restarted. We would have had a new contractor put in place. This is now December.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member cannot reflect on a matter that has been passed in this House or a Bill that was laid in this Honourable House. The Honourable Member knows that, Sir.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Sir, the record of the House would indicate that the Minister advised this House that the project would have recommenced almost a year ago.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is again misleading the House. I indicated to the House that the project was restarting. Since that date the project has restarted. Contracts have been awarded and the project is ongoing. I do not know what is going on in the Honourable Member's head but it is clear that he is not seeing what is going on the south coast.

I also said just now that more than half of the properties in the project area are already connected because the project is ongoing.

This is part of the comedian in him, Sir, and I guess this is the time at which we are going to see it manifested.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, please. You do not have to go down that route, please.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member knows the contract to which I am referring. I am not referring to the contract which seeks to connect the sewage system to the properties. I am talking about the main contract which sets up the functional role of the sewage plant. It has been abandoned. All the micro tunnelling has come to a halt.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The micro tunnelling contract was awarded to Y-Dig several months ago, perhaps close to the middle of the year or before, some considerable time ago and the micro tunnelling work is going on. It has not been abandoned. The Honourable Member must not come to the Chamber and say things that he knows to be untrue.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to find out exactly what is the status on this project. I cannot get any information out of the Minister. They have a closed shop on information. The Minister has failed to make any timely announcements. Nobody knows what is going on and I would like the Minister to come and explain the cost involved. How much the new contracts were awarded for? You have not come back and skid anything to Parliament. You have not come back and said one single word about the cost. We do not know and we want to know.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, I suggested to you just now that there is a Bill clearly worded before the House. It relates to the marine. As I suggested to you, I recognise that you would want to make certain references but the line of your argument seems to be suggesting that this is not the Bill.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the long title of the Bill says: "An Act to prevent, reduce and control pollution of the marine environment of Barbados from whatever source." It could be from the dump. It could be somebody dropping it from an airplane. It could be pollution from anywhere. They have airplanes that fly with all kinds of chemicals spraying fields and they could spray and pollute the environment so do not say it is not possible. They can pollute it from any where. It is relevant. It has to be relevant.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the disposal of garbage, garbage has the potential to contaminate the marine environment. I am saying, Sir, that you have a landfill that is now being prepared and you set it up in Greenland which is contiguous to the east coast where there are detected leaks in that landfill and where it is likely that garbage that is leaching is likely to pollute the marine environment which will have an impact across the south coast.

Now, this has been sitting there, Sir, for over a year. The Minister has not yet come to the country and said who has been awarded a contract to manage the landfill, who has been awarded a contract to manage the waste station. The waste station has not yet been built. The Minister has not yet said anything. Why the secrecy?

This is a matter that the public of Barbados has to know how much money is involved, how many people tendered for the contract, whether the contract was awarded to the highest bidder, whether the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder, but there is silence because they know that they are taking millions of excess dollars from the taxpayers, awarding contracts to certain people and still the public of Barbados has no guarantee that the marine pollution around Barbados would not be contaminated. We do not know. There is no explanation.

You are bringing a Bill with 20 different sections, schedules and so forth seeking to empower this body and the next body and all kinds of things when the management of the Government itself needs to be under control because the management of the Barbados Labour Party Government has failed the people of Barbados in this regard. It has been a dismal failure and when we have to report to the taxpayers of this country and we have to report to the taxpayers of the country in the January election, we have to be in a position to tell the taxpayers how much money was spent, but you keep coming to the public of Barbados saying you are going to open a landfill.

It is the only landfill that is close to getting in the Guinness Book of Records because you promised to open it about 17 times and it has to be close to getting in the Guinness Book of Records. It is the first landfill that has had so many proposed openings. The openings that it had are in the bottom of the landfill, and the openings will create leaching that is likely to contaminate the marine environment that we need to protect.

Sir, the Government has no clue about these Bills. The Minister cannot take one single iota of credit for them. The Bills were handed to that Administration *fait accompli* with minor amendments that were done by the technical people under this present Administration but in general, the Bills that were presented were handed to this Administration literally on a platter so I am now convinced, Mr. Speaker, that they seem not to understand that this goes hand in hand with the proper management of the total environment. It has to be. Government in bringing this piece of legislation, is bringing a piece of legislation that they simply do not understand that in managing the environment, you have to be very vigilant where you site landfills, how you handle sewage projects and how you handle outflow pipes. These are all matters that are very important and we are taking them for granted. 8.30 p.m.

You know what, Sir, I take nothing for granted. I am an asthmatic and the slightest thing bothers me and I have to be very careful about the environment for our children, our children's children and for generations to come. Because if we do not get it right, no amount of legislation that we put on the statute books, if there is this continued bad management, this will be a complete waste of time. The intent around this was to prepare Barbados in such a manner that the public would be so educated that there would be in sync with the general approach to total control of our marine environment so that people can see the value of it. It is a whole process that we have to go through to teach the Barbadian people about what is right and what is wrong. When we live day by day, people have no concern for the damage they are doing to the marine environment or to their own natural environment by simply adding to it by illegal dumping or indiscriminate burning or dumping where they should not be dumping and so forth. People do not understand and it is a total package that has to be properly .managed in this country.

I just want to. make it very clear and to tell the whole of Barbados from St. Lucy to Christ Church where garbage is not being collected at all, across the whole island; so you can see the likelihood, with the amount of rain falling, the contaminants that will find their way into the sea and do damage.

We have to tell the whole of Barbados and I hope, Sir, that CBC will not vet as tfiey have been vetting comments made from this Side and that they will tell the whole of Barbados that the Barbados Labour Party have failed in their management of areas that will make sure that our marine environment is protected. They must tell the whole of Barbados that they have failed and failed significantly.

We can pass this Bill and I am sure that when we are given a change very early in the new year that we will once again have a chance to resume the work that we started in the last Administration of the Democratic Labour Party and make sure that this country does not suffer as it is presently suffering under the hands of the present Minister of Health. I hope that that will not be too soon.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak very briefly to this matter. I am very happy to see this legislation coming before the House. It is clear to me, as I am sure that it is clear to all Honourable Members in here and I hope that Barbadians are finally getting the message. The 21st century will be the century of the seas.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The century of the seas. There are global implications which I do not particularly want to dwell on in this intervention. I think we are fully aware of the way in which climate changes and sea levels rise and other consequential matters can have their effect in this part of the world.

Speaking to Barbados in particular, this is an excellent beginning and I see it only as the beginning. The damage to the coastal zone of Barbados over the years has been really quite extensive.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is speaking about the Coastal Zone Management. Earlier on during the debate we were told we had to stick within the rules. This has nothing to do with Coastal Zone, this has to do with Marine Pollution. We cannot be discussing Coastal Zone according to the rules that were set down.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I have said nothing about Coastal Zone Management. If you can distinguish between Coastal Zone and Marine well then, good for you. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that the damage done over the years has been significant and perhaps more widespread than we recognise. We built highways and destroyed mangroves, a natural swamp wetlands in Barbados. We have built a deep water harbour into which we encompassed Pelican Island and that did it damage. There has been severe beach erosion. The removal of Mangrove, Sir, the destruction of coral reef - Graeme Hall swamp, finally now, happily before the end of this century being rescued from further degradation. Long Beach and Long Point -1 mean, there are so many places in Barbados where you can point it out.

Accra Beach and Folkestone where in an earlier administration the Barbados Labour Party put down artificial reefs which today are now showing us that new corals can grow on them. Of course, that does not solve the problem because unless we know what the original reason was, why reefs die, these new corals might well succumb as well.

The way in which the ordinary Barbadian householder continues to discharge pollutants into the near shore waters is still a very shocking thing. I have said it in here many times and I am going to go on saying it. I walk my beach and I see rice grains. I see all the wash from kitchen waste and so on thrown on to the beach. We have this serious situation. The public health inspector comes to my house and I tell him all the time, do not bother about me, I know what I have to do. You need to be looking to see what damage is being done to the beach and the reef. Of course, that is another person's domain. The public health inspector stops at the high water mark and the coastal zone management people will take up from there on end.

Clearly, the Minister is going to have to come back here at some time because more hands need to go to that pump. We eat out of the ocean and the sea around us. We live out of it, our tourism depends upon it. In every respect we are going to be eating out of it more and more. It is said that Barbados eats more fish and seafood per capita than any other island in the Caribbean and you can believe that. We know that for years we have been fishing flying fish in territorial waters and economic zones which are not ours. Let us face facts. We have seen sea eggs disappear and sea cats and all kinds of things that we grow up with we see disappear in our waters. You cannot get a lobster in Barbadian waters with any ease. We have a serious problem with water run off on both coasts - on all three of our coasts. On the west coast and south coast where you have the coral terraces, you have the well known established gullies, people blocking gullies and water going to places where it never used to go before and the point is that we are just bending natural forces to our human will and in the end, they will have their way. Nothing is stronger than the forces of nature.

I watched it last week. Big heavy rainfall and within five minutes the water outside of my house was the colour of this floor - brown. The wash off was almost instant. The same thing is happening on the east coast. It is very important if we do not begin to do what this legislation is attempting to do and other pieces of legislation to arrest the damage that we are doing and to put preventative measures in place, we may well wake up one morning and find that we do not have this island anymore. It is entirely possible.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Members may smile at that but it is entirely possible. We see the cyclical movement of tides around Barbados. We have seen chunks of Barbados that we knew when we were children disappear but we have seen accretions elsewhere. These things do not happen willy-nilly. This is all part of a great cyclical movement of nature. It does not matter about me and my generation. It is the generations to come. We are only trustees and now that we know better we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to do exactly what the Honourable Minister of Health is asking us to do as people with this legislation and other pieces of legislation which I am sure in due course she will bring before the House. So I wish to give it my unreserved support, Sir. 8.40 p.m.

I represent a constituency which is below sea level and which, almost from the beginning of the settlement of Barbados, has suffered marine degradation, degradation of the marine environment in one way or another. When we were children we had a river known as the Constitution River. When I was a very little girl the Constitution River was tidal up to the Globe Roundabout. Today's generation does not know of a river. They see a canal. They may see water in it but I do not think they understand that that really is still the remnant of a river. When you get heavy rainfall and water comes down the gully all down behind the prison and comes down through Hindsbury. It was a river when we were children that was tidal and that is not now the case.

We happen to be an island without much surface water. We do not have a lot of rivers and lakes in Barbados and for that reason as well the sea around us and the sea is what makes us an island, without the sea we would be a continent. But the sea around us is what protects us and we need to understand that a little better than we presently do.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to again congratulate the Honourable Minister for bringing this before the House and I give it my unreserved support.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not wish this legislation to pass without my making some small contribution to it. I happen to have been the Minister responsible for Health at the time when these bits of legislation started in what might be called their gestation. It was very important then and even more important now that we understand much of what the Honourable Member who just sat down has alluded to.

The whole question of the law of the sea and the impact which countries of this size have been able to make on the rest of the world in the context of the need to preserve the marine environment and to preserve our entire marine resources is one of the phenomena of the last 20 years. Up until the very tiny country called Malta went to the United Nations and galvanised a number of other similar countries to move in a certain direction, the developed countries of the world who constituted a small part of the population of the world have been destroying a substantial part of the environment, had been going merrily along until small countries like Malta, joined by Barbados and some other small island territories were able to bring them up short to draw to their attention the necessity for us to preserve our environment. The whole concept of sustainable development, especially in small island states has become, in the last part of the 20th Century a matter of serious concern.

Now, Sir, it makes no sense for us to be able to go to the international community and have an impact there with our language and our attitude while in our own domain we take no steps to perfect what we are advocating for others. It is in that context and with a lot of help from others around the world that we were able to start putting together the kind of legislation that would be necessary to carry us into the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my interest in the marine environment became even more intense when I spent a substantial part of my time in the University of the West Indies dealing with the Law of the Sea and it is now known, I believe, in certain quarters at least that I have done a lot of work in the area of the Law of the Sea. And when one came to look at the resources of the Caribbean and in particular the resources as they related to Barbados we became aware that we did not have any sufficiency of legislation to protect us as we should.

These pieces of legislation which we have been dealing with and more to come because it is going to spill over into 21st Century, in some ways it really does not matter who is the Government or who is the Minister, there are certain things which if we do not do them we will perish and these things therefore have a sequence to them.

It became very clear that we needed to put on the statute books certain pieces of legislation but one of the short-comings which we have in Barbados is that while we are able to put the legislation on the books, policing that legislation is a problem. Let me give an example, Sir. No matter what legislation we pass in these August chambers we still cannot prevent the Japanese and the other developed countries from bringing their bilges and washing them around our shores.

If one goes on the East Coast of Barbados one is still able to find globules of tar the source of which we cannot identify but those of us who are familiar with what has been happening we know that every now and again some bastard ship comes along and washes its hold or whatever they do and leave the deposits on our East Coast. There are times when you can actually see the tar. But we do not have and are not likely to have, as far as I can see, the capacity to patrol the East Coast. Now that is something which a Government is going to have to pay serious attention to and I certainly hope that the Democratic Labour Party when it forms the Government will make the necessary expenditure to provide the kind of capacity that is necessary for us to patrol our eastern shores. If we continue to pretend that we are unable to do that then much of the discussion we have will be simply utterance of words because we have to be able to have a coast guard.

Let me divert a little bit and say, Sir. When the idea of a coast guard was first mooted in Barbados, Your Honour might have been too young, certainly too young in politics to remember the levity which our having a coast guard brought to the public domain. It was considered to be funny that the late Right Excellent Errol Barrow thought that we should have a coast guard.

Now that was part of his problem that his vision was so different from that of many of the people of his generation that very often he was light years ahead of other people. But the fact that Barbados now has a coast guard as part of its culture, accepts that it must have a coast guard as part of its economic defence, not its military defence, but its economic defence, suggests that the policy makers need to make the wider and broader step to ensure that such coast guard as we have is capable of defending our shores because as the Honourable Member correctly said, these seas and these shores are important to us beyond the simple fact that they are the gateway into Barbados on many counts. It is necessary therefore for us to make the commitment to have a proper protective capacity for these shores. Now if one were to ask the Government to give an indication as to what are our present resources in the coast guard the answer would be laughable. Indeed it would be pitiable. The one ship that we had has been languishing somewhere in North America as far as I have been able to determine for some considerable time and no one ever pronounces on when we might expect that this state of affairs will be corrected 8.50 p.m.

The result is that almost anyone ... The Honourable Member is saying from his chair that his understanding is that the refitted George Fergusson is going to be coming back but the need for us to have two or three proper coast guard vessels is now pellucid and does not require any debate in my view.

If the Honourable Member, the representative for the City is going to make the kind of speech which she made, she as Deputy Prime Minister should be able to advise the Government to take the necessary steps to ensure that we have the capacity to protect our shores from the marauders who come either to steal the fish in our waters or to contaminate our shores and our waters. That is at the international level if you will.

Mr. Speaker, there is something more sinister that has been happening at the domestic level very often, because in the days when most people over fifty were growing up almost everything was biodegradable. It was not considered a necessity to have any regime for the disposal of ordinary household garbage. Therefore when one used a paper bag, when one went to the shop, one got a paper bag and if one threw that paper bag into the ground at the back of the house it was certain that in due course that paper bag would be reduced to whatever was there before.

However, the amount of plastic that is used in Barbados per capita has to be among the highest anywhere in the world. You now have plastic for the milk, plastic for the soft drinks, plastic for the rum - they call it unbreakable, plastic containers for almost anything that is used in Barbados. That in itself is a cause for concern.

What is much more dangerous is that there is no proper provision for the disposal of these plastics and hence much of the flooding which occurs in this country can be traced to blockages of what used to be otherwise passable leakages as it were in our general environment. It is a phenomenon which we must pay attention to.

Every time there has been in the last month a sudden downpour there is flooding in almost everywhere that one can see. There are areas which are flooding now which never used to flood, Sir. There must be a reason why that is happening and I submit humbly that one of the basic reasons is that we are not getting a proper exit of the waters and we have added to areas and I take my own constituency where I have spoken about this before. There was a time when the rain fell, there was sufficient open land that we could expect the usual absorption and evaporation and within a short time that water would have found its way to the sea.

We have had a massive amount of consumption of all kinds, some planned and some not planned but the waters do not have exits like the waters used to have. When that is coupled with the amount of blockage brought about by plastics in almost every quarter of our lifestyle then we are heading for disaster. I wish to suggest that in one small way if the country will move toward the recycling of plastics that that alone would constitute a serious assault on one of the problems which this country faces, a problem which is not as far as I can make out guaranteed to become any better unless there is an all out assault on this issue.

That all out assault does not have to require a massive amount of expenditure. What it requires is a commitment on the part of the Government to provide education for the people of the society in how it might proceed to change a problem that is destructive. It does not require a large amount of expenditure. What it requires is some intuition and some serious planning and thinking by the authorities to ensure that this particular problem has some means of solution.

Mr. Speaker, I know that time is of the essence so I am going to come to an area of beach land that I see on an almost daily basis. Fortunately for me and others I am able every morning to travel on the beach between what is called the Flour Mill and "the Pot". It covers about a mile and a half. I walk up and down every morning at least five days a week.

One is able to see literally the changes which occur on this piece of land. I used to walk on the road side and one is able to observe changes as they were occurring on the road side. There is no doubt in my mind that the destruction of our coast line based on the absence of management of both the environment in a specific way is a cause of serious difficulty for us now and it is a disaster waiting to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member said in her speech that she was surprised to look out and see the colour of the water beside her house after a flash flood. Mr. Speaker, if one swims in the ocean at Brandons and Brighton as I have the honour to do on an almost daily basis one can actually see the changes in the quality of the water without any instruments. One can almost taste the change in the quality of the water.

One can feel something is happening that ought not to be happening and one cannot put the blame at the feet of any individual or group, but what I am saying is that unless there is a concerted effort, a national effort which of course has to be led by the Government because it is their responsibility and certainly a Democratic Labour Party Government would have at the front of its commitment to the 21st Century such a programme where the people of this country beginning with the children of this country will be taught how to preserve the environment which has been bequeathed to us and especially the marine environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am please to say that not all is lost. Whereas five to ten years ago it was very difficult to find moss on the same beach of which I speak, I am please to say that we have been seeing in recent times the return of sea moss. 9.00 p.m.

The return of sea moss is usually an indication that the sea area is becoming healthier. And as long as we are able to curb the effluent which is going from the two or three factories which operate along that stretch, to direct as we did with the Bridgetown sewerage project the outflow of sewage into the marine environment, I think that we can hope that the 21st Century will be a little better.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is something which the Government has embarked upon and they seem hell-bent on having it done in a hurry. And I wish to take this opportunity to register my own concern as a citizen about the desalination plant which is about to be constructed just along the Spring Garden Highway.

Mr. Speaker, this has been given some modern phenomenon by those who are intent on ensuring that it comes to fruition. Let us put aside all of the environmental degradation which I have spoken about in relation to the desalination plant elsewhere. Let us deal only with the disposal of the residue from this desalination plant.

I am saying that for an area of Barbados which is the youngest part of Barbados, geologically speaking, that whole area going from Exxon all the way to Lands End, Paradise Beach, Batts Rock, that is the youngest part of the country - I have said that in here before - and for us to build the desalination plant exactly in that environment is, "disaster". When one looks at the benefits which are alleged to be coming from that desalination plant, one needs a much more detailed examination of the cost of the benefit, not in terms of the dollars and cents only, and it will be a very expensive proposition, it is guaranteed to be a very expensive proposition no matter what they say. But one needs to look at the cost/benefit analysis in terms of the environmental degradation that will occur.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the world where they have put a desalination plant, they found a sufficiently acceptable methodology for the disposal of the residue from the desalination process.

In California where most of the advanced desalination has occurred...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am talking to myself because I have an intelligent audience at last.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But, the desalination plant is not merely a political issue. Because, I do not see it as a political issue. I have been very concerned at the haste with which they have been proceeding as though there is some Galilean slope down which we must travel. I feel that we should look at the examples of what has happened in California where this struck a balance. And as soon as the rains come in and they avoid having a desalination process, they stop it. You have to apply for a licence along the coast in California and they have indicated that it is not in the interest of the country to have a desalination plant. But they have vast expanses of land where they can spread the residue from the plant.

In Barbados, no matter which way we go there is no, in my view, sufficiently efficacious manner of disposing of the residue from the desalination plant. And I would really like the Government to take the citizens of this country into their confidence and to spend some time examining this issue because the benefit of a 10% increase in the water is not so urgent at this stage that we could not spend a little more time examining it to see if it really is truly beneficial.

I say that with all humility. I have no expertise in the field, but I have had an interest in the field and have taken the trouble to examine what has happened elsewhere, and I have to say that I cannot in^ll conscience be in agreement with the creation of the desalination plant. And one final thing. The location of that plant will disrupt the customary flow of a large number of citizens in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, the constituency of St. Michael West Central and to a little extent, constituents from St. Michael West, who have traditionally had a right of way from where they are to the sea at Brighton. That right of way has either been cajoled or obfuscated in the utterances which I have seen and I want to say finally, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the interest of the country that the Government should re-examine this entire matter before it is too late.

If that desalination plant is an indication of the Government's attitude to environmental matters, then I say, the sooner we have a new Government the better it will be.

I am grateful to Your Honour.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this type of Legislation should go hand in hand with a public education programme. To me, Sir, it makes no sense having this Legislation on the statute books. It makes no sense saying that you are going to punish those who pollute the marine environment, those who destroy our fish and our coral. Because indeed what happens is that they have already destroyed it.

I think what you need to do, Sir, is to have a public education programme telling them exactly what they should do in order that they would not destroy the marine environment; the fish and the coral, *et cetera.*

Mr. Speaker, there is already on our statute books a lot of well meaning environmental Legislation and the whole problem is that there is not enough enforcement of the Legislation. We have a lot of anti-litter Legislation. You should not litter. You should not throw paper cups through the windows of the Mini Buses and so on. And it is only a few days ago that I was travelling behind a mini bus and a snocone cup actually dropped on top of the bonnet of my car. And people continue to dump daily even though we have this type of Legislation on the statue books. People continue to dump daily even though we have this type of legislation on the statute books. My problem, Sir, is a problem of enforcement that it is all well and good to put it there but you need to have enforcement mechanisms and make sure that you enforce this type of legislation. There are two things. First of all, it is a public education programme that is necessary. Secondly, you need to have the legislation enforced wherever possible. 9.10a.m.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to dump a lot of extraneous materials on the beaches and in the sea. I was walking along a beach just a few mornings ago in St. Philip only to find that there were lots of things like paint skillets and old stoves. I saw two old stoves actually. They would have contained a lot of residual chemicals. They would contain a lot of petroleum still. I do believe that is extremely harmful to the fish, but we continue to put these things there rather than dispose of them in the proper manner. I am sure that a lot of this has actually caused the disappearance of things like sea-eggs in the sea. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to matters pertaining to the sea and so on, I tend to believe more in the fishermen that live in Bayfield and the fishermen that live in Marley Vale. I must say that they, to me, are the experts.

As a young boy, Sir, sometimes they used to call us sea hags because we used to get up on mornings and at 8.00 o'clock we are in the sea and we never came back out of the sea in the summer vacation until 6.00 o'clock in the evening. Wherever we walked along in the shallows of Skeete's Bay, Baker's Bay, Spring Bay and all the others, we were literally stepping on sea-eggs because the sea-eggs were there in what you called the lily banks and wherever we stepped we were stepping on sea-eggs. Nowadays, Sir, we cannot now even see out in the deeps a single sea-egg at all.

The fishermen that I spoke about, they are all agreed that a lot of it comes from the pesticides which flow into the sea, a lot of the pollutants, the same thing I was speaking about the old stoves, petroleum and so on.

In addition to that, we have the whole question now of over-harvesting. Just about two or three years ago when the sea-eggs had come back in, we saw some large boats on the eastern side and the way in which they were diving these sea-eggs I would say left a lot to be desired because whereas when I was a boy people used to go to the sea and would dive the sea-eggs in the nets, with a little - what we used to call a scraper. You might know this, Mr. Speaker. They would scrape the sea-eggs into the nets and in a way they limited themselves as to how many sea-eggs they were able to catch. But with these big boats now when they come, they have the oxygen masks and so on their backs, they go down and they literally bleach the grounds and take up every single thing, the good, the bad and the indifferent, the young and the old, the big and the small, every single thing they take up and leave the sea-egg grounds bleached. All the young sea-eggs that would have been there for the next year, none of that is left. That is one of the reasons, Sir, why all around Barbados we can scarcely find a sea-egg from over-harvesting.

Another thing which they did, Sir, was the whole question of the way they dropped their anchors and destroyed the coral, destroyed the fish and so forth. We have no way in managing the way in which they operate when they are out there but, certainly, I would believe that those larger boats that came here from time to time did a lot of damage to our sea-egg crop.

Mr. Speaker, I belie.ve that anything you put into the sea which is foreign is harmful because I do not believe that nature runs amok or turns its back on you except you interfere with it.

A lot of us have spoken about having things like wrecks in the sea. Whether some of us may want to say that it is an excellent thing, the people go, the divers love it and it is a tourist attraction, but I want to make this point that when I lived in the Cayman Islands there were about half a dozen wrecks outside just off the Grand Caymans. It was

virtually turned into a copper bank. You had a lot of copper on these vessels and the fish would go onto the copper.

I saw a very strange thing happen, Sir. About the third week I was there, I looked through the fence where the next door neighbour was. The next door neighbour was a Cayman Island native. They were actually cleaning fish and the first thing I saw them do was to cut a piece of the fish out before they did anything else and dropped the fish on the ground. Every single fish they were cleaning they did that to, cut a piece out and throw it off. I asked: "Why is it you are doing this?" They said: "Come let me show you."

Would you believe, Sir, that when they put a piece of fish on the ground and they see the ants come around and take that piece of fish, they begin to clean and scale it and say '1 will eat this one." When they put a piece of fish on the ground again of another one, the ants just came and did like that and went away and they would not touch that one because they said the moment you see the ants behaving like that it means that the fish have copper and they are not going to eat it.

Even in the days when people used to dynamite the fish, that made a lot of people sick. It destroyed a lot of the very young fish in the sea because when you dynamite fish the young ones and everything dies. I think in a way we have curbed that activity.

Asides.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: The point I was making earlier on about the copper, it just shows you what pollutants can do. If I did not know and the next person did not know it would make you very sick. In fact, it could even poison you. It just shows you what pollutants can do. If I did not know it would make us very sick. In fact, it can even poison you. In a way we have to be very, very careful with the number of wrecks and so on that we have around Barbados and the type of fish that we catch from near to those wrecks. As I have said, when you have been brought up in an environment that I have been brought up in and as I have said, I used to be virtually a sea hag and would roam and listen to the fishermen night and day. These are some of the lessons that you would learn. 9.20 p.m.

In a way, Mr. Speaker, I must commend the Honourable Minister for bringing what I consider to be a very comprehensive legislative package to the House and I give her my wholehearted support.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I intervene in this debate primarily because I perceive the sea and our marine environment as a very precious resource. I will speak, Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of the importance of the sea as a resource in this country.

For many years, Barbados, as a coastal state, certainly in the period before the end of the second world war, would have seen the sea primarily as a source of food by way of fish, shell fish, sea foods and such like and also as a mean of navigation linking Barbados to other territories. In addition, of course, to its potential for offering some recreation. Since the coming of tourism on a big commercial scale after the sixties, we have identified the sea as bearing enormous potential in support of our tourist resources.

Mr. Speaker, down through the ages, the attitude of Barbadians to the seas has been one of ambivalence. The reason why I say that it has been one of ambivalence is that every Barbadian would tell you that the sea is extremely important. In fact, there are Barbadians that believe that the sea bears special therapeutic value. There are Barbadians who go to the sea every single day because of the belief that the sea can confer health on you. As I mentioned this whole question of ambivalence, Mr. Speaker, I must also say that while we regard the seas as being this important resource, we have often abused it. The very people who go to the sea every day, have, down through the ages, Mr. Speaker, been known later in the day after having a sea bathe, to dump dead animals in the sea, to dump unwanted garbage in the sea. It used to be this belief in Barbados, Mr. Speaker, that the sea can purge itself.

I want to speak about this briefly. There was this old wife tale that the sea bears potential to purge itself and that is why so many people dump dogs and cows and dead animals in the sea and felt that by doing so, no harm was caused out of their behaviour. I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to see several other countries in this world and I was appalled about five weeks ago when I visited a certain place and saw that for miles and miles the sea close to the shore was so dark from pollution that I said to myself, I would never ever want Barbados to come to this.

For example, Mr. Speaker, if you know Trinidad well enough, when you approach Port-of-Spain you see cobblers and all sort of parasitic birds around the shoreline and then for miles and miles around, you see dark blackened waters, not caused by any act of nature but caused directly by pollution.

I recall two instances, Mr. Speaker, of some unfortunate Caribbean island other than Trinidad in this very position where the management of the coast was so poor that you had coastal degradation to a point where there was no real shoreline and the seas encroached upon people's properties and houses in a situation where the seas themselves throw up mud because of coastal degradation.

I am going to welcome this piece of legislation for a lot of reasons. I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that this legislation seeks to do something about marine pollution. I also want to repeat something that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West said. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, clearly aware of the fact that there are large ocean going vessels and foreign interest operating within our shoreline, was able to tell this Honourable House tonight that we in fact in Barbados have a situation -where foreign vessels and foreign interests pollute. Because we do not have sufficient military or marine might, they do so with impunity. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West said that he would like to urge that we find resources to be able to protect this important resource. I am going to support that, Mr. Speaker.

Clearly, if you have Japanese, Koreans, all types of person coming within 200 miles of Barbados, coming as close as eight miles, nine miles and ten miles within our waters, Mr. Speaker, and they discharge effluent, discharge waste, discharge tar, discharge asphalt and we are really a sovereign people, then we should not hide behind any excuse of shortage of finances to avoid our responsibility to do something about it. Even though there are those who might think that since we are small and poor, we might not be able to afford this type of protection, clearly, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we have to find a formula by which we do something about some of these interests that do these things to our waters.

Mr. Speaker, it would require, in my view, an all party approach. Clearly, the question of financial resource would matter and clearly the question of adequate enough marine strength would matter. Clearly too, Mr. Speaker, what would also matter would be having enough might to be able to ward off these interlopers who enter into our waters.

Sometimes it is known, Mr. Speaker, who the culprits are, but because we are not able to arrest them and to deal with them, then they manage to get away. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for all sides in this Honourable House to reiterate (1) the question that Barbados is a sovereign nation and that (2) foreign interlopers have no right to come in here to pollute our waters and (3) that brave new steps would have to be taken to ward off this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am attracted to Clause 3. Clause 3 says:

> "No person shall release or caused to be released any pollutant into the environment which is in violation of any applicable standards, conditions or requirements specified under this Act of regulations. A person who contravenes the provision of Sub-section 1 is guilty of an offence."

This Clause 3, Mr. Speaker, effectively says that those who infringe this law are guilty of an offence. It goes on in Clause 5 to confer power on the Director and in the definition in this Bill, the Director means the Head of the Environmental Engineering Division. At this point, Mr. Speaker, the current head of the Environmental Engineering Division is a responsible person, a senior public servant, a conscientious civil servant and I daresay, that whoever succeeds him in the future is going to have to carry the same type of work load and responsibility that he is ably discharging right now.

In Clause 5, Mr. Speaker, it says:

> "The Director shall be assisted by such number of public officers as are designated by the Minister to be marine pollution control inspectors."

We are having a situation, Mr. Speaker, where this Bill is going to confer extensive powers on the Director and at the same time empower him to have marine control inspectors. Up until now, Mr. Speaker, even though some of us who are well aware of Barbados, know that on the beaches we find Park & Beaches inspectors, NCC patrols, NCC workers and such like, we have never had marine control inspectors.

I welcome this particular legislative provision in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because it means that at least an effort is being made to police. What I do fear, however, Mr. Speaker, is that even though these marine pollution inspectors will have a role to police, I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of resources they may find themselves with limited power from the point of view that they may never be able to go out on the high seas and really deal with those who pollute on the high seas unless we find the resources to be able to empower them to go out there and deal with those who violate our resources. And in pursuance, Mr. Speaker, of these provisions clause 16 also matters. 9.30 p.m.

Now clause 3 speaks to the creation of offences. Clause 5 speaks to the power of the Director but clause 16 supports clause 3 and clause 5 by laying down, Mr. Speaker, that a first offender who violates the provisions of this Act shall on indictment in the High Court be subject to a fine of $200 000 or imprisonment for five years or to both. That is the provision in clause 16. If perchance the case is heard in a Magistrates Court then on summary conviction the person who breaches the provision of this Act shall be subject to a fine of $100 000 or two years or both.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this legislation here which has come before this Honourable House tonight sets out to identify a practical problem, a problem which will not only affect Barbados now in the short run if it is unchecked but

which can very well compromise, Mr. Speaker, the livelihood of generations of Barbadians to come.

I want to make that point again, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is that to her credit, the Honourable Minister of Health is dealing with a problem now and looking for a solution that is workable in the short term. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that if full effect is given to these legislative provisions and if this legislation goes on to work then Barbadians of 20 or 25 years from now can be proud of the fact that their ancestors in this Honourable House set out deliberately to do something to arrest the problem of marine pollution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Philip North said quite clearly that if we do not do something about pollution then pollution would adversely affect our fishing stocks. He also said if something was not done about pollution it would affect our coral stocks. He also said words to the effect that if we do not do something about pollution then in the long run, not just the seas but lands inside of the island could be adversely affected. I concur, Mr. Speaker, in those sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that in a situation where we, as a coastal island state, depend substantially on the sea for lots of services if you want to put it like that, that the sea can provide us - I am of the view, Mr. Speaker, that this piece of legislation deserves the wholehearted support of this Honourable House.

The last thing I would say, Mr. Speaker, before I close is that the only tricky, ticklish situation was raised by my friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael West who said that in the context of a situation where foreign vessels, some of which may be armed, enter our waters and we have not yet been able to implement concerted patrols, then down the line we are going to have to find resources to be able to deal with this problem. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you. Thank you.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, these three pieces of legislation which we are today passing in this House substantially redefine the approach of Barbados to the management of its marine resources. They in fact establish a policy grid work of which we can be proud and sets up a legislative, a policy and policing regime that will seek to ensure the protection of our marine resources, the beach water quality itself and then the resources within the beaches and within the seas themselves.

I am pleased that it has attracted such large debate and approbation. Although the Honourable Members for the Other Side would seek to claim it, the reality is that in 7 years they did not bring it to the House. It is a piece of legislation, the concept of which came some considerable time ago.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is seeking to mislead the House. We are not seeking to claim it. It is our legislation that has been amended slightly. So we are not seeking to claim anything. It is our legislation that has handed to the Minister. I have the entire file with all of the legislation, word for word. I do not have it here but. if we can come back tomorrow I will bring it tomorrow. It was drafted during the period between 1991 and 1994.

Mr. SPEAKER: No speech, please. You are on a point of order.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I cannot account for the failure of the Minister to count. It was handed to the Minister in 1994. It is now 1998. If she is nervous and cannot count it is only four years. What are you nervous about? It will not be the 7th January, it will be 15th January. What are you worried about seven for?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: After seven years they still did not bring the legislation. It is not a fact that it was handed to us in 1994. The reality is that we are now redefining Barbados' relationship with its coastal and marine resources and that is what is significant. I am very happy to have brought it before the House and to have the wide endorsement of the Chamber.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is now in Committee.

Clauses 1-10 were called and passed.

Clauses 11-20 were called and passed.
9.40 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do adjourn until Tuesday, December 15, 1998 at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.43 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER.....1

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meetings of 24th November, 1998 and 1st December, 1998 were taken as read and were confirmed on the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. Miller.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR .

1. The National Insurance and Social Security (Miscellaneous Amehdments)(No.2) Regulations, 1998.
2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 19) Order, 1998.
3. The Value Added Tax (Refund) (No.6) Order, 1998.
4. Insurance (Forms and Fees) Regulations, 1998 (re-corrected copy).
5. The Annual Report of the National Insurance Board for the year 1997.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2

The Annual Report of the Barbados Investment and Development Corporation for the year 1997.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2

The Penal System Reform Bill, 1998 was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 9 - BILL ENTITLED AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF MONEY LAUNDERING AND FOR RELATED MATTERS 2

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 2, 12; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 7; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 15.

ORDER NO. 12 - THE HOUSE RESOLVED ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY ...

ORDER NO. 12(a) - RESOLUTION THAT THE SUM OF $47,140,605 BE GRANTED FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND BE PLACED AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 1998-99 AS SHOWN IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 4 WHICH FORM THE SCHEDULE TO THIS RESOLUTION AND THAT THE EXPLANATORY NOTES TO HEADS 13, 19, 34 AND 42 BE AMENDED AS SET OUT IN THE SCHEDULE TO THE RESOLUTION 15

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 15, 20; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 18; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 20; Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 23.

27

HEAD 15 - CABINET OFFICE Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur,

27.

HEAD 16 - MINISTRY OF CIVIL SERVICE 28

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 28.

HEAD 19 - MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS 28

Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 28.

HEAD 25 - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT..... 28

Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 28.

HEAD 28 - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS 28

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 28.

HEAD 29 - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS 29

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 29.

29

HEAD 30 - ATTORNEY GENERAL Hon. D. A. C.

Simmons, 29.

HEAD 34 - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH AFFAIRS AND CULTURE 29

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 29.

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TOURISM AND INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT..... 30

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT..... 30

HEAD 42 - MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORT AND HOUSING 30

HEAD 50-POST OFFICE..... 30

ORDER NO. 10 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF LAND AT LEARS PLANTATION IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION 30

Hon. G. W. Payne, 30; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 30.

ORDER NO. 11 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF LAND IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT WALKERS, ST. ANDREW 30

Hon. G. W. Payne, 30.

ORDER NO. 14 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S, ST. PETER 31

Hon. G. W. Payne, 31; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, .31, 34; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 35; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 32, 33; Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 37.

ORDER NO. 15 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THE WHIM, ST. PETER FOR THE PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FOR USE BY THE PUBLIC.....39

Hon. G. W. Payne, 39,48; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 39; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 39; Mr. W. C. C. Callender, 40; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 41.

ORDER NO. 5 - TO MOVE THE SECOND READING OF THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT BILL, 1998 49

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 49; Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 49; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 49; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 49.

ORDER NO. 4 - TO AMEND THE MARINE AREAS (PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT) ACT, 1985 50

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 50.

ORDER NO. 6 - BILL ENTITLED AN ACT TO PREVENT, REDUCE AND CONTROL POLLUTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT OF BARBADOS FROM WHATEVER SOURCE..... 51

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 51; Mr. J. O. Tudor, 51, 53; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 54; Mr.'B. M. Taitt, 55; Hon. R. N. Greenidge, 58; Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 59.

SUSPENSIONS.....12, 50

ADJOURNMENT..... 62

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 62.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Rt. Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) CALLENDER, Mr. W. C. C. (Christ Church East) **EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St. James North) KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy) MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown) MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East) PAYNE, Hon. G. W. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas) 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)**