
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 2003 – 2008

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 28, 2003

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.m. on Tuesday, October 28, 2003.

PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT, G.C.M., B.A., Dip. Ed. (Speaker)

His Honour J. M. EDGHILL, J.P. (Deputy Speaker)

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, B.C.H. (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade)

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A. (Hons.), Dip. Ed., LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C., J.P. (Minister of Labour and Social Security)

Hon. G. A. CLARKE, B.Sc., Dip. Ed., J.P. (Minister of Public Works)

Mr. R. D. MARSHALL (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY (Minister of Social Transformation)

Mr. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

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

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Q.C., LL.B. (Deputy Prime Minister, Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs) (Leader of the House)

Mr. T. A. PRESCOD, B.A.

Rev. J. J. S. ATHERLEY, B.A., B.Sc., J.P. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Hon. N. A. LYNCH, B.Sc., M.B.A. (Minister of Tourism and International Transport)

Hon. Miss C. Y. FORDE, J.P. (Minister of State, Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs and Sports)

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT, M.B., B.S., F.R.C.S., (Edin.) J.P. (Minister of Health)

Mr. R. D. JONES, B.A. (Hons.), M.A. Ed., J.P.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., M.B., B.S.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL, B.Sc. (Econ.) (Hons.), M.A. (Public Finance) (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. D. D. MARSHALL, LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C. (Minister of Industry and International Business)

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY, LL.B. (Hons.)

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS, B.A., LL.B. (Minister of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade)

Dr. W. F. DUGUID, B.D.S. (Comm.), F.D.S., FDRCS., J.P.

Mr. R. L. SEALY, B.Sc., M.B.A.

Prayers were taken by Reverend Canon Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is now in session.

MINUTES

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes for the Honourable the House of Assembly for its meeting of Tuesday, October 21, 2003, which Minutes have been circulated, be taken as read.

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

PAPERS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am commanded to lay the following:

1. Report on the Public Enterprise Investment Fund for quarter ending June 30, 2003.

2. Report of the Social Investment Fund for the quarter ending June 30, 2003.
3. Recommendation of the International Labour Conference concerning the promotion of cooperatives.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to give notice of the following:

Securities Commission Bill, 2003.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the following Bill be read a first time:

Securities Commission Bill, 2003.

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

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

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before I suspend the Standing Orders, I want to move a motion that Order No. 4 and Order No. 8 be taken from the Order Paper since Order No. 10 substitutes those two items.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 9 – THE BARBADOS PORT INC. (TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT AND VESTING OF ASSETS) BILL, 2003

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us comes at what we considered to be a critical time in our

nation's development. This debate is critical because this particular Bill sets out part of the framework for what Barbados would be like in the future. Barbados would be a very important cog in the wheel that turns towards our positive economic fortunes. This Bill and the entity of which we would speak, form an important part in how we intend to build our new services economy. It also forms an important part of any new overall new economic capacity building for Barbados in the future and for the Barbados Port Authority, it is going to play a significant role in how we develop our services economy for the future.

Sir, this debate would give all Honourable Members the opportunity to speak to issues relating to the development of the Port and I suspect that we are going to hear about things relating not only to cargo shipping but to cruise tourism, which would form a very important part of the debate. The Barbados Port Authority deals with a lot more than cruise tourism. This Bill speaks to more than the concept of cruise tourism but to a wide framework in building a new entity and creating the new framework of which I spoke earlier.

As we construct the new economy for the 21st century, the concepts and themes that we need to speak about must permit our institutions to be more responsive in a new global trading environment. These institutions must be compliant with and must have synergies with this new emerging trading order and global economy. These institutions must also ensure that there is sound, sustainable, economic and social gains through their workings. More specifically, they must ensure that there is new and continued investment and expansion in them so that the human capital that is utilized in these institutions realize full and equitable benefits from these entities and that the society as a whole can achieve quantifiable benefits from these exercises.

In addition, wider community involvement and development must be the principle upon which all of these entities are founded and the principle on which we intend to develop the Barbados Port Inc. and any other entities in the sphere of this new economy. Sir, we believe that this particular Bill fits this mode and that is why it is drafted in this manner. We also believe that the timing is correct for this new Barbados Port Inc. Bill, particularly as it relates to the shipment, transshipment, movement of cargo and the cruise elements.

Sir, the Port will also become a very important entity to showcase the hospitality industry of Barbados into the year 2007. Sir, most Honourable Members are aware that The World Cup Cricket is coming to this region in 2007 and the Barbados Port Authority is going to play a very significant role in how we bid and prepare ourselves for that single greatest opportunity to showcase our hospitality potential to the world.

Additionally, it would help to build our hospitality capacity beyond the year 2007. That is why we have taken the view that we need to corporatised the Port, as opposed to privatisation, which would continue to allow for the highest involvement of Government while securing the asset, given its national security importance, and this Bill speaks to that.

Sir, I am going to give some background to the reincorporation of the Barbados Port Authority. I am going to speak to the reform and expansion of the Port in that particular mode and I am also going to speak to specific sections of the Bill that I consider to be most pertinent to the debate when we reach the provisions of the Barbados Port Inc., 2003.

Sir, let me preface my presentation by saying that the Barbados Port Authority has performed well over the past decade or so relative to its economic standing. I want to set the record straight on that. However, we recognised that the Port needs to be set on a path where it could perform substantially better and we believe that the Port has outgrown its original design.

Mr. Speaker, the original design and set-up of the Barbados Port have served us well in the past. Honourable Members on This Side believe that the Port has outgrown its original design both in terms of its physical capacity and institutional makeup as it relates to its corporate governance.

Sir, in 1992, a pre-feasibility study was undertaken to assess the extent to which the Port could contribute to the sustained growth of the economy of Barbados. The study showed that Barbados had the potential of taking advantage of a growing demand for both cruise ship passenger services as well as issues and concepts relating to the expansion of shipment of cargo through the Port.

However, to be able to do that successfully, the Port requires an upgrade in most of its functions to stabilise its assets and create the expertise to efficiently manage the Port for future profits. The limited management autonomy in which the Port is structured was also a challenge for the Port to progress and many weaknesses were identified in the Port's structure that would affect the optimum performance and the ability to realise the expansion potential of the Port.
10.30 a.m.

Sir, the major weak spots that were identified at the time, in relation to the Port, had to do with the low financial return on the assets employed at the Barbados Port. There were higher administrative and operation costs, above the levels that were justifiable by the size of the Port's operations in Barbados. There was a lot of neglected equipment, because maintenance was not done as often as it should have been done, under the existing conditions.

Additionally, there was reduced availability of internally generated resources, particularly financial resources, for the expansion of the Barbados Port Authority, and inadequate reliance on marketing efforts to attract additional business. There was also insufficient orientation of Port services and the existing staffing levels in certain departments were considered to be excessive. There was an absence of clearly defined labour management commitments to the development and expansion of the Barbados Port.

Therefore, in 1994, a feasibility study, as part of the multisectorial programme for the structural adjustment to our economy, was undertaken. I do not have to say who was the Government at the time. The main output of that feasibility study, spoke to the concept of a plan called, Master Plan 2000, for the Barbados Port Authority.

Sir, the objectives of that plan were to improve the overall capacity of the Barbados Port, to meet traffic demands, to provide for sustainable efficient operations at the Port, and to ensure optimum use of the human resources through new effective institutional systems.

This development strategy, however, had to be supported by a corporate structure that permitted a higher degree of operational, financial and decision making autonomy within the Port. The Government of the day determined that the Port needed a much stronger commercial orientation than what existed at the time. It demanded that the Port becomes more flexible in its operations, relative to how it related to its partners and potential partners. The Port needed to be more responsive in its commercial dealings with those partners and potential partners, and the highest quality of Port services needed to be provided at the best and most competitive prices for the Port to move forward.

In 1996, Sir, an advisory committee to study and recommend a new institutional and corporate arrangement, and ownership management of the Port was set up. This Committee recommended that corporatisation could be the best and most efficient means to operate and manage the Port as independently as possible.

Sir, the Committee stated that this particular framework would have allowed the Committee stated, for stronger decision making and for stronger independent financial autonomy for the Port. It would be able to partner in the concept of raising funds through equity for the Port's development. It would fully allow the Port to enter into private sector arrangements to undertake many of the expansion investment potentials that have been voiced earlier.

The rationale, Sir, is that a significant amount of Government resources, employed by the Barbados Port

Authority were yielding less than optimum returns, and that this lack of financial operational autonomy would be resolved.

The conclusions were, Sir, to move to full corporatisation, that the Government would maintain the majority ownership in the Barbados Port and that mechanism would permit major development with private sector participation as well.

This approach, Sir, would further allow for a limited liability company which would operate, what they stated as, at arm's length from the Government regarding its day-to-day administration and financial management. An opportunity, as well, was made available to change the shareholding pattern of the Barbados Port that would allow the Barbados Workers Union (BWU), other credit unions, NIS and other institutional investors to get close to the Port which the existing system and legislation would not easily permit.

In addition to that, Sir, fewer social impacts would be felt, relating to the job levels and the corporatisation approach would retain, most important, Government's ownership of the Port. In essence, the corporatisation of the Port allows us to have two bites in the same cherry. What we were doing is giving the Port enough autonomy to run its financial administrative dealings, but the Government would still be involved as the major shareholder for the Port, allowing the Port to operate like a commercial, private sector led entity. Sir, at the same time, its importance to the development of Barbados, commercial importance, economic importance and security importance, would still lie within the hands of the Government as the major shareholder.

It would also allow, Sir, for built, operate and transfer (BOT) arrangements which would allow for immediate, private participation in the future development of the Barbados Port Authority. It was felt that this reincorporatisation would achieve these objectives, through a higher degree of operating autonomy:

- the Port would now be able to provide a quality service, at the most competitive prices available,
- adequate financial autonomy would allow for independent decision making,
- there would be full freedom on the ability to enter into joint ventures and partnerships, as I said earlier,
- the Port would employ corporation ownership in terms of stocks, being able to issue stocks, and being able to issue stocks on the markets through pensions and the like, first and foremost to its employees,

- due protection of these shareholder rights would be ensured,
- the improvements would be seen in the labour productivity, job satisfaction, workplace safety, health conditions, training,
- there would be performance-based pay, in some of the actions and some of the areas of the Port.

Sir, at the time, this move was thought to be one that the industry and new economy demanded. Also that this particular entity could realise substantial profits, further investment and sustainable profits over a period of time, if this was the way chosen to go forward.

The institutional reform of the Port forwarded a business plan. This business plan is dated 1998-2003. It sought to adjust the organisational functions in a consort with the assessed needs, and consistent with the planned objectives. It called for a restructuring of the organisation.

Sir, during the negotiations of 1999-2000 with the BWU, a job assessment, evaluation and reclassification was carried out at the Port. It was seen at that time that there was a specific need to reorganise the management and the human resource structure of the Barbados Port Authority.

The main objectives, Sir, of that particular reclassification and job evaluation study, would reflect the requirements that management needed and how management would perform. It would enumerate adequately, the levels of effort that were being employed at the Barbados Port. It would attract and maintain the most competent persons and, at the Barbados Port Authority, one would be assured, before anything else was done, that it could afford these changes that were being made to this organisational structure.

The observations that were made in that evaluation were:

- the reporting structure was outdated and too centralised
- there was a lack of focus among managers at the Port.

What happened at the Port, Sir, was that there was a general manager, and under that general manager there was a deputy general manager, and almost every function at the Port, reported to that one Deputy General Manager.

- the Port lacked focus among its managers for moving it forward,
- it lacked marketing strategy and synergies,

12. it lacked a lot of interdepartmental synergies which were important to move the Port forward,
 13. the asset portfolio was growing and therefore, strategically other components were needed.
- 10.40 a.m.

One of those work components was the concept of property management. The Port was starting to grow, therefore, other competencies within the work structure and the management make-up of the Port were needed, so it was agreed that there would be a new decentralized management reporting structure.

Sir, that structure, rather than having one vice president, would allow us now to have a general manager and four vice presidents. One of these vice presidents will be responsible for corporate development and strategy, another will be responsible for operations, another will be responsible for human resource management and development and another will be responsible for industrial relations and finance. Those are the four vice presidents who would fall under this chief operating officer or the general manager.

In that structure, there would also be some very important key performance indicators by departments. The Port would now pursue ISO 9002 certification which calls for a rebranding of the Barbados Port Authority for the delivery of the highest quality service coming out of that organisation. There were also many instances in which the service quality of the Barbados Port Authority was under question and under pressure, so a system to measure the performance on a value for money system became important.

There would be transparent mechanisms for tariff revisions at the Port. Tariff revision – as I will speak to later – is one of the issues that was a hindrance to the Port and its development when compared to other Ports within the region, so the introduction of a tariff review system and a service quality committee were instituted under this new restructuring.

Sir, it was well thought that if the Port could restructure its internal workings and if we could develop a new system of corporate governance for the Port that would allow it more autonomy, that we would have been on the right path. To be able to do that effectively and to get the best dealings out of that new corporate governance structure, it was necessary for the Port to have internal restructuring as it relates to its human resources, particularly its management resources. What that caused was a decentralization of the effort to manage the Port. No longer would everyone have to report to one general manager and one deputy general manager. We

have stretched out the span of control of the management of the Barbados Port Authority so that the four areas I outlined earlier, corporate development and strategy, operations, human resource management and development and industrial relations and finance would all not now fall under one general manager. These four vice presidents will be at the same level to bring about better interdepartmental synergies. Additionally, there will be a span of control to allow for greater autonomy within the Barbados Port Authority.

Sir, I want to speak to a number of highlights of the performance of the Barbados Port Authority over the last decade or so. The last decade or so has seen a 60 per cent increase in cargo handling at the Barbados Port Authority. As a matter of fact, the amount of tonnage handled reached the one million tonnes mark in the year 1998/1999 which was a bumper year for the Barbados Port Authority. That amount of tonnage handled continues to hover around that one million tonnes a year mark.

Sir, 90 per cent of the cargo that is handled at the Port is containerized cargo which is certainly a departure from what had happened at the beginning of the 1990s. As a matter of fact, in 1990 only 30 per cent of the cargo that was handled at the Barbados Port Authority was containerized cargo. By the year 2000 that had increased to some 90 per cent which speaks to developments and the changes that have occurred in this industry over that decade. The emphasis therefore would have been on land and space requirements to be able to handle this containerized cargo that was now coming in.

In addition to that, containerized cargo calls for a lot more efficiencies both in their handling, in their storage and the space made available for them. It also calls for significant training and retraining in the areas of information technology and management in order to deal with the containerized cargo coming off the ships and barges coming into our Port.

One of the things that this new wave introduced to us is that there would be direct delivery of cargo to about 70 per cent of the consignees. This has challenged the Port in its operations. The Port has put up proposals for central examination facilities. The Customs Department is looking to centralize their inspection as well. We are still in discussions and the proposals have not been accepted, but the Port can provide such a facility which will bring new business initiatives and new waves of business. As I said earlier, the competencies that are needed are being expanded and new business initiatives could arise out of being able to create this one central examination facility.

Additionally, transshipments at the Port are relatively low compared to the total tonnage that is handled in the

Port. Total tonnage, as I said, hovers around one million tonnes a year but only about 30 000 tonnes of that amount is transshipment tonnage. The reason for that is that Barbados is constrained in its transshipment development by its geography as it is so far south and so far east of the chain of islands which basically puts it out of the loop of where most of the ships would easily come when they come off most of the Ports along the North American coast.

Additionally, the Port also faces another challenge in that its cost when compared to some of the other Ports in the region is relatively higher. That has caused Barbados some restraint relative to developing transshipment to the level that we would like to see transshipment and really taking true advantage of our Port facility.

To effectively pursue any transshipment strategy for Barbados in the future... We believe that Barbados can be a perfect bridgehead for investment to the south of us particularly as it relates to the Free Trade Area of the Americas and how our relationship would improve in the future with South America. Barbados, relative to its level of economic development, its infrastructural development, the competencies and the education of its people, stands as the perfect bridgehead between north and south. When one speaks of geography and the movement of cargo traffic, one can appreciate that when one comes off all the southern seaboards of the United States of America that, Barbados is somewhat outside of the loop of the arch of islands that one would come to first.

We believe that if we are able to do a number of things in the make-up of the Port that we could substantially improve the transshipment potential that Barbados could enjoy being a bridgehead from north to south. Therefore, we need the additional container yard space that is now going to be made available to the Port. Last year we were able to dredge the mouth of the Port coming into the major harbour for larger cruise vessels to come in. The cruise vessels that were coming in have now become mega ships which carry about 3 500 passengers at one time. Those cruise vessels could not come into the mouth of our harbour unless there was substantial dredging.

10.50 a.m.

Sir, last year we were able to accomplish that work at a cost of approximately BDS\$7 million. The soil that came out of that dredging was used to create more space and reclaimed as much as an additional nine acres of land, which is planned to be used for container storage. Sir, the nine acres that were created through the dredging are going to become particularly important in this exercise. Originally the plan was to have ten acres of space but we were only able to provide nine that we believe would be important to us for the future.

Sir, for transshipment potential, we realise there is the need for additional equipment in the form of a modern gantry crane, rate adjustments would have to be made to our port charges, productivity would have to improve and work hours at the Port would have to be expanded.

Sir, the financial performance of the Bridgetown Port in terms of profits has been consistent over the years. The only year that the Bridgetown Port has lost money was in the year 1990, and I do not have to say which Government was in power at that time.

Sir, after these 12 years the Bridgetown Port now continues to realise substantial profits. Profits realised in the year 1999 were \$7.5 million. Profits admittedly have been declining since then in recent times and part of that problem is that there has been an increase in expenditure at the Bridgetown Port of some 47 per cent. Sir, fortunately what has fueled the profits is that there has been other economic revenues coming into the Port. What has happened was that in 1990, the revenue was \$34 million and by 2002 it moved to \$52 million.

Additionally, we have had to meet the requirements of paying a pension fund, which we did not have before. The employees level have also increased during that period from 410 employees, by 45 per cent, to 600 employees. Sir, innovativeness, productivity and new business opportunities have been the essence of how the revenues have been able to move forward in that past decade.

Sir, even though there have been increases in both expenditure and employees at the Bridgetown Port, revenues have also continued apace, moving from \$34 million in 1990, to \$52 million in 2002.

Sir, the most important part of this business plan calls for the reformation and expansion of the Bridgetown Port. The Bridgetown Port Rehabilitation Project is going to cost BDS\$68 million, which includes the building of a new sugar terminal.

Sir, to go over parts of what is going to happen at the Barbados Port Authority within the next ten years or so, what is important in this exercise is that over the period of 2003-2013, the Bridgetown Port has a master plan which would see expansion and reformation, with the full cost in the region of \$200 million.

However, the current strategic plan is designed to encourage private and public sector partnership in the implementation of the long-term vision of the Bridgetown Port. Therefore, all of the investments are not borne by the Bridgetown Port alone.

Sir, the first and major component of that plan in the next three years calls for a \$68 million expansion. The work involves landscaping and repaving of all the access roads that lead into the Bridgetown Port, new landscaping and beautification project along the Trevor's Way and Princess Alice Highway, revetment and the erection of a boardwalk which would lead from the Port down to the Public Market. It is anticipated that, in the future, the boardwalk would eventually be linked to the one that we now have in Bridgetown. Additionally, there would be the removal of the molasses tanks. Sir, the water mains and replacement works would also happen along with this repaving and landscaping work.

Sir, I know that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy likes to take credit for anything that relates to progress but if the Honourable Member wants to claim credit for the repaving and landscaping of Trevor's Way and the Princess Alice Highway, he is free to do so. The point is that if it redounds to the benefit of all Barbadians, that is what is important.

Sir, I have heard comments made about passengers coming out of the Bridgetown Port and not utilising the Pelican Village Craft Centre. Sir, part of that problem is that the amount of passengers we get are mainly American tourists. Sir, most Americans have been taught not to jaywalk, Caribbean people do not seem to mind it much. Most tourists who walk, end up on the other side of the road, which I believe is another deterrent. Another reason is that most taxi drivers do not just want to take someone from the Port to the Pelican Village Craft Centre.

Sir, I believe that if we are able to beautify that entire area running from the Port gate down to the market, we would be able to create business opportunities on that side because, there is no doubt there might be vending opportunities when the boardwalk and the revetment are completed and that persons would be encouraged to walk from the Port into the vending areas. If we could control traffic flow by having traffic wardens and pedestrian crossings, *et cetera*, I believe persons would be able to make use of the Pelican Village Craft Centre.

Sir, marine work comes under this plan which speaks to the repairing and rehabilitation of the bulk handling berthing facilities. There would be demolition and reconstruction of the cross berths. There would be repairs to the Shallow Draft area, bringing in new fender systems. It is expected that in the future, the Shallow Draft area must become more marine recreational than it is now.

11.00 a.m.

There will be reconstruction of the gate house complexes, construction of a new electrical workshop at the Port which is seriously needed, as well as additions to the

mechanical workshop which is also substantially needed. There will be the conversion of the Shallow Draft shed to cruise tourism usage and additionally, there will be the relocation of the sugar export facility.

Sir, the feasibility study spoke to major zoning at the Port. We need to create specific zones for cruise, cargo, small craft and bulk handling. The project calls for the removal of the sugar and molasses tanks and also for the removal of the handling facilities for sugar to the reclaimers site as the main bulk handling zone. The sugar facility will now become a two-compartment store, which will be a tower projected to handle 30 000 tons bulk of sugar under cover.

Mr. Speaker, in the past there was a lot of talk of how we were going to handle the shipment of sugar out of Barbados in the future and there was also speculation about how large this facility should be, particularly when you speak to the future of sugar for Barbados and this is an issue which we all have to tackle. I am not the Minister responsible for Agriculture and I do not want to go into the subject of where sugar will go in the future but we are building a facility which can adequately handle 30 000 tons of sugar under cover.

There will be a new molasses tank farm in that area with four tanks. Two will have 30 000 metric tons capacity and the other two tanks will carry 7 000 metric tons of solid condensed molasses. In addition, there are ancillary facilities for that area. The cost for the relocation of the tanks and the new sugar facilities is in the region of US\$13 million or BDS\$26 million.

The Barbados Port Authority has been in discussion for a long time with the Molasses User Group to fashion a solution to the removal and construction of the new tank farm and the new sugar facilities with the option that there must be some cost recovery involved if the Barbados Port Authority undertakes all of this work.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the issue which I believe occupies the minds of many people. There is going to be the construction of a new cruise pier at the seaport as a part of this reconstruction and rehabilitation project.

The estimated cost of the cruise pier is US\$25 million of which it is estimated that the port will put up US\$8 million or BDS\$16 million. All of the other funding for the new cruise pier which is so much needed in Barbados will come from joint venture arrangements and from partnerships with the private sector. Sir, despite challenges for Barbados in the cruise sector over the past two or three years Barbados has continued to see growth in this sector.

Mr. Speaker, in 2000 the number of cruise passengers arriving in Barbados were 582 000; in 2001 there were 594 000 and in 2002 there were 573 000 and it is projected

that for this year, 2003, for the first time, we will have over 600 000 cruise passengers and that by 2004, given the projected bookings and ships coming into Barbados, there will be 700 000 passengers.

It is also expected that we will reach the one million passenger mark for cruise tourism in Barbados by the year 2010 and already we are talking about how we will deal with one million passengers coming to our shores.

Sir, another problem for Barbados is its geographical location when we speak of cruise development. The Honourable Member for St. Philip West spoke about cruise development last week and he also quoted some figures but, Sir, most cruises originate along the eastern seaboard and southern seaboard of the United States of America. The normal cruise itinerary calls for a seven-day cruise as the standard and most people will buy cruises for seven days.

If you think about it, a cruise ship cannot get from Miami, make scheduled stops at four ports, arrive in Barbados and return Miami within seven days. The challenge has always been how to develop ports in the southern part of the Caribbean. This is why most of our cruises originate in San Juan, Puerto Rico because they can be done in seven days.

After the 9/11 incident, a number of cruise ships were repositioned out of the San Juan area to the south of the United States of America, therefore, Americans had to fly to San Juan to join a cruise ship and there was a lot of apprehension about flying and this fear still exists. In addition, ports that were traditionally not cruise ports became important to cruising for the first time and even New York saw an influx of cruise ships because Americans could drive there and then sail on a cruise.

As I said before, cruises that originated along the seaboard of the United States of America do not include ports like Barbados so far to the south and we have had to struggle to keep our brand above water so that we could continue to attract substantial cruise traffic to this part of the world. Cruise traffic is now beginning to come back to Barbados in a substantial way and that is why you saw the drop from 594 000 to 573 000 between 2001 and 2002. A lot of people do not understand that the real effect of 9/11 was felt not only in 2001 but also significantly in 2002.

This continues to be challenge because even though the apprehension of getting on to a plane may not be as pronounced in people's mind as in 2001, getting through an airport now is the most harassing thing you have to deal with as many security checks are required and, Sir, it is literally stress.

This is why the United States of America is encouraging their citizens to drive to cruise destinations

because it is not easy to board a plane now. Sir, you cannot board an aircraft unless you are prepared to tolerate long lines and several security checks. Recently, I had the experience of being in a long line. You had to take off your shoes and belt and depending on your appearance you were sent into a small room to be searched.

11.10 a.m.

Sir, the implication is, as passenger traffic coming into the Barbados Port increases, we are going to have another problem because the berthing space now available accommodates cruise and cargo ships. Mr. Speaker, the Carnival Destiny is one of the largest ships that come to Barbados and the space that would normally accommodate two ships, now accommodates this one ship. For example, this means that when cargo ships come to Barbados they have to berth outside of the Port until the cruise ships leave and during the winter season it is particularly problematic for cargo ships to get into the Port.

Sir, there are ongoing negotiations with the Barbados Cruise Terminal Inc. for possible investment in the cruise sphere as well as ongoing talks with other investors. As I said before, out of the US\$25 million that is being sought for this new cruise pier, only US\$8 million is expected to come from the Port and the remainder from other joint ventures.

Sir, we cannot speak about cruise development tourism for Barbados in just one sphere. I think that for a long time people have been trying to separate cruise tourism from the development of land-based tourism. The cruise tourism sector earns us approximately \$45 million a year and I believe this amount is way below what the optimum financial benefit could be if the tourism sector was developed.

Sir, we believe that we have not yet scratched the surface relative to what cruise tourism could provide for Barbados. It is not only the dollar spent per passenger and what is earned but there are opportunities on cruise ships for employment and other social and economic benefits that can accrue to Barbados from the cruise ship sector which we have not yet exploited to the maximum.

Mr. Speaker, in recent times the regional growth of cruise ship passengers has been approximately 6 per cent per annum and the Caribbean enjoys 45 per cent of the global market share of cruise tourism. Our market share in this region is only 8 per cent and we believe that we can do a lot better than that. Our geographical position is prohibited relative to what we can do for the development of cruise tourism because most of the cruises remain in the northern part of the Caribbean. Sir, Bermuda, Jamaica and Bahamas are the countries that get the majority of cruise ships because of the short distant itinerary, which allows them to return to the mainland, of the United States of America in a

few days. Sir, among the southern ports Barbados continues to be number one in the region even though the southern Caribbean is the most difficult region to compete for cruise traffic.

Mr. Speaker, our reputation as a high-quality tourism destination makes us a marque port for most of the cruise ships coming into the region and that is what has allowed us to be part of the itineraries. Whenever we negotiate for cruise ships, it has always been said that because of Barbados' prominence as a leading tourism destination and the level of tourism development in Barbados, that they continue to utilise Barbados as the first port when cruise ships come south and when cruises originate out of San Juan. Barbados is an important cog in the wheel because of its reputation.

Sir, long negotiations have taken place over time but we believe that there are serious challenges affecting our cruise tourism sector. We can only develop a proper cruise sector if we are able to create a good overall tourism sector for Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges in maintaining the high brand when most of the passengers were surveyed, confirmed that the condition and age of our attractions and the fact that a lot of new attractions have not come on stream over the past five or ten years, are two of the prohibiting factors for maintaining that high-brand equity of which I spoke.

Sir, our taxi services continue to be a source of complaint for some of our visitors and our infrastructure continues to be a source of concern for some passengers but not as high as the level of complaints for the taxi service. A lot of people do not want to visit our destination unless we do something about cleaning up our environment by making it comparable to their own countries and some other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to do as much as we can in Bridgetown but we really need to clean it up and do something about the litter and lack of debushing around Barbados because it continues to be a concern for most of our cruise passengers when surveys are conducted.

Sir, cruise development cannot be divorced from overall tourism development and it cannot be viewed in isolation. The Barbados Tourism Investment Incorporated has done a substantial and significant job relative to improving the offering that we have in terms of product but a lot of work still needs to be done in order to improve substantially tourism development and our overall product development.

Sir, development for cruise and land-based tourism must be viewed as one industry. The promotional and marketing strategies for cruise and land-based tourism must be taken together and we cannot separate them.

Last year, at the Barbados Tourism Authority, we were able to hire a Cruise Director who now forms part of the complement of the management of the Barbados Tourism Authority because we do not see a distinct separation between cruise and land-based tourism. The focus is to increase passenger spending, upgraded activities and overall product improvements of building a new tourism industry. This is to be done in collaboration with the ministry to help develop and market cruise tourism.

Sir, homeporting activities have become a significant part of creating a better cruise sector for Barbados and we were able to develop a cruise-and-stay programme that has worked significantly in bringing both sectors together. I know that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy would like to take credit for this too.

Sir, most of our ships homeport out of Europe and not out of the United States of America. The ships that come out of the USA are smaller vessels which carry less passengers. In the past the Honourable Member for St. Lucy was complaining every week in this Honourable House whether or not cruise ship passengers that arrived in Barbados were counted among the cruise passenger statistics.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. I never said in this Honourable House that I had a problem with homeporting passengers as tourists. I said that we have people who arrived in Barbados by plane, board a ship, went out to sea, return to Barbados and when they return to Barbados they were counted as tourists of Barbados and that created problems for the Minister of Tourism.

Sir, when the Prime Minister prepared his Estimates, the figures given by the Ministry of Tourism included those persons and inflated the projected revenue of the country and when he got around to the actual, he then realised that the projected and the actual were different because there were not tourists but figures being given by the Barbados Tourism Authority.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member continues to be confused. No cruise passengers were ever counted as arrival statistics. Passengers have to be in Barbados more than 24 hours to be counted first and foremost. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy knows that, so to constantly say those cruise passengers coming in on the ship and going out through the Port were counted as arrivals...

11.20 a.m.

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Sir, do you know what is amazing, people that come in here on a cruise ship, and then come back and get off, do not fill out any ED cards to go out of Barbados.

Aside.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Sir, I want to explain the system of homeporting. Homeporting passengers come to Barbados at the Grantley Adams International Airport, and go directly to the ships, in a bus. Their luggage is bonded and taken directly to the Port. They do their cruising and they come back. When they come back, Sir, everything remains in a bond. It is shipped back to the airport. They come back to the airport, and all they do is to pass the security arrangements because they have to go on a plane. The FAA and ITO requirements are that they go through security, but these people do not fill out ED cards, so you cannot put them among any passengers coming into Barbados, Sir, so that is ridiculous.

Sir, to make it clearer, what I think the Honourable Member for St. Lucy had a good point in, and he does not always have good points, is that we were allowing these people to come into Barbados and they go cruising on a cruise ship. They do not pay head taxes like other people, and what was happening was that these people were not really contributing, in great measure to the overall economic take for Barbados. I agree with that, and you had to find a solution.

Sir, I believe the Honourable Member for St. Lucy mentioned that in here, and he was correct that you had to find an opportunity for these people, not just to be here on Barbados, just coming in and going out, but that they needed to contribute significantly.

Sir, what has happened is that we have been able to create a cruise and stay programme. This has allowed the people into Barbados from England, who are sold a package of seven days at sea and seven days on land. Sir, he was correct and we are now deriving the benefits as we should.

Sir, what happens now is that up to 40 per cent of these homeporting people, are now actually staying on land after they return from their cruises, which is significantly improving the relationship between cruise passengers and long-stay passengers.

Sir, as you know, there has been a large gulf between hotels and cruise ships for a long time about who pays more, and who is more relevant to the development to the sector, *et cetera*. This Cruise and Stay Programme has permitted the cruise sector to source rooms, like the tour operators do for

long-stay visitors. They come into Barbados and source hotel rooms and, therefore, the hotel sector is now seeing a benefit from the cruise sector. Sir, we are trying to narrow the gulf that has long existed between cruise and long-stay passengers, and I believe that we are doing a good job because we are now getting the type of benefit from them that we should.

Sir, if the Honourable Member for St. Lucy wants to take credit for it, so be it. Thank you, Sir, for his contribution. The Opposition helps Barbados.

Sir, cruise development is maximising the strength of Barbados as a tourism destination, as it is improving the Barbados Port, as a port of call for the ships. What has been recommended, Sir, is a four-tier strategy for improving the overall cruise sector. We are going to improve the pier, the theme park and the attractions.

Sir, this market penetration will allow us to get additional capacity. As I said, we are now looking at European ships and we are looking to get more European ships to homeport out of Barbados. There are going to be nine ships homeporting out of Barbados this Winter season.

Sir, what that does, apart from the Cruise and Stay Programme, is to provide employment and services which are important factors. The cruise ships of one company that homeports out of Barbados, actually uses the IT services of a Barbadian company when they are actually in port in Barbados. This is the type of synergy and relationship that we want to project, and continue to create for the cruise sector and the Barbadian economy.

Additionally, Sir, market development, national and regional integration, in terms of the promotion of the cruise sector for the future is something that is happening, as well as airline traffic in the Caribbean. We have not been able to get an American cruise ship to homeport out of Barbados. One of the reasons for this is that the cruise ships, as I said before, relate a lot of airline travel.

If you are homeporting, when those nine cruise ships are homeporting out of Barbados to Europe, there are as many sometimes as three and four wide-bodied planes on the ground in Barbados, coming out of Heathrow, Gatwick, Frankfurt or some other port in Europe.

One of the reasons that cruise has not developed in the same homeporting way out of the United States, is that many of the cruise ships need airline traffic to be able to make them work. Barbados did not enjoy previously, the level of US traffic on US Airlines coming into Barbados. This will be a thing of the past because with US Air, American and Continental flying from another destination, which is

projected, and another US carrier which is going to fly into Barbados in the Summer, we think that we now stand a good chance of getting an US ship homeporting out of Barbados.

Sir, we negotiated with the US cruise ships to make cabins available to Caribbean people that can be utilised out of Barbados. Sir, we have seen a significant movement of Barbadians taking cruises from right here in Barbados as well people from the region, flying into Barbados to take cruise ships out of Barbados.

Sir, we have also been able to negotiate for an American cruise ship to stay in Barbados overnight. We cannot get one to homeport but what will happen is that if the ships come in very early in the morning, around 6.00 a.m. or 7.00 a.m. they usually leave between 5.00 p.m. and 7.00 p.m. We have a deal now with one of the major cruise lines to have that ship overnight in Barbados.

Sir, we are already in negotiations with the Chamber of Commerce, seeking obviously within the four corners of the law, to see if we cannot have extended shopping hours in Bridgetown, at the time when the ship is overnighing here. There are some other activities that are going to go on for that ship. The ship will come in at 7.00 a.m. and leave the next day at seven o'clock. We believe this will open up substantial opportunities, for taxis, restaurants and the like, because those ships are actually going to be in port for that entire 24 hours.

Sir, the issues of the head tax and new cruise levy have become vexing issues among many. Sir, this new cruise levy that has been bandied around for sometime has been discussed at the highest levels.

There are many, Sir, who agree that we need to get a better take from the cruise ships which come into our region. The only dominant economic activity that takes place where we have a larger global market share than any other region of the world is in cruise tourism. Therefore, it is important that we capitalise on it to get the best economic and social take that we can for the people of the region. It has also been agreed that the cruise sector does not pay as much of its way, as the land-based tourism sector. Sir, for the longest time, it has been agreed that we need to see how we can collectively do more to get a more substantial take from the cruise sector.

As I said previously, we believe that there are a lot of options available to us, outside of just increasing head taxes or levies. Sir, being able to create more economic and social activities from those ship, providing employment and entertainment are important. At the same time, it is important that we sign off on the issue of this cruise levy.

Sir, it was agreed two years ago that the Caribbean needs a sustainable tourism development fund to be able to market and brand the Caribbean as one.
11.30 a.m.

Those involved in the sector believe very seriously that if we are able to effectively brand the Caribbean, which already has substantial brand equity, that it would redound and inure to the benefit of all of the individual jurisdictions within the Caribbean. However, to be able to do that effectively, we need to have a sustainable tourism development fund which the heads have agreed on in principle.

We have not been able over time to create the basis for that fund and it was thought that the cruise sector could contribute significantly to that fund. How it got to be US\$20 on a ticket tax, no one can understand, but there is an agreement among the Caribbean people that we need a wider and larger take from the cruise sector. Barbados has agreed, at our last meeting, that substantial work needs to be done on the legality of the offering on whether or not one can legally go about taking the \$20 and add it on to a ticket tax in Miami. This issue was discussed at the last Ministers of Tourism meeting in St. Thomas, the Virgin Islands a couple of weeks ago. A paper was presented by a very renowned lawyer.

The legality of the cruise levy needs to be studied more. The issue relating to quantum needs to be seriously debated and worked out. Obviously, individual State laws would have to be amended to ensure that one can collect this levy. So much more work needs to be done on the concept of the cruise levy before we could even make a decision on it as Caribbean destinations.

This lawyer's experience with putting things in place at a collective level in the region saw some territories moving faster than others to bring legislation to Parliament and to do all the necessary groundwork. It was felt that if one country goes ahead of the others that it might be disadvantageous to that particular country for future itineraries for cruise ships. Sir, a final decision has not yet been made. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados believes that we should do as much as we can to get a better economic take from cruise ships plying our region but it must be done collectively. Any sustainable tourism development fund must also take into account the land-based tourism sector as well. We are very clear that we must have some form of a cruise levy but it must be done in the best legal fashion. We must all play a part because Barbados stands to lose a lot. I have already stated how difficult it is to maintain itineraries in the southern part of the Caribbean where we are leaders. We must be assured that any initiative that is put in place will involve each and every one of us in the sector.

We continue to enjoy good cruise development in Barbados and we are hoping that we would be able to keep it that way. So anything that is done must be done with the collective efforts of all of the territories in the region.

Sir, I turn now to the specific aspects of this Barbados Port Incorporated (Transfer of Management and Vesting of Assets) Bill, 2003. This Bill makes provisions for:

- “(a) the Port of Bridgetown to be managed by the Barbados Port Inc., a company incorporated under the Companies Act, for the purpose of enabling the Port to operate as a commercial entity;
- (b) the transfer of assets and liabilities of the Government of Barbados in relation to the operation of the Bridgetown Port to the Barbados Port Inc.;
- (c) the repeal of the Barbados Port Authority Act, Cap. 285B; and
- (d) related matters.”

The Bill has 13 sections and two schedules which are as follows:

Clause 2 which is the definitions, defines harbour, port, authority *et cetera*.

Clauses 3 and 12 deal with the management of the port. Clause 3 give the company the authority to manage and maintain the Bridgetown Port. The scope of this authority is limited though by clause 12 of the Bill which states that:

“Nothing in this Act or in any regulation shall be or shall be deemed to be in derogation of any functions conferred or imposed by any other law on customs officers, immigration officers, fire officers, members of the Police Force and the Defence Force or duly authorised persons of the Ministry of Health or the Ministry of Agriculture.”

Clause 4 speaks to the lease of lands. The lands at the port will be leased to the Port Company. This clause was necessary to distinguish between the assets to be transferred and those to be retained by the Crown. The Crown will retain ownership of the lands at the port. The description of the boundaries of the port are all detailed in the first schedule of this Bill.

Clause 5 deals with the transfer of assets. Clause 5 (1) (a) gives the authorisation for the transfer of assets that are vested in the Authority immediately before the commencement of the Act to the company. Clause 5 (1) (c) gives the company the rights to set, collect and retain port dues and charges.

Clause 5 (2) of the Bill is made for the company to take over and be responsible for all the contracts that would have been entered into by the port by and on behalf of the Authority before the commencement of this Act.

Clause 5 (3) gives the company, in respect of the operation of the Port Authority, the power to enforce all rights, privileges, duties or obligations conferred or imposed upon the Authority immediately before the commencement of the Act.

Clause 6 exempts the company from the payment of transfer taxes that is payable on the transfer of assets of the Authority referred to in section 5 (1).

Clauses 7 to 9 are the accountability clauses. The Government is the sole shareholder of this company, the Barbados Port Incorporated. The board of directors must report annually to the shareholders of the company.

Clause 7 (1) makes it mandatory for the port to submit reports. Clause 7 (2) details the types of statements the Minister must lay in Parliament. Clause 7 (1) states that:

“The Company shall within three months at the end of each financial year submit to the Minister the report, the audited financial statement and auditor’s report referred to in subsection (2).”

Clause 7 (2) states that:

“The Minister shall as soon as possible after the end of each financial year and not later than six months after the end of that year lay in Parliament:

- (a) a report of the operations of the Company during the preceding year including a comparison of the performance of the Port with the relevant business plan;
- (b) an audited financial statement for the preceding year consisting of
 - (i) statements of profit, loss and cash flow;
 - (ii) such other statements as may be necessary...
 - (iii) an auditor’s report on the financial statements.”

Clause 8 (1) states that:

- “(1) The Company shall once every five years submit a port master plan to the Minister for approval.”
- “(2) The port master plan referred to in subsection (1) is a ten-year development plan for the port that shall contain:

- (a) the details of the objectives, strategies and policies of the Company;
- (b) infrastructural and institutional activity schedules,
- (c) a marketing plan;
- (d) a land use and environmental management plan; and
- (e) any other relevant information which may be required by the Minister."

Clause 9 (1) states that:

"(1) The Company shall not later than six months after the end of each financial year submit to the Minister a business plan in respect of the ensuing financial year and for each of the four subsequent financial years."

Clause 10 deals with the provisions for staff. It states that:

"The officers and other employees who are members of staff of the Authority on the date of commencement of the Act, shall upon that date, comprise the staff of the Company."

Clause 11 deals with the pension plan and pension rights. Clause 11 (1) states that:

"There is hereby preserved to the staff of the Company to whom section 10 applies, the pensions and superannuation rights accruing to them at the time of their assumption of employment with the Company."

Clause 11 (2) makes provisions for the preservation of the staff of the Company. It states that:

There is hereby preserved to the officers and employees of the Authority who

- "(a) were members of staff of the Authority at or prior to the commencement of this Act; and
- (b) have not assumed employment with the Company at the commencement of the Act

all pension and superannuation rights that accrued to them by virtue of their employment with the Authority."

Clause 13 speaks to the company being responsible for paying these pensions.

11.40 a.m.

Clause 11 (4):

"Without effecting subsection (1) the service of the staff with the Authority referred to in that subsection shall be aggregated with their service with the Company and any other public service, for the purpose of computing pension and other retirement benefits under this Act."

Clause 11 (5):

"Where a public officer is seconded or temporarily transferred from a pensionable office within the meaning of section 2(1) of the Pensions Act to perform any service with the Company, the service of that officer shall, unless the Governor-General otherwise decides, count for pension under that Act as if the officer had not been so seconded or transferred."

Clause 11 (6):

"The company shall, within a period of two years from the date of the commencement of this Act, provide for the establishment and maintenance of a pension scheme for the benefit of officers and employees of the Company."

Clause 11 (7):

"Notwithstanding subsection 6, the Company shall for the purpose of computing pensions and other retirement benefits, use the date of hire of an employee by the Company as the date for computing such pension and other benefits."

Clause 13 (1):

"Subject to subsection (2), the Barbados Port Authority Act is repealed."

Clause 13 (2):

"The enactments specified in the Second Schedule shall continue in force until amended or revoked under this Act, and shall be so construed as to give effect to the provisions of this Act."

Clause 14:

"The Minister may by Order amend the Schedules to the Act."

Clause 15:

"This Act comes into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation."

FIRST SCHEDULE

“The Port of Bridgetown includes:

- (a) all the waters enclosed by the shoreline and the following lines from the point with Barbados Grid coordinates 24762.00mm East, 63875.00 North (being the approximate centre of the top of Needhams Point Lighthouse), thence due West for a distance of 4002.00m, to the point with Barbados National Grid Coordinates 20260.00m East, 63875.00mm North, thence due North for a distance of 7685.00mm to the point with Barbados National Grid coordinates 20260.00m East, 71560.00m North, thence due East, for a distance of 1040.00mm to the point with Barbados National Grid coordinates 21300.00m East, 71560.00m North, including:

- (i) the Deep Water Harbour

all the waters of the Deep Water Harbour, comprising the enclosed wharf area and water front of the Deep Water Harbour and Shallow Draught Facility; and

- (ii) The Careenage

all the waters and subterranean areas containing by admeasurement 3.445 hectares of sea, comprising the Careenage and the Dry Dock as further described in paragraph (c)(ii);

- (b) other harbours and anchorages as described in paragraph (d);”

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is the way that we need to continue in our economic fortunes to manage the Port and its development. The Barbados Port Authority will continue to play a significant role in the development of both economic and social fortunes for the Port’s future.

Sir, I commend this piece of legislation to the Honourable House. I believe this Government is on the right track in relation to how we are dealing with the Barbados Port Authority and like entities.

Sir, with those words, I am obliged to you.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the intention of this Government to corporatise and to privatise every valuable asset in Barbados.

We have had the experience of the Barbados National Bank and the Insurance Corporation of Barbados. We have seen what has happened at the Grantley Adams International Airport and now the Ministry of Tourism and International

Transport does not present any compelling argument for the corporatisation of the Bridgetown Port.

In this debate, the Minister has stated that the Port realises substantial profits. The Honourable Member went on to say that over the last 12 years, it was only in 1990 that the Port Authority has experienced any loss. The Honourable Member then suggested that the highest level of profit was achieved in 1999, \$7.5 million. He also suggested that the revenues from the Port moved from \$34 million to \$52 million in the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, any private sector entity would be extremely proud of such performances. In just over a decade, the revenues of the Barbados Port Authority has moved from \$34 million to \$52 million.

In addition, the Minister indicated that over that period, the level of employment at the Port has increased from 410 persons to 600 in a ten-year period, an almost 50 per cent increase in the level of employment. Therefore, there is no compelling argument why the Barbados Port Authority should be corporatise at this stage. It is functioning well, it is making excessive profits, and it has the capacity to do even better, according to the Minister of Tourism. Therefore, we are finding it extremely difficult to understand and to support the need for corporatisation of the Barbados Port Authority at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a model that has become prevalent under this Administration. We have had the Caves of Barbados, where a company was formed and there is no evidence that the Harrison’s Cave has been operating any more profitably than before. We have had a company formed to reconstruct the Barbados National Bank with the establishment of the Barbados Agriculture Credit Trust. We have also had a company formed to run the Grantley Adams International Airport and, as I speak, I am reliably informed that there are hardly any funds to pay those employees, in relation to the construction.

In fact, as usual, somebody in Barbados feels that I can promote a cause and I have been very reliably informed that someone in a very major position within that organisation has left Barbados with quite a large number of funds belonging to the company at the Airport and this has to be investigated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please. Let me make a suggestion. I believe that what is said in this House of Assembly, since we all are supposed to be Honourable men and women, there must be some kind of proof. This is not the place where these kinds of statements could be made. I believe if you want to make any kind of allegation, you should have proof and you should be able to substantiate it and present it to this House of Assembly.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I have heard that argument before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, if every Member were to stand and make such an allegation about some situation, board or person, it would be utter chaos, and the House would not be of any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I have heard that argument before and I have been on record in Barbados as highlighting several instances like that, only to discover a year or so later that it has now come to be investigated.

I speak of GEMS and of the Urban Development Commission and, therefore, when I speak, I am not speaking out of any position of trying to create chaos in the country. I have a record of telling the truth and I am saying that at this stage, there is concern over the affairs at the Grantley Adams International Airport.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please, I will not allow you to repeat your statements. I have not asked you to withdraw them. What I think for our discussion, would you please proceed by focusing your attention to the Bill that is before the House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am focussing my attention on the model that has been established in Barbados, that is a model to corporatise companies or entities such as the Bridgetown Port and the Grantley Adams International Airport. Therefore, I do not see how I could be anything other than being relevant. I am saying to you that what is taking place here is similar to what has taken place at the Grantley Adams International Airport.
11.50 a.m.

Sir, I am questioning the wisdom of corporatisation because I speak to the occurrence of an event that undermines the integrity of the system established at the airport.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I never called any names, implicated anyone or made any wild allegation so I do not know how I could be asked to withdraw or retreat and I will not retreat on that matter because I never said anything that was offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, I suggest to you that you proceed without casting any kinds of aspersions on the person in this Chair. I state to you and all other Honourable Members that they cannot come in here and make any allegations unless they bring proof to the House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that I am concerned with the establishment of a company at this stage to run the affairs of the Port. I have explained that the Minister of Tourism has not argued any compelling position with respect to the corporatisation of the Port. The integrity of the Port or its operations cannot be questioned. It has been highly and extremely profitable and, therefore, I am questioning why we need to corporatise at this stage.

Sir, the Port itself has a unique place in business and it is already a commercial entity. I asked what I was hearing when I read the Object and Reasons and saw that the Port Authority is being established as a company for the purpose of enabling the Port to operate as a commercial entity.

Sir, the Port Authority is one of the most commercial entities in the landscape of Barbados. It has the highest level of traffic of any business and it operates year round. There is hardly any seasonality except around Christmas, Easter and Crop Over and there is no competition because the Port is virtually a monopoly.

Sir, only the airport can offer any degree of competition to the seaport. The Port Authority has a major advantage because of its ability to handle excessive cargo so that the airport could hardly be seen as competing against the seaport since the kinds of items that can come through the seaport cannot effectively come through the airport.

There is a unique and special place that the Port has in the landscape of Barbados. It also has a unique and special place in the history of the unions and in the affairs of Barbados. We know for a long time that the Port has been used extremely well by the labour union movement because of its strategic position in the affairs of the country.

Sir, I want to look at the restructuring of the organisation. If you want to restructure an organisation you have to introduce a department of human relations or an industrial relations and a financial arm. I would like to think that an entity that has been so profitable would have been restructured before. At Clause 10 in the legislation, it is being said that we are simply going to have a transferal of the employees to this new company.

Sir, if we are repositioning the port to become a commercial entity, are we saying that it is just a question of repositioning the staff in terms of trying to execute whatever plan this entity has, or is there a need for an overall restructuring of the entity.

Sir, we are very familiar with the Minister of Tourism because he wanted to change the structure of the Barbados Tourism Authority for it to do exactly what is being said here today and for it to become a company, more suitable to this new era of globalisation and competitiveness.

The existing Chairman also wrote a report, as a consultant, outlining clearly why the Barbados Tourism Authority should become a company and even though the Barbados Tourism Authority has not been incorporated, all of the proposals to get rid of the staff were implemented. There has been the removal of the head, Tony Arthur, the deputy head, Hugh Foster, Hugh Riley and others were being sent home in spite of the fact that there was never any incorporation of Barbados Tourism Authority.

Notwithstanding the lack of incorporation, because it required Government's fund to still constitute 98 per cent of overall funding in any given year, the Barbados Tourism Authority was able to say that it is just a question of repositioning and got rid of a lot of staff in the process. Of course, we know the history of tourism under this administration. We have moved from Minister Cheltenham, to Minister Miller, to Minister Payne, to Minister Lynch.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, we do not need to look at the history now. Please move on.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, we are discussing this company within the context of incorporation and I am using the Barbados Tourism Authority as an example of the kind of incorporation that never existed but still the programme and policies were executed. I am, therefore, saying that we do not have to restructure, incorporate and corporatise the Port since we have an example of the Barbados Tourism Authority that was not incorporated yet the policies and programmes have been executed.

Mr. Speaker, I should be given some degree of latitude in terms of showing the correlation of experiences elsewhere in the system of tourism and what is taking place at the Barbados Tourism Authority.

Sir, I have only heard discussion on one aspect of the Barbados Port Authority even though there are two aspects, cargo handling and cruise ship passengers. I will get back to cargo handling later in this debate.

On the question of cruise ship passengers, this Minister was highly critical of that subsector of tourism and when he was Vice President of the Barbados Hotel Tourism Association, he made some very disparaging comments about cruise ships. I well recall he made the comment that cruise ships do not make any major contribution to the economic affairs of Barbados and that we need to look at land-based tourism. He went as far as to suggest that cruise ship subsector makes little or no contribution to the overall tourism sector and that statement was verified this morning. 12.00 noon

Mr. Speaker, this morning we heard that it contributes \$45 million to the purse. If there are half-million cruise ship passengers coming to Barbados, then on average a cruise ship passenger spends about BDS\$90, according to the

Minister's report. I suspect that the Minister is still not satisfied that cruise ship tourism is making a major contribution to the affairs of Barbados because this figure was quoted by the Minister. He said, "In any given year we are earning about \$45 million from cruise ship tourism." Sir, as I said, about half-million tourists translate to about \$90 per tourist.

Sir, this is the same Minister who, unfortunately, last week, I had to listen to on the air as I was returning to this August Chamber. He said that we can never assess the performance of tourism on the whole by arrivals. The Honourable Member said that he is not a numbers man and he went to say why he is not a numbers man as it relates to tourism. He said that we should not take the tourists arrival seriously but we need to look at the achieved rates in the hotel industry and the amount spent by the tourists and he went on and on. Sir, he also went on to say that he was also the Vice President of the Barbados Hotel and Tourism Association (BHTA) at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we are not certain where the Minister really stands in relation to a proper assessment of the tourism sector and whether he is convinced that even if you incorporated the Barbados Port Authority (BPA) that any major benefit would be derived to the industry, given his theories about cruise ship passengers and the sector as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that less than 25 per cent of the cruise ship passengers leave the port in any given year. It has always been the case that...

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. It is wrong to mislead the Honourable House. The Honourable Member cannot conclude from any statistics made available to him that less than 25 per cent of the people come on cruise ship leave the port. It is untrue and it is misleading the Honourable House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I cannot know how the Minister can draw that conclusion. He is not the first and only person to have done any surveys in Barbados and he is not the first person to be at the Barbados Port Authority. I had the fortunate or unfortunate experience of being a member of the Board and I know only too well ...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, not even the Minister is convinced about the capacity of the Barbados Port Authority to make any substantial input into Barbados' economy when it is incorporated or when it becomes a company.

Sir, the Minister admits that the Barbados Port Authority is extremely profitable. The Honourable Minister said that this morning and he went on to make the point that only in 1990 did we experience a loss. I wish, therefore, to understand what it is that Minister Lynch will do at the port...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, no names please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: What it is that the Minister of Tourism will do at the port when it is incorporated to improve the profitability of the Barbados Port Authority? Sir, profitability can only be improved if you increase revenue or you reduce cost. Is the Minister saying that there is potential for enhancing revenue at the port?

Mr. Speaker, if it is that all of our companies do business with the port, the question is, from whom would the port be deriving further revenue in the future if it becomes incorporated? The port can only be deriving that revenue from the companies and other persons with whom it does business. Therefore, if it is being said that the Barbados Port Authority is making an attempt to become more commercial and more profitable, then the logical extension of that is that it has to derive more revenue from the businesses and private individuals in Barbados. Therefore, by extension the incorporation of the port will have to increase doing business with Barbadians if more revenue is to be derived. Mr. Speaker, that is the simple logical conclusion of the incorporation because it is premised on the view that profitability can be enhanced at the Barbados Port Authority and the revenue must come from some source.

Sir, we are concerned, as usual, about incorporation because we are in an environment where the market now dictates. If the Barbados Port Authority is inefficient and is making such a profit, do we understand the implications of a Barbados Port Authority that is efficient?

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, where would the efficiency be derived. Would it be a question of managing more effectively your resources, thereby managing your costs or would it be a question of enhancing your potential to earn revenue? Depending on where you derive your increased profitability, it is going to have increased implications for the business community in Barbados and for the overall fabric of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, that is an argument that has to be understood and it must be respected in light of what we are hearing because when we look to the future of Barbados and to the fact that there are two major components of business

at the port, cruise ship passengers and cargo, there would not be any substantial or dramatic increase in revenue derived from the cruise ship industry.

Sir, the Honourable Minister of Tourism hinted in his presentation that there cannot be any fundamental changes made at the port that would derive substantial benefits by way of revenue enhancement out of the cruise ship industry given the excess competition to which he alluded. The question as to why there cannot be any agreement on head tax throughout the region has to do with competitiveness. It has to do with persons now trying to get their share of the market and it is believed by some people that the imposition of such a tax may dampen their opportunities to get an additional share of the market.

Sir, if that is accepted, we can, therefore see that unless Barbados decided to get out of the race and go in another direction, it could not hope, in the foreseeable future, to get any major share of the cruise industry and that is a fact. The other part of the business, which is predominantly cargo, must be seen as the area in which revenue enhancement can occur at the Port Authority. This is the impression that I am getting.
12.10 p.m.

Sir, I think that the Government is in fact using the Port Authority to introduce other kinds of capital works within the area surrounding the Port, because I am hearing about substantial development across Trevor's Way and a mile away from the Port of Authority.

Sir, I thought that such expenditure would normally come out of the central Government. If it is that you are now going to incorporate, it means that the Port becomes a company. Sir, would the Government be able to use the funds at the Port of Authority to conduct or engage in such capital works expansion across Bridgetown, if it is now becoming a company and, in fact, as going so far as to encourage persons to buy equity?

Sir, we have not limited the amount of shares that they can have, because I do feel that somehow, the hope is that this entity would eventually be privatised. If you allow BS&T and other such large corporations to buy shares in the company called the Port Authority Inc., can you then still indulge in such expenditure programmes to enhance the environs around Bridgetown? This is the question I need to have answered.

Sir, can you indulge in improving the environment around Trevor's Way? The company is a private company, and if it is incorporated are you going to allow shareholders to participate in the process? Therefore, can you see shareholders deciding that they want to get involved in a

venture that incorporates a mile of land around the Port? That is the thing about it because you are going to go all down Spring Garden Highway, up to Bridgetown to do projects. We were told in the debate that part of the \$68 million expansion and repairs is to do landscaping, a boardwalk, a marine walk, and all kinds of things all around Bridgetown. I am simply asking a question.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I agree with that but I am asking you, if you allow others to sit on the Board to become directors in the company, whether or not you feel that businessmen who are looking to get maximum profit, would allow you to engage in such expenditure?

I am therefore saying that it changes the management ethic and style at the Port. As a result, you need to take into consideration that there will be implications for the policy direction of the Port Authority, if it becomes incorporated. This is what we are saying. You have to be concerned about it. You have to be concerned about the culture of the Port Authority Inc., once it becomes incorporated.

Sir, you also have to become concerned about the ability of others to sit on the Board of Directors and influence the direction of the Barbados Port Authority. Therefore, that is the concern we are raising here in this question.

Aside.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: It cannot be. The Minister said that the reason for incorporation has to do with trying to achieve substantial profits. The Minister also said that we tried to raise funds through equity. If in fact we are already making profit at the Port Authority, what does the Minister mean by substantial profit and from whom and from where would it be derived? Who would it affect? It could only affect the persons who do business with the Port Authority.

There cannot be any magic wand that can cause, all of a sudden, profits to increase by \$7.5 million in the year 1999 to \$20 million over the next five years. It must come from somewhere. You cannot make profit artificially, unless you 'cook' the books. From where would it come? At what cost will you be seeking to increase profits of the Port Authority substantially and from whom would it come? Those are the questions we need to ask.

The other thing is this, when you look to the future of the region and you take into consideration the whole question of the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME) would Barbados be in a position, over the next ten years to attract many other kinds of firms to its shores, as a means of enhancing the economic landscape of Barbados?

I am of the view, and I have said it before, that in the initial stages of CSME, Barbados will in fact lose because given where Barbados is at the stage of its economic development, like Trinidad, you are going to have the influx...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, in making your point, would you just show its relevance to the Port. That is all I want you to do, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you are not listening because I am talking about the location of firm within a new CARICOM arrangement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair wants to know what does that have to do with the present discussions. We have rules in here of relevance. I have not asked you to withdraw anything. All I am simply asking you to do is relate it to the point that we are discussing.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, it is very simple, if in fact the new global or regional environment encourages businesses to come to Barbados, then there will be increased levels of activity at the Port. This is the very simple point I am making.

The potential of the Port has to do with the ability to enhance economic activity locally. If more firms are attracted to Barbados, by extension this means that there will be more cargo through the Port. There will be more potential for revenue of the Port. There will be more potential for profitability of the Port. There will be more potential for employment at the Port. There will be more potential for tariffs of Government. There will be more potential for taxes. There will be more potential to earn foreign exchange, Mr. Speaker, Oh Lord!

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, order please, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, we are saying therefore that in a future CARICOM, the capacity of Barbados to attract additional businesses would be critical, in the process. We have divided the Port into two, the cargo element and the cruise element. It therefore means that if Barbados, in the short term is going to be the loser, as I suspect it is going to be in the area of manufacturing and other hard goods entities, not services, then I am suggesting that the potential for enhancing revenue in Barbados, via the Ports, will be diminished. This is all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, Oh Dear!

12.20 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. You got to be evenhanded. There will be losers but there will be winners as well. Let us hear about the big winners that will come in now in an expanded port. He should talk about that.

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

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am for integration but the point has to be made that there will be losers. I said that Barbados is going to be a loser in the initial stages of the regional integration movement.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Yes, in services. There is not going to be the anticipated exponential growth in business. We have said that.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please!

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I have a major concern at this stage as to why we need to corporatise the port because the two major elements for revenue, the cargo sector and the cruise industry, are not showing any substantial potential for growth. I am sure that some of the Honourable Members on the Other Side, in their conscience, would not really support the corporatisation of the port, but perhaps they have to go along with Government on this one. There can be no justification given the experience and the profitability of the port why there is a need for such at this stage. So I would argue that we should not really be considering that line of attack. The evidence in Barbados at the airport, which has to be investigated, does not suggest that incorporation is going to mean any fundamental change to the affairs of the port. That has to be considered and investigated.

We are allowed in this debate to speak to the US loan as well. On the question of the US\$34 million loan, it has not been indicated what would be the conditions of the loan. It has not been indicated what would be the burden of carrying this loan. Some years ago the Government of Barbados was in the process of getting an investment sector loan from the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), and we well recall that a reporter was castigated on this same matter because that investment sector loan was to be part of the proceeds to corporatise the airport and the seaport. Some years later now we are looking for a loan to do precisely what could have been done several years ago, apparently to reposition the Barbados Port Authority. So we need to know the terms and conditions of this loan. We need to know how

this loan would be serviced. We have been told about a master plan.

In fact, Clause 8 of the legislation says that:

“(1) The Company should once every five years submit a port master plan to the Minister for approval.

This is a ten-year development plan that should consist of a marketing plan, a land use plan and an environmental management plan. Is there already a port master plan in existence? Apparently, there is such a plan in existence.

I would have thought that this debate would have been the ideal place to let Honourable Members know of the contents of the existing master plan. I do not think that a Government would have reached the point of seeking to incorporate the Barbados Port Authority without having discussed an existing master plan. We have not been privy to the real objectives of the company in this debate. What we are told in the legislation is that a port master plan shall contain the details of the objectives, strategies and policies of the company. We certainly have not been privileged to hear of the policies of the company in this debate. We have no real indicators, except for passing reference to a US\$25 million in development at the Port, of what the marketing plan is all about and where is the focus.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we should not have been debating the incorporation of the Barbados Port Authority Incorporation without having been privileged to such a plan. That is the major bone of concern for us. If the Government has already decided that it is going to the market to borrow BDS\$34 million, there should have been a plan somewhere knocking about and it would have been alluded to in this debate. I notice that the Minister has not said much about the loan.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: He will speak to it in the wrap-up. We have to be very careful in this Chamber because, and it has been happening, important information is coming in the wrap-up to a debate and not in the first speech. It has been understood that we would be able to speak to both the incorporation and the loan in this debate, but we have not heard anything about the terms and conditions of the loan. It has been agreed in principle that we would speak to both matters in this debate. That has been agreed on with the Leader of Business in the House.

Therefore, it is extremely important that we understand what are the issues pertaining to this loan of BDS\$34 million by the way of a local commercial bank

that has been very active in Government's affairs. We no longer have a Barbados National Bank. I notice in recent years that the Caribbean Commercial Bank is becoming the national bank of Barbados. In almost every major transaction over the last couple of years the Caribbean Commercial Bank has been intimately involved. They have been involved when we raised the \$30 million in Trinidad and when we raise money for GEMS in Barbados. There is still a \$15 million overdraft facility that HRL has with the Caribbean Commercial Bank, so I am concerned.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: We have to be concerned that all of a sudden one commercial bank is raising its head. I would have thought that given...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please! Yet again I have to stop you. There is nothing wrong in a debate in making a reference as you did to the other bank or to a bank. You make a reference to make your point. According to our rules of relevancy, you cannot therefore go on and on and on about that particular point to which you referred, to make your point, you cannot do it. That is not how debates are done in this House, please.
12.30 p.m.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that I am taking note of the fact that this loan... and I thought I would have been permitted the freedom to speak to this loan *ad nauseam*. It was agreed in principle that we would take the two issues on the Order Paper jointly because they both relate to the Port Authority. I am surprised to hear that I am being restricted in terms of what I can say.

SUSPENSION

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I intimated to the Honourable Member who is speaking that now would be an appropriate time to break. In the circumstances I beg to move that this House be suspended until 1.30 p.m. at which time we will resume the debate of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. G. A. CLARKE: I beg to second that.

The question that the Sitting be suspended until 1.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.
12.32 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This Honourable House is resumed. May I say before we begin that I have been made to understand that Honourable Members can in their presentations refer to the Bill before the House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, now that I have the freedom to address the loan for the Port Authority, I wish to make a few observations (1) that the capacity of the company, Port Authority Inc., to repay this loan is of concern to me. We are aware that the Port Authority makes relatively good profit and even though we are not privileged to know the extent of the Authority's assets, we are aware of the profits indicated by the Minister.

I repeat my concern that the Government of Barbados is seeing it fit to use a particular commercial bank in seeking out loans. I have nothing against the particular commercial bank but I know for a fact that it would be good for any commercial bank to give a loan to Government because the repayment is guaranteed and in terms of the diversification of the bank's portfolio, to be guaranteed of such a flow of income over an extended period of time, allows for better management of the assets of that commercial bank. We have been told in recent times that another large project is also being funded by this commercial bank. I wanted to say at the time that having sold the majority shares in Barbados National Bank, perhaps we could have looked to prop up that commercial bank as well.

In terms of the specifics, given that Barbadians have been encouraged to invest in companies over time, the denomination of \$20 000 each or multiples thereof could have been reduced to \$10 000 in concert with the tax proposal that permits individuals to invest as much as \$10 000 and be given concession. Sir, a lower denomination would also encourage smaller investors to get involved in the purchase of such bonds when they become available. Also, in concert with our tax proposal to encourage the purchase of new shares and investment there is a need to consider a \$10 000 denomination instead of a \$20 000 one which would encourage the spread of ownership of bonds to a lower class of purchaser rather than looking only at institutional investors, large companies or entities within Barbados. The point should be taken that perhaps we could consider using a denomination that is half as much.

The important thing to note, however, is that the capacity to repay is critical in determining whether or not any company or firm is able to access funds without being privy to the level of repayment per year. We know that there is a grace period of two years and it means that 2005 is when the burden of the loan will start to kick in because there is a moratorium of two years in the loan.

It is a question of whether or not Barbados Port Authority Incorporated would be able to take up this loan and then get involved in further expenditure in the not too distant future of an additional BDS\$50 million or US\$25 million. We were told that the Port Authority itself

would contribute US\$18 million or BDS\$16 000 for further development of the Bridgetown Port.
1.40 p.m.

Sir, it opens opportunities for investors to become involved once there is evidence that the company is profitable, which it is, but I still repeat my call that given the present state of the Barbados Port Authority, there is no need to corporatise this operation at this point in time. Sir, it is not the way to go.

Sir, we wish to know on This Side whether or not there was full consultation with the staff at the Barbados Port Authority because if there were consultations, they have been extremely quiet. I have been informed that the consultations were not in-depth consultations with the staff at the Barbados Port Authority.

We must know that the culture of an organisation would change if it moved from a Company owned and ran by Government to a privately owned company or a company that is, in fact, majority owned by Government with the potential for investment by the private sector.

Sir, I stated earlier that the labour unions have for a long time used the port as a major weapon in its armory. In fact, lots of trade unions built their reputation on their capacity to pull workers from the ports, whether seaports or airports, as a means of demonstrating their power and might. In the event that the Barbados Port Authority becomes a privately owned company, which is not in anywhere impossible in the future, then the union would have to look at the whole question of its capacity to negotiate, if it loses its historical power in terms of having control of the workers at those ports of entry.

Sir, it is not a mere question of incorporating the Port Authority Inc. We have to look at the question of the culture of the organisation and see whether or not it changes or could change as a result of being incorporated and the potential for private investors to become part of the Board of Directors.

Sir, there is no doubt that large corporations in Barbados would jump to invest in the Barbados Port Authority. Could you imagine what it would be, for example, the Barbados Shipping and Trading, the largest business entity in Barbados, to have a say in the operations of the port? Could you imagine how that would empower that entity in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt, given that this entity, under Government, is already profitable, and it shows potential for greater profitability, that if it becomes driven by private sector concerns, that large companies would certainly

wish to become involved in the operations and certainly the policy direction of the Barbados Port Authority.

In fact, not too long ago we were told that some companies were able to take containers out of the port and unstuff them at some other location. Sir, that happened in Barbados some three or four years ago and that was a bone of contention between the union and the management of the Barbados Port Authority. Mr. Speaker, if you could recall, a private entity was demanding and was able to go into the port, take containers out and unstuff them at some other location and it caused the boss of the trade union movement to make noise at that point in time.

Sir, the overall potential for the privatisation of the port and the investment of large private investors to become involved in the operations of the port is very real. No one can deny this and we cannot see how major corporations in Barbados would not wish to become very much involved in the affairs of the Barbados Port Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand in the future that if a large corporation is able to buy major shares in the Barbados Port Inc., that the potential to be favoured would be present. If a large corporation is able to sit on the Board of Directors, some may cry of insider trading or benefits that may be derived as a result of being on the Barbados Port Inc. Board. Sir, even that has to be guarded against because if you buy major shares then you would have a major say in the operations of the port and that in itself is a cause for concern to the extent that you are going to permit further consolidation of power and to the extent that you are going to allow certain arms of the business community to be extended beyond the actual operation. This would mean that there could be further consolidation of power within the private sector and within the economy of Barbados and, perhaps, it needs to be looked at.

Sir, this is nothing that should be scoffed at because you can understand the linkages that occur between the distributive, retail sector and the hotel sector and the extent to which a particular group may be able to get more control of the operations of the Barbados Port Authority.

Sir, that is why we are saying that there has to be concern over the question of denomination being \$20 000 because we need to be able to offer smaller denominations. I have no doubt that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East, being socialist in orientation, would understand and appreciate the need to empower a wider cross section of the Barbadian public in such a critical arm as the transportation and distributive power of the economy.

Therefore, in every sense there is a need for us to understand the wider implication of incorporating the

Barbados Port Authority and understanding the impact that it would have on the culture of the company as well as the impact it would have on the overall capacity of individuals to consolidate power within the Barbados economy. We have to look at it from that standpoint.

Sir, years ago, the Democratic Labour Party was criticised for allowing certain individuals to get involved in duty-free operations at the port and there was major discussion on the Other Side that the Democratic Labour Party had missed a golden opportunity to pursue the process of economic enfranchisement in allowing smaller entities and players to become involved in the operation of duty-free shops in the port.

It, therefore means that if you expose the Board of Directors to an intrusion by certain individuals in Barbados, then you also must look at the implications it would have for certain individuals to consolidate wealth within the Barbados Port Authority. Mr. Speaker, that is something that has to be looked at and considered.

Asides.

1.50 p.m.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, it cannot be that years ago, the Government appreciated the need to have a wider cross section of the Barbadian public represented within the shops at the Port and, perhaps, it was an error. I am saying, therefore, that you could understand what it means now, in the event that large corporations in Barbados are able to get on the Board of the Barbados Port Authority Inc., to direct the affairs of the Barbados Port Authority Inc., it must be a major concern of the Government.

Sir, this Government indulges in the sale of our major assets in Barbados, BNB, ICB, BACT, and other corporations, and this Government should have been conscious of the possibility of this entity being controlled by major players within the Barbadian society. Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the culture of this new entity called, the Barbados Tourism Investment Incorporated (BTII), then you can see that it has implications.

Therefore, I have no doubt that someone as enlightened as the Honourable Member for St. James Central, would appreciate the whole question of the social consciousness of entities such as the BTA and the potential of these entities to undermine the process of economic enfranchisement in Barbados. Sir, he has spoken only last week very glowingly and, indeed, criticised the Government in that debate for making certain moves, with respect to pension plans. He could then extend that understanding of the social fabric to appreciate the implications it has for this particular debate.

Mr. Speaker, understand the capacity now of the Port Authority Inc. to control taxis and ZMs, to control who goes into the Port, to control who picks up passengers, and understand the implications it would have, if the Board of Directors of the Barbados Port Authority Inc., is changed to reflect the private sector emphasis, rather than the public sector. Understand also the implications over the last two or three years, of ZMs and BT buses going into the Port and taking large numbers of cruise ship passengers out, to the detriment of the taxi drivers. Even though we have increased the taxi fleet in Barbados to almost double over the last nine years, we have done so, in an era when they have to compete even more. This is why, if you want to understand the lack of efficiency in that particular subsector, in terms of what they are able to get, you only need to take a trip down Broad Street to see the lack of activity in that particular sector.

Sir, I am saying that could you imagine the extent, therefore, to which a Board of Directors, running the Barbados Port Authority Inc., has a complexion now that does not reflect the public sector of Barbados, but reflects the private sector of Barbados. I go further to say that there is an attempt now, to get major water-taxis to ply trade in Barbados. It is believed that the roads are congested. It is believed that we need to relieve the congestion on the roads and, therefore, there may be justification for allowing the plying of trade in water-taxis up and down the length and breadth of Barbados.

Sir, could you imagine an entity like BS&T getting access to the Board and then being the major operator of any such taxis in Barbados? I am saying that if they are able to buy equity and shares and bonds, then they are going to be in a position where they can demand to have a seat on the Board of Directors of the Barbados Tourism Authority Inc. If indeed that is not possible, then why would we form a company and talk about becoming a commercial entity? If it is that Board of Directors of the company would not reflect a shareholding ownership, why it is that we are going in that direction?

Aside.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Are you saying that in Barbados the flexibility is going to be restricted? Are you saying that if a major shareholder of one of the companies in Barbados bought \$17 million of these shares or bonds, that they would not sit on the board?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am reluctant to interrupt the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, but it is clear to me that the Honourable Leader is prefacing his whole speech on something that has not been stated as Government policy, or that is not in truth, a fact. There has been no announcement on the part of this Government to privatise the Barbados Port Authority, or to sell any shares in the Barbados Port Authority.

The commercialisation of the Port is simply giving it a corporate structure, such that it is flexible to take decisions in a market that requires greater flexibility, if we are to see the growth of the Port, as we would like to see it. Sir, to suggest that commercialisation means privatisation, or corporatisation means privatisation, perhaps reflects the fact that even as he studied economics, he did not even do a basic legal course, because they are completely different processes.

Sir, may I state for the record once again, on behalf of the Government, there is no intention to privatise the Barbados Port Authority, and to premise a speech on that is to exercise scare tactics that are not even worthy of his behaviour at election time.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the courses that I teach on campus are very much about privatisation, taxation and public centre entities, so I would not even get involved in the silly comment. I am saying, what is the purpose of corporatising the Port to become more commercially oriented, as stated in the objects and reasons for the Bill, if indeed, you are not thinking in terms of allowing others to penetrate the policy direction of the entity.

It therefore means that there is no need for this debate whatsoever, because the whole basis upon which corporatisation has been put in the domain of Barbados has been to allow those companies, seaport, airport, to be able to compete more effectively within a private sector driven market, and to be in a position to exploit any opportunities. You speak to the issue of enhancing profitability.

Profitability is the objective of any private sector entity. It is not seen as the major objective of publicly owned companies and that is a fact of life. The thing is therefore, why are you seeking to corporatise, if indeed you do not have the greater objective in mind of being driven by private sector realities.

Mr. Speaker, I have the right to make inferences. This is a debate that seeks to describe the future of Barbados. Therefore, I cannot be confined and locked into a static way of thinking. I am saying, therefore, that for me, this is the beginning of a process and I can, therefore make my concerns of the future real, in this August Chamber, as I have done.

I am saying that simply to corporatise an entity that has been profitable, with the objective of obtaining more profits, there must be some attempt to go the private route, and corporatisation is precisely that, Sir.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Honourable Member wants to speak about the Democratic Labour Party privatising the Port, let him say so

but he cannot say that by this Government bringing this method here that there is an attempt to privatise the Port, when the Government has clearly said that there is no such attempt. The Honourable Member clearly has in mind that the only time the port was ever put into the hands of the private sector of Barbados was when he was the advisor to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs in 1991. If that is still so much within his bosom and thinking, then as Leader of the Opposition he should state it as the policy of the Democratic Labour Party.
2.00 p.m.

It is wrong and misleading to say that because the Government is corporatising the Port, it is an attempt to privatise it or to sell off equity. Every time he says so, Mr. Speaker, I am going to get up and have him withdraw it. If I could say that it was a lie in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I would say so.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, privatisation occurs when 51 per cent or more of the assets or shares would be held by an entity.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I am suggesting that 51 per cent or more of the port assets would be owned by the private sector. I am saying that there would be private sector involvement in the decision-making process.

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West keeps making the point that corporatisation is another step to privatisation. Now he is trying to define privatisation by saying that is not what he said. He is mixed up and he would be misleading the House if he states that this Government has intentions to privatise the port.

I want to put it on record that there is no intention on This Side, I do not know what they think of on Their Side, to privatise the port. The reason that we are corporatising the port is to give it more financial and administrative autonomy to make decisions to better partner with people in the private sector. That is not an attempt to privatise the port.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South has said that there would be greater partnership with the private sector. I have never suggested there would be privatisation.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. Partnering with an entity or having more financial or administrative

autonomy, flexibility and responsiveness does not mean privatisation. The Honourable Member is confused if he believes that it means so. He keeps stating it, Mr. Speaker, and that is to take the debate down the wrong road. What he is saying is to mislead the House and those in the environs of this place. It is wrong.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting, and hear me carefully, that if the Barbados Port Authority is seeking to get private sector money to run part of its affairs, then the only logical following from that is that these investors could, sooner rather than later, seek to become part of the board of directors of the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated and be able to exercise some influence. I am not suggesting that the private sector would own 51 or more per cent of the shares.

I am saying that they can become involved and they have been given the opportunity to become involved in the operations and management of the port because their money would be put into the operations. That is what I am saying, it cannot be denied. That does not mean privatisation. It means partnership as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South have said. It means partnership with privatisation. There is partnership and where there is partnership, it cannot be partnership limited to money. The private sector must also have a say and will have a say in the operations and management of the Barbados Port Authority.

Privatisation is defined as the private sector owning 51 or more per cent as has happened with the Barbados National Bank. The Barbados National Bank was recently privatised because we allowed RBL to purchase over 70 per cent of the shares. I have said that, so I do not know how someone can tell me that I am talking about privatisation. I am saying that you are corporatising but allowing private sector money to become corporatised.

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. The Honourable Member keeps making the point that corporatisation, this is what he was saying in the past, is a step to privatisation and that the port will sell off more than 51 per cent of its shares to other private entities. He is now seeking to retract that but he is misleading the House. The Government of Barbados is seeking to corporatise, not privatise the port. There have clear distinctions in law and it must be said.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, corporatisation could be a first step to privatisation, that is what I said.

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, privatisation is not an option that was ever stated by this

Government. So if the Honourable Member is going to impute...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please! Let us do it orderly, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West has said that it could be an opportunity and you are saying it is not.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: We have not said it. We have not stated it and it is not an option.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: That is your business.

Asides.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nobody is on the Floor. Proceed, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why it is so hard to understand. I never spoke to the issue of privatisation. I am saying that private sector individuals will become involved in the management of the Barbados Port Authority because their money...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: They are shareholders and therefore there must be meetings. Are they going to invest in the Barbados Port Authority and not know whether or not their money is making dividends for them? Would they not be like other shareholders and be allowed to come to annual meetings and make some input into the process? Are they currently allowed to do so? I am saying that they would be allowed to do so even in an event where there is corporatisation because corporatisation here includes the use of private sector money. That cannot be disputed. My God, my students are easier to teach than you all.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I always have to do this.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about privatisation. I am talking about corporatisation. We have agreed to that and there is nothing wrong with it. We must not deny the reality that we can use. If you are using private sector individuals money, they are going to want to have a say in the process, so if the Port becomes a company, they are going to become shareholders.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member was trying throughout the length and breadth of his speech to imply that this Government is using corporatisation as the first step to privatisation. He keeps on saying that all the time. He is now seeking to back-peddle from that in terms of definitions. He was implying all the time that this Government is using corporatisation as a step to eventually privatise the port. That is what he has been saying all along.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I was not saying that all along and I hope that is not the intention of this Government. I hope they understand that you are not going to be permitted to use private sector money without allowing private sector input. Who appoints the board of the Barbados Port Authority? The Government is the shareholder. In a circumstance where you are going to use private sector money...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Are you saying that the private sector individuals cannot ask at some time for involvement on the board?

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Are you saying that? Are you saying that you do not now have to send them annual reports stating the operation of...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: They are shareholders. They have invested. You cannot ask a man to invest millions of dollars in an entity and then not be accountable to him. He has to be given access. Therefore, all I am saying is that these persons are going to ask to become involved in such things as the accounts, the dividends and as to how the company is operating. We had a debate this morning and the assets nor liabilities of the Barbados Port Authority were never explained.
2.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please. It is not for the Chair to become involved in the argument but surely it would clarify matters a bit if you would inform us where it is in either subsection 6 or subsection 9 that there is any private sector financing.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, we are selling \$34 million in bonds and any Barbadian could buy any amount, once there are more than \$20 000. Sir, I do not understand this.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, buying bonds do not give the person buying the bonds the right to determine or to direct management. That person might have a right to receive reports as to the transparency of the operations of the entity. Sir, what nonsense is this I am hearing from the Honourable Leader of Opposition?

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that if I wish to invest \$34 million in an entity, I would wish to know whether or not that entity is being run effectively and efficiently. I have that right to know that.

I am therefore, saying that for the first time in the history of the Barbados Port Authority, they would now have to submit annual reports, as has been stated in the legislation but these reports cannot only go to the Minister or to Parliament because people would now be investing in the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any say in the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society, now Sagicor Life Incorporated. We are going to have to have a situation in which persons can ask for reports or for further involvement.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: If the Barbados Shipping and Trading (BS&T) Groups of Companies is going to invest \$20 millions in this, what is going to prevent them from asking from involvement on the Board? How does one determine the Board? A Minister, with the consent of the Prime Minister or whoever, sits down and picks out a number of names.

In fact, the Barbados Shipping and Trading (BS&T) Groups of Companies Chairman is supposed to be chairing every board in Barbados. In fact, he is now supposed to be chairing the Cable and Wireless (Barbados) Limited Board. What is so special about the Barbados Port Authority's Board that he cannot sit on it.

Aside.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, he is a Senator in Barbados and a very powerful man, one who sits on boards across the length and breadth of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is, how could one prevent an individual like that from becoming part of the Board of the Barbados Port Authority. It cannot be prevented.

Aside.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a level of sophistry now entering this debate. The Honourable Member fully well knows that if any private sector person were to sit on the board, they would not be sitting on behalf of the private sector entity but would be doing so in their own personal capacity, and that they could be no level of investment in bonds that guarantee a person to an entitlement to sit on a board.

Therefore, to suggest otherwise in an area in which the Honourable Member is supposed to have a little more knowledge than the average person, is to suggest that he would wish to confuse and to mislead persons in respect to this debate. I can, at best, assume that is his intention and, at worse, that it is ignorance.

Aside.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, are we saying that the structure of the Barbados Port Authority would not differ from the existing structure? Are we saying that we intend to put four vice presidents in place to look after personal relations, strategy, industrial relations and finance?

Mr. Speaker, the directors are supposed to be the ones who carry out the policies of the Minister. Are we saying, therefore, that though we are seeking to transform Barbados Port Authority Incorporated to become a commercial entity, that the existing directorship is adequate to make that transition? Are we saying the existing directorship does not need to be changed in light of the fact that the whole culture of the organisation is now being changed? If we are saying that, why are we here in this debate.

Sir, I would have thought that the process of change would have occurred at the top of the organisation, in terms of the directorship of the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated because I have no doubt in my mind that given the state of politics in Barbados, whoever sits on the Board of the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated might not be sitting as a result of any particular financial expertise in any way but might have been handpicked as a result of political affiliation.

Are we, therefore, saying that in spite of the need to redirect the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated, and to reposition it in light of globalisation, that the existing Directors of the Barbados Port Authority are adequate for the job? If that is so, I can sit and rest my case now because the point would have been made.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that there has not been any convincing or compelling argument that was brought by the Ministry of Tourism and International Transport to corporatise the Port Authority. The Honourable Member has admitted that, in fact, the Port Authority has been making

wonderful profits under the leadership and direction of trained, able-bodied, intellectually competent Barbadians, who were trained at the Cave Hill Campus. He has admitted that there has been profitability in magnitude at which to be wondered.

The Honourable Member said that the employment levels at the Port Authority have moved from 410 to more than 600, and still there is profitability. Therefore, the objectives, including profits, *et cetera*, being met are all compelling reasons why the Port Authority should remain as a Government entity. Now we are seeking to corporatise it with the intension of getting additional funding from private sector individuals but without the intension of allowing private sector individuals to be part of the decision-making process. It therefore means, Mr. Speaker, that one is only seeking to rob these individuals of their money, without trying to rob them of their intellect or competencies.

Mr. Speaker, if they are saying that certain individuals would put their money in such entities but would not wish to have any control over...

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I would hate to allow the Honourable Member to get away with imputing bad motives that Government is seeking to rob private sector individuals. I think that it is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, when I say rob, I mean that they are taking money without allowing for participation. I do not mean literally rob because those persons would have received bonds or certificates.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to end by saying that unless we are preparing the Barbados Port Authority Incorporated for a challenging future that cannot be met by the existing structure and the Board of Directors, then there is no need for any changes at the Barbados Port Authority. However, if you are saying that you are going to need further funds to put the Barbados Port Authority in a position to compete, you are also saying that you are not allowing any private sector entity to become involved in the process of decision-making, then all you need to do is to continue to allow Government to guarantee any loans of the Barbados Port Authority because the only reason why you are making an attempt to corporatise is to get access to greater funding.
2.20 p.m.

If there is no private sector involvement, the Government is going to carry all the risks in future and all you have to do is to continue to guarantee any loans taken by Barbados Port Authority Inc. and there would be no need to corporatise or privatise. Sir, there is the need to accept that the workers of the Barbados Port Authority have been doing an extremely good job and we need to express some

degree of confidence in the authority they have in managing the affairs of the Barbados Port Authority.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The Government should make sure that the workers benefit from any corporatisation and stop saying that there are no cruise ships staying over in Barbados because, for years, cruise ships were staying for more than one day in Barbados so you are not doing anything magical by catering to another day for a cruise ship. Sir, neither do we need to open up Bridgetown for a night.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is no large American cruise ship that comes to Barbados and stay overnight for one or two days, that is erroneous. Again, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. If he talking about a book ship or a floating library, then that is a different thing.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are currently members of staff at the Port who benefit from working the night shift.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Am I hearing the Honourable Member opining that these people who get overtime at the Port should not now get overtime and that the people in the City of Bridgetown and Baxters Road who would benefit from ships staying overnight at the Port should not have that benefit.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I would never make that comment in the presence of the mayor of Bridgetown.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The implication is that these people should not be given anything and that is the same thing he said about the privatisation.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that if we are not careful that those persons could lose the benefit which they now have, that is the point I wanted to make.

Let me end the debate by saying that in all fairness there has not been a compelling argument for the corporatisation of the Port.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the measure before the House. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West buttressed

most of his argument on the point on which he closed which was to suggest that there was no compelling reason for the corporatisation of the Port. He began on the faulty premise on an abundance of evidence, as he puts it, of the profitability of that enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, the Port is profitable, of that this House and Barbados by extension can feel proud. The fact of the matter remains that Government comes here out of a willingness not to be complacent, out of a sense of desire to in any way accept success and translate it into mediocrity in the long term but rather out of the pursuit of excellence. I am yet to hear a compelling reason from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as to why ten years of evidence, as he puts it, of profitability should stymie Government's efforts to ensure thirty or forty years of further profitability.

The issue before the House has to be that the corporatisation of the Port creates an atmosphere of flexibility into which fresh management approaches can be brought and to the benefit of which the future success of the Port is almost certain.

Mr. Speaker, I have said at the outset that I do not wish to be in any way contentious, although some would say that is hard for me to do, but when we have to deal with the kind of chloroform that the House was subjected to from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please do not go there.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, chloroform sends you to sleep and then it is hard not to be contentious. Sir, we need to look at the legislation and see the purpose for which the Port is being established. Cap. 285(b) of the Laws of Barbados establishes the statutory corporation which we called the Barbados Port Authority and that legislation framework gives the commercial structure that we speak to today. The question, therefore, is one of the usefulness of that structure, the orientation of the Port today, its capacity to be competitive and flexible and to what extent does that legislation constrains management's ability to meet the requirements of a broad participation by an abundance of sectors in an emerging economy.

Sir, I want to speak first to the point about the broad participation by an abundance of sectors. I am appalled that the Leader of the Opposition could so do himself a disservice to come to this Chamber and suggest that even if we get to the point of shares, that the only entity in Barbados that would be interesting in investing would be those that would lead to a consolidation of economic wealth.

Mr. Speaker, we are in an era where the credit union and the workers union in Barbados must be encouraged

to participate in exercises of this nature and this is where you have to part company with the Leader of the Opposition because he is not prepared to see the broad range of benefits to the broad sectors of the society that can flow from initiatives such as this.

If we look at the usefulness of this legislation today, Sir, the Minister of Tourism said that when you are looking at the need to decentralise management, you are looking at a situation where the Barbados Port Authority has a general manager, a deputy general and an accountant. Sir, that is the broad management structure of the Barbados Port Authority. 2.30 p.m.

I want to speak to some extent to the question of corporate development and strategy but I am going to do that last. I am going to start with the question of operations. The legislation places broad responsibility on the manager. The general manager of the port has a broad operations responsibility for the maintenance and operation of light houses, port and harbour services, collection of dues and charges authorised under the Act and development of leaseholds. Mr. Speaker, you could then bring it down to a micro-level and look at the operational day-to-day issues which fall outside of managing and leasehold, collecting dues and maintaining a light house. If a container comes into Barbados but for some reason the contents of it are damaged, the responsibility is also that of the general manager and the official notification of such damage must be given to him under this legislation and he must initiate and supervise the investigation.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, in his presentation, does not seem to assimilate or appreciate the benefits which would flow from the need for flexibility. The claimant, businessman and private individual are the people who suffer because of that inefficiency. These people have their interests tied up in terms of costs, they have their interests squandered in the context of time and it is to that type of operational inefficiency that we say it is necessary to change the management structure. Sir, that is only on the side of the coin that we call operations.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, I am trying to listen.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed, please.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, on the question of finance, the Barbados Port Authority is unquestionably a revenue bearing entity and I think that we can all agree on that. Section 62 of the legislation treats the Barbados Port Authority and the management of the Barbados Port Authority as having responsibility for charging rates at the harbour for services and in a manner authorised under the Act.

Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at the question of rates, I would give you an example from my own personal professional experience. There have been cases where people have been called upon to pay for services, dues and fees under the legislation and they have been overcharged. The ultimate responsibility for rectifying the situation, for ensuring that the finances are returned to the individuals who have been overcharged, which can erroneously happen in any business, lies with the General Manager.

Similarly, there have been instances where under-charging takes place and that need not be the result of any negligence. It can be as a result of misinformation being laid by a captain of a vessel or some other use of services at the port. Once that information has been recognised to be erroneous, the responsibility falls on the same individual to correct it within the same limited managerial structural framework. I would go as far as to call it an obsolete managerial structural framework to rectify that situation and he is given a time-frame to do so in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, we are talking about a need to have the capacity to be as responsive as rapidly as possible in a changing economy. It is, therefore, necessary that when you have situations such as those which exist with respect to charging for services and placing them under the purview of the General Manager, you would want to look at recognising that the liability for collections, payments and efficiency falls within the scope of a specialist finance person, that is what the Honourable Member for St. Michael South said in this Honourable House today.

Sir, the Honourable Member pointed to the need for an operational and finance specialty arm of management. In fact, if I could use another example, which is very near to me recreationally because I believe that I am one of the very few Members of this Honourable House who is a certified Scuba Diver. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is also a certified Scuba Diver but his talent is less significant than mine and that of the Minister of Health.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which talent are you referring to?

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Sir, being a Scuba Diver.

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay.

Asides.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Sir, the legislation speaks to how we define the harbours of Barbados. Now, the harbours of Barbados are defined in the legislation as Carlisle Bay, the Careenage, Bridgetown Harbour, the Spring Garden Anchorage, Speightstown Bay and the remainder of the territorial sea of Barbados. Sir, the responsibility for that broad area lies with the same obsolete management structure.

Mr. Speaker, we have to recognise that we are at a stage where we have to see how best we can empower a newly clothed and redefined authority to give a greater degree of input to a broader category of persons in Barbados, so that they can make some sort of contribution to managing those areas we call the harbours of Barbados as well as the area of coastal zone conservation and management. We need to recognise that there is a group of indigenous business people who, ironically enough, were mockingly referred to by the Opposition, when a gentleman who sought election to this Honourable Chamber in St. James North but did not have the support of some of the Honourable Members on the Other Side in his nomination and became a shoreline executive. Sir, that indigenous business class in Barbados has contributed substantially to entertainment services at sea, they have contributed extensively to sports and transportation at sea, to educational services of a maritime nature and, generally to recreation and the environment. These things are part and parcel of what the water sports leisure craft operators have contributed to Barbados and I say so unapologetically on the floor of this Honourable House, Sir.

Sir, under a revised and recreated type of institution, an opportunity would for the first time arise, whereby persons who play such a critical participatory role, economically, effectively *et cetera* can have an input into the policy of the management of that resource.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I spoke on the question of the investments and I am hearing the *sotto voce* remark from the Honourable Member for St. Philip West, who is competent in pretending not to understand the spoken word even when you speak in his native tongue.
2.40 p.m.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the issue of investment is not a particularly difficult one in this exercise, because once an opportunity to buy bonds arises, there is nothing to stop any of the mass-based organisations in Barbados, including, not excluding, the Democratic Labour Party if they so desire, to purchase bonds, if the set of bonds is floated. There is absolutely nothing, make no mistake about it, Sir, if each of them has a wall house that they are renting out for more than \$1 000 a month as a constituency office, \$20 000 is no money for them.

The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the way to revisit the legislation is to create a broader spectrum of opportunity for people to participate at a policy level, for people to have an input and for people to have some meaningful stake.

I make this point, Sir, very seriously. I represent a significant portion of the west coast of Barbados and I understand very clearly, the extent to which those on That

Side have mockingly referred to water sports operators as shoreline executives. I understand very clearly the extent to which water sports and pleasure craft operators in Barbados have contributed to this economy and to the evolution of maritime services.

Mr. Speaker, I speak now to the question of corporate development and strategy. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South in his presentation placed great emphasis on the fact that revisiting the structure of the Port, will, as we have said repeatedly, give us an opportunity to have a more flexible type of management. Sir, the question of strategy is inherently connected to the question of this flexibility.

Sir, let us talk a little about strategy, because it should lie in no Party's mouth, especially the Democratic Labour Party to be in here today, in any way criticising this initiative. I really would want to say here, Sir, that I long for the day when we can have a debate as potentially constructive as this, without having to go back into yesteryear to deal with what happened, when who was fired and all sorts of things.

What we are talking about is the potential that this legislation has for the Port in ten to fifteen years. Sir, the fact of the matter has to remain, and the record has to be made very clear, that in the month of April, 1993, the Cabinet of Barbados would have determined that a joint venture be created, touching and concerning the operations of the cruise facility at the Bridgetown Port.

Sir, that joint venture was to be with the Port Authority, which was only going to have a 30 per cent interest in a new company, and other entities, including all of those big businesses that the Leader of the Opposition referred to, the BS&T's, the Goddards and the Caves and so on, comprised the overwhelming majority of that arrangement. You are not hearing that in his speech, Sir.

Sir, 30 per cent interest remained in the Port Authority and I go further, what the Leader of the Opposition did not tell us was that by July of 1993, we were in a situation where, as one of the first orders of business of that new entity, a 10-year lease was being created, with an option to renew, exercisable by the company in another 10 years. Sir, out of that lease is the fact that the Passenger Head Tax at \$6 as it then stood, US\$2 of that \$6 taken, was supposed to go towards that company as its management fee.

Aside.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: They like to talk about the past, Sir, but they do not talk about the fact that the \$6 which was to have gone to the Port was severed at a time when the passenger arrival rates were increasing and

escalating as the Minister of Tourism pointed out today, US\$2 for every individual passing through the Port of Barbados was going into that company as a management fee, a company created by the Democratic Labour Party regime.

Sir, what is more preposterous is that on the first day of April in the year 1994, *Anno Domini*, in the year of our Lord, we went into an arrangement with the World Trade Organisation, (WTO) which was speaking towards liberalising everything.

Sir, that group was given a strangledhold, on the facilities at the Bridgetown Port, not the leather craftsmen in the City of Bridgetown, not the people who are making dresses in my constituency, and the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, none of the small business persons in the retail sectors around Barbados, but the same big people that the same Leader of the Opposition and, Sir, if I were not on the floor of Parliament, I would say hypocritically, but I would not use that word.

Sir, the same Leader of the Opposition was able to relate to, in his speech but, yet still, not come to the Chamber equitably and show clean hands and say, that when I, as the Leader of the Opposition, was the principal advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and sitting on the Board of the same Bridgetown Port, that this situation was what I presided over, implemented and executed and was so proud of that I ran on that ticket, as part of a Democratic Labour Party Administration. This is what he should have said.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that when we come to discuss the question of corporate development and corporate strategy in Barbados, with respect to the Bridgetown Port Authority, we then have...

Asides.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: I have taken on everyone of them before and I will take them on again.

Asides.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, when we come to discuss the strategy of the Bridgetown Port Authority, we must be mindful of the fact that in many ways, Sir, the Port had to play a hand that it was dealt, and it was not dealt the best of hands. What we are trying to do today, is to begin a long-term process of creating a new ethos, a new spirit at the Bridgetown Port.

It is particularly disheartening and painful, Sir, to hear the Leader of the Opposition, who must know better, on this question of corporate...

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. James Central is misleading the House. I never sat on the Board of the Port of Authority. I was a member, in the early days, of the Board of the BTA.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, I was thinking in respect of the development strategy. It is particularly disheartening, because this debate really and truly should be seen in the context of how best we can reposition the Port Authority to continue the good work that it has to some extent, miraculously been able to do, in the last ten or more years.

When the Honourable Member for St. Michael South was speaking and he quite candidly said that there was a period of time when the Port did not make money in the last ten years. No degree of vexation was attributed. The fact of the matter is that when we have weathered a September 11, 2001 even, virtually a holocaust, the fall-out in the eastern Caribbean was exceptionally significant. We have been able to maintain our market share and we have been able to register an increase in passenger arrivals even in the face of a decline in ship arrivals which is something we, as Barbadians, should feel justifiably proud.
2.50 p.m.

With the greatest respect to the Leader of the Opposition, there are only two lanes to his argument.

1. We made some profits, so we can relax and be done with that; or
2. Because of the fact that you are trying to refresh the situation and take fresh guard to re-clothe the institution in a guard that will carry it credibly forward, you are in the midst of some conspiracy to sell everything off to the private sector.

Sir, neither of those two positions becomes a gentleman who has become recognised as having a modicum of intellect.

Mr. Speaker, either we are about operational efficiency at the Bridgetown Port or we are not. We cannot in all honesty today be thinking about containers arriving in Barbados and not recognising that we must create a bigger and more technologically-equipped container park. You do not hear the Leader of the Opposition speaking to that.

In almost every major port of the world people are looking at the fact that container parks have been associated with the possibility of terrorist activity. In looking at the issue of container parks and the method of transporting containers, one recognises the implications with respect

to criminal activity regarding the transportation of illegal substances. Therefore, one would want to be able to assess and access these containers as best as one could. This is what is confusing minds around the world.

We are saying that we wish to take the initiative to create a bigger container park. We want the flexibility financially so that we would not only have the types of gantry cranes and so on that we would need but we want to have ultimately the sorts of technologies that are being used in places in the eastern seaboard where they are now having x-rays equipment to see into the containers.

Mr. Speaker, that is progress, but it can only come about if you have an institution that has the financial flexibility and the broad-based managerial structure that it would be able to competently and efficiently put those kinds of policies and practices into place.

If the Members of the Opposition had taken the time to acquaint themselves with the contents of Cap. 28(5)(b) of the Laws of Barbados – the Honourable Member for St. Philip North has just come in and I know that he would have made some effort – they would have recognised that what we are dealing with is an antiquated piece of legislation which does not facilitate the administration of the port to be the best it can be.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South spoke about the question of maintenance. Mr. Speaker, when we come to this Chamber – as others have before me, I would have been in the Other Place – we have talked about EduTech, about the hospital and about everything and in all of them there have been a common factor that successive governments, and I am not being partisan, have been notoriously poor on the question of maintaining their investment, that is a reality in this Barbados. How then do you get out of that situation? One way of doing it is recognising that by using the best commercial practices possible you can get yourself out of the very tight financial situation of being a Government-funded institution and increase your flexibility thereby having access to capital for things like maintaining the investment that cost you millions and million of dollars. You are not hearing that in the Leader of the Opposition's speech. His speech has been a diatribe of negativity. At a time when this country is looking to go forward, the Members of the Opposition are stuck in the mud with their faces turned away, set like flint, against progress which is not useful or healthy.

With the greatest respect, Sir, this is the first elected Parliament of a new millennium and we cannot continue to so frustrate the process of public life by inflicting this kind of nonsense... Mr. Speaker, if you are talking about progress

and you are not speaking about the maintenance of the investment at the port, you are not speaking about the need for expansion...

I even heard an argument today about landscaping. Now goodness gracious me, Sir, this suggests to me that the Leader of the Opposition is blissfully naive about what is taking place around the world. If he went to Miami, he would have recognised that the bay front area in Miami, which is a stone throw away from the Port of Miami, a joint venture project which has transformed that bay front area so that today it is a centre of commercial and entertainment activity.

On the other hand, if you leave the Bridgetown Port and you walk along the long lonely road up to Trevor's Way... The IDB has tried its best with Pelican but the fact of the matter is that the entertainment and commercial activity really lies in the heart of Bridgetown, as the Honourable Member for the City would tell you. We need to see the poor black people of Barbados being given a chance to develop that which they have in terms of skills and services to provide forms of entertainment and commercial activity along that stretch between Trevor's Way to the heart of Broad Street.

Mr. Speaker, I am guided by your signal. I really wish that I had more time because I could go on and on. Mr. Speaker, I feel a great level of pain today after hearing a young man whom I have gone to school with and have known for a long time and to see him fall from grace this way. I am speaking about the new Leader of the Opposition in whom people have expressed confidence they hoped that he would surpass, which is not hard to do, the level set by his predecessor. He has fallen beneath it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I throw up my hands.

I thank you for the time.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Bill and I am happy to see that the Honourable Member for St. George North is in full glee.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is rather interesting. One gets the impression there is something the Government is about to do that they have not told the Parliament of Barbados about even though they have had two speakers speaking on their behalf.

Sir, over nine years ago in this same Chamber I tried to get the Government to understand the importance of Trevor's Way. At that time I pointed out to them that they needed to reclaim more land so that the place we now call Pelican Village could have been relocated to the other side. I made the point that the same way they could have reclaimed land to give to other players that the people

who were doing business at Pelican Village were entitled to some of this reclaimed land. I am happy to know after nine years that they will now be building a boardwalk from the Harbour straight to Broad Street. By accident, Sir, that boardwalk coincides with the Pierhead Project.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. We have already had one speaker premising an argument on speculation. This is now fantasy. It is untrue. There will be no boardwalk from the port to Broad Street.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member said there will be a boardwalk on Trevor's way leading to Broad Street, let me correct that part of it. For my one part Broad Street runs to the Careenage...

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order. Anyone who knows Bridgetown would not imagine that you can put a boardwalk in Broad Street. It is physically impossible to run a boardwalk from the port to Broad Street.

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not say that.
3.00 p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Honourable Member has said that in effect, whenever the boardwalk is completed, one would be able to walk from outside the Bridgetown Port, to outside of Parliament, then onto Broad Street. It would be the closest way to get from the Bridgetown Port to Broad Street.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is sure, that is that it connects to the Pierhead Project. I do not have a problem with the Pierhead Project getting cruise visitors but it is not for me to have to inform Parliament of this. If it is the intention of Government, they should have informed Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong in making the Pierhead Project viable. I support it but Government should level with the people of Barbados. If Government has a master plan and wants the Pierhead Project to be profitable, then do it but at the same time, Government must recognise that nine years ago they had made an error. Government claimed they have spent millions of dollars to represent the interest of the businessmen at the Pelican Village Craft Centre but they should have built something to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Minister of Tourism giving very good reasons why tourists would not leave the Port and walk into the Pelican Village Craft Centre to shop, and I agree with him. That is why from the beginning I said that the Pelican Village Craft Centre project was on the wrong side of the road.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I agree with the Minister of Tourism. In the same way that he agrees this morning with

what I have always accused him of, that is, he copies everything I say and then uses the excuse that he, being the Minister, has the authority to implement them, while I have the authority to think of them. I have no problem with that.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You would say that because as soon as you hear that Pelican Village is moving, you have a problem with that. I am saying that if the economic activities could enhance the livelihood of the masses of the people of Barbados, then I do not have a problem with that. If the Honourable Member is talking about closing the window to the sea, then close it, so long as my brothers and sisters can make a living instead of staying in Pelican Village and 'sucking salt'.

Sir, as your Government have acknowledged and we have now acknowledged that the traffic from the Port side will not travel on that side of the road and that if Government wants to move Pelican Village from that side of the road and carry it further up, then do it if they do not want to close off the window to the sea.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that there is another fundamental problem. The Honourable Minister is telling this House...

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, over \$200 million was spent to upgrade the Grantley Adams International Airport, now another \$200 million to upgrade the Barbados Port Authority. I would like a feasibility study done to find out what would be the cost of building another airport and another seaport.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I do not care where it would be, it could be on Baxters Road. The point is that if we have a country that is supposed to be a service industry we cannot, on a piecemeal approach, deal with the finances of Government by spending substantial amounts of money to upgrade an airport or seaport, when that money could have been used to build another airport or seaport and thereby we would be able to have cargo ships at one location and cruise tourism at the other, especially when the year 2007 comes and we are supposed to be having many ships coming to these shores because of World Cup Cricket.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, I have to listen to him, that is the Minister of Tourism speaking. On the one

hand we are hearing that there are people who would have to live on ships and the Honourable Minister is saying that is not true.

Mr. Speaker, if the Barbados Cricket Association and the Government of Barbados, through the Barbados Tourism Investment Incorporation (BTII), can spend \$60 million to attract World Cup Cricket to Barbados, we know we cannot get the airplanes to bring the people in, and if we cannot get the number of airplanes because as one knows, the planes would have to move on and if we have a problem with capacity, then we would have to turn to the cruise ships.

Sir, my question is, during the period of World Cup Cricket, with this large number of cruise ships berthing at the Port, what are we going to do about cargo? As it now stands at the Bridgetown Port, we would not have the capacity to accommodate this magnitude of ships.

Sir, it has been said in this House that on some occasions when there are too many cruise ships in the Port, the cargo ships have to remain outside. Therefore, I would like to know what is going to happen when World Cup Cricket comes to Barbados. Am I to believe there would be people in Barbados and we would not be able to offload the food? Why would we want to spend \$60 million to upgrade the Kensington Oval and not recognise that we should have another airport with the amount of money that is being spent?

Sir, my argument is that whenever such funds are spent, Government should look at the opportunity cost of that money and find out whether we could get another seaport or airport, without having to go through the problems with which we are being confronted at the present time.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, we are now hearing that Barbados, being 166 square miles, is too small, while there are other places that are smaller than Barbados. It is not the size of the country but the capacity of the country to attract the traffic that it needs.

Mr. Speaker, if we are looking towards the future and have the foresight that shows capacity building, then we have to plan towards that, but based on the argument from this Government, it is clear to me that they are not futuristic in their thoughts and are limiting the growth of this country by ideas and policies that do not push Barbados forward.

Mr. Speaker, what I have always said about this Government is that no matter what good ideas that are given to them, they still cannot get those ideas implemented but instead, would only destroy them.

Sir, we also have to ask the question, where is the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development on this policy about building a new sugar terminal at the Bridgetown Port? Everyday one hears that the workers have now received their monies in bonuses or whatever but the independent sugar farmers have not received theirs, yet we are speaking about building a new sugar terminal. Why should Government build a new sugar terminal, when it seems that we are going to have the capacity to deal with bagged sugar and, therefore, there is no need for a sugar terminal. Sir, it is better to leave the old Harbour as it is and find another location on which to expand.

Sir, in looking through this Bill, it mentions all of the Ports in Barbados except one. I do not know if it is omitted by accident but I see no mention of Port St. Charles.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Who owns the Cement Plant? Who owns Port St. Charles?

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. George North is amazing. The Honourable Member has said that in order for that Port to be included, it must be owned by the Government of Barbados, yet when I look here, I can see the Cement Plant Jetty. If this could be included, why not include Port St. Charles? Only the Minister of Public Works could explain that.
3.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that development in Barbados cannot be only for the minority but for the majority. I have finally got the Minister of Tourism to accept that community tourism is now worthwhile in Barbados because at one time you could not speak about community tourism in this House unless the Minister of Tourism use his regular negatives and adjectives against you and now these days he speaks as if he has coined it. He speaks and he does not quote, everything is his but I have no problem with that. The problem is that they need to tell the people of Barbados how they claim they are not going to privatise the Bridgetown Port yet they still speak about a relationship with the private sector and how the private sector will finance certain things while Government finances other things.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were in this House when they also spoke about Barbados National Bank and we got the impression that the Barbados National Bank was going to be corporatised but not privatised. I cannot understand how they can challenge anyone who speaks about the privatisation of the Port because there is a process that the Government has always adopted and that is, they corporatise before they

privatise. Sir, there is good reason to make assumptions when it comes to Government because you know the road they travel and the direction they take.

Mr. Speaker, they are not going to privatise the Port now but they will set the framework in place now and later on attract bids for the Port. It is also clear to me who the buyer will be. Based on the evidence and what I see, there is going to be a linkage between the Barbados Port Authority and the Pierhead Project. Sir, I make that charge and I am prepared to stand by it because I know how the Government thinks and the direction in which they walk.

Sir, one only has to listen to the Minister of Tourism speaking about the development on the seaside and one could understand that he was heading straight to the Pierhead. I challenge the Minister of Tourism to tell this House that there is no connection between the Pierhead and the Bridgetown Port, directly or indirectly.

Sir, I am not vexed because it is a wonderful idea when I think about it. I would not want the Minister to shy away from such a wonderful idea that he has conceived on his own this time and has not repeated because he heard it from This Side of the House. I congratulate the Minister because he has worked in the Barbados Hotel Tourism Association, he knows the players in the field and he has represented them well. Sir, no one on This Side could have done better.

Sir, if I were a shareholder in the Pierhead project, I would start to market the project and to seek finance which I would be assured of because I would tell the entire world that indirectly, so far, I have put my hands on the Port of Barbados which is one of the most attractive and profitable projects to be found in Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Port is featured in all international magazines and you can imagine the kind of coverage you would get if you link the Pierhead and the Bridgetown Port together. Sir, it will be international marketing without cost to the Pierhead Project.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I like the idea but I am asking the Minister not to forget the guys at Pelican Village. I am begging for a piece of the cake for Granville and the boys at Pelican because they too should enjoy the benefits of cruise tourism. Sir, even if you have to build a bridge over the road to make sure that there is safety in crossing over so that people can be attracted over the other side to Pelican Village and not simply build the boardwalk to take you into the Pierhead. The Pierhead is deserving of the boardwalk and the guys at Pelican Village are also deserving of a safe passage for the tourists into their project.

Sir, the policy of the Barbados Labour Party flows in one direction and I want to see a change. I do not want to see action only at the top but also at the bottom. It is no doubt that the Government has done well but the masses are still trying to find a piece of the cake. The guys at the top have enjoyed the bounty and those at the bottom have to deal with wage restraint.

I hope that the unions of Barbados understand what is happening at the Port and I want to hear their voices on this particular Resolution.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am being told that they were consulted but what is interesting is that if the Democratic Labour Party were in power, we could not consult the union. Sir, we would have to involve the union. We have now moved to a stage where the union only has to be consulted and not involved anymore. I know that the Government cannot consult the private sector, instead, it must discuss this matter with them. This is why they welcomed the proposal when the boardwalk was included on Trevor's Way leading to the Careenage and onto Broad Street.

I must say that the junior minister of tourism is doing well because he has put a case to the Prime Minister why the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of International Transport should be separated. Sir, he has rightly justified his position in Cabinet for a full ministry. I congratulate him because he has always been very clever. Sir, he knows how to manoeuvre. I now understand why he has been chosen as one of the 'blue eye boys' because he represented his Prime Minister and the party well and those who did not want him in the party should tell him they are sorry the same way he said he was sorry to them.

Sir, the unions must understand that reform at the Port and the development must be done for the masses of people in Barbados and not for the minority. We want to hear the voices of the people of the union on this particular matter. This matter is too important because we are now saying that when mega ships enter the port, it decreases the number of ships entering the port. Sir, if we have fewer ships visiting, it tells a story for the workers.

3.20 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, it does not mean that if more tourists are coming to Barbados that they will be more workers at the port. It means that if you bring more ships you would get more workers.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, if a ship can bring one million people to Barbados it does not mean that we would keep all the workers at the port.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I have been in here for nine years and you will not be able to dictate my politics. You are a BLP and I am a DLP.

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay, continue, please.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, a point was made that the lowest year of the port's operation was in 1990 and that is a fundamental point. If in 1989 the country did well because the local industry did well for Barbados and we instituted a policy that saw more cruise liners and less food being imported because we were producing food to feed our people, what is the quarrel with that?

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: If 1998 was the most productive year what do you expect, do you expect to bring in food? We were a Government that believed in import substitution where we felt that we should feed ourselves. Sir, we would expect to see more ships in Barbados under the Barbados Labour Party Government because they like importing food but the Democratic Labour Party believes in consuming what is locally produced.

Mr. Speaker, we have to separate the cruise ships from the cargo ships. This situation causes a complex problem for the police. The sooner that we can have the cargo ships in one location and the cruise ships in another location, the better it would be for Barbados. However, that is a particular point that I would not discuss at this point in time. Those persons in key positions would know what I am referring to even though some of the Honourable Members on the Other Side would want to call it ignorance because enlightenment is ignorance to some people who do not understand.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am leaving this question with you this evening. Why is it that the Government has not accepted the praise for being able to merge the Pierhead and Bridgetown Port together in one expansion? When one looks at the opportunity cost of \$200 million being expended, one would recognise that it would have been better to take that money and build a new port and have two ports. Sir, at least we would have all the facilities in the new port and as you expand the product at a later date,

we can then do the necessary expansion or repairs and there might not be a need for expansion seeing that we would have a new port.

Mr. Speaker, the same error that was made with the Grantley Adams International Airport has been made at the Bridgetown Port. I am saying that we have to look at the opportunity cost of what we are doing and this Government has not been doing that. The workers of Barbados have not been able to receive the amount of money that should have been passed on to them because that money has been spent in cost overruns.

Sir, I am saying that \$200 million to repair any project in Barbados is too much. That is the amount of money that should be used to build a new project. It is alright when you do this kind of thing once but when you do it twice, it is a very serious thing. I cannot understand why people do not want to appreciate having new things.

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

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sir, the important thing is, when you have money of that magnitude, you really have to stop and look at what you are doing.

It is interesting to note that they have decided to use the piecemeal approach and spread the development over a nine-year period so that people would not be able to quantify the amount of money being spent.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that if the total cost is going to be \$200 million, do not bring it to Cabinet in a piecemeal manner, bring it to Cabinet with the full total so that the comrade from St. George South, when he hears about it at the parliamentary group meeting within the Party, he could tell them that \$200 million is a lot of money and that he wants a new port because that is the kind of gentleman that he is. He would tell them that it is a lot of money and we should get a new port.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member your time has expired.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Thank you, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that we would postpone consideration of this matter to a later time. I beg to move the motion for the postponement of this debate until a later time.

Hon. R. R. FARLEY: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

SUSPENSION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Honourable House be now suspended until 3.35 p.m. today.

Hon. R. R. FARLEY: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the House be suspended until 3.35 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.29 p.m.

RECOMMITTAL

Mr. SPEAKER: With the House's permission, we will now recommit to Government notices.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, earlier I gave notice of the Securities Commission Bill. It should have been the Securities Commission (Validation) Bill, 2003.

Mr. SPEAKER: Recommittal First Reading of Bills.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Securities Commission (Validation) Bill, 2003 be read a first time, and for Honourable Members to take note that the notice which was circulated had the wrong title.

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

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

ORDER NO. 10 – TO MOVE THAT THE HOUSE RESOLVE ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY TO CONSIDER THE GRANT OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE SERVICE OF THIS ISLAND

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before moving that the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply, I wish to move a motion that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West sits as Chairman of Committee for this session.
3.40 p.m.

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 M. A. MOTTLEY, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the House resolved

itself into Committee of Supply, Dr. W. F. DUGUID in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

(a) RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF \$5 154 954 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND TO PLACE IT AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 2003-2004 AS SHOWN IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 2, 2003-2004 WHICH FORM THE SCHEDULE TO THE RESOLUTION AND THAT THE EXPLANATORY NOTES TO HEAD 22 BE AMENDED AS SET OUT IN SCHEDULE II TO THE RESOLUTION

HEAD 12 – PARLIAMENT – \$481 236

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the amount which is being requested of this Honourable Committee has been occasioned as a result of the general elections held earlier this year and the coming into play of the new constituencies. As you know this House is now constituted by 30 constituencies as opposed to 28. At the time when the Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue were settled we would have only budgeted for 28 constituencies.

In addition, the vagaries of politics have seen to it that there have been a number of Honourable Members who either by their own deliberate determination or by the determination of the electorate are no longer members of this Parliament and are therefore entitled to their gratuity. As a result, their constituency assistants who would have been employed by Parliament are also so entitled.

This figure of \$481 236 comprises a number of different lines of expenditure. There were also three former members of staff who were employed by the Leader of the Opposition who have also to be paid out because once the Leader of the Opposition change even though the parties did not change those staff were made redundant and sent home and new persons have come on. So Parliament has a responsibility to pay them out after their eight or nine years of service as the case may be.

The sum required is made up of a number of different things. I do not think that there is anything overly contentious here but it does need to be resolved as a matter of urgency.

There are also new Members of Parliament who are entitled to have equipment for their constituency offices who have been unable to access that equipment. This vote

here would facilitate the access to that computer and office equipment that is necessary for their offices to be furnished.

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 22 – MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – \$276 165

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The amount here relates to a number of different expenditures yet again. The largest amount, \$204 000, relates to the purchase of equipment which is being requested specifically for the Telecommunications Unit. This amount is desired to purchase an automatic frequency management system which would be used by the Telecommunications Unit to manage a radio frequency spectrum in Barbados to ensure that there is no unsolicited use of the radio spectrum by the various wireless operators. As you would know, Mr. Chairman, this is a critical area now.

This sum is also required to purchase radio frequency survey equipment for \$52 253 which is also needed to conduct radio frequency, radio testing surveys to ensure that the emission levels of radio frequency radiation at the antenna sites across Barbados are satisfactory. In those circumstances, I believe that all can see the urgency of the acquisition of this equipment because we do not want to have a situation where, with the numerous providers, we are not in a position properly as a Government to regulate that which may fall properly to the purview of the Telecommunications Unit. In the circumstances, we are asking that this sum within the overall amount be agreed to for the purchase of the equipment.

There is also a small amount of \$48 161 to treat to the matter of Other Personal Emoluments to meet the cost of three temporary posts of telecommunications officers. The increase in staff would facilitate the implementation of a shift system at the Gun Hill Station to be able to effectively monitor the radio frequency system on a 24-hour basis. It makes no sense buying the equipment and not having the manpower to be able to utilise the equipment effectively.

There is also a small amount of \$3 925 for the appropriate national insurance contributions and then a further amount to cover travel in respect of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to the Schedule such that the explanatory note to Head 22 is also being amended in order for us to be able to state specifically that

the funds which we are agreeing to would be for the purpose of purchasing that automated frequency management system and the radio frequency, radio testing equipment of which I just spoke. As new members would soon be aware if we vote for the money and the explanatory note does not reflect our capacity to purchase it, we would be in breach of the law. Hence we are voting the money and we also have to amend the explanatory note to give the Telecommunications Unit the authority to purchase.

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, unless there are any questions that Honourable Members would wish me to respond to, I ask that Head 22 stand part.

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

The question that Head 22 and the Explanatory Note as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.50 p.m.

HEAD 23 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH – \$3 522 760

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$3 522 760 is required to supplement the Current Estimates of the Ministry of Health for this fiscal year. \$33 000 is for grants to a non-profit agency. This has to do with a subvention to the Barbados Red Cross Society. Last year, at negotiations between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs and the Civil Service, it was decided that based on the good work the Barbados Red Cross Society was doing in this country, that the subvention should be increased from \$25 000 to \$58 000. However, there was an oversight on the part of the Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs and the Civil Service and only \$25 000 was allocated. This \$33 000 now being requested is agreed to make up the subvention of \$58 000.

Mr. Chairman, the other portion, \$3 489 760, is required to provide for additional expenses which were incurred by the Sanitation Services Authority as a result of the construction of Phase 3 of the Mangrove Landfill. Sir, Honourable Members would recall that during the year 2000, after the non-commencement of the Greenland Landfill, a decision was made that Phase 3 of the Mangrove Landfill should be constructed. The cost was primarily due to construction, aggregate cost and certain professional fees.

At that time, it was estimated that the initial cost would have been \$9 107 634, and the estimated cost of construction was \$7.3 million. However, the consultants working on the project had given a revised construction cost of \$10.9 million. The actual sum to which the contract was awarded to C. O. Williams Construction Company Limited was \$9 484 694.

In addition, there was the matter of the purchase of aggregate, which was not initially factored into. It was felt that local materials would have been used in the leach collecting systems. However, around that time it was also determined that the local materials had, in fact, clog the leach collecting system at Greenland Landfill and a decision was made to import aggregate from Canada, and this cost the Sanitation Services Authority an additional \$1.3 million.

In the original estimate, a provision was made for \$150 000 for professional fees for the design of the plant. The actual amount paid was \$464 000. In that estimate, no provision was made for contract administration cost and it was thought that this was vitally important to review the designs and to ensure that the structural elements were being followed. This was entered into at a cost of \$610 000.

Sir, the project was completed last week and the amount required this year for the entire project is \$6 851 259. In this year's Estimates, \$3 361 499 have been approved and hence the additional sum of \$3 489 760 is required as a Supplemental.

Sir, the management of solid waste in this country is one that should not divide us within this Chamber, as I am confident that all Honourable Members are mindful of the grave public health issues that could occur if solid waste is not managed properly and efficaciously.

There is no easy solution to the issues of the management of solid waste. As I speak, there is a debate going on in Toronto, as to how they should deal with their solid waste. There are concerns that they have been sending their solid waste to places such as Atlanta and Michigan, *et cetera*, and indeed, these are countries that have greater resources than we have, both in terms of land size and finances. In Barbados, we come to more important and serious issues.

Mr. Chairman, in 1993, the Democratic Labour Party administration of the day had the good sense, wisdom and foresight, in conjunction with the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), to enter into an agreement with Stanley Associates, to design and to develop an integrated management programme for the entire island.

Sir, in January 1994, they reported to Government and spoke of the need for a waste management centre and the need to have a new sanitary landfill, and Mangrove was chosen as the best location. It also spoke to the need for a composting facility, a bulky waste facility, the importance of having a public education campaign and the need for change of attitudes in this country regarding the disposal and handling of solid waste.

The Government at that time obviously did not accept Mangrove and the consultants were advised to look at other possible locations. The consultants looked at 42 additional sites across the island and focussed primarily on 17 sites. They looked at issues such as location, the relationship of people living in proximity of such, the communities, the effect on ground water reserves, all geological and topographical aspects, the utilisation of land, whether it is agricultural or land earmarked for housing development, and any historical or cultural aspects associated with such land.

The consultants made their decision and scored various categories. At the end of this assessment, four sites were chosen and again, Mangrove came out top. The other areas were Lowthers Quarry, St. James, Greenland, St. Andrew and Harrison's Point, St. Lucy.

Government then set up a special advisory committee which consisted of technocrats from various ministries, representatives from the Barbados National Trust, the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers, the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, along with other interest groups, to review the report of the consultants, as to the decision where the land would have been sited.

Sir, I must say that another issue was the cost of the proposed landfill, and it was shown from the consultants' report that at the Harrison's Point, the total cost would have been in the region of \$70.2 million, in the case of Mangrove, \$66.8 million, Lowther's Quarry, \$57.2 million and Greenland, \$50.2 million.

This was not the only thing at which the special advisory committee looked. They had discussions with the consultants and looked at a number of issues in relation to these areas. In the case of Harrison's Point, it was felt that it was too far removed from the waste centroid. It was felt that the site identified was good agricultural land and part of it was earmarked for housing development.

As Lowther's Quarry was an excavated quarry, it was taken into consideration but the concern was that there was a very important water catchment area along the Trents and Porters areas, which are responsible for approximately 6 per cent of the water catchment in those areas.

There were also concerns about the depth of excavation at this quarry where in some cases, it was going as far as 60km. It was felt that this would directly affect the filtration rate for possible leach flow into the subterranean areas. In addition, within 1km of this area, there were a number of persons living in close proximity and, therefore, it was felt that this would not be a suitable location.

Again, Mangrove was considered and felt to have been the best possible location but as a concern for the

residents living in Arch Hall, Bennetts, *et cetera*, and also the issues concerning the possible contamination of the water supply in the Molyneux and Norwoods area, this was thought not to be advisable.

Therefore, the Committee agreed on the Greenland Landfill, bearing in mind it had clear soil which would reduce the filtration of the leakage, its location, there was adequate cover material; there would be no effects on ground water reserves and generally, not many communities downwards of the surrounding areas.

4.00 p.m.

This special advisory committee determined by a vote, eight out of ten persons that Greenland should be the choice. This happened in May 1994 and the Democratic Labour Party administration was mindful that these were technocrats and we took their advice. Sir, there were no politicians on this advisory committee.

It is interesting to see how the members of this committee voted and the National Trust and the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers voted in favour of Greenland being the ideal site for this to be located. The Democratic Labour Party administration of the day also endorsed the report pending the outcome of the consultants' report on incineration. Sir, I say this because incineration has now become topical and is seen as the panacea to solving waste problems in this country.

The committee looked at five possible sites. If the Honourable Member of St. Lucy were in his seat, he would be pleased to hear that two of possible sites looked at were in his constituency. The other areas looked at were the Texaco playing field at Brighton, the Flour Mill site and old faithful Mangrove. Having looked at these sites the consultants were of the opinion that it would be too expensive. It would cost \$135 million to construct an incineration and the cost of operation would run into \$30 million and it was thought that we did not have the technological capacity in this country to deal with this. In addition, there were concerns about the toxic fumes and how to dispose of the ash.

The Government sent technocrats on a tour to visit different incineration sites to report finally on what was the best technology. A group went to the United States of America, the U. S. Virgin Islands and to Britain and the final report and recommendation was that based on all the problems associated with incineration at that time that the landfill should be constructed at Greenland.

Sir, it was not a mad frolic or a Government coming in 1994, in the face of all criticism deciding that it should go to

Greenland. It was well-thought-out and it was the advice of technocrats but there seems to be amazing silence since then.

When this Government came to power in September 1994, the first issue they faced was the construction of the landfill. Initially, they were cautious, it was placed on hold and they looked at other possible sites like Walkers. They then identified three areas in St. John, Ashford Quarry, Kendal and Guinea as possible sites but the Government was concerned about the aquifers and contamination of the ground water reserves.

This Government was still concerned about the entire issue in spite of the recommendation and it had reservations about going to Greenland. However, time was running out and there were problems at Mangrove but it was quite efficiently contained eventually. Government went further and requested a feasibility study and environmental impact study. The Minister at the time set up a task force on solid waste management to look at all these issues. Sir, this Government was involved in consultation but the impression has been portrayed by those on the Other Side and other people that the Government did not listen to anybody. After all this, the best technical advice was that we should go to Greenland and the landfill was constructed at a cost of \$21.4 million. The Honourable Member for St. Philip West keeps saying that it will cost \$35 million but I know that from time to time, he has these erratic gestures.

Again, there was still some concern from the public about Greenland and Government stopped and decided to have an independent review of the area. It showed that there were possible design flaws and that there were defects in the actual construction.

Sir, this is no secret, it is common knowledge and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is aware of this. This is not unique to construction at Greenland because people build houses there yearly and there are construction defects and the Honourable Member would also know this. There were these concerns and because of them as well as the tendering process, Greenland has not started. In the interim Government had the opportunity to take stock of the matter and to review it.

The construction of the landfill was based on the thinking of 1994 and nine years have passed and there are different and improved technology like gasification and anaerobic degeneration and a number of the concerns about incineration are being addressed. We have been able to take stock of the matter and review. Sir, we are not a bunch of dithering fools and we can realise when something is not going smoothly.

As a Government we, had to decide if the decision made to go to Greenland was the correct one in the circumstances. If the answer to that was no, it would have been to ignore the advice of technocrats. I would then ask, what is the responsibility of technocrats?

We must ask ourselves whether we should still be focussing on landfills as a solution to our garbage as it would be foolhardy to do so in a world where people in the world are looking at the whole concept of recycling and removing the dependency on landfills. All technology is going towards the reduction of incineration plants. Based on the fact that there is not a lot of information readily available, people still have a lot of concerns about incineration.

Sir, solid waste management is not a static event but a fluid, dynamic process and every day we are hearing of more innovation in this process. Every week, we see in the newspapers some person giving a synopsis of their proposal to the ministry but Government has to look at some of them seriously and review them.

Sir, it has been said that incineration should be the method of choice to solve our solid waste problems and that we should undertake the establishment of these incineration plants but all over the United States of America the number of incineration plants are being reduced.

If the Honourable Member for St. Philip West is a part-time biochemist, he would know that all over the United States of America they are reducing the number of incineration plants because there are concerns about the fumes, acid gases, oxides, sulphurous acid, hydrogen chloride and there are also significant concerns about dioxins and their potential to cause cancer.

I am concerned about having these incineration plants in a small island and about all the dioxins which may be thrown into the atmosphere. The other problem is the ash which is transferred and deposited into people's homes which consist of cadmium, lead and mercury, as these days people are concerned about the level of mercury as a result of a number of these plants. I would like to hear the Opposition's plans to address these issues in the context of Barbados.

4.10 p.m.

Sir, also speaking about the ash and the residue of the inert materials, the Opposition said that the proposed landfill at Greenland would never open under a Democratic Labour Party Government and this area would be turned into a heritage park. I want to know from the Honourable Members on the Other Side what do they propose to do with the ash, residue and the inerrant material if there are no landfills at Mangrove or Greenland.

Aside.

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT: Is there some secret landfill somewhere in Belleville that we do not know about that they plan to put the residue in? Sir, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to close at this point and time but I will speak later about some of the plans for solid waste management in this country.

I beg to move that Head 23 in the sum of \$3 522 760 stand part.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister in making his maiden speech highlighted a number of relevant points. The Democratic Labour Party Administration had the wisdom to assess the options it had in terms of landfilling when it formed the Government. We recall those days of 'Mount Stinkeroo'. Honourable Members would recall only too well how topical it was and they would remember the living hell that was made of the life of a former member of this Chamber, Cyril Walker of St. George North who was minister at that time. Sir, threats of civil disobedience were made at the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) conference, those were the realities. Therefore, it was only sensible for us as a Government to assess our options.

Sir, what the Honourable Minister declined to say, and which is extremely germane to this debate, is that after September 1994 a new Government came to power promising in its Manifesto that they would end the nuisance of 'Mount Stinkeroo'. We heard that 500 people's lives in Bennetts and Arch Hall were being destroyed. How do those people feel today, nine years later, when they hear that we are looking for \$3 million today to extend the Mangrove landfill again?

Asides.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: They were compensated in 1995 and, admittedly, you are fulfilling a Manifesto promise. We all recall the fury with which the former Honourable Member for St. Thomas, the esteem Chief Justice now, advocated the need for these people to be compensated and now we are back extending Mangrove into a new phase.

Sir, the Minister is right to have focussed so long on Greenland because the people of Barbados really want to know what is going on with Greenland. Even the most dispassionate person, someone with no political conviction at all, would really be at his/her wit's end to try to comprehend this whole Greenland situation.

The Honourable Minister said \$21.4 million but he did not say what currency he was referring to because the figures that we heard before that is no way near that amount. We need to understand why is Greenland taking so long

and having spent that sum of money to fulfill a nine-year-old promise, it is only fair that we understand a little more about this issue.

I remember the Prime Minister, as recently as the last election campaign, waxing warm about the fact that this Government put legislation in place to make Ministers personally liable for reckless expenditure. I want to know who is going to be held personally liable for the \$30 to \$50 million spent in Greenland. I would like to know, Sir. Are we going to prorrate it over the three Ministers of Health?

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. Even though the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, the Minister of Health gave the figures, the Honourable Member on the Other Side, who is on his feet, insist on misquoting him and this is part of the dishonesty that the public has had to deal with. The Honourable Minister has given the figure as \$21 million and the Honourable Member is insisting that it is \$50 million.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member withdraw?

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Sir, Bds\$21.4 million.

Sir, speaking about dishonesty, perhaps, when the Honourable Member for St. James South gets up in her subsequent speech can she explain why Mangrove Pond was not closed when she was Minister of Health. If the Honourable Member wants to talk about being less than honest we can deal with this. Mr. Chairman, where this issue of honesty and intellectual purity is concerned, I do not think that this Government has credibility on this issue of Mangrove Pond. Least of all, the Honourable Member for St. James South.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Chairman, it is very sad, to some extent, that we now find ourselves putting more money into this Mangrove situation, having spent all of that money in St. Andrew which is just sitting there breeding mosquitoes. We will be glad if this \$3 million would be spent on houses; on the boardwalk which the Honourable Member for the City wants so badly for her constituency; on health concerns; the Urban Development Commission and the programmes that they are engaged with at the port.

Sir, before I sit, I would say that the Democratic Labour Party is advocating a comprehensive solid waste

management programme. Yes, we said that incineration should be part of it but no one should suggest that there is something evil about incinerators. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South knows that the institution where he spent all of his professional life has an incinerator and I do not think that it has killed anyone because he is still here.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Sir, the port that we were discussing here today has an incinerator. Incineration is considered a fair method to reduce the volumes of your solid waste and hence extend the life of your landfill. Admittedly, there are environmental considerations but there are technologies to deal with those concerns. I am sure we are going to hear a lot about this because I see a lot of the Honourable Members writing.

Mr. Chairman, the point is, we are not the Government. We did not make the promises on Mangrove Pond, we did not make the promises of going to Greenland; we did not spend the Bds\$21.4 million and we have not been here in 2000 for a \$4 million Supplementary and now back again in 2003 for a \$3 million Supplementary on this Mangrove Pond.

Mr. Chairman, while I think that the Minister made a good first effort in his maiden speech, he still has to give some more detail. The people of Barbados want to hear exactly what is happening in terms of this issue of our Solid Waste Management Programme and how we deal more specifically with landfilling. I would, therefore, sit at this point and hear some of the other contributions.

I thank you.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Mr. Chairman, even though topics of this type present themselves as right for debates which we can indulge in across the aisle, I would want to possibly look at a different perspective to this issue of solid waste management in Barbados, starting from what I call basic principles.

Sir, the basic principles would relate to the education of our people, as a fundamental first step, as to how to deal with domestic waste, which multiplies into this whole notion of solid waste management that we are talking about under this particular Head, in the Supplementary Estimates. 4.20 p.m.

I believe that we have made some attempts in the past to seek to educate our people as to what we should do and

must do, if we are to deal with some of the health issues which can arise out of inadequate and poor disposal of garbage, or refuse as we tend to call it, from time to time in our country.

I need not speak of issues of leptospirosis, rats, the *Aedes Aegypti* mosquitoes and all of these things, when we do not deal with the other waste products which we generate in Barbados at quite a substantial level. A middle income country, as Barbados tends to be referred to from time to time, tends to generate large amounts of garbage per capita.

Maybe outside of the education which we must focus on in a very deliberate manner at the level of our schools, communities, youth groups and wherever we meet, radio programmes and GIS, we have to refocus consistently. We say from time to time recency and frequency tend to bring about some changes in the minds of persons as they relate to various issues. Sir, maybe on this particular issue, we need to also have more recency and frequency, relative to the management of solid waste in Barbados.

I want to make a call for more re-education, in relation to the handling of our domestic waste. We have to respect the hard work of our sanitation workers. There are many of us in here, who will not necessarily do the job that they do and there must be a level of consideration given to them in how we put out our garbage, as they move from house to house and area to area. Also how we respond to the timing and the placing of our garbage on the outside for them to take away to the Mangrove landfill or to some other landfill, if it is for asbestos or other solid material.

We have to be conscious of those Barbadians who work on our behalf throughout the night and day to make sure that some form of sanitary health exists. I think that as a country, we have to indulge ourselves in a bipartisan approach to deal with such a fundamental issue.

I was pleased to note that the Minister of Health recognised the initial attempts of the Democratic Labour Party in the early 1990s, difficult periods at the time in this country, to try to get a process and a programme going, relative to the issue that we are talking about here today.

Nevertheless, I would not want to see a situation where we just completely get rid of the notion of incineration for some of our solid waste. As mentioned by a colleague from St. Michael South Central, it is known that the technologies today, can adequately deal with a lot of the concerns raised by the Minister, the kind of chemical compounds and gases which can emanate from historically inadequate incineration plants, but I think that we have to go that way.

Sir, we live in a very small land space and if we continually dredge large holes in the surface of the earth and

keep dumping more and more refuse, eventually, in truth and in fact, we may have a landfill in Belleville or in the heart of Bridgetown. I am sure that the representative for the City would scoff at even such a notion of it being in the heart of the City, since all of us, in fact, make many a journey to the City.

Sir, we have to take sensible and reasonable approaches to the management of our waste, and the management of the things we do in Barbados. We may have to look at the way we do our packaging. We may have to look at how we bring them from overseas, in these large cardboard boxes, containers, plastics or whatever. We have been doing some recycling, not all of it adequately, and we must do a lot more recycling of our plastics and bottles. We can have paper, card and books in one bag and cans and bottles in another bag. There is nothing wrong with letting our people know when the trucks come around, so that they can go to a recycling plant, rather than to a landfill. There is also a lot of foolishness we put in our garbage, and then ask the sanitation service workers to remove them, dead animals for example.

Sir, I am talking about a certain consciousness relative to those persons who provide such services on behalf of the wider Barbados. As consumers in Barbados, who go out there and buy everything, we should be conscious of what we are doing to the landscape of Barbados.

We can talk about Greenland and the big hole which was dug out, and this has been stated already. I think Barbadians understand to some extent, what went wrong with that issue, so I do not think we need to belabour it. What we need to do is to take decisive steps to deal with issues of solid waste management, such as incineration.

Sir, this is what I want to see happening in Barbados. It is my garbage as well as the garbage of all us on This Side, all of you on That Side, and every Barbadian citizen, which must be placed somewhere and something must be done.

I am not happy with the amount of money that has been spent in that area, whatever the figure, because I am not into the figures in that kind of way. As I said, I put that aside for now. I want to see more purposeful steps taken in dealing with solid waste management in Barbados, because it spreads into other ecological issues, which impact on my livelihood, on your livelihood, all the people who live in Barbados, and those who come from time to time and spend a few days here in Barbados.

Sir, what they take from Barbados, if it is a disease, will impact on whatever else we do in Barbados so we have to be conscious of those kinds of realities. We must work assiduously, spread the message far and wide, and

unite to ensure that whatever we do, will redound to the benefit of us and our health.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise in this matter obviously, out of a certain sense of heartfelt feeling of the people, on whose behalf I have the privilege of being here. In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I would want to preface my remarks by saying that I could not more wholeheartedly embrace the sentiments of the Honourable Member who just took his seat.

I do not think, Sir, that the people of Arch Hall, Bennetts, Redman's Village or any surrounding area, would want to know that the issue of solid waste disposal is being treated lightly, but I think they have come to understand that a number of difficult situations have confronted successive Governments in Barbados. Sir, for the benefit of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, whom I believe has been perhaps a little too exuberant in his presentation, I calculate, Sir, about three of four Democratic Labour Party Ministers of Health who would have been confronted with this issue.

I know that by September 1994, when the Barbados Labour Party came to Government, Sir, a position had been taken on Greenland. I said in a previous debate that I do not know how useful it is for us to continue to rehash the ancient history, when the issue really is the way forward. It is for this reason that I join with the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, because we all drive through Barbados and the fact of the matter is that we see the proliferation of plastic bags which are indiscriminately dumped around this country. We know that every time the crop season is in, we will find plastic bags in the areas of suck wells, along plantation land. We know, Sir, that metal, fridges, old furniture, bed springs, *et cetera*, are tossed into cane fields and that is how they dispose of them. Repeatedly, I have seen truck loads of those types of things being deposited. I have seen it happening in Christ Church East Central particularly in the area behind the Globe Drive-in and by the Foundation School.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is that we are dealing with a community that does not seem and will not seem to appreciate the urgency of reassessing the way in which we dispose of and manage our waste. That is the problem we are facing. Maybe we can go on and beat each other up on Greenland which has become an issue that has become very weary and tired, but we have now to look to see how best we can point to useful solutions.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central pointed out that one of our primary duties is the responsibility to minimize the amount of garbage and to do some useful recycling of it.

Mr. Chairman, part of my constituency runs along the large portion of the west coast of Barbados and we are constantly mindful of the reality of what took place on the south coast of Barbados. Let us not make any mistake about it. The millions of dollars that have been spent on the South Coast Sewerage Project have been spent in an effort to preserve the reefs on the south coast to try to get some of the contaminants that otherwise would have been poured into the water, out of the water, which is the situation that is now facing the west coast.

Barbados cannot and must not continue to treat this issue in the glib partisan way the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central sought to treat it because Barbados, as a country, is at stake in this matter. I say that very seriously. The damage to the reef, the consequential fallout in terms of tourism receipts and the health of the nation and the well-being of our fishermen are not Barbados Labour Party, Democratic Labour Party nor National Democratic Party issues, they are Barbadian issues. It is Barbados' livelihood and it is to that I believe this Chamber must speak.

I honestly believe that there are a number of obligations on our people, so the question of citizens responsibility comes immediately to mind. I am in the process of initiating an essay competition in the schools within my constituency on the rights and obligations of citizens on this matter. This is an outreach programme to try to get people to understand some of the role that they should play.

I say this very seriously. This Parliament commissioned a Constitution Review Commission. That Commission in its report, which is a document of this House, speaks to the question of the role of our citizens not only of rights but the question of responsibility. The question of solid waste disposal is an issue of responsibility for every householder in this country. It is also an issue which must be ingested and digested by every young person in this country.

When the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central spoke, I was taken back to a visit to Toronto where at every street corner without exception, I saw different garbage cans for different types of waste disposal. There is one to put your card in, right next to it, there is one for your paper.

Asides.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Apparently it is not supposed to work that way in Barbados. Therefore, it cannot lightly and glibly be treated and dispensed with as though one party had the idea and the next party did not have any idea. I think we need to use this forum in the manner akin to what the Americans call a 'bully pulpit' with a view to try to drive home to the people whom we represent the importance of us all joining hand-in-hand and playing a meaningful role in correcting some of the difficulties that we have had.

Sir, I want to say this for those who are very keen on That Side of jumping up and prancing up. A debate of a similar nature took place in this Chamber on December 15, 2000. The then Leader of the Opposition – God bless him – made the point of saying that what happened at Greenland could have happened to any Government, let us understand that, but perhaps a better issue would be how we manage what happened at Greenland and how we manage waste disposal.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know to what extent they are minded to be guided by the utterances of that Honourable Member. In fact, they might feel more comfortable if it is attributed to him as opposed to coming from me. At the end of the day, we could all get caught up in the to and fro, the repartee, on the issue.

There is no doubt, the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment could say this, that there is a demand for housing in the immediate environs of Mangrove. The people of Arch Hall and Bennetts are not placing as a priority the fact that there is a dump there. The issue there for them is the quality of the management of the dump. If we can take steps which will reduce the problem of a scent... I will tell you candidly that from time to time it reasserts itself, but that is also true of dumps in other parts of the world. When I was at law school in Trinidad, I had to pass a dump regularly and every time it rained you had the scent. I know of the experience in St. Lucia where there was a dump, but that dump has been so well managed that today that it is now the surrounding grounds and landscape of the Windon Hotel. The question here is how effectively we manage the issue.

I come to the point about the incinerators versus the landfill. I recognise this is part of the electoral silly season thing and it appeared in a Manifesto and so on. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, if I had an interest as an engineer in having an incinerator I would be against landfills forever more hereafter because of the significant capital benefit that would attribute to me. So we must not fool ourselves. There is a professional on the Other Side who understands that concept and who would be able if he were minded to be completely candid with this Chamber to indicate that is part of the problem.

There is a school of profession in the engineer fraternity who would want to see the incinerator, who would want to benefit from the implementation of the incinerator and who would want to benefit from the attendant consequential economic fallout from the incinerator, and obviously there are those people who would be laughing then.

Government's role must be to try to evaluate what is the best feasible position and to implement it and to do so in a broad national context within which we are saying that it is not a partisan issue but rather an issue of national development.

The people of Arch Hall have grown tired of the 'lotta long talk'. They want to see, and I will say it again for the benefit of the Chamber, efficient management of that situation there. That is the issue for them. The people of St. Thomas want to buy the house spots that are becoming available. It is not true to suggest that you got 50 house spots there and nobody wants them because there is a dump there. The exact opposite is the truth of the matter.

We all need to be mindful of the fact that if we are going to ameliorate the conditions that have historically affected those people, then we can only do so through the best possible practice of management.

Sir, when we talk of recycling, we must also recognise that Barbados has a very finite land space. So I do not see anything wrong with us trying to engage in the old practice of getting some of those dumped fridges and cars, metal especially, out of this country to larger markets where people are anxious to purchase them for the purpose of doing large, broad-based recycling in metal. That is a market that is very prominent in the United States of America and other places.

We have taken it as a given that when we finish with a fridge we should throw it in a canfield. We have taken it as a given that if our car get hit and we cannot get it fixed by a roadside mechanic, we will pitch it down in a gully.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that in days gone by, certainly when I was a little boy, I used to hear about persons such as the Honourable Member for the City's uncle, who would have been engaged in the business of exporting dry goods in the form of used heavy metals, therefore, I believe that is a matter which we could reassess and revisit.

Mr. Chairman, my most urgent request to this Chamber is that we do not descend into treating this matter as only a partisan divide because when everything is finished, a lot of the Honourable Members on That Side would have never passed through Arch Hall, unless

at election time. They would not and could not understand what it is, on a day-to-day basis, to have to deal with such a situation.

Sir, the persons who have to live with that situation would rather much hear that there is an agreement in this country, that the very best possible practice would be applied to the management of that which exists, because I think that those persons have recognised that it is not going to disappear in any great hurry. I do not think that anybody in Barbados is going to fool himself or herself that there is an Honourable Member of Parliament who is so concerned and conscious of the people who live in Arch Hall or in Bennetts, that the Honourable Member is going to ask that the dump be moved from its present location and carried to that Honourable Member's constituency. That would not come from this Chamber, nor would that Honourable Member say that he or she wants the incinerator built in his or her constituency because of all the attendant toxins, dioxins, ash, *et cetera*, that would affect that Member's constituency.

Sir, it is a peculiar thing where people, for want of beating their chest politically and sounding as though they genuinely care about the people, would make a loud noise but then when the issue comes as to whether or not it should be in that Member's constituency, that becomes another issue.

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

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: I thank you, Sir.

Aside.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Sir, I am hearing the interjection from the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and I realise that all is lost.

Sir, there are some persons who could beg, beseech or cajole but at the end of the day, it is like talking to granite, and that is the problem with the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my voice to this debate but I am somewhat concerned because I believe I would not find one Barbadian who would choose to live next to a dump unless there are no other alternatives. It is a dump. It is indeed callous and indecorous.

Sir, this House is charged with the responsibility to guard Government's expenditure and I have a fundamental problem when there is an attempt to take any taxpayers'

money and use it in such a way that it is inconsistent with prudence, and then persons come to this Honourable Chamber and attempt to justify it.

I well recall the talk about bringing experts who were knowledgeable about landfills, *et cetera*, into Barbados and these were men and women who would have never before visited Barbados. It is like bringing an economist who is living in New York and is an expert there, and bring him into Barbados and say that he is an expert in Barbados.

The experts in Barbados were those men and women who live in Greenland and the surrounding areas, who had indicated to Government, without reservation, that it was the wrong place to put a landfill. Sir, if the experts had used the internet and had done their research, they would have recognised that if the environmental protection agency criteria were checked for landfill placement in any part of the world, the Greenland landfill would have failed on at least two of those criteria, and I will define them for this Honourable House.

Sir, one of those criteria regarded the issue of underground rivers and streams. Sir, everybody in Barbados knows that there are underground rivers and streams there. I remember advice being given from experts who worked for a number of years and said that, in fact, there were underground rivers and streams.

Secondly, there is the slippage of land in the entire Scotland District area, another failure which cannot be refuted. Therefore, there were failures on at least two of the three fundamental criteria.

Sir, the third criterion was a fork-line and we can understand why. Therefore, for Honourable Members to come here today and to suggest that it was only an error and that they had gotten bad advice, is absolutely incredible. I do not believe that any Honourable Member on This Side would be in consonance with that kind of foolishness.

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the Honourable Member while he is on his soap box but I do not remember ever stating in my speech that we had gotten bad advice.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of looking in the English or the Oxford Dictionary for an explanation for the Honourable Member. Sir, if an Honourable Member says to this Chamber that advice was given from technocrats, they took that advice, and it proved not to be scientific and did not allow them to make prudent decisions, how could one otherwise define that advice? I do not know how else to define it and maybe the Honourable Member could tell me.

Mr. Chairman, all landfills produce leachate and are risks to a country's underground water resources and its environment. All landfills are also risks for the production of toxic and explosive gases. Sir, anybody who wants to understand that can check the environmental protection agency reports, and not listen to Doctor Estwick.

Mr. Chairman, I have a more fundamental point to make in relation to the usage of archaic technology in respect to incineration. As part of our tourism initiative and marketing plan, we accept large amounts of garbage from cruise ships when they berth in Barbados. On average, one cruise ship deposits approximately 30 000 tons of garbage. Therefore, when we have about five cruise ships berthing here, that amounts to 150 000 tons that must be disposed of in Barbados, by using an archaic gas incinerator that I know from my experience in science, must necessarily be producing a significant amount of pollution within that area.

Hon. N. A. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is impossible for any one cruise ship to bring 30 000 tons of garbage in, at any one time.

Sir, as I said this morning, in terms of cargo tonnage, the transshipment is 30 000 tons per year and therefore, it is erroneous on the part of the Honourable Member for St. Philip West to indicate otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House and I would, therefore, ask for that statement to be withdrawn.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: No, Mr. Chairman, I will not withdraw my statement. Let the Honourable Minister bring the statistical evidence and I will bring mine.
4.50 p.m.

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It cannot be right for the Honourable Member for St. Philip West to be asserting a statistic if he is not in position to corroborate it on the floor of the House because it will find its way out of here into the broad public domain where it will carry wings.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please continue.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Apart from all the pointless asides, I will stay focussed and I want to re-emphasise that I would like the Minister of Health to carry out some test at the Port and prove to the people of this country that there is no pollution and that the levels of dioxins are not significant

enough to cause risk to the health of residents in the area. Sir, I do not make idle statements and I always research what I say.

I also want to suggest that in Barbados and other parts of the world technologies exist that allow for the effective incineration of the majority of materials outside of plastics. This technology has been in use worldwide for the last thirty to forty years and you do not get the normal toxic emission of dioxins and other substances.

Sir, if the Minister of Health does not know what I am talking about he should avail himself of the research. I am aware that these technologies are being used in France, Martinique and Guadeloupe and that they are being contemplated by Trinidad & Tobago and St. Lucia. If the Honourable Member would like to advance the cause of incineration and solid waste management in Barbados, I would suggest that we look at a proactive approach of combining both incineration with specific types of landfills as they are not all the same. It is important that we understand that if you put clay liner from a cane ground in St. Lucy and compact it as a landfill liner, you are fooling Barbadians because there are requirements for liners and unless they are met, the landfills will leak and cause significant stress in the future for our water resources and such like.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister of Health was listening well and I hope that he would do a good job in the future.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I can speak now that the Honourable Member has completed his speech. He told us, what is contemplated for Trinidad for incineration and he took us on a tour of incinerators but I do not know if there are accurate because what I remember obtains in Martinique and France is a spin-off of incineration. It goes a step further, it is a gasification process and the Honourable Member needs to read the fine print because he is getting mixed up. The Honourable Member also spoke about the situation at the Port and it is a preposterous statement. Mr. Chairman, I was stunned, I could not move. In Barbados 600 tons of garbage goes to the landfill each day and the Honourable Member is saying that cruise liners bring 30 000 a day. Sir, it is preposterous. Where would they put that amount of garbage?

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central was more rational and level-headed. He understood the issues because he is not given to bombast and hot air. I must inform the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central that we are mindful of what he said about education. Indeed, the Ministry of Health's solid waste management

department in conjunction with PAHO and the Ministry of Education have developed a curriculum guide to facilitate the integration of solid waste management into the schools' curriculum across the island and over 100 teachers have been involved in the development of this curriculum. I take the Honourable Member's point that education is necessary and to say to him that teachers have been attending workshops as far back as November last year and have been benefitting from these workshops.

The Honourable Member from St. Michael South Central has been speaking about incinerators at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Port. He must know that the incinerators that cater to the entire municipal solid waste of Barbados must be different from the one at a health institution. Sir, it is homogeneous waste versus heterogenous waste and similarly, the one at the Port will be burning primarily cardboard boxes.

Sir, Government is looking at an overall policy and at the entire framework. It is not a one-fixed solution and no one modality can solve the problem of solid waste within this country. We have taken the point about the importance of recycling and have commissioned a study to look at the economics of recycling because we cannot recycle for the sake of it. We have to look at the economies of scales in the context of Barbados and see if we can collect enough pep bottles to make it economically advantageous.

We are focussing on reducing the amount of garbage that has to go to any of these entities and we are looking at a home composting project throughout Barbados and this is to be started within the new year.

We have also been looking at the concept of separation realising that Barbadians are not in the habit of separating garbage at home because they are not conditioned to do so.

We will also look at liquid waste management and in the process of solid waste management we will look at extracting the water to be used for agricultural purposes and on golf courses at a time when Barbados is having water problems.

The Honourable Member for St. Philip West said that a landfill is potentially explosive at any time if it is leaking gas and he is quite true. We are actively looking at areas in conjunction with consultants from overseas and the Ministry of Energy to develop a feasibility study of utilising the gas present at Mangrove.

All in all we are looking at a number of areas such as gasification and the concept of incineration. I take the point that incineration has improved but there are still many concerns. If the Honourable Member checks the internet, he

would see that these concerns remain and are becoming more stringent at this point in time.

Sir, there is the new concept of anaerobic degeneration. I believe that any sensible Government should look at all of these. The Honourable Member for St. James North said that everyone would believe they have the solution but we have the welfare of this country at heart. I believe that we are sensible people on This Side and I know that the Honourable Members on the Other Side are sensible at times.

5.00 p.m.

Asides.

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT: I know that they can see with me on this point and if we put our heads together we can find the sort of solution that is suitable and advantageous to the entire population of Barbados. It should not be a partisan issue when we to and fro about if it was a landfill or an incinerator. I think that at this point and time that we need to look at it seriously and in the coming months you will be hearing more from the Ministry of Health.

I should caution you that the new landfill at Mangrove is now finished and it is expected to have a lifespan of three years. It means that within that time, we not only have to identify a total solution but we need to be ready before that time.

Sir, with these few words, I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 23 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 24 – MINISTRY OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION – \$279 677.88

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for the sum of \$279 676.88 which is basically needed to facilitate the completion of the Senior Citizens Village at Vauxhall, Christ Church.

Sir, the establishment of a Senior Citizens Village, at Vauxhall, was conceived in 1993 and at that time I was working at the National Assistance Board (NAB). This type of housing complex synchronises with the sectorial plan of the Ministry of Social Transformation which is to provide alternative accommodation options to address the national problem of housing accommodation for the elderly.

Sir, everybody knows that Barbados has the fastest aging population in the English-speaking Caribbean. There

was a time in Barbados when you could easily distinguish housing for the elderly. Those were the outdated welfare houses which would either be painted in grey and white or brown and cream, hence it created a stigma for our elderly people.

Sir, when the Ministry of Social Transformation was established, we sought to change that image so that our elderly persons would be living in housing conditions more conducive to community development. In addition, we would meet the need of further development of recreational activity centres for our elderly persons. Sir, when I say recreational activity, I refer to creating a society where our elderly persons age actively because Barbadians are living longer and we want to create the type of environment which our senior citizens can relish.

Sir, against that backdrop, we have created seventeen activity centres across Barbados and it is our vision and hope to create activity centres in every community in Barbados.

In addition we have increased our activity programme. We have introduced a travel programme for our senior citizens. They are now travelling across the Caribbean and to North America.

Mr. Chairman, since we are an aging population, I believe that at some time we have to look at a hospice care facility for our elderly, particularly in their last days on this earth.

Sir, to get to the specific reason why we are seeking this \$279 676.88, let me say a little on the background of this Senior Citizens Village. Initially, this village was designed to comprise a complex of five-and-a-half cluster blocks, providing for eleven three-bedroom units, Sir. I am going to try to quote at times because this is a technical report that has been submitted to us by the engineers who are responsible for the project and in these turbulent times when we are talking about economic and financial transparency, I want to take Honourable Members through the report step by step so that they can understand what I am asking this Honourable Chamber to approve.

As a result of the topography, additional space on the land became available and the final configuration of the village would now be six cluster blocks with thirteen three-bedroom units and two spaces for day care facilities. Also at this facility, we have made provision for a community centre for the elderly with an auditorium so that the facility would not only be for those elderly persons who are in the village but will also be shared by the immediate community.

Additionally, we are hoping to create a kind of Hall of Fame within this village by recognising persons from within

that geographical area of Vauxhall and naming each of these beautiful cluster blocks after persons from within that particular area, Sir.

Sir, this Senior Citizens Village is stretched on 54 260 square feet of land abounding Vauxhall Methodist Church on the north and Adams Castle Plantation on the other boundary. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central and myself are quite familiar with this territory and we will be very close to each other since I do not live too far from that village.

Asides.

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY: Sir, work on this project is being carried by Islands Caribbean Services Limited and 90 per cent of the work has been completed. The sum of approximately \$3 million has been spent to date. The tiling, electrical installation and plumbing represent the remaining work on the project to be done, as far as construction is concerned. The landscaping is about 30 per cent completed. Sir, we are hoping to open this project on November 21, 2003.

Mr. Chairman, when you are working on projects with some of the best designs in the world, sometimes you get some problems that you did not anticipate. It is said that the true topography only became evident when the site was being prepared for construction. The site appeared to be relatively flat but when preparation for construction commenced, an excessive amount of mold revealed the presence of a ravine. It is the opinion of the engineers that the site was reshaped in previous years, and when the mold was cleared off, the land took on a valley shaped appearance, sloping towards a water course and then up again. As a result, the site presented several incidences of rapidly changing levels, making the proposed floor levels quite high, above the formation level for a portion of building No. 5 and building No. 6.

5.20 p.m.

It is at this point, Sir, that I want to invite Honourable Members from this Chamber to visit this facility anytime to see for themselves what is happening.

Sir, it also goes on to say that the height had to be done, because of the large outcrop of rock, located within its footpath. The height of these floor levels, created an additional 3 000 square feet of space, which the contractor recommended should be incorporated into the project. This called for additional expenditure but it would also enhance the project by expanding the facilities offered, making way for additional units or day care facilities. The estimated costs to utilise the additional floor space was \$348 600.

Sir, the incorporation of this additional space in the project, as recommended, changed the project design so that

the village now comprises six clustered houses, providing for 13 three-bedroom units, rather than five-and-a-half clusters, which provided for 11 three-bedroom units and two day care facilities, on an additional 2 200 square feet.

Sir, the excavation of the rock to facilitate the construction of Unit 2 on its eastern and western sides, and Unit 5 on its western and southern sides, necessitated the construction of retaining walls. These changes have resulted in additional costs amounting to \$168 805.10. Sir, if Honourable Members want me to break it down in detail, I could.

Sir, this is a critical point. The funding for the construction of the senior citizens' village, has largely been met by the NAB out of savings accruing from capital expenditure. The Board was originally allocated the sum of \$1.2 million to construct the village. This was placed in a special account in 1993-1994. Protracted delays in moving ahead with the project, resulted in accumulated interest of another \$1.2 million. Therefore, this increased the funding to \$2.2 million. This amount however, fell short of the expenditure approved by the Cabinet by \$160 365.97.

Sir, in the 2003-2004 Estimates, the sum of \$700 000 was approved, making the Government's initial commitment to the project to be \$2.9 million. This means that another \$436 276.88 is needed to complete the project. In order to cut cost, we decided that we will approach the private sector, corporate Barbados to fund the road and the parking spaces to the project. We believe that corporate Barbados should obviously be playing a positive role in projects like these, especially for those senior citizens who would have been the pillars.

Sir, we believe that this concept of a village is not institutionalising our seniors. We are really seeking active seniors. Sir, I am hoping that when I retire from this stressful job, I could retire in comfort in a home like one of these. I am certain that this Honourable Chamber would also accommodate Honourable Members from Both Sides when that time comes, if they do not have the necessary funds saved.

Sir, we are proposing in the next financial year, to build two more of these types of villages in Barbados. I suppose that most of our Honourable Members in this Chamber would realise that by now there are a number of returning nationals and there are a number of foreign investors who are interested in investing in these types of villages across Barbados.

Sir, what we want to do is to create a link across generations. We do not want to ostracise or marginalise our seniors but we want them to be actively involved in this society.

Sir, I would want to put this Resolution for the sum of \$249 676.88 before this Honourable Chamber, and I would want to rest on this point by asking Honourable Members to recognise that there is nothing more powerful than an idea whose time has come.

Asides.

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY: Sir, I am obliged to you.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I stand in this Chamber but I am moved to stand on this particular occasion because this facility is located in a part of Barbados which lies in the constituency of Christ Church East Central, a constituency that I have the honour and privilege to represent.

I am pleased to note as well that the Honourable Minister of Social Transformation, clearly stated that the origin of this idea was in 1993, and for that I applaud his honesty. Sir, a good idea must be applauded from wherever it comes. If this good idea is followed through to its ultimate conclusion, we should give the plaudits to those who have the courage and tenacity to carry it right through.

It is not like many of the others which commenced in the early 1990s that remain like albatrosses around the necks of the taxpayers of Barbados. One would hope that we would find some adequate conclusion and satisfaction in relation to all of those other projects.

We on This Side support any initiative which would deal with the adequate housing, taking care of the adequate health needs and the basic enjoyment of the elderly in Barbados. In fact, we did point to some of those areas in our Manifesto, during the recently concluded election, relative to taking care of the elderly in Barbados.

The facility, and I have seen it several times, has progressed quite nicely and I am pleased to note that this slightly less than \$280 000 is being put in these Supplementary Estimates to complete that facility at Vauxhall.

I would want to also commend the Minister, maybe he comes from the same school of thought that I come from, for the naming of the six cluster units, would reflect the character of persons who came from that area. My commendations on that particular initiative. Nevertheless, I am sure that the Minister of Transport and Works, should note that in placing this facility there, some community tensions have developed, relative to the small facility where young students are taught. Previously to the placing of the Vauxhall Senior Citizens Village they used to make access to the land in that area. That has created a problem now where

another resident of the area has extended his garage and access now cannot be made in that kind of way to that area. 5.20 p.m.

I believe that part of our role is the relieving of tensions within communities. As we sought to construct a sensible Senior Citizens Village in the area, a slight negativity is emerging. So I want to speak to him more face to face on this issue to find a way to relieve the tensions which have arisen in the community as a result of this.

I also want to commend the Minister, I am in a position of giving praise, not because I have known him from another place for a number of years but because on this occasion he spoke very deliberately on how the taxpayers' money is being spent, and I applaud that. He carefully and lucidly pointed out how the money was spent, where it came from, which is out of the savings initially of the National Assistance Board, where the additional monies are to be spent and what are the things that need to be done in the future. I love and commend the Minister for the kind of clarity and the kind of explanations that he has given to this particular Head.

He has also issued a call to the private sector and other concerned citizens of Barbados including those concerned persons in here who are millionaires, none of us on This Side fall into that domain. I see the Honourable Member for St. George South already saying no, but I am sure that recognising his generosity and his status as one of those whom I have mentioned, he will make a contribution to the area of car park access and landscaping in that particular area. I believe that there is generosity over there. There is generosity here as well, but our pockets are a lot smaller than the pockets of those who sit across the aisle from us. I know the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is not yet a millionaire but she is approaching there and therefore we will also accept her contribution, so there is no need to scout at all.

I want to move on by saying that the appropriate staffing needs of the facility must be adequately met. The infrastructure and the aesthetics of it is not what is important but the putting in place of the caring staff to look after the peculiar and the particular needs of the elderly. We know that just like young ones, the older ones could be precocious as well. Therefore, we have to ensure that those persons we put in place to interface with the elderly, will do so in a manner that is caring and understanding and will relate to the kinds of needs and the kinds of behaviours which can be manifested from time to time. We on This Side support this particular Head relative to the Ministry of Social Transformation.

I thank you.

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like to thank the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central for his intervention. I am happy to see that this Parliament is taking a position on critical issues as they relate to the national interest of Barbadians in that we look at things objectively and not take a partisan approach. In saying that, I want to extend an invitation to all Members of Parliament on Both Sides to come to the opening of the facility on November 21.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central mentioned a very critical point, the problem with access to the day nursery and to the other facilities in the area, which we are looking at and trying to solve so as to lessen the tension in that area. We are currently talking to the Town and Country Planning Department to see if we could bring that matter to an amicable solution.

There was an area that I did not touch on, that of the appropriate staffing, and I am happy to see that the Honourable Member has brought it up. Sir, I am glad that I would be given the opportunity to address appropriate staffing. A Ministry, like the Ministry of Social Transformation, clearly needs the right type of staff to execute its functions toward the public of Barbados. We have to critically look at how we ask persons to come to work at the Ministry of Social Transformation. It is not an ordinary Ministry. It is a Ministry in which, as we rightfully say, people must be empathising, caring, sympathising and understanding, particularly to the most vulnerable sectors of our community.

Sir, once this facility is opened, I hope that it does not become an institution. We are trying to merge this facility with the immediate community. I am sure that the facility would be named after a person from Vauxhall who would have contributed to the development of that community over a period of time.

Sir, since there are hardly any other issues I want to give the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central the assurance that we will follow up on the number of suggestions he made to help enhance this community and the particular facility, the Vauxhall Senior Citizens Home.

With that in mind, I beg that Head 24 stand part.

Hon. G. A. CLARKE: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 24 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 30 – ATTORNEY-GENERAL
– \$590 628

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the amount here represents a number of things for which there is an urgent need. The majority of the sum required

relates to the forensic services centre which was completed a few months ago. The staff complement at that centre prior to its completion was only 12 persons but that has increased to 27 or 28 now. As a result, there is a need for us to be able to bridge the gap in relation to what was originally voted for in the Estimates of Expenditure of this year.

As a result we are asking this Committee to provide the sum of \$528 671 so as to be able to meet the full staff complement which is as follows:

1. A director;
2. A deputy director;
3. A pathologist;
4. Three senior forensic scientists;
5. Seven forensic scientists or criminalists as they are styled;
6. An information system officer;
7. A forensic liaison officer;
8. An assistant accountant;
9. A forensic security officer;
10. An evidence officer;
11. Six forensic support officers; and
12. Two general workers.

You would appreciate that these allowances would not reach full capacity but they would indeed increase substantially the level of operations which would have been there prior to the opening of the centre. We anticipate that this forensic centre would be able to continue to service in a far greater way, the needs of Barbados as well as the Eastern Caribbean as it was designed to do.

We shall shortly be bringing a Bill to Parliament to govern the operations of the Forensic Centre. We shall also be looking at the question of revising a number of fees and also setting new fees for new tests that would be available for the first time to be done domestically. These, I should say, do not only relate to criminal law. Many people do not realise that the purview of the Forensic Centre would affect matters pertaining to paternity, the management of poisonous substances and in terms of general health concerns.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are a whole range of activities that, hitherto would not have been conducted, that now become possible because of the infrastructure and staffing that are being put in place. We trust that this centre would not be a net drain on the Treasury of Barbados but that, in fact, it would be able to meet its own operational cost with some level of surplus going into the Treasury. We anticipate that it would take us about three years to reach that point, as well as the full staff complement, which ultimately would be about 50 persons. I would say that we are moving to about 50 per cent of the capacity at this juncture but with room to increase in the future.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things that are going on, that the landscaping will start shortly. It has been a great eyesore for me but apparently, there were some difficulties on settling on the contractors. The National Conservation Commission, I believe, would be the one undertaking the landscaping of the centre.

Sir, for those persons who have not yet visited the building and for Honourable Members of Parliament who have an interest, they should take the opportunity to visit. It really has brought distinction to Barbados in terms of the range of services that we would now be able to offer domestically.

We also believe that it would aid considerably in the capacity of the police to detect crime because there would be greater use of scientific tests in order to assist police in their investigations. Those persons who watch television might be mesmerised by the variety of scientific aids that are available in television programmes such as CSI (Crime Scene Investigation) or Forensic Files, where one truly begins to understand, as you would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, with your background, that there is always a print left once there is human interaction, whether it is a fingerprint or some other kind of Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) print, which significantly would aid police.

Mr. Chairman, this is important. It comes at a time when we are looking to proclaim the section of the Evidence Act which would strengthen the protections that are available to accused persons, in relation to the taking of statements, *et cetera*. This significantly amplifies the resources that are available to police in relation to scientific tests for serious offences. It also protects the accused because it ensures that the accused can rely on scientific evidence as opposed to eyewitness, hearsay or statements alone. I believe that in the next 5 to 10 years, there would be a different perspective to policing in Barbados by reason of the establishment of the Government Forensic Centre and Laboratory.

I also want to say that it also opens up opportunities for employment for a number of Barbadians who have had an interest in that area but have not been able to gain such employment due to the limited employment opportunities locally. It will service Barbados and the rest of the Eastern Caribbean.

In relation to the other figures, \$26 984 is the requisite National Insurance Scheme contributions for staffing arrangements. There is also the sum of \$19 900 in relation to travel for the Solicitor-General Chambers. That has been occasioned by persons who have been appointed, moving from S5-S4 to S3-S2 levels, which would not have been known to us at the time of the Estimates because the Judiciary Legal Services Commission would not have made those appointments at that stage.

In addition, there is the sum of \$15 073 for the Royal Barbados Police Band in particular, which is required because of the upgrade of the telecommunications system within the Police Band headquarters. Sir, in all, the sum of \$590 628 is required under this Head to treat to those internal housekeeping matters that I have just outlined.

Mr. Chairman, with those few words, I am obliged to you.

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

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: Mr. Chairman, certainly we must agree with any proposals that seek to improve the administration of justice in Barbados. We have to look at the issue of forensic evidence and its availability in relation to the judicial system. Sir, certainly with the availability of forensic evidence, along with other evidence, we could say that justice would not only seem to be done but it would be seen to be manifestly done.

Sir, the particular difficulty I would have is in relation to the cost of this service to the country. In fact, from my experiences in the court system, when we make applications for scientific evidence in relation to paternity matters, that sometimes takes a long time and what happens is that a backlog of cases occur because of the long wait on that scientific evidence, due to the unavailability of a forensic laboratory at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, the Forensic Centre and Laboratory would assist in the efficiency of our court system. I am not casting any aspersions on our court system at this stage but I am saying that it would assist in the development of justice in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this Supplementary speaks to the administration of justice. In many court matters, we do not

have the availability of prints and we would sometimes have a jury who would have to make a decision based on a statement only, which defense counsel sometimes challenges. What I am saying is that if there were the availability of prints then we would feel more certain. As I said, we live under a constitution where the presumption of innocence is primary in our law.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to see some other developments in our system. We would like, as the learned Attorney General has said, to have a speedy introduction to the videotaping of statements given by accused persons when they are in police custody.

Sir, another issue is that the administration of justice would be better served if we have the functioning of the independent Police Complaints Authority, in relation to the Royal Barbados Police Force. That is an issue that I believe is very central to the system of justice.

5.30 p.m.

Sir, a man cannot be a judge in his own cause so if a member of the public brings a complaint against a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force, I am respectfully suggesting that very soon we have the functioning of an independent police authority because justice must not only be done but it must be seen to be done, that comes from the principle of natural justice.

Mr. Chairman, we look at the rights of the accused person but we must also look at the rights of the victim and we can further extend that to what we could call a victim compensation scheme.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am giving you significant latitude here but could you please stick to the Head.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: Sir, we must balance the rights of both the accused and the person affected by the actions of the accused persons or persons who inflict injuries. Those components must be looked at within our judicial systems.

Mr. Chairman, if we speak about forensic evidence, I submit we should bring trained prosecutors, persons legally trained who would be able to produce this evidence to the court. It is scientific evidence and it is at the Magistrates Court that we deal with these cases and they then set the agenda for the High Court.

Sir, the Magistrates Court is an important component in the administration of justice. I am submitting respectfully that we should have trained prosecutors, persons legally trained at the magistrates courts who can then deal with forensic evidence at that stage.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to say that we must look at this issue of forensic evidence seriously and I hope very soon we would have this centre and the services available because it will assist in the efficiency of our judicial system.

I thank you.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Member for his contribution because his day-to-day activities bring him into contact with many of these issues. It is also clear that he has studied the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto in relation to this area and has cited it as accurately as if he had recited a poem. I thank him for his endorsement of our policy programme during this term of office.

May I say in relation to the issues which he raised with respect to the independent Police Complaints Authority that money has been voted in the Estimates this year for it, the authority has been appointed and we are waiting on the Ministry of Housing and Lands to find us a location for the authority to operate from, for the same reasoning that you advanced, we cannot put the Police Complaints Authority in the police station because this would defeat the purpose of having an independent authority. We are trying to find a place in the St. Michael area preferably near to town or in town because it has to be central to persons coming from all parts of the island.

Sir, this matter has caused me some distress in terms of the inability to find an appropriate building. We have looked at the BITS building near Carlisle car park and I trust we can get the assistance of the Ministry of Housing and Lands to have this matter completed before the end of the calendar years.

In relation to the victim support scheme, this Government has spoken towards a regime being put in place for victims and if you look at the draft national plan on justice, peace and security you will see all of this articulated there as in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. There is a victim support officer employed by the Royal Barbados Police Force who now treats to victims on serious crimes particularly people who have been raped and the victims of serious beatings, shootings or trauma. Sir, the person is a nurse by training and she works all hours of the day and night.

Sir, we accept that there is a need for further measures in respect of victim support and we await the comments on the draft plan on justice, peace and security by the National Commission on Law and Order which, as recently as this weekend, have been doing walkabouts across Barbados to supplement the town hall meeting they have had. They are

truly trying to ensure that they have the widest possible consultation such that when they comment on the draft plan on justice, peace and security, it reflects as comprehensive a perspective as is possible.

In relation to the trained prosecutors, there is no divide in the House on our moving towards that direction. We have been discussing that where there are lawyers in the police force, they should be utilised in the prosecution system pending the completion of the establishment of a national prosecution system. This is a matter to which I have treated with the previous commissioner and the present one and I hope that we could move towards it because there are a large number of police officers who are trained in the law and capable of doing this work.

May I say that there is a necessity at this stage to reform many of the processes that inform how the police do their business particularly in the building of cases and in the prosecution of matters. There are funds provided under the National Task Force and Crime Prevention to have a study done on how we can modernise most of the processes within the police force to make them relevant to today's need while not compromising the objectives we set out to achieve in the first place when we established the measure.

Sometimes a file may go to four or five different people when it need only go to two people and, therefore, we are looking at recording all of those processes to streamline the administration of justice as it relates to police prosecution.

In relation to the audiotaping and videotaping of evidence, I will address this tomorrow morning at the annual conference but the matter has been raised by the Honourable Member for St. Philip North and I want to say that only this morning in this Chamber, I had a meeting with the Commissioner of Police. The Oistins Police Station, the Glebe and Holetown are the three stations that will be outfitted in the first phase to be able to audiotape and videotape statements from accused and suspected persons.

We have already finished the infrastructural work at the Glebe and Holetown and we should be finished shortly at Oistins.

We have already trained 30 per cent of the force to take the statement and what must be done to be able to proclaim that section of the Evidence Act. We have in possession a draft code of practice which I am now going through and once approved, it will then be sent to the Chief Parliamentary Counsel for official drafting and then to Cabinet before we could sign off on the code of practice.

5.50 p.m.

Sir, with that in mind, we are hoping that by the beginning of next year, we should be able to proclaim the five most serious offences that come before us even if we make a slight amendment to limiting to five offences in the first instance murder, rape, robbery, aggravated burglary and endangering life. Once we get that going and we can get more people trained by the middle of next year, because training is continuous, we can then expand the range of offences to be able, ultimately, to cover all indictable offences. Sir, it would be impractical for us to cover all offences but certainly, the indictable offences should be the ones in which people would have the opportunity to have their statements videotaped or audiotaped.

Sir, last week I made this point at an international body representing Barbados' interest that we have been since the 1990s allowing attorneys-at-law to be present during the interview stage of persons charged with murder. Certainly, before I came into this Honourable Chamber, all of the murder cases that I was involved with at the point of charge, because very often lawyers also became involved at the post-charged stage. From the very beginning I attended three or four interviews with the murder accused. There are not many countries in the world where the police force extend that courtesy to attorneys-at-law prior to charging.

I believe that when we talk about the things that happen, it is sensational to refer to the beatings in Waterford Bottom or wherever they are supposed to take them now.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, we also have to remember that we have a lot of good things in our system and I certainly do not know of many cases where accused are denied access to legal representation in this country. Sir, the State also funds the attorney-at-law of choice as opposed to funding attorneys-at-law who are designated to you. This is a fundamental difference because in many jurisdictions you have a public defender and whether he/she is good or bad, you have to go with that public defender.

In Barbados, once the attorney-at-law is on the legal aid list, invariably, you can choose whoever you want to represent you and the State would pay the cost. Sir, any lawyer worth his or her salt would go on the legal aid list once he/she wants to do advocacy. Sir, it is true, some may argue that the State should do more but in the context of all of the services that are delivered to the country, the Government is not doing badly.

In these circumstances I feel that we should continue to guarantee and afford rights to accused persons. Sir, the question is, can we and will we improve? Sir, we will but all

things happen incrementally and hopefully would be sustainable in respect of this area of the administration of criminal justice.

Sir, I am satisfied that we can do more. I genuinely believe that the Royal Barbados Police Force is trying its best and is doing a reasonably good job. Many people may not be aware that until the end of September 2003 crime was 17 per cent below what it was last year. That is something for not only the police to be happy about but for all Barbadians. I think, genuinely, there is a mood in the country that we want to be able to wrestle crime down on a continuous basis. Sir, just as it is not the task of the police only to do that, it is not the police only who must be praised for the reduction in crime.

Mr. Chairman, all Caribbean countries are not only seeing horrendous increases in crime but the appearance of the types of crimes that grip a society, with fear like kidnapping and the kinds of shooting that we are seeing in other Caribbean countries. Sir, that we could have a situation where crime is 17 per cent below for the first nine months of this year, what it was last year and in many instances, robbery and burglary below what it was ten and twelve years ago when we had an increase in crime, I think that all Barbados should be commended for that effort and in trying to ensure that we live in as peaceful a society as we possibly could.

There is going to be an outreach programme, as I understand it, to be able to build more partnerships with the communities.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there is a determination to work even closer with communities through parish committees. However, we are awaiting the report from Sir Roy Marshall and the National Committee on Law and Order and, therefore, those things would be implemented once we have the report back, which we anticipate will be early next year if not by the end of this year.

With those few words, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head 30 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 44 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND
SOCIAL SECURITY – \$4 488

Mr. T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. Chairman, I am making a very simple and reasonable request for sum minuscule sum of money, not deserving of any debate, \$4 488, which is required for the rental of a photocopying machine for approximately six months. The information that leads to this request is that the present machine, which has been malfunctioning for a considerable time, is no longer in operation and the repairs have been very costly. This obsolete piece of equipment has to be replaced urgently in order that the staff can get on with productive work, so I am making this request.

I beg to move that Head 44 stand part.

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that Head 44 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

On the separate motion of Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, seconded by Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, the Resolution was read a second and third time and passed and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government's Business for today's Sitting and beg to move that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, November 4, 2003 at 10.00 a.m.

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

The question that this Honourable House be adjourned until Tuesday, November 4, 2003 at 10.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 1

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of
Tuesday, October 21, 2003.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 1

1. Report on the Public Enterprise Investment Fund for quarter ending June 30, 2003.
2. Report of the Social Investment Fund for the quarter ending June 30, 2003.
3. Recommendation of the International Labour Conference concerning the promotion of cooperatives.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 2

Securities Commission Bill, 2003.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 2

Securities Commission Bill, 2003.

MOTIONS RE: ORDERS 4 AND 8

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 2

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 2

Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43, and 44 were suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 9 – THE BARBADOS PORT INC. (TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT AND VESTING OF ASSETS) BILL, 2003 2

Hon. N. A. Lynch, 2; Mr. C. A. Mascoll, 14, 20; Mr. Speaker, 14; Hon. K. D. Symmonds, 27; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 31.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES (recommitted)

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 36

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY 36

ORDER NO. 10 – HOUSE RESOLVED ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY 36

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 36.

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION THAT THE SUM OF FIVE MILLION, ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR DOLLARS BE GRANTED FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND BE PLACED AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 2003-2004 AS SHOWN IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO. 2, 2003-2004 36

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 36.

HEAD 22 – MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – \$276 165 37

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 37.

HEAD 23 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH – \$481 236 ... 37

Hon. J. X. Walcott, 37, 46; Mr. R. L. Sealy, 40; Mr. R. D. Jones, 41; Hon. K. D. Symmonds, 43; Dr. D. C. Estwick, 45.

HEAD 24 – MINISTRY OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION – \$279 677.88 47

Hon. H. A. Lashley, 47; Mr. R. D. Jones, 49.

HEAD 30 – ATTORNEY GENERAL – \$590 628 50

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 50, 52; Mr. M. A. Lashley, 52.

HEAD 44 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY – \$4 488 55

Mr. T. A. Prescod, 55.

SUSPENSIONS 20, 36

ADJOURNMENT 55

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 55.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ESTWICK, Dr. D. C. (St. Philip West)
JONES, Mr. R. D. (Christ Church East Central)
KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy)
LASHLEY, Hon. H. F. (St. Michael South East)
LASHLEY, Mr. M. A. (St. Philip North)
LYNCH, Hon. N. A. (St. Michael South)
MASCOLL, Mr. C. A. (St. Michael North West)
MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East)
PRESCOD, Mr. T. A. (St. Michael East)
ROETT, His Honour I. A. (St. Michael Central)
SEALY, Mr. R. L. (St. Michael South Central)
SYMMONDS, Hon. K. D. (St. James Central)
THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South)
WALCOTT, Hon. J. X. (Christ Church South)