
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

THE SENATE

Friday, January 28, 1994.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Friday, January 28, 1994 at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator J. J. PAYNE, (Deputy President);

Senator the Honourable L. V. H. LEWIS, G.C.M., (Minister of the Environment, Housing and Lands), (Leader of the Senate);

Senator A. MORRISON;

Senator Mrs. V. C. FRASER, B.S.S., J.P., M.C.F.A.;

Senator A. J. N. PHILLIPS, G.C.M.;

Senator the Honourable Dr. C. D. CLARKE (Minister of State, Ministry of Economic Affairs) (Deputy Leader of the Senate)

Senator Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE;

Senator Miss Y. V. WALKES;

Senator Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH;

Senator Dr. E. A. SIMMONS;

Senator Mrs. A. STRAUGHN, G.C.M.;

Senator Mrs. M. WALCOTT, S.C.M.;

Senator the Venerable Archdeacon J.L. SPRINGER;

Senator J. G. BELLAMY;

Senator J. A. F. COLE;

Senator T. E. BARKER

Senator Miss M. A. MOTTLEY and

Senator T. C. BECKLES.

Prayers were led by Fr. Errington Massiah.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OR SITTINGS OF THE SENATE AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended to enable us to deal with two Bills today in all their stages.

The question was put and agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that the Venerable Archdeacon Senator Springer be appointed to serve as Acting Deputy President for today's sitting.

The question was put and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1994, a second Bill to amend the Barbados National Bank Act, Cap. 322A, and a third Bill known as the Evidence Bill, 1994 be read a first time.

The question was put and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 2 – TO MOVE THE SECOND READING
OF A BILL TO AMEND THE BARBADOS
NATIONAL BANK ACT, CAP. 322A

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, the Barbados National Bank Act, Cap. 322A is before us for amendment today. The Barbados National Bank established by this Act came into force on 21st March, 1993. I believe that my good friend and colleague, the Honourable Senator Harcourt Lewis, had a hand or shall I say a limb in the paternity of that institution. Amongst the divisions making up that Bank is the Agricultural Banking Division. It has as one of its functions the making of loans and advances for the cultivation and/or the management of sugar plantations or sugar factories in Barbados. Evidence of and security repayment of any such loans made either to the sugar factories or to the sugar plantations was a certificate of loan which was issued by the borrowers in such a form as prescribed by the Act. The necessary format is spelled out at Section 4(a)(6) and states among other things:

"The loan so constituted takes priority over all other liens or charges and is a first lien against,

(a) in the case of a sugar plantation:

- (1) the lands comprising the plantation in respect of which the loan was made,
- (2) the crops to be reaped or being reaped at the plantation in the agricultural year in respect of which the loan was made,
- (3) the livestock, vehicles, equipment, machinery and plant belonging to the plantation, and

(b) in the case of a sugar factory:

- (1) the lands comprising the sugar factory in respect of which the loan was made,
- (2) the sugar and molasses to be manufactured or being manufactured by the factory in the agricultural year in respect of which the loan was made, and
- (3) the vehicles, equipment, machinery and plant belonging to said factory.

Over time, Mr. Acting President, some of the sugar estates became so heavily indebted to the Barbados National Bank that their indebtedness tended to vitiate the

entire lending portfolio of the Barbados National Bank. As a result, Mr. Acting President, this Government recognises that the sugar industry plays a significant and vital role in the economic life of Barbados in terms of its foreign exchange earnings capacity, its employment generation and as a source of raw material, molasses in this case, for the expanding rum industry which too has become a significant foreign exchange earner.

11.25 a.m.

Thus, this Government could not allow the entire industry to collapse, neither could it allow the Barbados National Bank to continue making loans to insolvent estates without eventually bankrupting itself. Thus, in order to rescue the industry and also make it possible to continue its financing, the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust was established. The main function of this new institution is to facilitate the transfer of debt now carried by the Barbados National Bank as it relates to the various sugar plantations and the Barbados Sugar Industry Limited.

However, Mr. Deputy President, in an attempt to give effect to this mandate, a difference of legal interpretation and opinion arose in relation to Section 4A(6) of the Barbados National Bank Act, Cap. 322A, in that the said Act does not spell out the rights which attach to the liens constituted under this Section, that is, Section 4A(6) of the Barbados National Bank Act, Cap. 322A. As a result, doubts have arisen about the transferability and enforceability of these loans and their security.

In order, therefore, to remove this ambiguity and out of an abundance of caution, this amendment to the Barbados National Bank Act is before us to facilitate the smooth transfer of debt and to permit the continued financing of this vital sugar industry.

What we have seen here today, Mr. Deputy President, is that a local industry, although critical to the economy of Barbados, stands tottering on the brink of bankruptcy while threatening the very financial viability and integrity of the sole indigenous commercial bank, the Barbados National Bank. This sad state of financial affairs in which the Barbados National Bank now finds itself mainly arose because as a local bank it felt compelled to rescue a local industry which is so very important to the local economy. This act, while rescuing the local sugar industry, also rescued the foreign owned commercial banks by removing these high risk loans from their portfolios. Mr. Deputy President, the net effect of all this was to improve the overall performance and profitability of those foreign owned financial institutions at the expense and at the financial health of our own indigenous commercial bank.

This amendment before us today, Mr. Deputy President, affords us the opportunity to examine, analyse

and express our opinions on the role and performance of commercial banks in Barbados, especially during the post colonial period, as they contribute to the growth and development of the local economy.

The foreign owned commercial banks in Barbados control well over 80% of the assets of the entire commercial banking system and have, in my opinion, failed to make the type of contribution to the economic development of this country that their privileged position would warrant. As a matter of fact, when the economic history of this country is written, it will show that Barbados as a developing country did not fail to generate savings, but that the savings so generated were not converted to investment in Barbados but rather the investment realised from most of the savings generated in Barbados took place in the countries where the head offices of these foreign banks are located, such as the United Kingdom and Canada. It is for this reason that their behaviour has been no different from that of branch offices of major money market banks which operate in the ghettos and inner cities of metropolitan countries. I do believe that those of us who listened to President Clinton's State of the Union Message a couple of nights ago would hear his plea asking branches of those banks operating in ghettos and the inner cities to make investments out of the savings and deposits which they take in the ghetto areas, to businesses and to other investments required for the development of the inner cities. So this phenomenon is not really peculiar to Barbados.

Perhaps it would do us well if we would take a look at the evolution and history of commercial banking in Barbados. Perhaps we can go back to the goldsmiths who were set up really for the safe keeping of gold bullion, and soon they recognised that it was not necessary to return the same package or the same gold bullion that was given to them once they returned a similar quantity in weight and of the same measurement. This was the first start of banking, in that the depositors soon recognised it was no longer necessary to claim the gold but rather a certificate or receipt indicating that you had deposited the money was then sufficient to conduct any business which you might need to transact. So you had now a case of the full-bodied money in the form of bullion, that is the actual commodity itself, gold, giving way to fiat money or faith money, dealing with the receipts in lieu of the gold itself.

The goldsmiths soon recognised that people were always depositing and withdrawing their gold and that they always had some inventory left over, so it did not take them too long before they recognised that it was possible to lend out or to issue receipts for little more than the gold they had, but acting fairly prudently. In those days the goldsmith charged a fee for lending out the gold as a credit on those receipts, and he also charged a fee for the safe keeping, benefitting from both sides of the transaction.

From this humble beginning we found that the receipts started to circulate and they had all the characteristics of what we define today as money, that is, they could be used as a store of value, a measure of wealth and as a medium of exchange. That is, people took them in exchange for goods and services. Over time, and with the advent of central banks, based on the experience of the goldsmiths – and we are still at the stage of dealing with bullion where the notes issued were secured by gold, the era of full-bodied money – it became clear that you could lend out more than you had. This was the advent of the fractional reserve banking system. So we have gone through the stages of full-bodied money, gold, silver or precious metals to fiat money, gold receipts and bank notes and we have also gone through the period of reducing the reserves against the money issued from 100% to a fractional reserve system.

11.35 a.m.

An example of this fractional reserve banking in Barbados today is the requirement that all commercial banks hold as of May 1993, 29% in reserves of which 6% will be in cash reserves and 23% in government securities. I will return to the implications of foreign owned commercial banks holding these government securities a little later in this presentation.

Now, during the colonial days and immediately following Independence we had no indigenous commercial banks. They were all foreign owned but there was a Government Savings Bank and this institution operated downstairs in this complex to collect savings, especially small deposits from Barbadians, which is a fairly costly operation. The Bank was staffed by civil servants who collected the small deposits, carried the transactions and then at the end of the day made deposits to the commercial banks then operating in Bridgetown. Most of the costs of mustering and collecting these deposits were borne by the Government Savings Bank and the proceeds made available to the commercial banks.

This action made available funds to the commercial banks for on-lending. Now, during the pre-Independence, sugar and molasses were the main exports in the country. The commercial banks operating in Barbados financed the growing of sugar cane for the large plantations with local deposits received from the Savings Bank through the commercial banks while the Government's Agricultural Credit Bank financed the small farmers.

When payments were collected in foreign exchange for the shipment of sugar the proceeds were applied towards the loans made by the commercial banks for the growing and harvesting of the sugar crop. In those cases the lands were secured by the plantations themselves and receipts of payments for the crop. That is, the loans received from the commercial banks were really short-

term loans used for taking the plantation through the growing cycle in the first instance where you paid the plantations for growing the canes and after that for harvesting and processing the sugar during that period of the processing until the sugar was actually sold. So in all cases we have here the commercial banks performing the role of providing only short term loans. That is the history of commercial banking in Barbados as it evolved in the country.

Following on this behaviour, we find the commercial banks financing the distributive sector using the foreign exchange earned by the sugar industry for the importation of goods and services manufactured in the home countries of the respective banking institutions. Thus the savings generated in Barbados, as resolved through the Barbados Savings Bank, which found itself eventually a commercial bank and the foreign exchange earned from the sugar exports were used to create jobs in the metropolitan countries and for the remittance of profits of the commercial banks which were earned in Barbados.

During these early stages, too, we found in existence a currency authority and a currency board. This meant that with the currency authority and the currency board the money supply was limited as to the amount of foreign exchange you were able to earn during that period. This means that it was not possible to have balance of payments problems because you could not spend more foreign exchange than you had earned *vis-a-vis* your exports. It was a rather strict system and ensured fiscal discipline. However it was very limiting in terms of the development of the country.

What we need to bear in mind so far is that the evolution of commercial banking in Barbados has been one that has dealt consistently with short-term lending and short term lending has never been ideal for investment purposes. It is generally used for consumer purposes and also for seeing any manufacturing cycle or the growing cycle just through to production. But in terms of long term financing we actually need capital investment with a much longer life, and when I talk about a longer life, I am talking about 5 years and over and the commercial banks have not performed this role so far.

With post-Independence, I believe around 1972, we had the Central Bank of Barbados established and with it came the fractional reserve banking system. Also emerging around this time was a nascent manufacturing sector and the budding tourism sector. This fractional reserve banking system allowed the money supply to expand supported mainly by foreign borrowings, grants and unilateral transfers.

At the same time, there was demand for longer term financing for housing, manufacturing plants and tourism

facilities. These were all new demands for financing from which the clean-up or the pay-outs could not be expected to be completed in a year as was the case in the financing of the sugar industry and/or the distributive sector. Yet the commercial banks continued to provide high-cost short-term money in the form of overdrafts and/or lines of credit to these new enterprises which in fact required low-cost, long-term and medium term financing.

Such actions by commercial banks made it clear that they had abandoned or rather not performed their basic function of extending appropriate credit to business, consumers and Government by making loans suited to the needs of the borrower. They failed to provide the requisite working capital needs of deserving businesses although they did and still continue to extend loans to Government. The composition of the maturity of loans of the commercial banks is to be found in the Economic Report of the Central Bank of Barbados.

11.45 a.m.

At page 20, I am quoting here from the Economic and Financial Statistics of the Central Bank, will show that overdrafts and loans up to a maturity of one year have always accounted for well over 50% of the commercial bank loans. We should now compare this with the maturity of the loan portfolio of the Barbados Development Bank which has over 74% of its loans with a life of 5 years and over, and 94% of loans with a life over 3 years. Of course, there is no comparison with the amount of monies in loans by the commercial banks compared with the Barbados Development Bank because the capital base is much smaller.

Mr. Deputy President, we might raise the question and wonder how come the commercial banks had no problem at all in financing Government throughout this period while turning their back on the long term investment possibilities that existed within the private productive sector and the answer to that is rather plain and simple. It is a matter of safety, profits and profitability.

Turning to the same document, the Economic Report, we will find that at page 33 of the Central Bank's Economic and Financial Statistics, what is surprising is the excess reserves above and beyond what is required to be held by the commercial banks. What this means is that there is little or no loan demand from the private sector and as a means of earning money, the commercial banks have decided to use their excess reserves to hold Government securities. This means that by the holding of Government securities they are earning profits in Barbados but at the end of the day when profits are to be remitted, they are

holding Barbadian dollars, lending the Barbadian dollars to the Government of Barbados, but based on the profitability of these institutions, foreign exchange must be found for these institutions to remit their profits to their respective home offices.

Mr. Deputy President, I think we need to say here that from time to time when the choice is available to borrowing, especially when there is excess liquidity within the banking system, we wonder and question Government's borrowing from the Central Bank of Barbados. But if it does when there is excess liquidity in the banking system and loan demand is soft, it means that any profits from those earnings will not have to be repatriated but remain in Barbados compared with a soft loan demand market. You borrow from the commercial banks making it profitable to them, and they are using local currency, and even if they had to borrow they will borrow from the commercial banks in local currency, earn profits which at the end of their financial years they will again repatriate in foreign currency to their home offices. It is my understanding that at the end of the financial year they do not hold funds, based on their profits, beyond 45 days for fear of changes or fluctuations in the foreign exchange rate between their own currencies and the local currency.

What we have seen here is that the Government, through borrowing on the market in local currency from foreign-owned commercial banks, gives them an opportunity to earn profits which profits are then repatriated in foreign exchange which the Government itself and the other institutions who find it rather difficult to obtain long-term funds in order to become more and more productive must earn to allow them to repatriate those monies.

I am contending, Mr. Deputy President, that if this country is to attain sustainable economic development, commercial banks in Barbados must become more responsive to the developmental needs of this community. No longer is it satisfactory for them to mobilise savings in Barbados and utilise most, if not all, of those savings for investment in their respective home countries, neither is it sufficient to earn profits from deposits and local loans and then seek to repatriate those profits in foreign currency. The same call put out by President Clinton to the commercial banks operating in the ghettos of the United States is pertinent for Barbados vis-a-vis these foreign owned banks.

I am not confused in my mind between the roles of a commercial bank and that of a development bank. We have seen that the Development Bank, in addition to providing medium and long term capital, is also required to provide technical assistance and other factors essential for development. In order to ensure the financial viability of

those industries which have neither been appropriately nor adequately financed, I am calling upon the commercial banks to collaborate with the Barbados Development Bank in providing adequate and appropriate financing to bankable enterprises.

I believe that the commercial banks should stay and continue to do what they have been doing extremely well and that is providing short-term lines of credit, overdraft facilities, etc. to the system, but make resources available to the Development Bank which must take up the long-term position of loans and we know the saying, "time is an enemy of credit." The longer out you go the more likely you are to have loans defaulting. What are we asking here? We are asking the commercial banks – I have gone through in this presentation to point out how the profitability of the commercial banks is developed – on the excess reserves, that is, those reserves on which the commercial banks are earning profits above and beyond those required by the reserve requirement of the Central Bank, and for which there is no other demand for those funds, that is, had Government not come into the picture and allowed them to hold Government paper, it would mean that there would have been excess reserves sitting idly in those commercial banks not earning any income. Almost analogous to this would be inventory sitting on the shelves of stores not moving.

What I am calling upon the commercial banks for, Mr. Deputy President, is to contribute a minimum of 40% of all its net income, and listen carefully, Mr. Deputy President, earned from the excess holdings of Government securities to the Development Bank to provide technical assistance, market intelligence and financing for those industries such as music. Senator Mottley apparently does not support music any longer.
11.55 a.m.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT : Please address the Chair.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy President. Music, fine arts, publishing and the cinematograph industries which now find it virtually impossible to acquire adequate and appropriate financing. These courses of action, Mr. Deputy President, must be taken if we are to remove the bottlenecks which hamper economic growth and development while reducing the dominance of the oligopolistic position of the foreign dominated commercial banks in local, financial intermediation.

Mr. Deputy President, I do not think that this is too much to ask the commercial banks and I do believe that the commercial banks and the Development Bank together...

Because at the end of the day by this action the local industries especially within manufacturing and tourism and those industries that I alluded to, music, fine arts, et cetera, if these are strengthened then there will be greater demand for short-term financing from the commercial banks by this very industry. What I am asking for here is a symbiotic relationship to develop between the commercial banks on the one hand and the Barbados Development Bank to strengthen one another and to provide the type of financing and capital needed if we are to enjoy long-term and sustained economic development in this country.

I beg to move, Mr. Deputy President, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy President. I have listened for a very long time to the Honourable Minister who introduced this Bill. I have heard very little in fact about the Amendment which is before us but instead a long treatise on the history of banking which my colleague, perhaps, would refer to as a 101 course. It would seem that with the return of the Honourable Minister to the Ministry of Economic Affairs that in that building there seems to be a propensity for Ministers to want to teach. The only difference being that when the other Minister teaches his pupils he seemingly dismisses them with ease, whereas this Minister cannot dismiss anybody in here with such ease.

Neverthe'ess, Sir, I wish now to turn my attention to the Amendment which I believe has not been the subject of debate so far for the day, unfortunately. It is an Amendment which comes out of the need to ensure that the legal technicalities to allow for the transfer and the holding of the debt by the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust, that that would be in order, this would be as opposed to the present situation, prior to the Amendment where it was only stated that any loans made pursuant to that section of the Barbados National Bank Act were to have priority to all other liens and charges.

Indeed there was a case that was decided by the Supreme Court of Judicature some years ago arising out of the Turner Hall Woods plantation where the question was whether the charge by the Barbados National Bank had priority over a previous judgement. Indeed, Sir, what this simply seeks to do is to add the words "or charge" to the section so that it would cover all forms of debts, charges, liens etcetera to give the Barbados National Bank that priority in respect of its loans. This raises some interesting questions one of which is the one of the constitutionality of the section. I believe that if this Amendment is passed, it is my judgement that it will not be long before an action is carried before the courts of this country to test the constitutionality of the section.

If you bear with me, Sir, anything which perhaps may be described as a charge but not a lien which indeed existed before the law made by the Barbados National Bank would now by this section no longer have the priority that it would have had prior to the passing of this section. Indeed, this therefore raises the question whether this section does not remove a property right of the person who may have held that charge. That is not a lien. Those, perhaps, who are familiar with the law would know that it is indeed possible for something to be a charge without being a lien. And therefore it is indeed possible given the extensive array of debts already in place in respect of the sugar industry and the Barbados National Bank, that this may well be depriving the property rights of any persons holding a charge that existed in time prior to the Barbados National Bank loans that indeed were not liens.

This issue of the constitutionality of this section I believe is fundamental because I do not think with these Houses of Parliament that either House can be seen to be endorsing legislation which, by its very nature, may run and is likely to run contrary to the fundamental precepts of our existence. Strange things happen. That may well be a voice from above endorsing the points that I am making.

That is the primary concern I believe with which this Chamber should be concerned, to which it should place its mind and address its mind to. Because we cannot be seen to be doing something that is contrary to an ordinary law *a fortiori* contrary to the Constitution of Barbados. I am not satisfied that the Honourable Minister has assuaged any doubts that I may have as to the constitutionality of this section. This section has already passed the Lower House. As we all know the Attorney-General has a duty to ensure that sections of legislation which comes before that House are in accordance with the Constitution of Barbados. I believe – unless my understanding of the law is so totally flawed – that this will end up before the law courts before long.

The second point is this. This raises into question the whole issue of the Barbados National Bank itself. Before I go on to deal with the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust and the sugar industry, I wish to deal shortly with the whole issue of the Barbados National Bank and banking. It cannot be a point of no concern or to put it another way, it must be bothersome at the very least that the Barbados National Bank has not produced reports to this Parliament to which it is accountable since 1990. It has done so in breach of the Barbados National Bank Act, that it has done so in breach of the Financial Intermediaries Regulations Act which this Parliament has recently passed within this session. Indeed, Sir, I believe that it might well be fair to say that it may well be the only financial institution in this country that has allowed a period of 3 years to elapse

without the presentation of such reports and audited accounts.

12.05 p.m.

If what I understand to be true, Sir, is true, if what I understand, Sir, in the form of the auditors refusing to sign the audited accounts unless qualifications are made to the 5 major bad debts that the National Bank is unable to resolve, then, Sir, that is cause for serious investigation. If, Sir, that is indeed true, particularly since loans over a certain amount must be approved by the Minister of Finance and particularly since there would seem, Sir, to be a strange coincidence in the political persuasion of those 5 accounts and the Government of this country, it becomes even a greater cause for concern. In other words, Sir, it raises the question as to whether those loans were made in accordance with the strictest financial probity and judgement being administered or whether indeed they were made as a result of political persuasions being the same.

I, Sir, would not go any further at this stage. I believe the Chairman of the Board who happens to be a Member of this Honourable Chamber knows exactly what I am speaking about and I hope, Sir, that he will speak after I sit and explain and indeed tell me if what I understand to be true is true.

Sir, the point is that you cannot escape the fact. Indeed, Sir, I hope he will give us an account as to why this Chamber has had the contemptuous behaviour of refusing or being unable to see accounts and reports in respect of that institution and indeed in breach of the National Bank Act and the Financial Intermediaries Regulatory Act.

Sir, I would like to also raise the question of the amount which the Government of Barbados has issued in terms of bonds to the National Bank in respect of the debt of the sugar industry and indeed the quantification of that debt.

Now, my understanding, Sir, is that when loans were taken out this figure was supposed to be at \$208 931 000 and to facilitate this restructuring with the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust which has taken over the debts of the various sugar plantations and of BSIL from the National Bank that Government issued bonds to the National Bank in the amount of \$208 931 000 to cover the debt owed to the National Bank by the Barbados Sugar Industries Limited and the sugar plantations. This debt as I understand it, Sir, has now been taken over by the Agricultural Credit Trust.

The problem as I understand it, Sir, is that the figure of \$208 931 000 is in dispute because plantations who borrowed money from the National Bank, many of them initially borrowed money under an arrangement of 6% and

when they failed to meet the installments of the loan, the National Bank, without their consent, started to apply a rate of interest of 12%.

Indeed, Sir, I believe, that too, is the subject of legal dispute and that too would significantly alter whether that figure of \$208 931 000 is indeed a true figure. Indeed, Sir, I believe Government itself is extremely worried about it because the Inter-American Development Bank has told them that they must settle once and for all the veracity of that figure and then if it has to be discounted then discount it.

Sir, this raises and carries me back into the whole issue of the sugar industry because this has arisen out of the sugar industry and it is to facilitate the restructuring of the sugar industry that this amendment has of necessity come about, not to restructure the whole banking sector as the Honourable Minister would have given us the impression when we listened to his speech, but indeed an amendment to deal primarily with the restructuring of the sugar industry.

Now, Sir, much ado has been made. Many institutions have been formed and we are hearing talk almost daily. What is significant, Sir, is that the funds which the sugar industry needs to complete its structural adjustment still cannot be found. Government has been negotiating with the various financial institutions, particularly the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the European Investment Bank for some 3 years now for structural adjustment funds and for 3 years in the Estimates, Sir, figures are placed in the Estimates for the expectation of a receipt of those sums, not only for the sugar industry, Sir, but for the other productive sectors of Barbados. What is significant is that to date the only money that this Government can draw down from those international financial institutions has been the sum of \$20 million to improve the administration for the collection of taxes for Customs, Inland Revenue and for the administration of the VAT. Sir, that is a damning indictment on the performance of this Government which came to this country in 1991 and told this country that they wanted them to bite the bullet for 18 months. A short sharp period of 18 months. They have sent home over 5 000 people, they have told people to take an 8% pay cut although they had even promised previously that the pay cut would be both private and public sector. They did all of that, Sir, on the premise that at the end of that stabilisation period there would be a period of structural adjustment, when the productive sectors of this country would go under fundamental changes that were badly needed and that this structural adjustment would be financed by the International financial institutions in particular the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank.

For 3 years, Sir, in successive Estimates, and Sir, I am sure that we will see it in this year's Estimates for 1994/95 again because we are still in the invidious and unbelievable position that the IMF is still judging us without the benefit of us receiving any money and that their last test on us, Sir, is the 31st of March of this year. It is only at that time that those international financial institutions will again address their minds once again as to whether they are prepared to offer Barbados any funds for structural adjustment including which funds for the sugar industry would be part of.

It is already significant, Sir, that the Minister of Finance has already stated publicly and admitted that the IDB figure where the loans for structural adjustment had initially started at \$60 million has now been reduced to \$30 million and God knows what further cuts may come even before the IDB approves that loan for structural adjustment in the productive sectors of this country. That is the invidious position that we find ourselves in this country today, Sir. Yet, Sir, we want the people to believe that because we have formed two or three institutions in the sugar industry that the fundamental restructuring has taken place.

12.15 p.m.

Sir, the mechanism which is so critical to any renewal in the sugar industry cannot start because there is no new equipment at all. There is no new equipment because there have been no funds to buy them. But yet, Sir, they want us to believe that they have embarked upon the process of structural adjustment. What is even more significant is that it is a sign of the poor confidence that the same commercial banks (in fact perhaps that is what the Honourable Minister was driving at when he spoke) have of this Government and the sugar industry, that it could not advance the \$30 million or so that was required to get the industry started this year, but that they had to go outside to borrow this money at the interest rate that would mean they would not be able to maximize the foreign exchange benefit once the money for the crop is received. That is what we have been reduced to, Sir. In the past, the Central Bank was the agency that allowed the credit pending the receipt of funds and they cannot deny that and the Honourable Senator said it. But no, Sir, we have had to go overseas begging again hat in hand to get \$30 million to get the crop off the ground and this is not the first year.

Sir, this amendment really raises fundamental questions apart from the strict legal and constitutional process. It really causes us to address our minds to fundamental points relating to the sugar industry and to the whole restructuring process and indeed, Sir, to the whole structural adjustment programme. If the truth be known and the truth be stated, the only structural adjustment that is taking place in the sugar industry in Barbados today is

being financed by Barbadians themselves, not by anybody from overseas and not by World Bank or the IDB. It is the Barbadians who have signed the leasing. It is the Barbadians who have gone ahead with what Government wants them to do, who have planted and done all of these things but who to date have not received a cent. They are the ones who by giving credit to Government have been underwriting the structural adjustment cost, what little there may be in the sugar industry to date. That needs to be said and said loudly, Sir, because a lot of propaganda is going out there making us believe otherwise.

We have heard that this country wants to return to 80 000 tonnes and we would like to see that. But we have not seen Government place any concomitant policy on the ground that would allow for the re-encouragement of the small farmer in the sugar industry to start back planting cane in order to reach that target. We also know, Sir, that it is Government's plantations that have seen the largest decrease of acreage coming out of cane in the last five years larger than any other body of ownership of lands for the use of the sugar industry in this country. That in itself too has been the most damning indictment. But what is Government's policy as it relates to the small farmers? Because, Sir, at the end of the day the small farmers in this country will not go back to planting cane unless they can be guaranteed that they will receive assistance in their transportation and reaping costs. That is the cost of harvesting the crop and the cost of transporting it to the factory. This Government has not given those guarantees and it was that that was primarily behind the Barbados Labour Party's decision when it instituted the guaranteed price for sugar which this Government – (I want to use the right word.) – so easily removed, whether it be under a previous Minister of Finance who has now distanced himself from this Government but nevertheless which the rest of this Government concurred in when he so did.

Sir, the point is that small farmers need that reassurance if you are going to ask them to re-commit themselves to the planting of sugar cane in this country. Sir, I am not a farmer but I have taken the time to go around the country and to have discussions with a number of people who previously planted cane, and particularly the small farmers. Those of us who know that when Carrington's was closed, it dealt a fundamental blow and a significant blow to the amount of small farmers planting in the south of the island. A number of small farmers in the south of this country came out of planting cane.

Aside.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: There are those who would want to put the chicken before the egg but do not mind. But the issue is there for us to see. I believe, Sir, that the fact that I have managed to wake from slumber a number of people mentally – (I am talking obviously

metaphorically and not literally, Sir, because nobody would sleep in this Chamber.) – is evidence and testimony that what I am saying strikes at the truth of what is going on with the National Bank and the sugar industry in this country.

Sir, the IMF test comes in March 1994. God hopes that this test which we have subjected ourselves to without benefit of the receipt of the money that we will pass. Because we cannot afford to go into another year without the money needed to make the fundamental changes in the sugar industry and to force Government hopefully, Sir, to make the policy changes which it needs to make to bring small farmers back within the fold again so that the 1995 sugar crop would not be faced with the same problem that the 1994, 1993, 1992, 1991, 1990, 1989 and 1988. God knows, Sir, no one would believe that this country had been producing in excess of 100 thousand tonnes up to 1986 and has now been reduced to the spectacle where we cannot even fulfil our quota and are in danger of losing those quotas as a result of our inability to consistently fulfil them.

Sir, this is a matter that cannot be trifled with and, in this context, I hope that the matters that I have raised in relation to the sugar industry in particular but more particularly, Sir, in relation without causing panic to the fact that the National Bank really cannot see itself as a maverick in this country in terms of a financial institution. It has a duty to report to Parliament of this land which has established it as a separate legal entity. I would hope, Sir, that all efforts are made to comply if it is the request of the auditors, Peat Marwick, and that they will not sign the report until there is a qualification that those five debts be named, and that any politics that may obscure any of the relevant authorities taking that decision be removed and that decisions be made in accordance, Sir, of maintaining the highest financial probity and judgment to ensure that the National Bank remains a strong and viable institution in this country because I believe that it has a strong and valid role to play. But, Sir, you cannot administer it in the manner in which it has been administered. Indeed, Sir, how long is it now that it has not had a Chief Executive Officer? Again, Sir, that seems to be the latest thing in vogue in this country whether it is from the Barbados Tourism Authority, Insurance Corporation of Barbados, Barbados Development Bank or the Barbados National Bank. Perhaps when the Honourable Minister spoke of creating that symbiotic relationship between commercial banks and development banks, the first thing that he might get his Government to address is that of the two banks that they do have control over, the National Bank and the Development Bank, let persons be appointed to head those institutions at the executive level. Thank you, Sir.

12.25 p.m.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I listened very carefully to the presentation of the

last speaker. I am going to take up from where she left off, but not necessarily in the same vein. I am not privy to the kinds of information which she has access to. The Senator was calling on the auditors of the Barbados National Bank to make certain disclosures.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading this Chamber. I never called for the auditors to reveal anything. I called for the persons in charge to comply with whatever requests the auditors are making so that the reports can be laid before Parliament in consonance with the National Bank Act and the Financial Intermediaries Regulatory Act.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I wish to thank the Senator for her correction. I accept it.

I think the Senator went on to say that the auditors were insisting that there were five major bad debts.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would just want to say this, though, before you proceed. To make that statement implies that the auditors themselves are not conducting their duty in a professional manner. If the auditors are publicly asking people to produce information, that is implicitly suggesting that the auditors are not performing their duty.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of elucidation, if I may crave your indulgence, because you seem to be going down the wrong road. I never stated that. All I have said, and listen to me very carefully, Sir, is that it is my understanding that the auditors – Peat Marwick – have refused to sign the accounts without a qualification allowing for the naming of the five bad debts. Indeed, Sir, I am applauding the professional integrity of the auditors, because they refused to do something which in their opinion would reflect badly on them, and in accordance with all standards of financial probity they are saying that the bad debts are ones that seriously affect the institution and that any report and any audited account should state those specifically. That is what I am saying, Sir, I have not cast any aspersions at all upon the auditors' financial probity or indeed their professional integrity. I applaud their integrity for taking such a stance.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I now wish to join the Senator and re-issue my call made a couple of years ago for an investigation into the Barbados Branch of the BCCI, the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, because I want a public statement on which Senator borrowed money for a mortgage and

refused to pay it back, using every possible legal tactic to avoid honouring the contract. I want a public statement on that. I will have more to say about it, not in this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy President, this Bill before us about restructuring the National Bank, I admit that there are legal issues, because you yourself, a trained attorney at law, will recognise that whatever we want to do in this society, in the final analysis law has to give effect to it. But the law is a facilitator of the things we want to do and I would not wish to see this Chamber being caught up in essentially a legalistic type of argument.

Senator Mottley makes the point that this particular Bill is not about the restructuring of the Barbados National Bank. That is an admission of a failure to understand what we are called upon to discuss. You cannot restructure the Barbados National Bank unless you restructure its portfolio. When you restructure a bank that is what you are doing.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Senator came in very late this morning. Perhaps that has altered his ability to listen carefully and understand, because he is once again misleading the Chamber. Never have I said here this morning that the restructuring of the National Bank could not be done without restructuring these things and hence this amendment here. I spoke of the amendment in the nature in which it was brought and which the Honourable Minister indeed failed to speak of it. That is in relation to the need of what they see as to tidy up the legal technicalities to allow for the transfer of the loan portfolio that is now being held by the Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust. When I spoke of the restructuring of the Bank, Sir, I had spoken separately and distinctly from this amendment, and I said I was referring to the treatise then that the Honourable Minister, my friend, led before I spoke.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I will rely on you to make sure that I have my time for this debate. I am commenting on what I heard since I was here. The record will show that the Senator said that this Bill is not about any restructuring of the National Bank, and that is what I am dealing with.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. Let us get the record then, because the Honourable Senator is misleading this Chamber. I dealt with the amendment and I started off by saying very calmly that the amendment dealt with the restructuring of the sugar industry. I never said that this Bill had nothing to do with the restructuring of the National Bank. I spoke subsequently about the restructuring of the National Bank on the basis of the treatise that the Honourable Minister gave on banking.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I will proceed. I am making the point that you cannot restructure the Barbados National Bank unless you restructure its portfolio, because a bank is about doing banking business. I will go on to make contact with some other nuisance points which the Senator made.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Senator knows that to refer to my points as nuisance points would mean that this Chair Your Honour is sitting in is presiding over a level of debate that is not befitting this Chamber. Unless, therefore, Your Honour wishes to have that reflection against you, Sir, it should be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, the Senator is only expressing an opinion, and everybody may not agree with him.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir. I dealt with what offended you, I am dealing with what offends me now, Sir. The Honourable Senator is referring to points and to me in a manner that I am a person who makes nuisance points. Therefore I am taking serious objection to it.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President,...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am waiting for your ruling. I am waiting for the Chair's ruling one way or the other.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You have stated that you disagree. I also disagree with him, so we all disagree.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, Sir. I am not asking whether you disagree. That is a misunderstanding of what I have asked for. I have asked for a ruling on a point of privilege. The Honourable Senator has referred to me in a disparaging manner, which is contrary to the Standing Orders of this Chamber, and I am asking for Your Honour to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: What are you asking me to rule?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am asking you, Sir, to rule that the Honourable Senator has referred to me in a manner that is disparaging and in breach of the Standing Orders of this Chamber and befitting of an Honourable Senator, and that consequently those remarks be expunged from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the Senator had said that you are a nuisance, I think that would be out of order. But if he makes an opinion about your points, I do not find anything wrong with that.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am grateful for Your Honour's ruling and I will remember it as precedent.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, the Senator said there is no structural adjustment in the sugar industry. This is a blatant untruth.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I think the Honourable Senator should call for the record of my speech before he goes any further. So far I have said that the structural adjustment was taking place at the expense of Barbadians. The point I did make was that they had not received any structural adjustment funds from the international financial institutions, and that to date it has been only the institutions that they have created.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I am prepared to put up with any number of interruptions by the Senator. The Senator said there is no structural adjustment taking place in the sugar industry.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of privilege. I am asking for my copy of the record from my speech to be presented now, because I remember specifically stating and the Honourable Minister over there looking at me in dismay when I said that the structural adjustment in the sugar industry that was taking place in Barbados today was being done at the expense of Barbadians because they have not been paid.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I did not say, Mr. Deputy President, the second statement was not made. I am not denying the capacity of the Senator for making conflicting statements.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of order. You have not ruled and I am saying that the Honourable Senator is misleading this Chamber when he says that I said there has been no structural adjustment in the sugar industry. I have said specifically that there have been no structural adjustment funds received from the international financial institutions, to wit, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank and the European Investment Bank, and I am asking for my record to be produced because I think that this Senator wants to continue the habit that he has of misleading this Chamber when it comes to fundamental points.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, the Senator called on this Government to state a policy of structural adjustment in the agricultural sector. I am saying beyond the shadow of a doubt a very clear and comprehensive policy on reform of the agricultural sector

has been put in the public domain for discussion. If the Senator is ignorant of these matters, say so, but do not come inside here and say no policy exists. I am a Director of the Barbados Agricultural Management Company.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of order. I am asking for the Chair to rule. 12.35 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator, if you stand you must first state the point on which you rise.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There is a procedure for interrupting a member who is speaking and we would like...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am so sorry, Sir. On a point of order. Yes, Sir, I would like to comply with this.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I will direct that the record be produced but in the meanwhile we would still like the Honourable Senator...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: In the meanwhile, I am asking that the Honourable Senator refrain from continuing to make the remarks that he is making.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: He will continue to speak and he will make the correction when the record is produced if that becomes necessary.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am asking that the Honourable Senator refrain from making remarks which reflect and seem to impute that I am a person capable of speaking with both sides of my mouth when he says that I am capable of making conflicting statements, Sir. I believe it is a statement that once again is not consonant with the Standing Orders of this House because he is imputing that I am lying.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would also ask the Senator to address that particular.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I never said Senator Mottley speaks with both sides of her mouth. I never said it and I do not have any comment to make on her statement. I said I do not deny her capacity to make conflicting statements. That is what I recall saying.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Anyway, I will ask the Honourable Senator to continue his speech and we will see what the records say on that particular point.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, the statements made by the Senator strike me very sharply because I have an intimate knowledge of what is happening in the sugar industry. I am a Director of the Barbados Agricultural Marketing Company. Up to late last night we sat down in a Board meeting discussing the reform of the industry and evaluating performance, and it pains me to see that people who should be more responsible can get up and make the kind of statements which Senator Mottley made.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Honourable Senator cannot infer that an Honourable Senator in this Chamber is irresponsible. I do not understand what has gone wrong with the Honourable Senator's head this morning.

Certain remarks made by Senator Miss M. A. MOTTLEY were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. Deputy President.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If a member of the Senate expresses an opinion, it is for the Chair to determine whether in the opinion of the Chair those remarks contravene the Rules. I did not hear any remark which in my opinion was in contravention of the Rule. If you can just direct my attention to the remark to which you refer.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am a little amazed at Your Honour's ruling but the remark I am referring to is a remark that imputes to an Honourable Senator irresponsibility. I do not know, Sir. If that were the case that Honourable Senators could reflect opinions...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Just tell me which Standing Order it breaches.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The Standing Order which says that you cannot refer to an Honourable Senator in a deprecating or dishonourable manner, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Which Standing Order is that?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour gives me a chance, I will look at the Standing Order, Sir.

Certain remarks made by Senator Miss M. A. MOTTLEY were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Just one moment, Senator Alleyne. I just want to see the Standing Order to which the Honourable Senator refers.

I do not see how to refer to someone as being irresponsible is being unparliamentary.

If you look at Standing Order 34 that may give you some guidance.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Standing Order 34(3):

"It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of either House."

If the Honourable Senator refers to an Honourable Senator of this Chamber who is supposed to have a certain level of responsibility to say that that person is irresponsible means that he or she is unbefitting of being a member of this Chamber. If not, Sir, Ding Ding and Gear Box could be in this Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If making reference to the Honourable Senator... As her remarks... I think he said that the remarks... I speak subject to correction. Senator Alleyne, you would just correct me on this. I understand you to have said that the remarks were...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have accepted your ruling when it came to "nuisance" because I understood that the remarks were nuisance remarks. In fact, I even went so far as to say that I would be bound by that precedent. But, Sir...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I don't want to go back. Just one moment, Senator Mottley. I don't want to go back. I think I have already said that I agree with you that your remarks were not nuisance remarks.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: But do not let us rule on points and then go back. We are dealing with the one...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, Sir, I am making the distinction. When Senator Alleyne referred earlier to nuisance remarks I accepted the Chair's ruling. On this occasion Senator Alleyne imputed to myself, not to any remarks that I made, irresponsible behaviour. I am saying that that is in breach of Standing Order 34 of this Chamber.

Certain remarks made by Senator Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, the statement was made that the sugar industry could not get financing. It is a blatant untruth.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Honourable Senator once again is misleading the Chamber. I do not know what is happening with him, Sir. I stated specifically that the sugar industry could not get financing in Barbados to finance the crop and that it had to get financing overseas and its foreign exchange returns would not be maximised as a result.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, the record will show that the Senator spoke about the down-sizing of loans which were applied for by Barbados from international financial institutions. The record will show that. I am saying that what the Senator said is incorrect. One of the major institutions responsible for financing the reform of the sugar industry is the Caribbean Development Bank and those discussions so far have been very fruitful.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of order. I referred specifically to the statement of the Honourable Minister of Finance referring to the fact that the \$60 million they were to get from the Inter-American Development Bank has now been reduced to \$30 million. Nowhere in my speech did I refer to any loan being down-sized by the Caribbean Development Bank. 12.45 p.m.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I never said, Mr. Deputy President, that the Caribbean Development Bank down-sized any loan. I am saying, as a matter of fact, that one of the major institutions from which the Barbados Government has applied for financial assistance to reform the sugar industry is the Caribbean Development Bank and those discussions have been very amicable and fruitful up to this day.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Alleyne, before you proceed I just want to make this remark. It is really difficult for any speaker to develop his points properly with the number of interruptions which we are presently having. I really have not been able to follow the trend of the speech being made by the Honourable Senator. I would suggest that we seek, as far as possible, to avoid all these constant interruptions. I would suggest that unless it is really necessary we seek not to interrupt members while they are speaking.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. You cannot criticize the Government of Barbados for accessing the loan from the ING in the Netherlands for the sugar industry and at the same time say that nobody has confidence in the competence of the Government of Barbados and therefore they would not lend them money. The Government of Barbados got this loan from the ING...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading this Chamber and in a most vicious way.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I just wish to say this, as I have said before. We have been having too many interruptions. When you spoke we really did not have any interruptions of your speech. I would be in a good position, having heard what you said, to tell when he is misquoting any remarks that you made. I am listening very carefully to the Honourable Senator's speech to see if he deviates from any remarks which you made. No doubt you may be able to pick it up better than I can.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of privilege now. To prevent me from rising on either a point of order or a point of privilege is to restrict the freedoms that I have been guaranteed upon taking the oath to enter this Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Stop there. Stop right there, Ma'am. Senator Mottley, I have never said that no Senator should interrupt another member. I suggested for the proper conduct of the proceedings that members should seek to avoid too many interruptions. Those were the remarks which I made.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: And, Sir, I agree with you in so far as asides are concerned. But if the Honourable Senator makes statements that are misleading or statements that are unbecoming of an Honourable Senator, or that cast aspersions on an Honourable Senator, it is my understanding of the Standing Orders and I have every right to get up and speak on either a point of order...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Nobody will deny you that right.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Your Honour will rule accordingly in or out.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Nobody will deny you that right. But further, I have said that I am listening very carefully to the Honourable Senator's speech and I myself will seek to correct any areas of deviation. Thank you very much. The Honourable Senator may proceed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have not made my point of order so Your Honour is wishing to restrict me from making my point of order now?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I understood what you had to say.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I have not said what I wanted to say.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You have another point of order?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I have not made it, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You are making a speech.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, No, Sir. You have not allowed me to make the point of order.

On a point of order, Sir, I am saying that he is misleading the Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You said that already.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: But you have not heard in what regard, Sir. If that is the attitude and the Chair does not wish me to make the point I want to, then I will abide by that ruling too but I will deal with that in another forum.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I like to deal with facts. The Senator said, by way of criticism, that this loan from the ING Bank of the Netherlands was nothing to be proud of. The Senator never told this Chamber what was the cost of the loan. The cost of the loan is 2.5% above the London Interbank offer rate and the current Libor rate is 5% so Barbados will be required to repay 7.5% on that loan. That is a cheap rate. Mr. Deputy President, I am sure you realise that if you borrow in foreign exchange you will be required to pay back in foreign exchange.

Mr. Deputy President, the point was made that the previous administration, in the interest of small farmers, put a mechanism in place to guarantee them a price for their canes. All I have to say by way of comment is that the Price Support Scheme which was introduced in Barbados in the sugar industry in 1982 was doomed to failure because it was a short-term solution to deal with a long-term problem. That is the reason why it failed.

Mr. Deputy President, I want to say that the sugar industry debt in the BNB, about which we have heard so much, yes, is an area of the portfolio which is non-performing. We all know that, but there are other areas which are just as bad. If a careful history of decision-making in respect to that institution was done, those who are pointing fingers might have to hold their heads in shame.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am the only person in here today to point fingers and I am not

holding my head in shame about anything. The Honourable Senator is casting aspersions on the fact that I have done something of which I would be ashamed. If therefore he wishes to qualify it outside of this Chamber, fine, but so long he says that those who have pointed fingers, of which I have been the sole person to speak in here, he infers that I have been guilty of conduct that would cause me to hold my head in shame.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, there are several persons in Barbados who have been critical of the Barbados National Bank and have made partisan points. That is why I said "those who". I chose my words very carefully. I am saying that if a careful study is done of decision-making with respect to loans in that Barbados National Bank through time, that there are several persons who would have to take cover.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, please.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: When we start to speak of the Barbados National Bank, let us recognise that it is the only commercial bank which we Barbadians have. So when we take it and drag it through the mud, who are we dragging through the mud? We are dragging Barbadians.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy President, the Honourable Senator seeks to cast aspersions once again. I made my speech very carefully and very consciously and I ended off by saying that none of us wants to see the Barbados National Bank fail because it is our only commercial bank. I ended my speech...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, again....

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I have asked for the Barbados National Bank to comply with the laws of this land and if that is dragging it through the mud then no wonder.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I want to assure you again that I am listening very carefully to the Honourable Senator's speech and I would be very quick to stop him if I hear him say anything which makes reference to you in any derogatory manner so I am duly trying to avoid so many interruptions. I do not want to prevent you from exercising your right to interrupt but we do not want to have so many interruptions. The Honourable Senator may now proceed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Therefore, Sir,...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Your point of order has been made.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, if I made a submission to this Senate that there are parties within the Barbados National Bank, whether they are in management or the Board, wherever they are, who are holding out against the auditors and resisting them and do not want to do some things, I am saying that there is something wrong. I am criticizing people at different levels of management either at the highest level at the Board or some other level. All I am submitting is that at the end of the day when we are finished making strictures on the Barbados National Bank, all of us still must turn around and ask ourselves what image do we have of ourselves. Are we only good at tearing down ourselves and elevating other people and then become jealous of them? That is the question which we have to ask.

I am saying that the restructuring the Barbados National Bank is essential in order to make it into a full-fledged commercial operation. For too long people in Barbados have been thinking that the Barbados National Bank must have a relationship with the people of Barbados which is somehow different from the other commercial banks. I have no doubt that perception has been the cause of much of the difficulty which has been inflicted on the Barbados National Bank.

12.55 p.m.

The Bank has to be restructured. I know there are some schools of thought which feel that the Bank should be phased out. I have resisted that in different fora on several occasions. They somehow feel that Barbadians should not have a commercial banking institution of their own. In the same way at this time in Barbados you will find there are some who feel it is necessary to cause fragmentation in our co-operative movement. Barbadians seem to be past masters at fragmentation.

The Barbados National Bank restructuring, Mr. Deputy President, is just a small part of the structural adjustment which is taking place in Barbados in spite of some who do not wish to see it succeed and some who are ignorant. There is fundamental reform taking place in the agricultural sector. There is fundamental reform taking place in the way in which Government manages its fiscal policy.

There is fundamental change taking place with respect to public sector investments and so on. For anyone to sit down and believe that there is no structural adjustment taking place in Barbados that person either does not know what structural adjustment is about or they know and yet they do not want to admit it.

Mr. Deputy President, I have no doubt that Barbados has to go through structural adjustment.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I will allow you three minutes for the interruptions.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: The fact of the matter is we have to ask the question. Structural adjustment for what? And at the end of the day who is going to benefit from that structural adjustment?

There is some confusion in places where confusion should not exist. For example, the Senator spoke of an 18 months sharp, short structural adjustment programme.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. I never spoke about 18 months sharp, short structural adjustment. I spoke of sharp, short stabilisation programme of 18 months.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I will take that point, Mr. Deputy President. But what the Senator does not recognize is that there is a difference between implementation of a stabilisation programme and the time period in which that programme starts to produce results. They are different things. They are fundamentally different things. When we hear people running around Barbados talking about they said it would be 18 months and the 18 months have gone and this happened and that happened. What those people are portraying is a lack of understanding...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The point that I made was that we were asked to take 18 months of stabilisation and at the end of that we were told that a period of structural adjustment would be imposed. I never spoke of any results. I spoke of what would be imposed subsequently and what continues to be dominating our Estimates year after year because we cannot draw the funds.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would suggest that for the next minute and a half that you make no reference to her speech.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, I must admit it is almost impossible for me to join in a debate without joining the arguments which have been made.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, I believe this is an opportune time for us to suspend the sitting for one hour.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.00 p.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly at 1.03 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, we had made some arrangements for an acting Deputy President which have been frustrated. I therefore now move that Senator Ada Straughn serve as Deputy President for the remainder of today's sitting. I am persuaded that we will not suffer any frustrations.

The question that Senator Ada Straughn act as Deputy President for the remainder of this sitting was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR ADA STRAUGHN in the Chair.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: This Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Madam Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendments and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly

On the separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Barbados National Bank (Amendment) Act 1994.

NO. 1 – A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE GRANT OF A SUM OF MONEY OUT OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND AND THE APPROPRIATION OF THE SAME FOR THE SERVICE OF BARBADOS FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1994

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, this Government, the Democratic Labour Party Government, promised that they would provide an opportunity for this Honourable Senate to debate

supplementary appropriations on a more timely basis. In the past, as you remember, Mr. Deputy President, all supplementary provisions passed by the Lower Chamber were combined into a final Appropriation Bill and this was presented within the first quarter of the new Fiscal Year. This Chamber felt that in order to make more timely contributions to the debate that it would have been fitting that they be given an opportunity to debate the supplementary provisions earlier. This Government agreed and in the spirit of bringing more parliamentary democracy to the debates, have made it possible to discuss the supplementary provisions.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy President, this Bill was only debated in the lower Chamber on Tuesday January 25 and here we are today, January 28, debating the same measure, a record that those sitting on the other side have never achieved and would do well to emulate.

Mr. Deputy President, this Supplementary Appropriation Bill is seeking approval to pay out of the consolidated fund the sum of \$24 250 283. What is particularly significant about this is that when the Budget was presented nearly a year ago, March of 1993, at that time the total expenditure estimated was \$ 1 280 233 896, and to date, some 9 to 10 months later we are seeking less than 2% adjustment within that Budget. I think that this Government and the Minister of Finance in particular should be complimented on his ability to present this Chamber with such an accurate record of expenditures. It was not just a hit and miss arrangement but one that has been pretty well thought out.
2.10 p.m.

The breakdown of the expenditures is as follows: Personal Emoluments will account for about 15.2 per cent of the Supplementary Appropriation or \$3 674 539. Goods and Services will account for 33.5 per cent or \$8 113 484. Current Transfers, that is subsidies and grants to public institutions, will account for \$4 107 957 or 16.9 per cent. Capital Formation will account for \$6 354 303 or 26.2 per cent and Capital Transfers will account for \$1 500 000.

I might add at this point, Mr. Acting President, that just as we saw fit to make an amendment in terms of presentation of the supplementary provision I can assure this Honourable Chamber that this whole budgetary process and the method of compiling the Estimates are under careful scrutiny by the Minister of Finance. I would hope that in the not too distant future, Mr. Acting President, that rather than presenting Estimates that tend to encourage Departments and Public Officers to spend every last penny since there is no provision for carrying forward any savings from one financial year to another that this will be looked into. Another factor that we will strive to take another hard look at and seek to have some improvements made will

be within the area of capital budgeting, because right now capital expenditures are treated and dealt with as though they will be expended in the given year. Because of this, there is a psychological blockage, I dare to say, that tends to treat the objects of these capital expenditures as though they will all be used up in the year. I would hope to give more meaningful and a truer picture of expenditures as compared with capital formation. Now we are able to identify what is capital and what is adding to the asset base in the country and that part which will be used up in a given year. Because then and only then can we really get an accurate feel for what we are spending the money rather than building up the asset base of the country. It is true that the Supplementary Appropriation is less than 2 per cent, but I would also like to add that most of the expenditures within that 2 per cent will be accounted for by the Ministry of the Environment as it seeks to provide travel, utilities and other items to enable it to host the Conference on Sustainable Development in Small Island States.

Sir, I do not believe there is much more to be said at this point. I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. This Bill seeks to provide for a grant in the sum of \$24 million for Government's use until the end of March 1994. Of this amount, Sir, almost \$11 million is going to the Ministry of Health and smaller amounts to the other Ministries. So the first thing to ask, Sir, is this. Why is the Ministry of Health figured so prominently in these supplementary provisions when we note that some are for structures of the new polyclinics and so on? One would have to ask: What happened to the estimation process that they have to come back for such a large sum of money? But I will come to that at a later date in what will be a lengthy presentation.

Sir, I refer you to the Estimates as were approved in March 1993 where this Chamber gave approval for Government to spend \$1.28 billion and revenue was estimated at \$1.06 billion and in the Budget 1993 \$21.6 million more in revenue was levied as a result of the increase in the consumption tax and other taxes. In March, it was projected that the excess of expenditure over current revenue was \$220 million and the provisions in the Budget of March 1993 would have reduced that to just under \$200 million. So that was the projected excess expenditure over current revenue which was approved by both Chambers.

Looking at the same Estimates that we approved, Sir, when it came to Table 10, Summary of Government's Operations and Financing for the current year, it said that \$144 million in foreign financing was expected during the fiscal year 1993/94 – \$174 million and \$46 million were to

come from domestic sources such as National Insurance and other commercial banks and so on. Sir, \$174 million of this excess was projected to come from foreign financing sources including the IADB, the World Bank, the CDB, the European Development Fund as well as other sources.

Sir, the question I would like to ask the Minister is this. How much of this \$174 million was, in fact, realized especially as we note the Press Release which the Governor of the Central Bank made available to us in the last couple of days. I think it was about two or three days ago. I am reading from this Press Release issued by the Barbados Central Bank. It says, Sir:

"Government continued to rely heavily on domestic sources of finance during 1993. The NIS supplied \$50 million compared to \$39.1 million in 1992 and private non-banking sectors provided \$62 million."

That is a direct quote from the Press Release given by the Central Bank a few days ago. I think it was Tuesday but I am subject to correction on that. I know that it was this week. Sir, what we noticed is that Government at the beginning of the financial year decided that only \$46 million was to come from domestic sources but now the Central Bank is stating that most of the money is coming from domestic sources. Sir, I wonder if the Minister of State in the Ministry of Economic Affairs would be so charitable as to enlighten this Honourable Senate as to how much of this \$174 million was realized.

Sir, I say that in relation to the Bill before me in case you are wondering because we are asked to approve additional expenditure. Nowhere are we hearing where the \$24 million is coming from and that is important.
2.20 p.m.

Sir, it is important to know where it is coming from, because if we look at the latest information – and again, Sir, I am quoting, because I always come armed and ready – the Central Bank indicated, as the Minister stated this morning in another matter....

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Just tell us what you are quoting from.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will tell you in a minute when I get the correct page. This is the Central Bank's Economic and Financial Statistics for December, 1993. It says that the commercial banks held \$189.5 million more in Government Securities than they were mandated to under the law. When we come to domestic credit, we notice that the amount of credit which was

supplied to the private sector at the end of October 1993, which is the latest information I have, the figure there was less than it was two years ago. In October two years ago the indebtedness of the private sector to the commercial banks was \$1 378 million and now it is \$1 363 million, which means, Sir, given that there was some inflation and so, that the private sector actually in real terms is borrowing about 10% less than it was two years ago. At the same time the credit to Government in those two years has increased by \$175 million. Everybody said the private sector is going to be the main instrument of growth and development and so on, but while the credit to the private sector is declining in absolute as well as in real terms, the credit to Government has increased by 30% or thereabout. Which means, Sir, when it comes to job creation, which everybody is saying now is going to be as a result of private sector activity, because the Government is soaking up all of the little money the commercial banks have,...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. I really did not want to interrupt the Honourable Senator, but I feel compelled to point out that the statement he is making is illogical, which is the best face I can put on it, for the simple reason that the economy – and Senator Barker is an economist – has been performing at less than full capacity, there is excess capacity within the economy. I pointed out in another presentation this morning that were it not for Government Paper the banks would have had excess liquidity just sitting on their shelves and they would not have been in a position to earn profits. If he was in his place for the other debate he would have heard at that time that it was an opportunity for the banks to earn money, because it is no loan demand. You have excess capacity and you only go out and borrow if you want to put equipment and plant in place. If that is not done it is excess capacity.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That was really not a point of order. It was either a speech or a point of elucidation.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am not enlightened, Your Honour, so I do not know. The point is that if the banks are borrowing money at 5%, which is the savings rate, and the interest rate on Treasury Bills at the end of October was 4.95%, I do not know why they want to lend to Government at 4.95%. I thought they would be keener to lend to private individuals where they would get a much higher rate of interest, so I do not know that the Government is doing the banks any favour.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Deputy President, on a point of elucidation. The Senator says he does not understand why you would borrow at 5%, meaning the deposit rate of savings, and why you would lend at 4.9%. Senator Clarke said there was an adequate

demand for loans. That is correct, but also I want to point the Senator's attention to the effective rate of interest on loans. It is in the region of 17 and 18 per cent, so do not only concentrate on the Treasury Bill rate.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I rest my case. If the effective rate is 17%, why are the banks holding \$189 million at 5% or 4.95%? It means that there is no demand out there. The important question is why is there no demand for loans out there? The answer is, the economy has been so depressed by the illogical and stupid actions of this Government, that they have reduced demand in the economy by so much that the firms out there know that it does not make any sense to invest when there is nobody to buy the goods. There are lots of people out there who want to build homes, but their jobs are cut, wages are cut, nominally and in real terms. They would love to go out there and get a mortgage to buy or build homes, but in the prevailing economic climate they are not going to take the chance because they do not know what is going to happen tomorrow in terms of their jobs. So the fact that there is a soft demand for loans by the private sector is no feather in Government's cap, it is an indictment against their misguided economic policies which have us in the state where the banks are foregoing a 12% interest rate because there is no demand in the economy.

Sir, the point I was on is that because of the fact that foreign sources of financing that had been promised have not been delivered to any great extent, the Government now finds itself as the only salvation for the commercial banks, because the commercial banks, as the Minister quite rightly said, have no choice. They are slow on demand so they have to buy Treasury Bills which are only paying less than a 5% interest rate.

Not only that, the Government borrowing from the Central Bank, which any economist would tell you puts pressure on reserves, is also at a high level. It is only recently that advances came down to within legal limits. By advances I mean the Government's ways and means. It may have been above the limit in October, it was a little below in November, so it is operating near the limit. One has to question now what the effect of this \$24 million is going to be. Contrary to what the Minister said, this \$24 million does not include the cost of the conference, it includes money for Sherbourne.

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: By conference, Sir, I mean the Global Conference on the environment which is to take place in April. It includes money under Head 37 for \$3.7 million for Sherbourne, but when you look at the explanatory notes we note that it is for the purchase of kitchen and audio visual communication equipment and a security system. It is not for the conference. 2.30 p.m.

That is money to put in equipment in Sherbourne. The Conference now has to have a separate source of financing. What I am saying is that the money for the Secretariat is not included in these supplementary provisions here. I don't see them anywhere. Sir, if they are included, perhaps the Leader of this Senate can enlighten us as to where the money for the Conferences *per se* is in the Estimates. I have looked through these estimates and every item and I did not see any money voted for the Conference *per se*.

What I am saying, Sir, is that most likely we will have another supplementary because money has to be put in because a conference of this nature has to have advanced planning and you have to spend a lot of money beforehand. So the question is where is it.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, please address the Chair.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will come back to Sherbourne in the course of my debate but I just want to turn to some specific items in the Schedule. I am going first of all to Head 42: Ministry of Public Works, Communication and Transportation where I notice that the tidy sum of \$1.4 million – subprogram 01. This subsidy goes to the Transport Board. This \$1.4 million is to supplement the tidy sum of \$100 which was given to the Transport Board in March when the Estimates were presented. So it means that the total amount voted to the Transport Board is \$1 400 100.

Sir, on that occasion, we congratulated the Government on bringing the subsidy down but I am afraid that none of us in here feel happy about the state of transport in this Island of ours. I am stating that we have to come back to the days when we had an efficient and functioning Transport Board. Sir, we can carry things to the logical conclusion and say that the Transport Board will have fewer subsidies if it stopped operation and hence the cost to the taxpayer would be substantially reduced.

I want to say that I do not see the bottom line in an accounting sense. I see it in an economic sense where you are saying the subsidy is reduced; but I am going to look beyond the bottom line and talk about the wider cost to the society as a result of what is going on at the Transport Board or what is not going on at the Transport Board. Sir, there were times in the past when the subsidy to the Transport Board was 10 times more than this figure. While all of us would agree that that may have been too high we can now go to the other end and say that the economic and social chaos that results from the decimation of the Transport Board is too high a price to pay for reducing the deficit to this amount.

We need to look around and see what is happening on the Island as a result of the Transport Board not fulfilling its function. I spoke about this already. Our old age pensioners who used to travel...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, if you have given us this information already there is no need to repeat it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I did not give it today, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If you gave it in a previous speech it does not need repeating.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I cannot remember what I said in a previous time and in any case if a point is worth saying it is worth repeating.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. But the Rules do not permit people to repeat speeches over and over.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will always bow to your greater wisdom but I am not certain that the Rules do not allow me to repeat what I said 6 months ago. If you are telling me that I cannot talk about the Transport Board then I will have to bow to your wisdom.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: No. You were saying that you made your speech before and I am just saying to you that there is no point repeating it.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Address the Chair.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I will try my best to make the point I want to make without repeating too much even though I personally believe that it is worth repeating but I will bow to your Ruling. I don't want to get into trouble in this New Year.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You won't get into trouble.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you. I am glad for that assurance. Talking about the old age pensioners. They are forced to travel on overcrowded small vans on a lot of routes where the music is killing them. They have to pay the fare like anybody else contrary to what the Democratic Labour Party promised in 1986. If I may take you back to 1986 when you were involved in that campaign, Sir...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We are not talking about campaigning. We are talking about a Resolution before us, the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Senator Barker, at this time it is not necessary for us to prolong the debate if you do not have much more to say.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I have an hour and I intend to use it. I would like to follow the Rules. If you are telling me that I do not have an hour I will have to bow to your greater wisdom.

Asides.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: The point I want to make is that our old people are forced because of the decimation of the Transport Board to suffer massive inconvenience day after day. Notice, Sir, that the Democratic Labour Party in 1986 – when the pensioners were only to travel at certain hours of the day, in other words they had to avoid peak travel – made a campaign point that our old people should be allowed to travel throughout the day.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: On a point of order, Sir. The point the Honourable Member just made is in respect of his own Party which stopped the old people from travelling all the time. Only at certain times of the day. When we got back the Government they could travel anytime. So the Member is misleading the Chamber.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I am glad for the Member's enlightenment. What I am saying is that telling persons living in Grazettes they can travel on the Transport Board bus when the bus does not pass in Grazettes is foolishness. To tell a person you can travel free in Holder's Hill but we are not sending any bus for you is the sort of foolishness that we hear the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary talking. It is no sense...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Just one minute. I don't think you can get up and make that remark about a member talking foolishness.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I take it back unreservedly and call it a nuisance point.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: The Honourable Member has already agreed to the point I made that it was his Party which stopped the old age pensioners from travelling. Are you calling your Party then a nuisance Party?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I do not know what the point of order is about and I do not know why he is interrupting me because he has no point to make. He could as well sit down and listen to points instead of getting up and talking nonsense.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would really suggest that you stop wasting time.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I want to see a properly functioning and expanded Transport Board. I want to see that happen again where on every route in this Island, including Hoytes Village in St. James – and you know the place well, Sir. I want to see every route on this Island serviced by the Transport Board. We have to get back to those days. It is a moral and economic imperative that we have a Transport Board which will service again the whole of the Island. This idea of leaving certain routes to the minibuses or to the maxi taxis is nonsense. They cannot provide the service to which the people of this country are entitled and to which they are accustomed.

Sir, congratulating ourselves that the subsidy is \$1.4 million hides the fact that the cost to the community does not come near the benefits that accrue as a result of this small deficit and it goes against everything I believe in. My social conscience is pricked when I see the results of this bumbling, this lack of transport policy. I see the effects of it day in and day out. We see chaos on our roads. We see indiscipline on our roads and among our school children which is fostered by the ZR van culture. On mornings before children go to school, they have half an hour of dub music beating in their ears dulling their senses and destroying their minds. Then they are expected to go to school and take in French and Mathematics when we are forcing them because of our transport policies to travel under those circumstances.

I say, Sir, that this is an indictment against this Government.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. This Government does not force any school children to travel on any given mode of transportation. This is a choice exercised by the travelling public. The Transport Board buses are put on for school children and I do not think that Senator Barker should try to mislead this Chamber.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Your Honour, you know as well as I know that the children in Hoytes Village St. James cannot catch anything other than a ZR van unless they are going to walk from Hoytes Village down to Highway 1 or cross to Highway 2A. I am repeating that they are forced to travel on these ZR vans by virtue of the fact that the Transport Board which used to run on that same route no longer comes up there.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: So I am saying, Sir, that they are forced to do it.

I want to move on to talk about Head 25: Agriculture. I notice that under Subprogram 626 it says that it is to provide legal and professional services to what looks like 4 legal firms, including one from Barbados and the object of some of them especially (d) is to recover the trademark from CARSICOT and the recovery of royalties from WISICA Japan.

Perhaps, Sir, the Minister can inform the Chamber as to the current status of the legal proceedings with regard to CARSICOT, especially regarding the trademark. It is only in December 1990 that in this Honourable Chamber one Senator got up and castigated Government for dealing with a bunch of crooks. That is a matter of public record. I was not in the Chamber at that time but the phrase "dealing with crooks" was mentioned. So I just want to know what is the true cost of the CARSICOT fiasco.

In 1994 we are called in this Chamber to provide money for Government to deal with legal matters pertaining to CARSICOT. When, Sir, is it going to end? Are we going to be forever saddled with the aftermath of this fiasco? It is a stain on Barbados and we take these things a little bit too lightly but we now have to be in courts all over the world dealing with the recovery of what is basically ours, the trademark.

Sir, I am waiting on the Minister when he sums up or the Leader of the Senate since he was very much involved in it to enlighten us as to the current status of the litigation process with regards to the CARSICOT matter. I believe that the whole disaster is probably stopping Barbados from fully benefitting from what could be a profitable short term industry. It left such a sour taste in people's mouths that a lot of people do not really want to get involved in the whole cotton industry because of what transpired 4 or so years ago with CARSICOT. I was most surprised when I saw in the Estimates that we are still spending money and I want to ask when is it all going to end.

Then, Sir, I want to turn to Sherbourne and the whole question of the Conference on the Environment. I have said a lot about Sherbourne on other occasions so I am not going to repeat what I have said before. We all know that it was built without any planning and any foresight and it is half built. We cannot cry over spilt milk anymore but I want to talk about the conference. I want to state that despite the fact that the Prime Minister committed Barbados to host a conference without even informing the people of Barbados or as I am told without even informing his own Cabinet, in spite of the fact that we are ill prepared physically and technically to hold a conference of such magnitude, in spite of the fact that we are going to have a

problem finding suitable accommodation for 3 000 or 4 000 persons coming to this Island and in spite of all this the country is going to benefit from the staging of such a conference. It does our prestige some good that we are hosting such an important conference. It does our country good that we have been chosen as a place where important people involved in the whole environmental scheme, including the Vice President of the United States. 2.50 p.m.

It does our country good that we have been chosen where important people are involved in the whole environmental scheme, including the Vice President of the United States and so on. It does us good so I want to appeal to all Barbadians to support the Conference. I know that the DLP is going to maximize every little bit of political mileage they can from the Conference. I know that the consequences of having a failure are horrendous to even contemplate. A lot is at stake here, our prestige. Anything that is going to carry us along is our prestige and the whole image of Barbados and to have that sullied would be disastrous. So in spite of everything, let the DLP have their moment of glory because it is being built as a DLP Conference Centre. We are a bit bigger than that. We are above that. We want to see it succeed. I am appealing to all Barbadians to put a little politics aside in spite of the fact that the others say that the DLP is going to, and do everything to make the visitors comfortable. In other words, I am appealing to them to show their usual good manners and hospitality and let us make the best of what otherwise is a bad situation. As I said before, to fail is horrendous to even contemplate.

Sir, while we are on this environment business, I want Government, as I said before, to come clean with the people. Say how much the Conference is going to cost. It annoys me to hear the Minister responsible for half the Environment because the Environment is split between 3 and 4 Ministries, say that he does not even know what the Conference is going to cost as though he did not care. The impression I got is that he did not care. That is unimportant but the people of Barbados need to know these things because if you are going to ask us to co-operate, I am saying come clean. Put the things on the table. Do not try to score cheap, political points. Come clean with the people of Barbados and say, "Look, this is what we expect you to do and this..."

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, are you seeking to impute improper motives, as I understand it, to the Government?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: When you say that they are not coming clean, what do you mean?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I mean that they are not disclosing information. I am saying that we are not getting the full information. I want them to come out and be frank with the people of Barbados. Put everything above board. Let us know what arrangements they have for the Conference and what we the people of Barbados are required to do in terms of making the Conference the success we all want it to be. I am first and foremost a Barbadian and that is always my most important consideration. We either swim together or we sink together. I want this Conference to be a success and those who know me know that I sincerely want it to be a success.

Sir, while I am on the environment matter, I see that there is some money made available for the Mangrove Landfill. Only last Friday I happened to drive through the area and I was amazed, in a short space of time, to see the unsightly mess that has been created at Mangrove. I feel sorry. I empathize with the people who live in Arch Hall, Bennetts and those areas who are within a couple miles of the landfill. It must be an awful place to live. The stench is unbearable and a lot of it is a result of unsafe and unhygienic practices at the landfill.

Sir, everybody in Barbados knows you must have landfills. You must dispose of your garbage. Nobody is questioning that. There are only a few places on the island where you can operate landfills. We know that but we are in an advanced technological age and there is no reason why, with proper management and security, that the bad odour and the other effects of the landfill could not be mitigated; but the will must be there. In all of this I see a sort of callousness by those in authority over the plight of the people who are affected by the operations of the landfill.

Now that we are hosting an important Conference on the environment we stand to suffer the embarrassment of a major environmental hazard in what is highly a densely populated area because Bagatelle is not far from there. Then a couple miles down you are on to the Sandy Lane area and so on. It is a major environmental hazard. I am calling on Government to use whatever resources it has to make sure that the landfill at Mangrove is operated in a hygienic manner because the garbage does not only come from Arch Hall and Bennetts. It comes from Providence, St. Joseph – all over the island the garbage originates and I do not see why it is fair that the people in one area are made to suffer unnecessarily.

Sir, while I am on the environment I come back to an age old problem that is the operation of quarries near residential areas. I have had to live near a quarry for a few years and I saw the damage that quarry has done on the lives of people who were close to me. This is not anything anybody told me. This is something I experienced. I saw a close relative of mine suffer as a result of the siting of a

quarry in a residential area. I also know a gentleman who lost his wife because of the operation of a quarry in a residential area because I happen to come from that area. I am saying, Sir, that we have to be extremely careful how we are creating potential health environmental hazards, that the planning and siting of these quarries – we heard of the one down St. Lucy that has caused so many problems. We have to make sure that we site these industries...

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, we need the quarrying service. It is not something that we do not need but we have to make sure that they are sited in areas which would cause minimal hurt and inconvenience to the people who live around there. For years the people of Green Hill were complaining about the operation of a quarry and nothing seemed to have been done. I am saying that as we focus on environmental matters the relevant Minister of the Environment, for which we are voting money, we want them to use the money to alleviate the suffering caused by the unwise siting of these industries.

Only last month we had the fire at the McBride plant which, thank God, we were spared what could have been more harmful effects of that fire and we have to be very careful. It is not to say that we do not need these industries and these quarries, yes, we need the industries.
3.00 p.m.

Yes. We need the industries but we have to be very careful as to where we put them. That is very important and the Ministers who oversee the environment have to be very careful. They have to wake up to their responsibilities and make sure that when they give permission for industries to be sited...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, Sir, Senator Barker is making some severe statements here about ministers not being aware or accepting their responsibilities. I would ask him to withdraw that. There is nowhere on the record where he can substantiate this.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I said awake to their responsibility. If you want me to withdraw it, I have no problem. Anything for a peaceful life.

As I was saying, Sir, they have to awaken to their responsibilities and take the environment very seriously. I think we first had a Ministry of the Environment in 1984 which looked after all sorts of environmental matters. But when this DLP Government came in in 1986, true to fashion, they had no foresight and therefore what was a very important Ministry was shifted all about the place. The Ministry of Health had certain parts, the Ministry

of Labour had certain agencies and so on and there is no cohesive policy on the environment. Because when you have 3 or 4 Ministers handling the issue, it is very difficult to get a cohesive policy especially when we know that each man is very careful to guard his own turf in a sort of cannibalistic way as is evidenced in the Administration.

I should like...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir, Senator Barker is being carried away. There are not any cannibals which I know of in here, in this Government or anywhere in Barbados. I would ask him to withdraw it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I talked about the cannibalistic way. I did not say anything about cannibals.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, I am asking the Senator to withdraw the statement that the Members of the Cabinet are cannibals.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I never said that. Sir, I never said they are cannibals, I said the cannibalistic way. If he wants me to withdraw it, I will withdraw it and substitute dog eat dog.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The truth is Senator Barker you are not permitted to make those kinds of remarks. You cannot suggest that Members of the Cabinet operate as cannibals.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I never said...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If that is the remark, you have to withdraw it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I want to substitute that and I want to substitute dog eat dog attitude.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would suggest if you have finished your speech we can move on.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Let me finish. Sir, the point I want to make is that there is a need for all the environmental agencies to be under one Minister. The sewerage system should be under the same Minister as the Sanitation Services. The NCC should be under the same Minister as the Bridgetown and south coast projects. All of them need to be under the same Minister so that we get a cohesive and a coherent policy with regard to the environment. But as it is now with two and four Ministers intervening here and there, planning cohesiveness is absent. We are getting a haphazard approach to the environment. We are seeing a lot of environmental degradation taking place but nobody seems to be in charge. All of them seem to be asleep.

The cameras of this world are going to be on us in April. All the cameras of this world are going to be focussed on this little rock. We have to present a clean environment. We have to show the world the better side of Barbados. And there is a better side. We can start now. All the unsightly dumps we have around the place, we have to make sure that between now and April and forever henceforth be cleaned up and kept in a proper manner.

Sir, I want now to touch briefly on the Ministry of Health. As I said before we see a lot of money for structures. For example, we see under Head 36 the new polyclinic. There is \$1.272 million for structures. The question I want to ask is, is this a cost overrun? Why is it coming now. I am not aware that there are any polyclinics being built around this time. I know that the one in Black Rock was opened a little while ago. I want to know why are we coming now for an extra \$1.272 million? Is that an oversight? Why is the Minister of Health not operating in a professional manner? Why at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital we are spending 10% more on salaries than we otherwise asked for. Because, Sir, in March we granted the QEH \$15.4 million for personal emoluments and now we are coming back for \$1.5 million more. Perhaps the Minister can explain to us why it is that they underestimated it by such a large amount that they have to come back now for more money.

I see that we granted almost \$7 million for supplies and materials and we are coming back for \$1 million more and still we are hearing horror stories about lack of supplies at the QEH. Why is it at the QEH that we ask for \$1.4 million in maintenance and we are now asking for \$400 000 more. What went wrong that we underestimated so badly. It is not 2%, we are talking about 30% and thereabout. It is a lot of money. We want to know why the maintenance bill is 30% more than we estimated in March? Why is the wage bill 10% more? Why is the material bill 14% more? That is all I am asking. We need to know. Is it because the Minister of Health decided let me underestimate knowing that I can always come back for more. Because this can happen sometimes. At times certain Ministries can...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. In order to avoid this debate going where it should not go. On the question of supplies we import most of the supplies from overseas for the Hospital. We do not know the type of illnesses we will have in the Hospital at any given point in time. Whatever supplies we use we import and we do not control the prices on those. Once we place the order and import them, we have to pay for them.

As a reasonable person I assume that Senator Barker would have understood this.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir I am glad that the extra 14% more on supplies is a result of cost of materials. I am not sure that the cost of materials went up by 14% in any one year. If the Minister says so, the Minister is an honourable man so I would have to believe that inflation caused the material to go up by 14%. I do not know what happened that caused wages to go up by 10%. Is it because of a wage increase? I thought we were in the midst of a wage income policy. I do not understand.

All I am saying is that we have to be more efficient when it comes to planning and to have these enormous amounts in supplementaries without explanation is wrong. The Minister has to come and tell us why is it that they underestimated maintenance by 30%? Has there been a sudden increase in breakdowns at the QEH?

I am saying if you are asking us to approve these estimates you have to give us information. That is all I am saying. If I had not asked I would not have been told that material cost went up by so much. And then we see that the medical aid scheme we were scheduled to spend \$1.4 million in a year, they are now coming back, Sir, for \$1.7 million. We are now coming back, Sir, for \$1.7 million. Sir, is it because that we are getting that much sicker? I do not know but to have estimated at 1.4 and to end up at 3.1 is a gross miscalculation. Sir, I am not aware that we had any such outbreak of disease that would require overseas visits to carry the figure from 1.4 to 3.1. All I am saying, Sir, is that this points to shoddy planning at the Ministry of Health and it requires an explanation.

3.10 p.m.

Sir, then we come to the drugs service. Budgeted \$14.2 million and we are now coming for \$2.6 million more. Sir, all of this is pointing out to me that we have a sick nation because the Ministry of Health alone is coming for \$10 million more. I do not think that all of a sudden we are any sicker. It points to something fundamentally wrong in the budgeting process that would cause these large cost overruns.

Why is it, Sir, that it is only the Ministry of Health that has these large overruns. All of the other Ministries ... Education is not even mentioned here, Sir, and that is a big spending Ministry. They have not come for one cent in supplementaries. The Ministry of Education is the biggest Ministry in terms of expenditure and they have not come for one cent more.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you have one minute.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you. But the Minister of Health is coming for \$10 million more. I am

saying, Sir, that the Minister of Health needs to get his act together.

Sir, the next two months we will be discussing estimates again. Next two months we are going to be here on the Estimates for 1994-95 and I want to be assured that when the Ministry sends down the Estimates they are truly good estimates and we are not, during the year, going to be coming for \$11 million and so on to spend in the particular Ministry.

Sir, there is a lot more that can be said.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Not much time though.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, there is coming a time when there will be no restrictions and, Sir, all shall be revealed. Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, in the opening remarks I was at pains to point out that the total supplementary provision will account for less than 2% of the overall budget. During the course of the debate on a point of elucidation, I rose to explain to Senator Barker that any expenditures that are taking place now, the supplementary provision will be made from savings which will be effected.

Senator Barker has raised certain questions and I am really appalled that someone of the lack of intellectual capacity could not...

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, on a point of Sir, a lack of intellectual Sir, I take offence at that. He is degrading me and I appeal to you, Sir, to ...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, I have no intention of trying to degrade Senator Barker.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would not expect you to do that.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: I discovered that Senator Barker was at pains to take the Ministry of Health to task. First of all he was questioning the competence of a very Honourable, hardworking and dedicated staff. He raised the question of the increase in personal emoluments for the hospital. Personal emoluments can be increased for one or two reasons – an increase of salary or stipends and/or an increase of staff. If there has been no increase in stipends, given the wages and prices policy, I would assume that given the intellectual capacity of Senator Barker it could easily, because there is only

one other conclusion that could be drawn, that staff has been increased. If he failed to do that, I will for the record ...

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, there are other conclusions that could be drawn and I have drawn one.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, just one moment. You just made an hour speech. You cannot make another speech.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On the question of the Medical Aid Scheme, Senator Barker would have us believe that he is quite capable of determining the type of illnesses that people will suffer during the course of a year and what the cost would be to help them. I would like for the enlightenment ...

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: This is the only place where light will not drive out darkness.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke, please address the Chair.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy President, Sir, on the question of the Medical Aid Bill, provision is made for this service but during the course of the year one is never quite sure what type of illnesses you have to deal with. You do not know this. It does not necessarily mean that there is a greater incidence of illness. One high cost illness like brain surgery could pretty well wipe it out with only one case. So to give the impression that because we are asking for more money it means that we have a sicker population is really sick thinking. Really to play games with ...

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Deputy President, I never said that we have a sicker population. Sir, I was saying that all of these increases point to the fact that we have a sicker population. What I am saying is that if there are no other explanations for this, all of this increase in expenditure points to that fact and I saw no evidence of it.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: The question of the medical aid provision: The amount of money that is spent on that will be determined by the types of illnesses which we encounter during the course of a year and it is rather difficult to determine at the outset of a given year what types of illnesses the scheme will be asked to support.

On the question of the drug service and goods and supplies for the hospital ...

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke, just one moment. I would appeal to all Senators to let us have some order in the Chamber. We must recognise that this is a very serious place and I do not only oppose the cross talk but we must have a certain amount of decorum in the Chamber. Senator Clarke you may wind up.
3.20 p.m.

On the question of the Drug Service and Goods and Supplies for the Hospital...

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator, just one moment. I would appeal to all Senators to let us have some order in the Chamber. We must recognise that this is a very serious place and I do not only oppose the cross-talk but we must have a certain amount of decorum in the Chamber. Senator Clarke, you may wind up.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. On the question of the supplies of the drug formulary, drugs are imported into Barbados and we have no control over the prices offered to us. Again, depending on what drugs are prescribed for the people who use these services, we are into an area where we cannot forecast the types of illness that we have to treat during the course of the year. I would expect, Senator Barker, who claims to come from a caring party the people's health would have a high premium. What we are talking about here and I will get back to this very point that we are talking about less than a 2 per cent change. We are only re-arranging it. I mentioned earlier that we need to take a hard look at the way we budget, because if we had the amount of money available we would move this around without detaining the Chamber. For Senator Barker to utilise the time of the Chamber to be nit-picking over an issue in which savings have been identified to take care of this is really most unbecoming, Mr. Deputy President.

I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

The question that this Bill be read a second and third time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

The question that the Bill be now passed was put to the Senate and agreed to and was cited as the Supplementary Appropriation Act, 1994.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, earlier in today's session there were certain documents which were to be laid and they have since come into my possession. I now propose to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Leader of the House has indicated the intention to revert to the item

Introduction of Papers. If there are no objections from Senators, I now ask him to proceed.

INTRODUCTION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Yes, Mr. Acting President, I am commanded to lay the following documents:

- (1) The Post Office (Licensed Vendors of Postage Stamps) (Amendment) Regulations, 1993;
- (2) Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No.5) Order 1993;
- (3) Reports on the audit of the accounts of the National Insurance Fund for the years ended 31st December, 1989 and 31st December, 1990;
- (4) Report of the National Insurance Board on its operations under the Severance Payment Scheme for the period 1st January, 1992 to 31st December, 1992.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 3 – TO MOVE THE SECOND READING OF THE EVIDENCE BILL

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I do not propose to proceed with the Evidence Bill today having given the other side certain assurances that the time available to us would not permit.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I therefore wish to move that the Senate be adjourned until Wednesday, February 9, 1994 at 11.00 a.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.
3.27 p.m.

CONTENTS**SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER****SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS..... 1584**

Suspension of Standing Order 45(2) for the remainder of the sitting.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT**SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS..... 1584**

Appointment of Senator the Venerable J. L. Springer to act as Deputy President for the remainder of the sitting.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS..... 1584**

1. The Supplementary Appropriation Bill, 1994.
2. The Barbados National Bank (Amendment) Bill, 1994.
3. The Evidence Bill, 1994.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**ORDER NO. 2 – THE BARBADOS NATIONAL BANK (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1994 1585**

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 1585; Senator Miss M. A. Mottley, 1589; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT**SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS..... 1599**

Appointment of Senator Mrs. Ada Straughn to act as Deputy President in the absence of Senator the Venerable J. L. Springer.

ORDER NO. 1 – THE SUPPLEMENTARY**APPROPRIATION BILL, 1994 1599**

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 1599, 1607; Senator T. E. Barker, 1600; Mr. Deputy President, 1608.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS**SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS..... 1609**

1. The Post Office (Licensed Vendors of Postage Stamps) (Amendment) Regulations, 1993.
2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 5) Order, 1993.
3. Reports on the Audit of the Accounts of the National Insurance Fund for the years ended 31st December, 1989 and 31st December, 1990.
4. Report of the National Insurance Board on its operations under the Severance Payments Scheme for the period 1st January, 1992 to 31st December, 1992.

SUSPENSION 1598**ADJOURNMENT..... 1609**

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1609.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ALLEYNE, Senator Dr. F. W.
BARKER, Senator T. E.
CLARKE, Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D.
LEWIS, Senator the Hon. L. V. H.
MOTTLEY, Senator Miss M. A.