
THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th February, 1981.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, C.B.E., J.P.; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A., (Econ.); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A. and Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. CAYLESS.

Dr. HAYNES and Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 10th February, 1981.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes be confirmed unless any members have any comments to make on them.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by hon. members, let those Minutes stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1980 as prepared by the Accountant General.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

The Auditor's Report and the twenty-third Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1978.

The Auditor's Report and the twenty-fourth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1979.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, Sir, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$4 105 959 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980–81, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980–81, No. 40 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act.

A Bill to amend the Off-Shore Banking Act.

On behalf of the Hon. Attorney General I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Bill to validate certain matters in respect of The Vital Statistics Registration Act (1980–55).

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, a Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, a Bill to amend the Off-Shore Banking Act was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, a Bill to validate certain matters in respect of The Vital Statistics Registration Act (1980-55) was read a first time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 3, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

DEVELOPMENT (CANADIAN LOAN) (WATER DEVELOPMENT) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1981

Item No. 3 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) (Water Development) Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a slight amendment of the original Bill under the Canada/Barbados Agreement in relation to the further development of water in Barbados for its necessary infrastructure.

The amount of money in the original Act was set out as \$5 700 000. Obviously with increasing costs the amount which is necessary to complete the programme will have increased and accordingly arrangements have been made for additional finance for this very worthwhile programme so we are seeking basically to amend the \$5 700 000 as set out specifically in that Act and to substitute therefor \$10 000 000.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRADSHAW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that as Minister responsible for Waterworks, it is necessary to

place on records the gratitude of successive Governments of Barbados to the Canadian Government for the financial assistance and grants which have been given to this country for the development of its water resources.
12.30 p.m.

This Bill comes at a time, when we are now going through the third Canadian Development Loan, which will provide Barbados with material and other articles needed for the extension of the water services throughout the Island. In this programme, we plan to sink an additional well and create another pumping station at the Belle. We are now completing the reservoir in Black Rock, the St. Stephen's Hill reservoir. We are extending the number of four inch mains which will serve people in rural areas and remove the banjo strings, as they were once referred to in this Honourable House by another Minister responsible for Waterworks – that we now see scattered all over the Island.

I must say, that this Government's programme is to bring water to every household by the end of 1981. I am happy to say, that we are now running at approximately 227 applications per month. Last month alone, we made something like 274 connections. I am very pleased, that the general public has now accepted what we put before this Honourable House sometime ago, that if they require water services to their household, to come to the Ministry, or the Waterworks Department pay a \$20 down payment, we will make the connection and then, spread, the payment over a number of years, so that, after having dug up the roads to make the installations, we can then go in and resurface the roads once and for all without getting into the problems that we had years ago, when one person asked for a service, and as soon as, that line was cut, the road was repaired somebody asked again and you had the continual method of digging up, repairing, digging up, repairing, which in the long run made our roads rather uneven.

This Loan coming at this time, Mr. Speaker should be welcomed by the people particularly in the St. Michael, St. James areas of Barbados. Last month, we commissioned a one million gallon tank at Lodge Hill, which was the general development programme in the Second Canadian Loan and we go on in the third Canadian Loan now, with the pumping station at the Belle. I believe, that the Honourable House will well remember a Resolution coming here sometime ago, with the acquisition of a portion of land and a well in St. James from a Mr. Price. That is also earmarked for development.

We now move into the stage of the water resources and then the Waterworks would hand over its present facilities to water resources, which will look after the whole water development, by bringing it under one umbrella, the total water resources of this country, the

irrigational, commercial, domestic supplies of water. We hope to continue our developmental programme and we hope to be able to avoid the outages which we have in certain areas, which are only due to insufficiency in pumping capacity in some of the stations. These are areas like parts of St. Joseph and parts of Black Rock. When we bring the St. Stephen's reservoir into operation later this year, we do not hope to have any further problems in the Black Rock area and in the eastern part of the country and with the further development of water resources, we are hoping that by the end of this programme, which is scheduled for a three year developmental period, that Barbados would have one of the finest water resources in the Caribbean.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I would like also to express sincere thanks and gratitude to the Canadian Government for the assistance which they have been giving this country for a very long period.

The Development Canadian Loan came about during the period in which I had the privilege of serving as Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works and therefore, I am indeed happy to know, that the present Government has found it possible to carry on with this Loan. This Canadian Loan plays an important role in the development of our country, when we consider the number of homes, which had the water service during the periods which the former Government served and now, the present Government continues to take special interest in improving what has already been done. This improvement calls for funds and therefore, without the assistance which the Canadian Government is rendering, it would not be possible for the poor people of this country to have the water service at their homes.

It was also the policy of the former Government that all the inhabitants of this country, all the householders should have water service at their homes and therefore, I would like to say, that I have great pleasure in giving this my whole-hearted support.

Concerning the number of strings, the pipes, which the Honourable Member for St. Joseph has spoken about, the former Government had also started to deal with that matter and I am indeed happy, Sir, to know, that the time has come now, when it may be possible for all of these strings and pipes to be taken up and for water mains to be laid.

12.40 p.m.

There are several reasons why this should be done, and one especially I should mention, that these strings of pipe and with the various vehicles travelling on these roads, you get a problem regularly with burst pipes, and in many cases the poor people are unable to pay the Waterworks for the service, but it is the policy of the

Waterworks that those pipes cannot be repaired unless the owner of the house signs what I call an agreement to pay for the repairs. This creates a hardship on the poor people, and I am indeed happy to know that something is being done to alleviate the hardship which these poor people suffer financially from time to time to pay for the repairs to these pipes when through no fault of theirs the pipes are damaged.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I have just a few points to make in regard to this Resolution. I should like to join with my colleague in noting that with this third phase of the development programme which had been envisaged some years ago, and which is now proceeding apace, that it would seem as if we are in the process finally of removing the service of water to people in Barbados away from the partisan political arena.

I believe, Sir, that services such as the supply of water ought not really to form the basis of the kind of partisan political back and forth which is the norm in the adversary system which we have in this country, and so I was very pleased when I saw on television recently the hon. member for St. Joseph in his capacity as Minister and, I believe, the Canadian Foreign Minister, both of them struggling to turn the tap which ostensibly released the water in this large storage reservoir. In passing, I would also note that while I was pleased to see them, I was not particularly happy to see the hon. member for St. Michael North West indicating in the same television programme that somehow that particular project had been put there because he had communicated with somebody, ostensibly the Minister. I think that that is the kind of misleading information which when put abroad in the country can do nothing for the kind of non-partisan development of infrastructural resources which I spoke about at the beginning.

I should like in this context also to congratulate the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department. I think that he has played a significant role in the development of water resources in this country, and in so doing he has demonstrated, as I believe I have said some time ago, that the capacity of the Barbadian who is trained to operate at the very highest level ought never to be in doubt. All that we have to do is to provide our people with the basic training, and indeed the advanced training, which is available in all parts of the world, and we will see them operating at the highest possible level. I think that the supply of water in Barbados with as little fanfare and without great difficulty is a clear indication that where a public utility is being effectively managed, it can be managed under the aegis of the governmental sponsorship.

There is one area relating to the supply of water which I would like to draw to the attention of the

Minister and for which I would like to elicit a clear, unequivocal policy on the part of Government. There are a number of old age pensioners in this community who through the utterances of members of the governing party have been led to believe that they are entitled, because they are old age pensioners, to have their water bills paid. Mr. Speaker, in my constituency I am inundated almost weekly with the cries and complaints of a number of old age and indigent persons who in the belief that their water bills, and indeed their electricity bills, would be paid by the Government, have gone to the Welfare Department only to discover that having a refrigerator in their household was sufficient to disqualify them as "indigent persons" and as a result they have not had their water bills paid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is difficult for old age pensioners, but when the particular bills are kept for some time for what is said to be an investigation, what happens by the second or third quarter is that the bills are sent again to the particular old age pensioners who then discover that they are in arrears for two or three quarters, and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure Your Honour will agree that for an old age pensioner to be in arrears with water where the water rates have gone up the point of \$20 per quarter can be a monumental difficulty for many of our older people who live alone and who live in circumstances which are below the poverty line.

I believe that it is immoral for these persons to be allowed to believe that they are going to have their water bills paid and then when they present their water bills to the governmental authority they discover that they have been misled.

Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined at the beginning to say that they had misled themselves, but when I have done some investigation, it seems as if at some point, either during the election campaign or soon thereafter, a statement was made by one of the Ministers of the Government to the effect that all water bills of all pensioners would be paid. It does not seem, however, as if this ever was articulated into Government policy. The result has been that the effect of that statement remains abroad in the community while the reality is that those persons are subject to no more relief than what a person in the keeping of the Welfare would normally get.

Now, Sir, a lot has been said over the last two or three years by the Government, in some Government agencies, about their attitude to the poor and indigent of this country. It may very well be that the Government is unaware of the stringency with which the Welfare Department because of a lack of funds administers its responsibility to determine who is indigent and who is not. I believe that the Government has a responsibility to state their position as it truly exists and to refrain from allowing the poor and indigent in this country to

suffer at the hands of the rhetoric of some of their less concerned, and perhaps their more boisterous spokesmen, who from time to time perhaps taken on the upswing of political possibilities make statements which if they are not untrue are certainly misleading.
12.50 p.m.

When it comes to the ability to use water, Sir, that is tantamount to a fundamental right in a place like Barbados, for where a person may be able to survive without solid food, a person is unable to survive for a long time without the use of water and in Barbados, Sir, water use must not be confused with water use in some other parts of the world.

We in Barbados are accustomed to using water in a particular way and no matter how poverty stricken one is, the use of running water is now considered to be a norm and is now considered to be something which is no longer a luxury.

Mr. Speaker, I recognise that this Resolution deals with the development of water resources and I do not wish to draw the analogy about the real difficulties which persons are suffering with electricity as well but in making the point about water, I would like to say that such utilities as electricity, a refrigerator, a stove and running water ought no longer to be considered as luxuries and used against people.

When I say used against people, Mr. Speaker, if a Welfare Officer doing his job comes to visit a poor person and, let us say, was married to a Government pensioner, as I know in one case, that Government pensioner when he was alive living with his wife, received enough money from the Government pension to keep their heads above water. They had an old refrigerator but it is still functional. They had a stove but it is still functional. They had a television since the 1960's. It is still functional. The man has died and he has left a widow. She is not in the seat now, Sir, with the kind of old age pension which would allow her to live above the poverty line. She seeks to get assistance from the Agencies that have been set up for that purpose. They send up a Welfare Officer. The Welfare Officer comes to this house, notes that there is a refrigerator, notes there is a stove, notes that there is running water, notes that there is electricity and concludes that that person could not be indigent because that person lives in a house of a certain size.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member speaking about the situation which existed under the Democratic Labour Party up to 1976 because certainly.....

Mr. TAITT: Is he under a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Since the hon. member has risen on a point of order, the hon. member who is addressing the Chair should take his seat.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am only asking if the hon. member is referring to the situation which existed before 1976 because he certainly is not speaking about what is happening after 1976 because the means test of that order which he is speaking about has long been removed under this administration.

Mr. TAITT: Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I was speaking before the Hon. Minister intervened, I was speaking about the measure of restraint which might be informed by the fact of my experience in my constituency but I now can say categorically that it is the kind of intervention which the Minister made which causes the confusion among the poor and indigent out there because for the Minister to suggest that these conditions do not exist suggest to me, Sir, that I either ignorantly or deliberately am making statements that are untrue or it shows that the Minister is totally out of touch with the realities of life among the poor people in this country today.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not out of touch. I am just reminding the hon. member that he is trying to use the same tactics that he used with the Port Authority when they wanted to move five boats from Lands End when he got in here and made a speech that was totally incorrect but as far as he was concerned he was saying something to the Press. I can say off hand, Mr. Speaker, that the method of paying for the services of senior citizens has been changed and we have said openly that if there is an able-bodied person...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is really no point of order. The Minister will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am repeating and I am stating categorically that there are persons in this country who, because they have a refrigerator and a stove and or electricity....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard this argument over and repeatedly. I have heard it too often from the hon. member. The Standing Orders do not permit the hon. member to repeat himself so often, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with apologies to the Chair. I say, Sir, that my people in the constituency where I live give credence to the position which I have taken which the Minister by his intervention seeks to suggest is untrue. I say, Sir, that if the Minister would go out into the highways and byways of this country there he will find a number of persons who are suffering at the hands of his and his Government's rhetoric. There he will find a number of persons who are suffering at the hands of the

promises of a Government which has been existing and continues to exist on the basis of public relation gimmicks and statements which are not true, statements which mislead the community and allow the poor and the more under developed members of the community, the depressed members of this country to continue to suffer by telling them that they have bread when in fact they have not even got biscuits.

I will not allow any interruption or any suggestion or any question on either my integrity or veracity to turn me away from an imposition which is not touchable by the likes of those who, whenever faced with the real truth, whenever faced with the realities, will seek to denigrate the individual rather than deal with the issues. Mr. Speaker, let him walk into the streets and ask the people, then we will know who is lying and who is not lying.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to address myself to the Bill now before this Chamber which seeks to amend the Development (Canadian Loan) (Water Development) Act in order to increase the loan that the Government may borrow under that particular Act. It is noted that the increase would be from \$5.7 million to \$10 million and all we have been told so far is this reflects the increase in capital cost which would be involved.

I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that there will be such an increase in capital cost bearing in mind that the cost of living in this country would have risen about 100% over the past four years despite the kind of information that is put out from time to time in respect of the rates of inflation, particularly in those areas where construction and so on is involved.
1.00 p.m.

Whether or not this increased loan will have any difference in terms, for example, difference in interest rates or any other factors, that might reflect in the cost of the increase of the loan to the Government of Barbados. I say this, Sir because I am concerned, like other Honourable Members, on this Side, with the alarming increases in water rates in Barbados.

Now, sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, when the rates were increased by \$4.50 under the Democratic Labour Party, there was a national outcry, nevertheless, the minimum rate, domestic rate, this is for fixed rates per quarter was at the level of six dollars. By 1977, Mr. Speaker, that six dollars had become \$10. At that time, there was an argument put forward, that the increase was due to an agreement, signed by the previous Administration, in respect of the Bridgetown Sewerage Scheme. By 1980, Mr. Speaker, that \$10 had become \$20. On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, it was no longer the question

of the Bridgetown Sewerage Scheme, it was the projected cost of electricity which would be used, in order to pump water.

I can only say, that that formed part of the Budgetary Proposals of the Honourable Minister of Finance and it bears a remarkable and striking relationship to the actual increases in electricity, although it predated those increases by a matter of about two months. It was very effective, informed guessing by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not only in the area of fixed, minimum rates, where this is a problem, but the problem is equally severe in the metered domestic rates where we saw an increase of some 35% in 1977 and then on top of that a further increase in the year 1980. It is that the domestic consumers in this country have progressively paid significantly more for water in Barbados and certainly, Mr. Speaker, even in excess of the more reasonable levels of inflation. But, if you were to relate that to the published levels of information, you would see that it is very much in excess of the rate in inflation, as published by the Government and far in excess of the rate of inflation which we all know to exist in Barbados. In the non-domestic area we have seen massive increases, for example, by 45 cents per thousand gallons in 1977. In 1980, again, a further increase.

Now, the water rates of Barbados will be going up again. The water rates in Barbados will be increased again as of July 1st this year. There is going to be a significant increase in respect of domestic charges somewhere in the region of another 50%, or thereabouts and a significant increase in respect of the commercial sector and an even larger increase in relation to apartments, guest houses and otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that the Honourable Member is following his notes quite copiously.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I can make my notes a document of the Honourable House, if you wish. They are pure numbers for the inspection of the entire House for anybody who wants to see it.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a Point of Order, Sir, the Honourable Member is breaching the Standing Orders. You must not read your speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member may proceed.

Dr. HAYNES: In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are two things that worry me and I think, that we need more information on this loan as to the terms and con-

ditions of the loan and whether, or not it would lead to a further increase in the already burdensome water rates which people have to pay and in particular, the domestic consumers, bearing in mind, that the increase which is scheduled for 1st July, to the best of my knowledge did not take into account this particular loan but was predicated according to the arguments put forward by the Honourable Minister of Finance on the increases in the rate of electricity consumed by the Waterworks Department.

So, it is important for us Sir to be sure when we get involved in agreements of this kind to increase loans of this kind, for which gratitude has been expressed, of course, to the Canadian Government, but, we have to watch and see whether or not we do not end up with a situation where we are providing yet another utility apart from electricity, which is beyond the reach of the average person because in the area of utilities, I think that social justice, economic justice demands that one should be able to relate the cost to the consumer to reasonable wage levels within the society and any time when these matters become a burden to the vast majority of people and Mr. Speaker, I do not only speak of old age pensioners, who I believe are on the same page on which the photograph of the Honourable Member for St. Peter appears in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for 1976. There was a firm promise to implement proposals to pay the electricity and the water bills for all old age pensioners to the best of my belief. I do not have the document here in front of me and I believe, Sir, that you yourself, when confronted with a similar situation expressed some surprise of the generosity of that statement in the Manifesto.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am surprised at any attempt to involve the Chair in the debate of this Honourable House.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, that is why I was most careful to use another terminology.

We have no complaint about borrowing for infrastructural development of this kind provided that the national debt does not continue to escalate to a point where it would be extremely difficult even to borrow for infrastructural purposes in the next five years or so. But, we are concerned that there must be a significant humanitarian component to the delivery of utilities to the homes of the people in Barbados.
1.10 p.m.

We must be concerned when we enter into loan agreements, whether it be the World Bank in respect of Barbados Light and Power and other agencies or with the Canadian Government, that the final cost to the consumer will be reasonable, and I think that already the water rates are a burden to domestic consumers, particularly old age pensioners and those on fixed incomes, Mr.

Speaker, and even those whom one would consider in the middle income groups who have metered domestic services in their homes.

I move around this country, I represent a constituency that is reasonably reflective of the total composition of the population of Barbados, and the greatest complaints that I hear relate not only to the general increase in the cost of living but in particular to the cost of utilities. I would urge upon the Government to look very carefully and see whether or not there cannot be some kind of social thinking going into their provision of utility services, particularly for the lower income groups and persons on fixed incomes. In particular, I would wish clarification as to whether or not this increase in loan would have any impact on the cost of water in this country, because we know that when the electricity rates go up as they will have to go up in a year or two, probably in two years, in order to generate another \$51 million to capitalise the Barbados Light and Power Company, you are going to find again the same kind of reasoning applied for an increase in water rates, based on the increase in the cost of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that when initially the Government sought to increase the water rates in Barbados, they tried to pin it down on an agreement made between the Democratic Labour Party Government and an international organisation. However, a slip of the tongue during one of the Adams' comedy shows on television attributed it to the increases in electricity, and that had to be followed up by documentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate what the hon. member is trying to do, but remember, all the hon. member is now saying I have heard him say while standing on his feet already today.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the difference is here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The difference is that I have not asked you to take your place and did not intend. That is why I am giving you the warning. That is the difference.

Dr. HAYNES: If there is a firm linkage, Mr. Speaker, between the cost of one infrastructural utility and another infrastructural utility, and projections are that the first infrastructural utility will be increased in cost, then it means that the second one will increase in cost, and I want to know whether apart from that factor which has now emerged as the main cost for the increase in water rates, whether any factor surrounding this loan is likely to add to a further increase in the water rates apart from those already projected for July 1, 1981.

I have walked the slippery and treacherous path, Mr. Speaker, and I will take my seat now.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, if I may make a short contribution on this, I want to begin by saying that it is recognised on all sides that the proper supply of water throughout Barbados is crucial and fundamental not only for developmental purposes, but also for making a comfortable life for the citizens of this country. It was therefore against this background that on the 27th August, 1970 during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party that we have in the laws on the Statute Book Cap. 94A which we are now seeking to amend, and part of that bit of legislation, section 3, reads as follows:

"The money borrowed under the authority of this Act shall be appropriated and applied to finance expenditure to be incurred in the purchase of machinery, services, materials and equipment in connection with the development of the water resources and the water supply of Barbados."

We are therefore at the point where we are now looking at an extension, or indeed an increase in the amount of money which could be borrowed under the terms of this piece of legislation.

I do not think that this particular bit of legislation will provide any kind of controversy, because it is clear that both the Democratic Labour Party when in Government, and now in Opposition, and the Barbados Labour Party now in Government are committed to the idea of developing and improving the water resources of this country, and for this reason this loan is being sought. I believe, as I said at the outset, that the provision of water, an adequate and a ready and available supply of water to people all over Barbados must be of prime and paramount importance to those of us who are parliamentarians here, and for this reason obviously we will support this.

I would, however, like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that there are a number of areas which I believe that some urgent attention needs to be directed to, and it is an area of an even supply of water in terms of pressure. There are certain areas of Barbados, Mr. Speaker, where water pressure is very uneven, and where at certain times of the day one cannot get water. I know, for example — I am not of course attempting to steal whatever thunder the member for St. Michael North West has, because I believe that would be the only contribution he will make on this about the water pressure in the Cave Hill area — but this is a serious problem, and at certain times of the day, particularly on mornings, one finds some very serious problems in getting a fairly even flow of water, and I would hope that in seeking to extend the amount of money which could be borrowed under this arrangement with the Government of Canada, that some money will be directed towards improving the pressure and the availability of water to residents in that area.

Another area of concern, and indeed in this particular respect I would also want to indicate that there are still, in spite of the fact that there is a station and a booster station in the kind of hilly areas of St. Lucy, Josey Hill and over in Lamberts, that people still from time to time experience some difficulty in getting the kind of even flow that one like, and I would like to think that at least the Hon. minister could give us some kind of indication as to whether or not that problem can be rectified, at least how soon it will be rectified, because people have been complaining about the problems they get in this particular area.

1.20 p.m.

Now another area of concern, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to draw to this Honourable Chamber and I think it is one which concerns all Barbadians is the large number of what we will call burst pipes that we see around Barbados. Now if you drive around Barbados you will find almost every day probably dozens of pipes which have been disrupted and its supplies disrupted because of the fact that a number of pipes have broken and therefore have caused that kind of a problem.

I recall that only last week within a distance about 100 yards in a road going up by what we call the red line towards Rock Field in St. Lucy, we had a pipe burst in three different sections. I think that there is urgent need to look at providing proper pipes or renewing the pipes because there might have been put down for a long time and probably are in need of replacing. I would like to think that some of any additional money which will be brought into Barbados as a result of the extension of this loan can be directed to supply this particular need because I consider that it is an urgent need, one which the Government ought to pay some serious attention to. In the first place, it disrupts the service because it reduces the pressure and at the same time, if the repairs are going to be done, then people will necessarily have to do without water for that period of time.

At the same time it also causes wastage. I would therefore like to think that we would want to conserve our water resources as soon as possible. I see there is need for some major work to be done and I would like to think that some of the money which will be used, would be directed in this particular area.

I think my colleague for St. Philip South raised a question which has been raised in here over and over again and I think it needs repeating what one of the former Ministers of Communications and Works used to refer to as guitar strings which we see particularly going into various tenancies and I would think that the Government would pursue an active policy wherever possible to make sure that there is some kind of continuity in the flow and replace these many independent supplies

of water by proper mains which would ensure that there is adequate and proper supplies of water to people in the various districts and villages of Barbados.

As I indicated in the outset, nobody in the Opposition could refuse to support this particular amendment to this legislation because as was said this legislation was a policy which was begun by the Democratic Labour Party in 1970 and we would therefore like to say that we support this further attempt by the Government to improve the water resources in this country.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I should wind up the debate on behalf of the Government Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to make contribution to this Bill? The Hon. Minister.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South West. Mr. Speaker, up to 1976 the then administration in Government had a policy which was referred to as the means test dealing with senior citizens or old people in this country. The means test was applied every time a person had to apply to Government for any form of assistance and Welfare Officers at that time used to carry out the sort of exercise which the hon. member spoke about today.

We well remember when we sat on the Opposition benches we used to talk about old people knowing when the Welfare Officer was about to arrive that morning would run with their television sets and carry them next door and ask their neighbours to keep them and hide anything of worth which was at the house before the Officer arrived for his visit.

In 1977 this administration took a decision to remove the means test from the method of dealing with senior citizens. We said that we would assist senior citizens or pensioners with payments of their utility services, water and electricity, but we had to make a condition that where an able-bodied person or somebody who is employed was living in the same household as a pensioner, we insisted that that person carry their share of the responsibility of the household.

If the hon. member has any old people in his constituency who are living alone and drawing a pension, they are entitled to have their water rates and their electricity bills paid. What we have, Mr. Speaker, is a situation where a number of pensioners move house. They either move the entire structure and then they say we want water connected or we want electricity installed or they move out from one household into

another household and they are living with sons or daughters or relatives who are employed and they will still come down to the Welfare Officer and say the house is mine, I want the services paid, but when the investigations are carried out you discover that there are three or four able-bodied persons living in the household who are earning money. But the old age pensioners, I cannot blame them, because if they have a feeling that the property is theirs and in this society of ours there are old people who still believe today that despite the fact that they are only drawing a pension they must look out for their grandson or their granddaughter or daughter who is living in the household with them and working but we have laid down a condition that those persons who are living in the house who are employed that they must carry the services if they are occupying the house. It is only old persons who are pensioners living alone that will benefit under the Scheme.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member would give way. The hon. member obviously did not get the gravamen of my speech in this regard. I was making the point, Sir, that I was speaking precisely of persons who were pensioners who lived alone, one in Peterkins and one in Alkins. I can take the Minister and show him or I have the bills which I would present to the Minister if he so desires.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, we went further. In 1977 we removed the situation which existed under the Democratic Labour Party where two old people living in a house and only one could receive pension. We said "No". As long as you reached a pensionable age, irrespective of your earnings, you were entitled to a pension in this country. We did not care what the arrangements were. We did not care who lived in the house with you. Where before you had one pensioner in a house drawing pension to satisfy two, we have made it to \$25 a person as long as you reach a pensionable age so I cannot see how the hon. member can say that we have not been treating the old people well.

I move along, Mr. Speaker, to the question of pressures, burst pipes, etc. I have said before, less than a month ago that we have problems in the Black Rock area. Let me repeat it for the hon. member for St. Lucy.....
1.30 p.m.

The cast iron pipes in Barbados have been laid well over 30 years ago. Over the Island you had problems of outages and the Waterworks Department could not account for why no water was flowing. We brought, under the same Canadian Scheme technicians from Canada and we went through a leak detection process to find out why water was not arriving at certain points. We found that many of the old cast

iron pipes had been fractured and were leaking underground.

We also found in the Black Rock, Cave Hill and surrounding areas that every time we repaired one of the old pipes, there was an air lock, so although water was there, the air stopped the water flow. We have gone through the whole area. We have put in bleeder pads throughout the system. We have constructed the St. Stephen's reservoir, which we have said before, as soon as that reservoir is commissioned, which is hoped to be commissioned around September this year, there should be no water problem in the Black Rock, Cave Hill, St. James area. So, that is the situation where development of water is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked at water development, for instance, in the St. Joseph area under the Democratic Labour Party. We were told that because of the elevation, that you could not get water regularly. The Democratic Labour Party ran a direct line to Mr. Lloyd Smith's house, who was a representative of the area to satisfy his needs. We have not done it so, we have looked at the entire area. We have planned a second tank for that area in order to give everybody in St. Joseph water not one representative like how the Democratic Labour Party did it. They fixed one road in St. Joseph for 16 years, the one road that led to their candidate in the 1971 and 1976 elections, just like they ran one pipeline to the father, when he represented St. Joseph. We have fixed every road there is in St. Joseph, every, every one, we share the spoil evenly.

Mr. Speaker, I must turn to the other gentleman, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the gentleman who talks about statistics, Cost of Living Index figures, all sorts of figures he talks about. He talks about water rates going up in July, that it will be over and above the inflation patterns, *et cetera* but the poor gentleman has forgotten one little thing, that his colleague signed an agreement with the Inter American Development Bank. He has always denied that. He says, "I am nothing to do with that?" St. Michael South, the hon. member was Minister of Health — he signed an Agreement with the Inter American Development Bank which stipulated that for this country to install the sewerage works, that are going on now, that you had to raise.....

(Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member For St. Michael South Central were ordered to be expunged from the Records by His Honour the Speaker).

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if he wants to say that, last time we came in here with Supplementary Estimates for the Waterworks Department we said that cost of electricity had outstripped the amount

which was voted in the annual estimates and therefore, we needed an increase. But, the hon. member must remember that the terms of the Inter American Development Bank Agreement said that the institution must be self-financing within three years of the completion of the works, that the Water Authority must be in operation by January, 1981 and that the Water Authority must charge economical rates and must have a reasonable rate of return on its whole operation.

The Water Authority is in operation now, the works are going on and we have to abide by the Agreement signed by the Democratic Labour Party. We have to move the rate of water up to a figure agreed by the Democratic Labour Party in 1976 and not by the Barbados Labour Party. Even so, I am going to admit that whatever we do to raise the water rates, water in Barbados will still be cheaper than anywhere else that you can think about. It is the purest water, it is the best and therefore, if people feel a bit oppressed they must understand that this Government is still subsidising water to a great extent. (ASIDES).

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition in an Election year must find something to say, but they have never advanced a theory in this country, as the Honourable Member is now shouting about. He talked about the Government carried on a water policy and removed water from adversary politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like the Honourable Member pointing at another Honourable Member and saying, "he".

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I am sorry, the Honourable Member.

What I am saying is that the Barbados Labour Party took a decision and when the Honourable Member spoke about the third Canadian Loan, I could bring the files to show, that the Canadian Government had said, that Barbados had reached a stage of development, where it would not need any further money for water development and we argued with them, we said that if you looked at commercial enterprises, yes, if you look at domestic water supply, we say, no. We argued and I must join with the Honourable Member and compliment the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks, Mr. Nickey Sealy.

We started in 1977, we went back and did a total inventory of all the Waterworks' assets, the pipes, the pumping stations, *et cetera*. We looked at the number of houses in Barbados with water and the number without water. We even committed Barbados into an agree-

ment in a Training Programme for water development resources in the Caribbean and we pointed out, to the Canadians that it was necessary for us to develop our water resources technically and otherwise, in order to lead the other Caribbean countries when the World Body has been calling for a year of fresh drinking, potable water to Latin American and Third World countries. It is on this basis, that the Canadians agreed that we could then have the loan for the further development of water in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Canadian Government and I want to express on behalf of the people of this country and the Government of Barbados, how we feel about Canada making this further loan, so that, by the end of 1981, the wishes and aspirations of the people of this country and the plans of the Barbados Labour Party would be fully realised in giving every household running water, abandon stand pipes and the baths put up by the Democratic Labour Party which expose the women of this country to go in a bath on a Sunday and on an evening.

Thank you.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
1.40 p.m.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT, 1981

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, at present in Barbados as the law stands any person may change his name at common law without compliance with any formality, and it is usual to effect this by deed poll. The limitation on this provision is that no person can change his name for the purpose of fraud or illegality.

You will recall that when we passed in here various legislation dealing with the removal in law of the status of illegitimacy and conferring on all children equal rights

regardless of whether they were born in or out of wedlock, that I undertook to the House to bring down a series of measures which would support this kind of reform of the law, and the principal reason for the Change of Name Bill is to support legislation reforming the whole area of equal rights, both of women and of children, and at the same time to support some other measures dealing with family law which will shortly be before this House.

The law, if I may revert to the law again, Sir, says that the continued use of a name legally effects a change of name, and we have found that people may wish to evidence this practice, this *de facto* position, by something in writing, and hence the use of the deed poll which most people know. A minor on the other hand may change his name as he pleases, but a deed poll cannot be enrolled in the Registration Office by a minor without the consent of his parent or guardian, and we are seeking also to deal with the position of a child born of a common law union where that child wishes to change his name to the name of his father.

At present it is the practice to use a form of affidavit with a deed poll, but the original birth and baptismal certificates would still continue until the change which we have effected by the Vital Registrations Act, unless his father's consent is given to carry the name of the mother only.

I think it is but fitting that I should pay to the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works a tribute for inspiring this legislation, because on the 18th November, 1975 in contributing to a debate on what was then an amendment to the Marriage Act, the hon. member had this to say. (I am sorry I have not got the Hansard reference, Sir, but it is for the debate in Hansard of 18th November, 1975 on the Marriage Bill.) He says:

"We are faced with another problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker. A man has lived in a house with a woman for numerous years. He begets certain children. He goes to the United States and he wants those children with him. He goes through the fiction of changing those children's name to his, but up to now our law has no provision whereby the children's name can be changed to the father's name, despite the fact that the father and mother have agreed that they have lived together for all those years and have produced these children.

You go through a form of affidavit and the children have to walk with an affidavit, a deed poll, but the original certificates still have the name of the mother. There is no change, so how can we accept one section of the law as giving the father the right to place his name on the register when not giving the child the right to adopt the name of the father in future."

This is where I believe they should have made that necessary provision.

"You do away with the problem of those children having to get deed polls and affidavits."

I think he goes on to talk about the fact that in Barbados over 90% of the lawyers in Bridgetown shy away from providing deed polls for children, because legally they still carry the name under which they were registered at birth, and the view was held that that comment was very applicable and showed certain defects in our laws which we could remedy by means of the Change of Name Bill, and hence this Bill, inspired both by the comment of the hon. member as much as by our desire to reform the whole area of children's and wives' rights, the common law rights of persons in common law unions, as well as to reform the general law.

Under the provisions of the Bill before the House it will be possible for the father of a child of a common law union to have the child's name changed and registered accordingly and the appropriate changes made in the register itself, so that you could either still continue to use the form of the deed poll with an affidavit, or you can go forth and get a new certificate which is registered, since there are certain duties placed on the Registrar to effect the changes in the law.

1.50 p.m.

A Deed Poll will not be necessary as a change of name certainly would in future therefore be issued by the Registrar but I should let hon. members know that these provisions are without prejudice to the Common Law provisions and a person can still continue at Common Law, therefore, to use the method of the Deed Poll.

The Bill provides that "every application for a change of surname

- (a) must be in the prescribed form; and
- (b) must contain the name and proposed name of every individual whose surname may be changed as a result of the application."

Applications for changes of names must be made to the Registrar who must be given enough time to give notice of it in the *Gazette* and he makes up his mind as to whether it conflicts with other names etc., or if there is anything fraudulent about it but he cannot exercise his discretion whimsically because on the basis of that it will be open to the person to make any further applications to the Court if the Registrar acts whimsically or contrary to the objective standards being laid down in the Bill.

We have also conferred on the Registrar in this Bill the power to dispense with the necessity of publishing

notices of the applications, if in his opinion the applicant would be unduly prejudiced or embarrassed by the publication or if the change of surnames was of a minor character and the applicant has been commonly known under that surname for some years and therefore he is also well-known by repute.

I should draw to the attention of the House that under the provision of Clause 16 of the Bill, I believe, the Registrar may refuse registration if in his opinion the name is one that can be used to defraud or mislead the public.

Duty is placed on the Registrar to amend his records to comply in conformity with the Certificate of Change of Name and on payment of the prescribed fee, the applicant is given the relevant Certificate. Notice of the issue of the Certificate is published in the *Gazette*.

We have also provided in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, for the individual whose name has been changed outside of Barbados and whose birth or marriage is registered in Barbados to be enabled to register a change of his name here. Likewise an individual whose name has been changed is entitled to have his new name replaced the former name on any document.

We have conferred on the Registrar the power to revoke a change of name if he is satisfied that fraud, misrepresentation or duress has been used in attempting that change of name.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we have permitted persons in common law union who are spouses within the meaning of that phrase as contained in the Succession Act, to change their names to the names of each other if they so please so that a person who is in some permanent union of five years duration or more and there is a degree of permanence can adopt the name of their reputed husband or wife.

I should state reputed husband or wife because the Bill seeks to achieve equality of treatment and what we have done also is to permit a woman either during marriage or after marriage to continue to use her own name or to use a combination of her name and the combination of the name of her husband as well.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you would be familiar with the fact whereby persons in the professions have continued to be known under their maiden names, particularly Doctors and Lawyers, and this practice is more or less confined to this category of persons but there is nothing at all to prevent other people from continuing to use that name in this stance.

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

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I beg to second that.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2.00 o'clock. This Sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today. 2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that there are no replies to question ready.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: So, we automatically go into Private Members' Business. I am advised there is no Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

MR. SPEAKER: We find ourselves right into Government Business once again. When the Suspension was taken, the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet, but he is not now in his place.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, that further consideration of this matter be postponed at this stage.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. OLDE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980-81 No. 39

Order Number 1(b) was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,278,977 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980-81, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980-81, No. 39 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

HEAD 77 – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION \$1,147 000.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this matter has been debated and redebated. This is an appropriation, so as to have enough money in the Estimates this year to carry out this programme, Sir.

I beg to move, that Head 77 stands part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 79 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Explanatory Notes are very clear, Sir. There is going to be a school meals centre for St. George and it took some time to identify the exact area of land. Now that it has been identified and the architects have carried out their work, they have to be paid, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 79 stands part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980–81 – No. 38

Order Number 1(a) was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$107,414 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1980–81, Part I – Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1980–81 No. 38, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the Central Purchasing System will soon be moved to new headquarters and the Government, through the Ministry of Finance has been advised that it would be in order to have a look at the systems at the Central Purchasing particularly nowadays, in the era of computerisation of stocks and matters of that kind. The Government has approached the Crown Agents for the identification of a Specialist Consultant. We have to appropriate a sum of money, so that the Consultant can be employed to give advice on the modernisation of the Central Purchasing System.

Accordingly, Sir, I beg to move, that Head 19 stand part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the entire Head. There are several subheads under Head 19 and I wish to direct my attention to subhead 10, where the sum of \$1,150,000 was approved under that item to provide stock items for the Central Purchasing Department:

“This amount has proved inadequate due to the introduction of Consumption Tax as a budgetary measure, on most items, after funds had been provided, and also due to currency appreciation regarding overseas orders.

It is estimated that supplementary provision of \$50 000 would, with the available balance of \$7 137.69 under the item, meet requirements to the end of the financial year.”

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter, where this Administration now comes before this Honourable Chamber for this supplementary because of the massive range of Consumption Taxes, which they introduced into this country.

Much is said, Mr. Chairman, of external factors on the cost of living in Barbados and in other countries. Never do we stop to think of the extent to which we ourselves have been contributing to the rise in the cost of living, particularly for middle and lower income groups and it is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that many of those countries which are net exporters of oil have higher inflation rates, than many countries that are net importers of oil.

So that, I think that we must look very carefully at the subsidiary factors within the economic structure of any society before we start attributing inflationary pressures only to external factors and in particular only to oil. If, for example, we were to look at Trinidad; significant inflationary pressure within the economy stemming from factors that are different from those existing in Barbados. We need only to go a few miles across to Venezuela, again, another exporter of oil and yet, you see the kind of inflationary situation existing in that country.

My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that this Tax is a regressive form of taxation.

(Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the Honourable Member for Christ Church South Central were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.)

Dr. HAYNES: I wish to make the point, that in 1975, 1976, the amount of Consumption Taxes derived in this country was somewhere in the region of \$9 million. In 1978, 1979, when, Mr. Chairman, there were some 99 Heads subject to Consumption Tax, or 259 items the amount of yield was \$24 million.
2.55 p.m.

Now, the Minister of Finance came in this Hon. House and introduced a Consumption Tax under 630 Heads involving over 2,000 items, and in the Estimates of 1980-81 said that this would yield an increase of \$3 million, from \$24 million to \$27 million. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, you cannot put that in the Estimates and in a matter of a few days then come back in introducing a budget and produce a tax which would generate somewhere in the region of \$60 million and not \$27 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said this for this reason. I have before me here — I do not think I have to make this a document of the House — this is the Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for the nine months ended 31st December and of November. Let us look, Mr. Chairman, at the period ended 30th November. We will see here that consumption taxes have already yielded \$33 million, \$19 million more than for the corresponding period in the year before, and you will also see that the projections must be that it will not be less than \$52 million and more like \$60 million instead of \$27 million.

Now, where does this money come from? My contention is that in this kind of society consumption taxes, like all other forms of indirect taxation, bear far more heavily on the poor sectors of the community, because it is those people who have to spend the largest proportion of their income in the process of consumption, and consequently it constitutes an unfair burden to the vast majority of the middle and lower income groups in Barbados apart from generating its own inflationary pressures within the society.

Then, Mr. Chairman, when use is computed against a situation where the levels of taxation would have doubled between 1975-76 and 1980-81, and in that doubling of taxation you will see that there has already without the consumption taxes been a major shift in emphasis away from direct and progressive taxation to indirect taxation. For example, Mr. Chairman, you will find that whereas taxes on goods and services would have risen by over 100% from 38 to some \$86 million, exclusive of these additional consumption taxes, that taxes on property, indirect taxation would have gone up by over

100% from \$8.6 million to \$17.7 million, that taxes on international trade would have gone up from \$31 million to \$75 million, that taxes on stamp duties, and these affect every single person and particularly the small people in the society, would have gone up from just under a million to over \$4 million, and other areas of non tax revenue would have doubled from \$16 million to \$33 million, exclusive of the wide range of consumption taxes that have been introduced into this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you already have a built-in situation where you have gradually shifted the burden of taxation from a progressive form to a regressive form of taxation. On top of that you have now introduced a major inflationary component into the economy, an inflationary component which has a greater deleterious effect on the poor sectors of the community, and this is the situation that we have to face with the kind of conservative administration that we have, following the kind of measures taken by Margaret Thatcher and the like in the United Kingdom. In this situation this cannot be allowed to continue. (Mr. WARD: How are you going to stop it?) It will be stopped by a change of administration, and indeed, Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us who have any kind of conscience must recognise that with this kind of level of indirect taxation which can only worsen the lot of the lower and middle income groups in this society, that there has got to be a fundamental restructuring of the income tax system in this country. I do not speak, Mr. Chairman of the kind of tinkering with the income tax system with the introduction of tax credits and that sort of thing, because it is clearly demonstrated that people in the lower income groups can hardly be helped significantly by tax relief in a situation of inflation and a situation where you have the surreptitious introduction of wide ranges of consumption taxation in this country, therefore I am calling for and demanding a total restructuring of the income tax structure in Barbados to take into account the \$60 million that will be taken out of the pockets of the people in this country as consumption tax. I am demanding the total abolition of income taxation below a level which I will state in due course. Also, I am going to be demanding a meaningful restructuring of the rate of taxation in the middle and in the upper income groups, as well as to reflect the levels of indirect taxation inherent in these unjust consumption taxes which have been superimposed on an already punitive income tax system that exists in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not wish to go into this whole question in greater detail, because there will be an occasion in the not too distant future to spell it out in detail, starting outside, the lead up to, and inside on the occasion, but to repeat my call on the Government to recognise that they either made a serious error in judgment in believing that the consumption tax levy in the last budgetary proposals would only yield \$3 million additional, when in point of fact it will yield at least \$33

million additionally, and in any kind of new tax arrangements in this society that that will be taken into account with particular reference to those people on whom these taxes have the greatest and most deleterious and most harmful impact, that is the lower income group.

I think that no hon. member in this Chamber could disagree with the fact, whether it is by design – because it seems to be part of the package of conservative measures used by conservative Governments throughout the world at present, like Mrs. Thatcher's increasing the V.A.T. and so on – whether it is by design that we have had this very interesting shift in the burden of taxation, exclusive of the consumption taxes. If that is the case, then there must be a fundamental – I am not talking about tinkering, I am not talking about \$100 more in this allowance and that kind of thing, I am talking about drastic changes in the income tax structure in this country, and I am talking about abolishing income tax for those people who would pay far more in indirect taxation as a consequence of these consumption taxes than they would pay under any kind of direct income tax situation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would feel that this Resolution has certainly given the opportunity for us on this side to articulate the position for all Barbadians, in particular for the middle and lower income groups, to point out that this Government by its policy not only in relation to indirect taxation, but also in relation to lack of price controls, in relation to the various increases in prices in utilities in which they have a say, that they themselves have contributed significantly to the very high levels of inflation in Barbados, and that it is simply not good enough to try to ram it down the throats of the people in Barbados that the increase in the cost of living in Barbados are exclusively due to the cost of oil and the cost of imported items.

3.05 p.m.

If they say that, they even make their case worse because they have by charging the Consumption Tax on c.i.f. and duty, it is important for the people to realise that when you are paid 5% on c.i.f., and duty at the Harbour, when the wholesaler puts on his markup he puts on his mark-up on that 5%. Then the retailer puts up his mark-up and depending on what the wholesale and the retail mark-up, it can vary from probably 7½% to 10% and there are many of these items that are not at 5% too. Some are at 15%.

There is no point going through the Schedule for this occasion so you can see that what they have done virtually is to substitute a 6% Sales Tax which perhaps had some kind of minimal revenue generation but certainly some fiscal direction in terms of controlling consumption and assisting in your balance of payment position as reflected in the very favourable balance of

payment position which we managed to maintain in 1975 but which was whittled away in the last three months of 1976. Thanks to Mr. David Seale & Co., and his association with the present administration. (ASIDES). I am sorry to have used that name.

To go a little further. If they are saying, Mr. Chairman, that you are importing inflation and you are asking people to pay duty on these goods and then you charge a tax, you find that the tax is a tax on inflation, no matter what price. In every shipment that the price goes up it is 5% on the c.i.f. and duty on the goods coming inside here and that is why you will see that Government's revenue has increased quite disproportionately to the amount of growth within the economy and that is why if you look at the growth rates of 5%, 2%, 3% and 7% – I do not know what is going to be the official figure for this year – and you were to look at Government's revenue in relation to those growth rates you will see that Government could never have derived that revenue unless that revenue was consequential on a rate of inflation about approx. 100% increase in the cost of living over that period of time and it is not a reflection of growth in the economy.

That is the essential point but the problem here, Mr. Chairman, is that the way how the entire Government revenue system is organized that there is absolutely no incentive for Government to get out there and get out in the field and really get inflation under control because one of the main beneficiaries of rampant inflation in the society where you have these kinds of transfers by indirect taxation or even transfers at the level at which you have direct taxation in Barbados you will find that the Treasury of Barbados is the greatest beneficiary and consequently they misinterpret increases in revenue for genuine increases in economic out-put within the society but if you were to take, Mr. Chairman, your GNP per capita and if you were to deflate it, Mr. Chairman, even by their published levels of inflation over a four-year period, you will see that the percentage change, if any, is less than 10% but these figures have all been worked out, documented and they are all there but this is just the opening fire but in due course one will supply the information.

Therefore, I want to make it absolutely clear that as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned, either these Consumption Taxes will be substantially reduced or in the alternate, we will be demanding that appropriate adjustments be made in direct taxation and nothing less than the abolition of income tax below a certain level and that level we will tell you what that level is and it is about at least 300% to 400% more than what you have been trying to come in here and tell the people you are doing for the people of Barbados.

You tell a man earning \$90.00 a week that he cannot pay tax and the amount of tax that he would pay anyhow and all it would give him back is a tin of corned beef, anyhow. If he is a single man 1½ tins of corned beef and if he is married half tin of corned beef. That is what you are giving him back and yet you then slap this indirect taxation on him.

Therefore, there has got to be an across the board re-adjustment of taxation in this country because if we are a mixed economy, and I think that both sides are committed to the principle of a mixed economy in Barbados, that mixed economy can only strive if there is sufficient capital surplus in both sectors, private and public for that effective marriage to contribute to the further development and improve the productivity of this society so the Government is to be soundly condemned for the surreptitious introduction of these levels of Consumption Taxes in Barbados and fooling the general public that they were imposing a tax that would yield \$3 million when in point of fact the additional yield from the previous year would be not less than \$33 million, an increase in yield from \$27 million to approximately \$60 million and no matter how you alter the collection process between February, March and April, no matter when those out-turn figures come up, they will be sufficient information to extrapolate both in relation to this year and the previous year to have a pretty good idea what it would be so that we will not be fooled this time. (ASIDES).

It is \$55 million. There you are and you said it was \$27 million. You put \$3 million in the Estimates and nine days later come in and bring in a Budget. Now, is that right and just? What kind of disrespect that is for this Parliament? That is gross disrespect for Parliament. You cannot come in here and have us debate an item and tell us that you are going to get another \$3 million out of that item and then within a matter of two weeks come inside here and bring in proposals that must have been prepared at the time when they brought in the Estimates. (ASIDES). That kind of thinking is wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: It undermines the Parliamentary process. There can be no justification, Mr. Chairman, and I am charging now, now that he says \$55 million, I am now charging again that there was a significant amount of duplicity and.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, now, please, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He cannot say duplicity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot say that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: If the hon. member does not understand the distinction between Estimates, Revenue and Expenditure, it is his business but he cannot accuse other people of his own qualities.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have steered clear of attacking the integrity or any personal attacks on the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, patiently now, for about 1½ years despite very vicious attacks. I have done so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. This is not the time for any personal comments of that sort. Please carry on with your debate. I can see you have prepared yourself for the next Budget, an Election Year. Please carry on.

Dr. HAYNES: No, Mr. Chairman. It is not a question of preparation. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.
3.15 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some people on that Side, whom I ignore as you know, persistently. There are others whom I do not reflect on for reasons which I do not care to mention, but I would sit down and listen to them attacking me and the time will come when I will reply and my reply will be very vicious indeed.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, the point is that quite clearly, there was either a gross error made within the Ministry of Finance, as to the amount of money which the Consumption Taxes would yield, or alternatively that is the best consumption I can put on it. However, since the Taxes are in existence, the question arises whether to restore social and economic justice in this society, whether one will see a reduction in the number of items under Consumption Tax and whether the Government would heed my call, my earnest call, my pleadings, Mr. Chairman, for the abolition of Income Tax below a level to be stated in due course, when I shall make my final plea to the Government in the next few weeks.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, only today I was reading the Report from the Globan Mail on a statement made by the Premier of Ontario, Mr. Roberts on the dissolution of the Ontarian Legislature one year ahead of the scheduled date for elections and the reason why he did so was to prevent the sort of speech which has just been made by the Honourable Member going out, as representative in any way of serious politics or discussion. It has been very noticeable, that since the year began, the Honourable Member tries to speak before the 6 o'clock news, he speaks on absolute

pejorative terms. There are no limitations on his fundamentals the word which he repeats in every speech and there is no form of compromise in the language which he has used.

The Honourable Member has been shadow Minister of finance for three years going into the fourth year and he has never yet in this Honourable House made the reply to the Budget Speech in his capacity as shadow Minister of finance. On the first occasion, he was here and did not make it, either through a lack of knowledge, or lack of experience. On the second occasion, he gave as an excuse that he had left on professional duty. Let us accept his *bona fides*, in that case. The fact remains, that he did not make it and it has taken him.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of explanation.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not giving way to him, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: I was not shadow Minister of finance during the first Budget. I was not.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On the second occasion, he ran away and I predict that this time he will not make the leading speech in reply to the budget and the Honourable Minister of Finance because he is frightened for him. He is a political coward when it comes to instances of this nature. He is not going to be in a position to make any speech because of the emptiness of his knowledge of economic analysis and the faulty analytical approach that he brings to problems of this nature. That is the point, Sir. How can you take the Honourable Member seriously?

The Honourable Member says that he is calling for a reduction of Income Tax below a certain level. If he is a serious parliamentarian and he has a serious policy he has been in Opposition for four years and we are in the final stages of this Parliament, by this time he would have been in a position to disclose it to the electorate of this country, the so-called certain standard, but he has done neither the analysis nor has he any sincerity in the form of argument that he is putting forward.

It is a fact, that since this Government has been in power, the greatest reduction of Income Tax that has ever taken place in the annals of this country, since Income Tax was introduced in this island from 1921 took place in the four years of this Government. His Government had 15 years and you got an increase in direct taxation, as well as, in indirect taxation over the 15 year period and occasionally a little snipping of allowances given to people.

For the first time, 30 000 people at the lower end of the tax ladder were exempted completely from tax, by

the action of these people. It is a fact. Let us get the facts, Sir. Do not mind the amount of shouting that he does. We can tell him on the Front Bench and on the Back Bench, that we have more people with more commonsense on economic facts and economic analysis than he can ever attain. Thirty thousand people (ASIDES). What is he talking about? What has bothered the Honourable Member in analysing this problem, the Honourable Member does not understand that between 1977 particularly and 1981 there have been four years of consistent growth in the economy, a thing that did not occur in the last four years of Democratic Labour Party rule.

There was in the first, over five percent in the second over five percent, in the third 7.9% and last year well over four percent growth in the economy. Now, those growth rates in a country which had quadrupling oil prices between 1973 and today, those growth rates are contributed directly to the increase in the level of revenue which has accrued in the country and it could never be correct for the Honourable Member to say that an increase of Government Revenue is due only to indirect taxation. (ASIDES).

Let us deal with the point of inflation, Sir. The Honourable Member really should not talk. His colleague from St. Michael South West, who at least has the ability to dress up his language in a more acceptable form and who has a little bit more nous and experience than the Honourable Member about politics, he knows when to concede and when at least to attack, he would not get in here, Sir, and analyse a position, by saying that inflation is the only reason for increase in Government Revenue, that and Consumption Tax, he would not say that, and indirect taxation, he would not say that, Sir. I believe that he is shrewder than the Honourable Member to be able to analyse the position.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member is deliberately misleading this Honourable House in that I was most specific to point out the growth rates for 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979 and I pointed out that I did not know what the official rate would be for 1980, but that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot charge an Honourable Member of deliberately...Order, please.

Dr. HAYNES: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair speaks and everybody keeps quiet.

An Honourable Member cannot charge another Honourable Member of deliberately misleading the Honourable House.

Dr. HAYNES: Unless he can justify it and I am justifying it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must justify this.

Dr. HAYNES: The Honourable Member said that I stated that the increase in Government Revenue was purely a matter of indirect taxation and inflation. In point of fact, you may recall, Sir, that I was most careful to quote the growth rates over the past four years excluding 1980 and to point out, that these growth rates alone could not account for the increase in Government Revenue and that a substantial proportion would have to be inflation and indirect taxation, particularly when most of that indirect taxation is on a percentile basis as in the case of the Consumption Tax. That is what I said.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am glad, that the Honourable Member has got up to try to justify his statement at this stage because in doing so he concedes, he now concedes for the first time because when he gets carried away by the flight of his own language and imagination, he does not record what he is saying and he got up and said that nobody can convince him that it had anything to do with any growth rate and that we were surreptitiously bringing into air situations due to indirect taxation, that is what he said.
3.25 p.m.

The point is, Sir, that there has been real growth in the Barbadian economy consistently, and it is only purblind critics like the hon. member who is at all costs going to get power even if it means going for impressions, according to him, rather than truth. That is the point with him. At all costs he will misrepresent any position, because he is in a position that he is power crazy, Sir. That is the only reason.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is required by the Standing Orders not to make insulting remarks about another hon. member. To say he is power crazy is an insulting remark. He preceded it by saying he will go to any lengths or costs, Sir. That has been held on more than one occasion to be unparliamentary, and I submit that that is unparliamentary. The Clerk at the Table would know.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is only trying to divert my attacks on the policy, Sir. When it comes to the growth of the rate of inflation in Barbados.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. The hon. member has made a statement to which another hon. member has objected on a point of order because of the nature of the statement made, and you are required to make a ruling on the matter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, unless you order me to, I do not intend to give way to any other hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will request you to withdraw "power crazy".

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He is power seeking, Sir. I withdraw power crazy and substitute power seeking. It is well known in Barbados that the hon. member today epitomised the person that is bent on achieving power even if in the process he pulls his colleagues and everybody else with him down, Sir. There is no discretion in the country in the sort of way that he is approaching politics in this country, and he must be exposed for what he is.

I want to deal with his position now on income tax. He says he is going to reduce income tax to a certain level. I defy the hon. member to get up here in the House and subject his level of reduction of income tax in Barbados to any sensible analysis and to give us the figures as to where he is going to raise alternative revenue in the country in order to maintain the level of services. (Dr. HAYNES: Look for the Manifesto). What Manifesto, Sir? If the Democratic Labour Party had it in it to have reduced income tax to any level they would have done it in 15 years. That is the point, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. They are deriving more revenue from consumption taxes than the Democratic Labour Party derived from income tax in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member believes that his height and his ability to scream and shout and to adopt the stance of a Furor is any strength of argument, but when he has to face people who can argue against him he loses his temper, he does not bring any argument. He either loses his temper, he becomes furious, he is demanding, he is compelling. The hon. member must listen, he must stand and listen, Sir.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member cannot continue to mislead the House. For the last five years that the Democratic Labour Party was in power the total amount of income tax in Barbados was \$44.4 million.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman has ruled that that point of order is fraudulent, as fraudulent as the arguments which the hon. member seeks to advance from time to time on the public platform.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have interruptions that are bordering so closely on bad behaviour.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member would learn to conduct himself like a member of Parliament, quietly, Sir....(ASIDE). You see the behaviour, Sir? Sit down and listen. I listened to his speech without a word of interruption, even when I realised that his arguments were false. He has not got it in him to understand that people could differ from him at a high intellectual level and proper analysis without the vehemence that he brings in his language and his conduct. He must learn that in this country you could disagree and go along. At least I can say that for the hon. member for St. Michael South West, he very seldom loses his temper. I have seen him do it sometimes and go out right away and regret it, but not with this hon. member. (Dr. HAYNES: I will now go into Christ Church West). The hon. member could run in Christ Church West, Sir, I dare him to run not in Christ Church West, I would dare him to leave St. Michael South Central and go to one of the new constituencies now. I would take on both him and the right hon. member for St. John together.

On the question of inflation in this country, it is a fact that the whole world without exception, all of the economies of the world have been in inflationary conditions for a long time. The rate of inflation in Israel exceeds 150%, the rate of inflation in Argentina exceeds 50%, the rate of inflation in Brazil is 300%, the rate of inflation in every CARICOM partner with the exception of Trinidad is either similar to Barbados or in excess of Barbados. The rate of inflation in our major trading partners is either as close to Barbados, equal to it or slightly below Barbados. It is a fact that an open economy such as Barbados that depends on external factors and external trade in vital sectors of the economy will continue to import inflation and it must therefore try to continue in the avenues which it has here, the growth of inflation in other respects.

Barbados, on the recent figures available, and on analyses coming from people, for instance, like regional banks, has performed extremely well in controlling inflation in the economy. And what is more, more important than that, Sir, is the fact that real growth in the economy and a transfer of resources across the board, particularly in the lower socio-economic groups in this community, has meant that wages have more than doubled the rate of inflation in Barbados, and there has been a real growth in per capita income, so that despite some inflationary trends people are today better off in real terms than they were in 1975/76.
3.35 p.m.

The only person that would seriously want to contend against that and calls himself a so-call financial expert economist is the hon. member, Sir, because any reputable economist who has looked at the economic data of Barbados has concluded that there has been a real increase and growth in per capita income and not

only in the over-all Gross Domestic Product in Barbados during the last four years and it is therefore, in my submission, a rather pointless argument.

I do not know what particular point it was gearing at other than power seeking to try to contend that the figures represented by the out-turn statements are surreptitious in the way in which revenue has been collected in this country because one has to analyse them much more deeply than the hon. member has done or is capable of doing and not only to analyse them but to understand what they contain for an economy such as ours.

My contention is that the Government in four years has performed extremely well in the economy. People have never had it so good in this country and if you go round from house to house and speak to people they say, despite what the hon. member would say, that we are doing a good job. The Government is doing a good job. We are quite pleased with how this country has progressed in the four and a half years of Barbados Labour Party rule.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to participate in this debate until I heard the Hon. Attorney General who just sat down and I feel bound to join the debate to lay to rest some of the fallacies which emerged from his mouth and which have been emerging from the mouths of Labour Party spokesmen for a substantial number of months over the last two years.

It seems to me that an error continues to be made in their analysis of what is happening or what has happened in this economy and that error reflects itself in the statement made by the Attorney General that there has been real growth in the per capita income of the people of Barbados.

Now, Sir, the Government of Barbados cannot approve or reprobate at the same time. They cannot when they are appearing before the International Agencies, when they are negotiating with such Agencies as EEC, when they are negotiating with the IADB, when they are discussing in the context of the North/South dialogue, they cannot be heard to say that the per capita income in Barbados is a misleading barometer on what is actually happening in Barbados and then when they come to have a domestic debate use this same argument to make a point that there has been growth.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, ever since the CIAT Review of 1974 it was agreed at that Meeting in Washington that countries such as Barbados ought not to be judged in terms of the per capita income only but they ought to be considered with regard to the specific quality of life of the citizens in the particular country. Barbados

was the country being used as an example where a high per-capita income as it was portrayed in the statistical data was misleading.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the CIAT Review of that year clearly accepted, and sitting around that table were people from the IADB, the OAS, the World Bank, Canadian Financial Institutions, the English and British Financial Institutions. In other words the same group of people who are trotting about as authority now when for purposes of propaganda, the Government is seeking to show what good boys and girls they have been.

It has been an accepted form of political propaganda, I think, to use the words of other people to show up your good deeds if you can find any. It is an acceptable form but what we on this side contend is that the Government must start to analyse what is happening in Barbados in the context of what is happening to the actual people who live in Barbados.

Whereas in 1974 and 1973 when we had a sudden increase of 40% across the World in the inflation rate of consumable items, a sudden increase which was started in the Prairies of Canada when wheat prices went up in two days by 40% which was a reflection of a monetary problem which was exaggerated subsequently when the Arabs decided that they could not take the pressures brought on by the economic prices and they in turn precipitated another economic crisis through what is now popularly called the energy crisis.

The World would never have a period like that again. Between 1973 and 1975 was a unique moment in the history of the World for all times because it was the first time in the history of the World that the cost of energy suddenly became part of the economic market in the sense that the economic costs of energy were instituted for the first time. Cheap fuel disappeared. All subsequent increases would have been planned for and were expected. This came like a thief in the night. It was not something that any Government in the World had planned for and so it is quite wrong-headed to attempt in any circumstances to compare that period of time with any similar period of time in the World.

The fact is, Sir, that despite that, the same Agencies which they now quote if they would look at the same publications they would see that similar words were used to describe the performance of the Barbados economy at that time and in 1975 I recall vividly the same CIAT review people made up of the same experts whom I have heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister mentioning, whom I believe the Attorney General adumbrated in his speech

when he was being lucid and whom the Government's spokesmen speak from time to time, the same people said in 1975 that Barbados' performance was spectacular compared with the performance of other developing countries.

The difference then, Sir, was that the people of the community, people living in Barbados had something to draw on in the context of what it gained in the few years before and so were able to withstand and absorb the shock which came into the economy between 1973 and 1974 but they had by 1975 taken the shock absorbers as it were, and they had used them up between 1976 when this Government picked up an economy that had moved to 3%, and I have never heard a single spokesman from the Government deny that yet, that 3% is the level of inflation which this Government found in September, 1976 and I defy anyone on that side or anywhere else to deny or show anything to the contrary that the inflation rate was 3% in September.

3.45 p.m.

Based on their performance, unemployment was at 13% using the normal, natural figures which are available. The Honourable Member asked about unemployment. There was no such thing, as the voluntarily idle. The percentage employment was based on all those persons who were looking for work and could not find it. There was no such thing as the voluntarily idle, so we would not get into unemployment because the Honourable Member would not like that. But their performance in the first three months of 1976, they mentioned that it averaged out, the inflation rate to five percent. Since then, 1977, 1978, 1979 and again, in 1980, the inflation rate in Barbados has gone up steadily, by more than 10% per annum.

Remember, Sir, I said that at that time the shock absorber had been used up, whereas people could have absorbed what had occurred between 1973 and 1975, they had nothing left in the bottom of the barrel between 1975 and 1980, therefore, Sir, the 10% level of increase in inflation would effect the ordinary man more massively between 1975 and 1976, than it would or indeed would 30% have affected him between 1972 and 1973 and if you use the compound interest concept, Sir, between 1977 and 1978, the effect would have been even more dangerous.

So that, if you take the multiplier effect and continue right up to 1980, what we have now Sir is a continuing degradation of the quality of life of the ordinary citizen in the country as a result. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: As a result, Sir, when we discussed the performance of the economy in the context of the quality

of life of the people in Barbados today, it is a fallacy to counteract that argument by suggesting that the per capita income has doubled, or that the per capita has increased because the per capita of a country is no more than taking the total product and dividing it by the number of population.

Now, if on the one hand, you have certain people whose increase went up by \$5 million per annum for five years and persons whose increase went up \$500 per annum for five years, if you took those two persons and you add the \$500 per annum for five years, that is \$25 000 and the \$5 million for five years, that is \$25 million and you have said that \$25 million and \$25 000 is the gross, you divide that by two Sir. You would say, that the per capita income of somebody is \$13 million. (ASIDES)

I sometimes wonder if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Honourable Minister of Finance was aware of Samuelson as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, who is here citing Samuelson page one. That is correct, Sir, it is elementary economics. It is the first thing that you get when you go into the economics class, that is why when Honourable Members of that Side continue to put forward as some orthodoxy, as some philosophy emanating from deep in the fantastic brains of the Barbados Labour Party, I say, Sir, it is just short of foolishness. I say, Sir, that when they continue to do this, they continue to mislead the community into believing that something wonderful is happening. Nothing wonderful has happened Sir. You only have to ask any man, or woman in the streets and they will tell you, that something wonderful will only happen to them again in 1981.....(ASIDES).....when they have an opportunity to speak, they will have an opportunity to say their piece again. (ASIDE: This speech is Eagle Hall work). You, know the Honourable Member for Christ Church North Central said that this speech is better adapted for Eagle Hall. Mr. Chairman Sir, I am beginning to believe, that he is correct because I am certain that my people in Eagle Hall better understand the concept which I am expounding here, than the Honourable Members who sit on that Side. (ASIDE: How would I know?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: The Honourable Member for Christ Church North Central is truly an Eagle Hall person, Sir and therefore, when he attempts to heckle me, I know that it is a friendly heckle. If you lived in my constituency you would vote for me. In fact, I think that all of those Honourable Members, especially the Honourable lady would vote for me, if they lived in my constituency. I am certain of that, Sir. But that is irrelevant at this point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, a little levity does not in any way.....(ASIDE).....deviate.....(ASIDES)..... Mr. Chairman, Sir, a little levity is sometimes desirable to bring these matters in perspective because in the end we are dealing with humans and in the end, Sir, it is good that there is still some element of humanity, which demonstrates itself in this Honourable House. But I hope that the Attorney General the next time that he gets up to deal with the more pungent points made by my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he will recognise that to trot up the same old arguments about the doubling of the per capita income is to say nothing in the context of a country this size, where it is obvious to the naked eye that the ordinary masses have suffered a diminution in the quality of life in this country for the past four years.

They will have to make their case on an index basis, one on one in constituencies. They cannot depend forever on what I choose to call the rhetoric — I cannot say it here I would better say it on the platform — the rhetoric of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister. They will have to go and tell the people themselves in the little houses, why their lives have become such a burden so suddenly in five years. They will have to talk to the people one on one and the people like any good jury will bring in the verdict, Mr. Chairman.

I have no doubt however, that many of them who now smile will not have the opportunity after the bell is rung to smile in here again. Take, for example, my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, now of West Central, yesterday of North West, a man who cannot because of the pressures brought by ordinary people determine where he should rest his head, a man whose heart is heavy as he moved to the left, then found he was not wanted, he moved to the right he found he was not wanted, all that is left for him now, Sir is to move to the centre.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All we have to do is to come to Central Purchasing.

Mr. TAITT: I am going to end now, Sir. I accept the point made by my colleague that an increase of \$1 million of indirect taxation for Central Purchasing is an indication if of nothing else of a certain clumsiness, a certain inefficiency in the ordering of the business of the Government. This business of collecting money on one hand and passing it out through the other is something which cries for reform, that Government agencies functioning for governmental purposes are able to pay revenue into a department of Government which forces us and at the same time, we are forced to come back here and ask for additional money, when that money

which we are asking for is as a result of indirect taxation. There is a suggestion of something not quite quotient.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, the Central Purchasing Department, if we are to understand the Head before us, is only symptomatic of what must be the major difficulty for a number of small businesses in our community who find themselves with an increased consumption tax, who find themselves not getting the kind of assistance from the banking system that they should get, and who therefore find themselves trapped for the necessary expansion capital which they need, which they ought to have. In spite of efforts on the part of the Central Bank, which come more in words than in deeds by the bankers in this country, some of which bankers are behaving not as if they are part of this community, as indeed some of them are not, but they are behaving as if they are gods brought out of heaven by some strange being to wreak havoc on the poor and the medium sized in this country. They seem to feel that only a few persons are entitled to the higher services of the banking institutions, and even in the National Bank, Sir, which has been created ostensibly to solve this problem, we find a different kind of problem which I believe it is not appropriate to discuss in the context of the Central Purchasing Head. At another time and in another place, Sir, in this Hon. House I will deal with that, but I think some hon. members on that side must be aware that the problems which the National Bank were alleged to be solving are not being solved in the manner which they might have wished, and I say that without fear of contradiction, Sir, because the analysis is available for all and sundry to see.

The Barbados Development Bank is again not fulfilling the role, in spite of the statements that are made about its increased lending, it is not fulfilling the role which it was designed to fulfil and which successive Governments have urged it to fulfil, and the reason for that will also be discussed under another Head. Suffice it to say that this supplementary that we are seeking for the Central Purchasing Department is symptomatic of the kind of multiplier difficulty which arises from a wrong headed finance policy where a shifting of the burden of taxation from those who can bear it on to the shoulders of those who may not be able to bear it is not working out to the advantage of the community.

It cannot be gainsaid, what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said, that the Government indicated that it would collect \$21 million or \$24 million in indirect taxation. It now seems as if it will be collecting over \$60 million. If that is so, Sir, it cannot be wrong to suggest that the difference between that \$24 million and the \$60 million must find its way back into the people's pockets, because it came from the people. What is unfortunate is that it will not find its way back into the pockets of the people from

whom it came. Even if it is redistributed, Sir, it will not go back to the lower income groups, because those lower income groups invariably are not within the net of income tax, and I am not one of these persons taken in by this concept of raising the bottom level of income tax. We know that from the time the progressive tax has been introduced into the world that the bottom has been raised from time to time.

When, for example, we make the point that a maid is now making \$500 a month, and that maid finds herself paying income tax, whereas if she was making \$490 she would not have paid income tax, then it is wrong to suggest that she is making \$500 a month. If in fact you add an additional 25% on to the cost of the items which she purchases from the small shop around the corner, you have on the one hand suggested that you are lowering her tax burden, but you have in fact imposed a tax on her which she would never have borne in a progressive income tax system, so that when the difference between \$24 million and \$60 million comes to be redistributed, hopefully a more analytical look will be taken at how this money should affect the economy and how it should get to the people who themselves need it the most. Certainly, Sir, parliamentarians and Ministers would need it less than ordinary people in the community.

I see my time is up, Sir, and I will conclude by suggesting that it is not proper to talk about Israeli inflation at 100% without saying that the total quality of life in Israel is superior to the quality of life in Barbados, and that inflation forms a part of their socialist system of Government. It is not popularly known that the Israeli system of government is a socialist system of government, and therefore using the kibbutz as the base and using the nationalised industry as their methodology, the Israelis have perfected a socialist form of government which although it is divorced in its ideological base from that of the Soviet Union, it nonetheless has the same economic concepts. The difference between the two States is that one is a theocracy and the other one may be a dictatorship, but they are all the same.

To speak about Brazil having 300% inflation in the context of Barbados is not even to compare a donkey and a race horse, for it is now 14 years since Brazil has hovered between 150% inflation and 300%. It must be recalled that Brazil is one of the first countries in the world where printing paper formed the basis of their currency decisions. I am surprised that the Attorney General would seek to quote Brazil, and if one looks at the other Latin American countries, the same argument holds. If he is going to compare them with the Caribbean, let him compare the quality of life which Barbadians had in 1972, in 1974, in 1976, in

1978, and then let us see what has happened in terms of the quality of life in our country.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, when the Central Purchasing Department was set up under the Democratic Labour Party Government, it was strongly believed that administration of that Department would effect certain savings to the Government, but if you look over the performance of that Department over the many years of its existence, one would wonder very much if this has ever been realised, and over and over again on the floor of this Hon. Chamber and in various sections of Government, many many criticisms have been levelled at the Central Purchasing Department. None of the savings that were expected have come about, Government has not got cheaper goods for the same amount of money or even a better efficiency in the procuring and distribution of goods within the Service.

When you look at this Resolution here before us asking for technical assistance in the sum of \$35,000, one would have to concede that this is a good measure, it is an attempt to get the Central Purchasing Department operating efficiently, and I am saying that because I am well aware that the Crown Agents have some experience, have had some great regard for the Commonwealth countries for the way in which they have set about to obtain materials and other goods at good prices for the various Commonwealth countries. This is not to suggest for one moment that we will be returning to a colonial system or that we have any regard for the colonial form of government, but one has to acknowledge that the Crown Agents do have some experience in this matter and it is to some measure that we expect that a consultant from the Crown Agents would go some way in re-organising the Central Purchasing Department in such a way that they would be able to bring about the savings that we anticipated long ago when it was first set up, and at the same time to bring about some efficiency in procuring and distribution of drugs especially, bearing in mind the new drug service that the Government is setting into operation and the other facilities which Government must now use.

4.05 p.m.

What else is going on here I will not elaborate on at this stage because we will soon be running into the Estimates but it certainly did not give satisfaction to me as a Minister. It certainly did not give satisfaction to many civil servants in other Departments outside of the Central Purchasing Department and I am convinced, judging from the remarks made here from time to time on the floor of this Honourable Chamber that some members of the Government Party have not been satisfied with the performance of the Central Purchasing Department. What has happened in practice is that they have really transferred the habits which have been a feature of certain individual

Departments to the Central Purchasing Department. In other words they have centralised bad habits in purchasing, storage and distribution of goods.

Previously it was a common thing for nearly every Department to go into town or to send into town for everything they needed. You have centralised that but the same habits, the same practices which have gone on and have been a feature of the various Government Departments have now become a feature of the Central Purchasing Department and unless you are going to get a system which is really going to set out to administer itself in such a way that the economies which you can get by bulk purchasing, proper storage and proper distribution of goods within the various Departments of Government, you will not be able to bring about the saving in the economy which you hear talked about from time to time.

A lot has been said this afternoon, Sir, about the Consumption Tax. I am not going to go into that or repeat what has been said but what I want to draw to the attention of Government is that if they are aware of the feelings of the public in this country about the Consumption Tax, then they would be a bit reluctant to get up in this Chamber or any other platform in this country and talk about the amount of money which that Tax is bringing in to the Government.

It may be \$55 million as the Leader of the House has said or it may be less or it may be more but the important point that I wish to bring to their attention is that the public of this country is dissatisfied with that Consumption Tax just as they have been dissatisfied with the Sales Tax which was introduced by the preceding Democratic Labour Party Government because, in reality, what the Consumption Tax is doing is increasing the price of some commodities to people and it is no point trying to explain to the public or to a person when that person goes to buy an item that the price is this and the Consumption Tax is something else because whenever he adds them together, in his estimation, he is paying more for the particular item.

It is also strongly felt at large in this community that the introduction of the Consumption Tax is a step towards a partial goods reduction in income tax and when people hear of the amount of money which has been accumulated through this imposition of the Consumption Tax they will be expecting that they are going to be a satisfactory reduction in direct taxation at the same time during 1981. Therefore, I will say, it does not take any Solomon to anticipate that or to believe there must be the same reduction in direct taxation because all along the fact is in the minds of the people that this increase in Consumption Tax and the amount of money which has come about from the imposition of Consumption Tax must redound at some date in the future to the benefit

of the people of this country and one way of doing that is by reduction of direct taxation.

If we are to wait and hear at a later stage that this is not going to be the case then it is going to be expected that the people are going to be more dissatisfied with the imposition of this Consumption Tax and I repeat for the benefit of the Government benches that the people of this country are viewing the Consumption Tax in the same light as they viewed the Sales Tax. Therefore, they would have to explain to the public, not to us, and make us want to feel like them, that the collection of another or an additional \$55 million by the Government is something to shout about.

We expect or we have to expect that Government is concerned about raising revenue for its various forms of activity and, Sir, for a Finance Minister, an imposition of Consumption Tax may be a good way of raising this revenue or part of this revenue. The public outside expects any Government and maybe every Government to bring about a reduction in the various forms of taxation so that they would have more money to spend as they like. Some balance has to be struck between Government raising money and the concession that they are going to give to the public in taxation whether that taxation is going to be direct or indirect.

If the balance that is struck, if it can be so termed, is not satisfactory to the public, then you can expect them to growl and judging from the performance of the public or the reaction of the public, they are not happy about that. One does not have to look at what is going on in the Latin American countries or in Asia or in any other part of the World. One has to look at what is going on in Barbados and see how the people of this country are feeling about the imposition of that tax and if you have assessed it properly you would have got the message that either you are going to make a reduction in the Consumption Tax or you are going to give them back some benefits this year in the form of reduction or indirect taxation and that is my view on this matter.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think that in replying there is one thing I would like to point out; the amount of money that we are voting is the sum of \$50,000 not \$1 million as someone has said. The \$1 million was appropriated at the Estimates time and the Addendum to the Resolution makes it quite clear that subsequent to the passage of the Estimates two things have occurred which have necessitated the need for the Supplementary provision of \$50,000. One is currency appreciation overseas and secondly that some of the items which are imported by the Central Purchasing Department, Consumption Tax now become eligible to be paid thereon.

Obviously, any mathematical computation would show very clearly that even leaving out the increase of

currency appreciation abroad that \$50,000, according to my method of calculation, is 5% so that we are talking about an order of the magnitude of the maximum of 15% in respect of Consumption Tax.

To show that there is no overall 5% one has also to compute the same for the amount of currency appreciation. There is no doubt about it that the pound from which we import still regrettably as far as I am concerned, because my belief is that if the British pound having reached the height that it is today, that every importer in Barbados, as a matter of duty to himself, should look for alternate sources of supply, tell the British keep their goods high priced as it is, with a bad delivery record and things of that kind. But the truth of the matter is that despite what the other side would like to portray to the public there has been substantial reductions in the instances of Consumption Tax on a large variety of goods, particularly those goods which form an essential part in the Cost of Living Index.

The Government not so long ago came in here and announced that all duties and Consumption Tax on Drugs were to be removed.
4.15 p.m.

We know that on some building materials paints and things of that kind Consumption Tax has been removed. In short, there has been a widening of the scale of eligible articles, but in respect of essential articles, it is the sensual thesis of this Government that the burden of Consumption Tax has been lessened. Of course, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in his zeal and in his desire at any opportunity to pontificate on what he would so, if he were Minister of Finance today he continued in his normal fashion.

When Estimates are prepared, they are prepared between October and January they have to be prepared between October and January for the simple reason that they have to be printed and circulated, so that, they can be passed by the end of our Fiscal Year, which is 31st March. Therefore, revenue departments send in their Estimates of Revenue somewhere between October and December in the year previous to the year of the next Fiscal Year.

I also want to inform the Honourable Member, in case he becomes Minister of Finance, because obviously he needs a much longer period of apprenticeship that he cannot accuse a revenue department of sending in estimates in October on the Consumption Tax of knowing what the Budgetary Provisions in April will be. So, therefore, there is no question of any duplicity. How can you accuse an Honourable Minister of Finance of duplicity because an Honourable Minister of Finance finds it necessary in the course of his Budgetary Speech, which is prepared after the Estimates, become very clear, after an

assessment of the economic performance of your country and which is delivered in April? Obviously if there appears to be a gap between the level of existing revenue and the level of expenditure some measure will have to be taken to bridge that gap, unless you want to run a deficit and it would be most irresponsible, on the part of an Honourable Minister of Finance to communicate the contents of his Budget to anybody before that Budget was delivered in the Honourable House of Assembly, other than a narrow group of people, who are responsible for the preparation and typing of the Budget.

What does the Honourable Member expect, that the Honourable Minister of Finance, who has to deliver his Budget in April must tell the departments who are responsible for collecting revenue in October, "Look, I am going to in April increase taxes in this direction. When you send in your Estimates of Revenue, increase the revenue to take into account the taxes which have not been introduced yet." That would be a profound act of irresponsibility. Do you know what would happen? Every importer in Barbados, every person in Barbados would take advantage of that fore knowledge. The charge of duplicity can stand no examination. It only illustrates once again, the lack of experience, the lack of understanding of how these matters are done. That Honourable Member, the more he speaks, the more he shows, that he needs a longer apprenticeship before he can be entrusted with that profound responsibility of being an Honourable Minister of Finance in Barbados. The more he speaks, the more he will disclose that.

I also want to point out Sir, that at the time of the Estimates and at the time of the Budget, no lesser person than the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition himself said of these Estimates, "but, you have not included the magnitude of the salary revision increase in your expenditure". I remember him challenging me and saying, I remember the word vividly, "The surplus that would be no surplus because you only had a \$23 million budgeting surplus and you had not put in anything for a salary revision when negotiations at that time were going along with the Unions." Of course, everybody expects it and knew that there would have to be a salary revision. The Agreement had expired and at the same time, during the course of this financial year, you would have had to have an additional appropriation to cover the cost of that.

So, when you talk about an increase in Consumption tax, we must remember that a Government raises revenue to cover its recurrent expenditure and in the context of Barbados, it must make a contribution, by way of surplus towards the Capital Development Programme, or unemployment would reach 50% in Barbados. Government is the greatest barometer of employment and economic activity. The private sector in Barbados does not initiate, they wait until Government starts it and

then follow suit. That has been the history of Barbados under all Governments, so that, we must look at the Consumption Tax in the light of the overall Government expenditure. We must also look at it in relation to other taxation and this is where I want to deal with income tax.

In the same Budget Speech it was clearly pointed out, that there would be a drastic reduction across the board of income tax not only at the lower levels, but right across the board. But, Mr. Chairman because of the fact, that we have a different method of assessment of income tax than some other countries, that your year of assessment is based on your previous year of income, it was impossible in 1980 to reduce your tax relief, except for the year of income 1980. So that, this year, the year of assessment 1981, on your year of income 1980, you will feel the benefits of the Income Tax reduction and that is what is going on now.

Who can forget, Mr. Chairman, the fact, that there were two months last year, when everybody in Barbados, whose taxable income under PAYE was less than \$1 600 got tax free months? Who could forget that? It may be convenient for the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to forget that, but even the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has got a reduction already in his income tax for 1980 and he has not sent in his final assessment yet.

I would like to point out, that the estimated value of income tax reductions on the Budget of 1980 at that time and from my memory in the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's Speech was around \$30 million to \$35 million.
4.25 p.m.

If you look at the new PAYE tables, taking into account the tax free concessions, if you look at the new mortgage payments, reductions of interest, if you look at the new depreciation rates, all of those things, the tax reduction was in the last budget, you already begin to feel the effects of the tax reduction because you have had two months, August and December.

This question of income tax. It is very, very amazing to me, the presentation of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, because for a long period of time, he even brought a Resolution in here calling for income tax reduction, just before the last budget; a publicity gimmick, because we had promised in 1979 that there would be an income tax reduction. I want the hon. member to tell the public of Barbados what method is he going to use if he ever becomes Minister of Finance to ensure that there is a surplus on Current Account and a contribution to Capital Expenditure. Or does he believe that this is a country that can run without a revenue account, surplus on Current Account, and make no con-

tribution to Capital Expenditure? I want him to tell the public that.

I notice today that he is saying that at the appropriate time he will tell the public what level of income he will abolish income tax from. Now, I never heard of this yet. That is a terminological inexactitude when he talks about abolishing income tax only for certain people. That is foolishness, that is an attempt to convey to the public one thing when you mean something else. That is not abolition of income tax, what you are doing is raising the level of income which is eligible to pay income tax and already that has been raised in Barbados. In addition to the fact that the rates have been changed, the rates of income tax on certain levels of income have been changed, there has been a reduction in income tax in Barbados as a result of the last budget. (Dr. HAYNES: \$17 million).

The hon. member is a computer. All of the tax returns have not come in yet, so therefore the hon. member is saying that it is \$17 million. I know that the salary revision cost \$60 million gross, the largest ever amount of money that has been paid out by any Government in the whole history of Barbados was paid out to the Public Service of this country by this Government in October, November and December last year. There is no doubt about that, somewhere you had to find the money to pay it. You cannot have an increase in salaries, you cannot have an increase in the cost of goods that are necessary to run the Government, fed through by the oil price increase, you cannot have a reduction in income tax, you cannot have an increase in expenditure and at the same time do not make provision to raise some revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity. I know that the true criterion is what the public feels about their quality of life, and I know that there are more houses in Barbados today than there were in 1976, I know that there are more people working in those households than there were in 1976, I know that there is more electricity in those houses than there was in 1976, I know there is more water, more television sets, more refrigerators, more motor cars, and I know that the income in those households has gone up in excess of the cost of living during that period of time. If, Mr. Chairman, that is not an improvement in the quality of life, then I do not understand how you judge the quality of life.

I welcome the debate, and the Government has no apology to make for carrying into effect policies which have worked. You cannot accuse this Government of following Mrs. Thatcher, Mrs. Thatcher came into power after this Government. Mr. Chairman, I know and I am convinced that any attempt by the hon. member to sell anything in Barbados will be viewed with suspicion now. You cannot blame me for my feeling, because I feel that

Barbadians are intelligent, and I feel that they are able to assess very clearly fact from fiction, solid argument from political argument. I believe that. The Savings Accounts in this country have risen tremendously since 1976. You can argue all those things about distribution, Sir, I know there are 52 odd thousand motor vehicles in Barbados now. I know that there are more households in Barbados now with motor cars in them than there were under the Democratic Labour Party. I know that the applications for houses.....(Mr. TAITT: How many minibuses?) I will deal with that. There are more applications for houses, people have been able to meet the down payment and to meet the terms and conditions, than under the Democratic Labour Party. Nothing they say over there can convince the public of Barbados that they are not enjoying a superior standard of living now to what they enjoyed in 1976.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Head stand part.

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

HEAD 30 – JUDICIARY

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 stand part. It is self-explanatory.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, all of us in Barbados are very proud of the heritage that we have in the Judiciary of Barbados, and we certainly are favoured with having such honourable people filling the posts of Judges and Magistrates, but what concerns me at this time is the penalty that is issued by these Magistrates and Judges on the increasing number of robberies we are having where the people are armed.
4.35 p.m.

Numbers of the tourists in Barbados that are being robbed today if they at all resist the people taking their handbags can be sure that it will not be long before a knife is drawn on them. There are also instances where guns have been used. I do not know myself what the penalty is that these magistrates place on these people when charged but I certainly feel that the time has come when the Government will have to increase or make very severely the charges against people who are prepared to cut the visitors up that come to this country because they do not release their properties willingly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross-talk please.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, it will not be long before these same people will start to use knives and guns on the Policemen of this country if they have not started

to do so already and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that since this matter of the Judiciary has come up before us today, we ought to take a look.

I was extremely pleased last week to hear the Attorney General on Television and also in the Press speaking of upgrading the Police Force in Barbados. I know it was only a matter of time because the Police Force and Judiciary have to work together to keep law and order in this country and there is no way, Mr. Chairman, that this Government is going to permit a handful of lawless people trying to bring the name of Barbados into disgrace that we cannot control what is going on in this country and the locals as well as visitors cannot walk the streets as they should be able to do. The Attorney General spoke about upgrading the Police Force and I have confidence that this will answer some of the criticisms of Barbados in this direction and I say of the Attorney General that he should be congratulated for his step in this direction.

As far as the Tourist Industry is concerned, Mr. Chairman, it has been severely hurt by a handful of lawless people in this country and I believe that the move by the Attorney General if properly used by our Public Relations Departments in other parts of the World would make the people aware that this country is not going to allow its reputation as being a law abiding society to be interfered with by just a handful of lawless persons.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know the method in which Commissioners of Police are appointed in Barbados but I would like to say this. I have the highest respect for all these gentlemen that have filled these posts in my memory, men of integrity, decency, uprightness and suited to the Departments. Right now in Barbados we need not to give the next old fellow inside in line a job. We have got to get a young man to be Commissioner of Police, a man who would go into Nelson Street, Suttle Street and Baxters Road and pick up the lawless men, or a lawless person and put in the back of his van, pelt them in there, if necessary. The time for nice old gentlemen filling these posts has got to come to an end.

We want men both physically (ASIDES). Like you and I. Like the Deputy substitute Leader of the Opposition this evening. He and I. We want men, Mr. Chairman, at the head of the Police Force who can give an example. Men who can walk Nelson Street, Suttle Street, up Bay Street and Baxters Road any time of the night and themselves can arrest the men. The time for nice old gentlemen who sit at tea parties with ladies and talk about the latest programmes on television cannot suffice. It takes men with guts and courage to get out there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the Magistrates up there too?

Mr. WARD: No, Mr. Chairman, but we want people that the Magistrates and Judges would be able to back up with strength because the Police Force and the Magistrates are all part of law and order in this country but I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this time has given me the opportunity first of all to congratulate the Attorney General on the upgrading of the Police Force in this country, to restore law and order because the people in Barbados are not satisfied that our good name should be tarnished and I am looking forward to the Government taking some action in this direction.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we cannot allow that speech to go untouched, Sir. It is not often in the course of a life of a Government that a member of the Government side makes the kind of speech which suggests that the Commissioner of Police should go home and make way for a younger man but what I would like the substantive Minister to do is to get up and tell me.....

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, that is below the level. On a point of order. I never said that the Commissioner of Police should go home. I said that the future appointment of Commissioner of Police.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Mr. WARD: I said that he is an honourable, decent and dignified gentleman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member I am sure did not quite clearly understand what was said.

Mr. TAITT: Tell me what I did not quite clearly understand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

Mr. TAITT: I suspect, Sir, that the hon. member intended to say or probably did not intend to say what he said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot suspect about an hon. member.

Mr. TAITT: I can only say what I heard, Sir. He said that the time for men of integrity, men of decency, men who are soft, men who are fit for tea parties had passed. That is what he said and I am sure that the present Commissioner of Police is accepted by both sides, a man of integrity, etc. However, Sir, one can only conclude that a different type of Commissioner is being called for from the back bench of this Government and I know.....

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I never said that and this twisting of things. I have

already said that we want a man that is able to go into the streets. I never said that the Commissioner does not have integrity. We want people with integrity, decency, honesty but people who are also able to arrest when the time comes. It is as simple as that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point taken. Will the hon. member stick to this Resolution and this Head. All that talk is unnecessary and I think we have had enough of that. Let us stick to the matter before us.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, I want to keep to the point of the Magistrates Court. I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. member, Sir, that it does not matter what kind of Commissioner you have when you are dealing with the Magistracy. I would really not like to see that we are going to go back to the stage where we had a Police Magistrate, where the Magistrate would form part of the Law Enforcement Agencies as an extension of the Police Force and the gravamen of the hon. member's speech would be to suggest that there will have to be more cruel treatment to some of these persons who are brought before the Courts. I do not believe that that was his intention, Sir, but that was the gravamen of his speech.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order again, Mr. Chairman, I said that the people who go and rob other people and then use knives on them that there should be a severe penalty. Yes, I said that, robbing with guns and knives.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Take your seat. That is not a point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Yes. I do not understand why he makes a point of order to agree with what I said that he said, Sir. The point I was making is that the hon. member could not have intended what came out of his speech.
4.45 p.m.

I do not believe, since I have a knowledge of the Honourable Member, that he intended that the consequences of the statement which he made because he seems to be suggesting, there was an implied suggestion in his speech, that the magistrates are not handling certain kinds of offences in the manner which he would like to see them handled and that manner as I understood him would seem to suggest a little harsher treatment for certain offences. That is how I understood his speech.

The only point which I would wish to make is that as long as the magistrates are doing a fair job Sir whether the people cut up tourists, whether they cut up Honourable Members, or whether they cut up their next door neighbour, when they go before the courts we need primarily Sir to know, that the quality of justice which

will be dispensed from, the magistrates' Bench will be such as to allow us to continue to withhold the confidence which we have always had in the Magistracy.

Now, the Honourable Members' Speech, if heard by persons who do not know him and if read by people who do not know him might give an impression which he does not intend to convey. I am not attacking the Honourable Member, Sir, I am trying to assist the Honourable Member and his Side in not conveying to the public, that there was a call, from the Honourable House of Assembly for harsher treatment to deal with certain offences.

It seems to me that the statement by the Honourable Attorney General that there will be some attempt finally in Barbados to have a Forensic Laboratory is something which we have been discussing and hearing about for quite a number of years. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North Central confirmed that we have for some time been insisting that there be a Forensic Laboratory in Barbados which would assist the police in solving some of the more esoteric crimes.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in this country a few people are poisoned and that in the courts the police are unable to bring the appropriate charges precisely because they are unable, with the lack of a Forensic Pathologist to put the kind of evidence before the court that is required for the kind of decision which ought to be made in such cases and I hope that finally, when we hear because in election year, we hear of a number of things that are going to be done, we hope, that when that laboratory is established that it will be established along certain lines.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this point. Until the whole structure of the law enforcement process in Barbados is reorganised along lines that may be described as functional lines, we are going to continue to have the kinds of difficulties which the Honourable was alluding to. Let me show you what I mean Sir. How could we expect to attract the level, or the quality of medical investigator whom we must have in the Caribbean, if we offer the kind of reward which is set out for such persons in our civil Establishments. I believe, that by now, we in the Caribbean certainly, during the last five years or so, we in the Caribbean ought to have reached some arrangement by which Caricom countries share the cost of a top class Forensic Specialist, who would be available to all the countries in certain kinds of cases and who would be paid for ease of administration not necessarily by any one Government, but from a pool arrangement, by all the Governments to serve through the Caribbean Community Secretariat, or some other institution.

I believe, Sir, that when one looks at the role which Barbados has played and continues to play in the Eastern Caribbean that any laboratory which we set up in Barbados ought to take into account the needs of the

other Caribbean countries in the area, as they relate to this kind of crime. It seems to me that unless we do that, all we will do in the end is put up another building have another opening, but we would not have gone anywhere towards solving the particular problem.

As it stands now, Sir, if a man is accused, for example, commits the crime of murder by some foreign substance injected into the human system, poison, even the least competent attorney will be able, on the basis of arrangements which we have in the islands, except in the case of Trinidad and Tobago to get a no case submission that is acceptable to any magistrate, for the simple reason that we do not have the quality of investigative machinery and personnel which would allow such a charge to stand. I would like to hear, from the Government that they intend to take steps in this direction so that the job of magistrates would be made easier.

We have been debating in this Honourable House about the reform of the magistracy and I believe that one of the errors that we have in the Caribbean is that when a man comes to the legal profession for the first time and he joins the Government Service as a Lawyer, among his early jobs, or her early jobs is likely to be that of sitting as a magistrate. It strikes me that there is something fundamentally cockeyed about that.

A magistrate is required to dispense justice and ought to be a person who by his experience and when I say his, I mean his and her, both his experience and his training would be in a position to dispense justice and temperate it with mercy. I am not suggesting that magistrates in Barbados have not done that, but they have had to learn the craft on the bench and it would be better if some of the older lawyers, Sir could be induced by the quality of incentive to sit on the magistrates' bench, persons like the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West Sir, when we see him performing in this Honourable House in his capacity, I believe that if he were a magistrate Sir, that we could depend on him, or persons could depend on him to dispense justice in an impartial, but at the same time experienced manner. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please.

Mr. TAITT: Of course, the Honourable Member being learned in Law is removed from the same arena as those officers of the Honourable House, and like yourself, Sir who are not schooled in Law, but that is immaterial and irrelevant, I will not be drawn into that, Sir. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk, please address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Seriously, Sir, I believe that the system which obtains in Jamaica, in terms of having senior magistrates and junior magistrates and having more than one magistrate sitting in more than one jurisdiction are all reforms which cry out for implementation in Barbados. I really think, that to have a magistrate at District A, a magistrate at District B and a magistrate at District C is not useful in the context of smoother and quicker dispensation of justice in the court. It seems to me, that now that the Government has abolished the parish boundaries for all practical purposes, that the question of jurisdiction of a magistrate ought to relate to the workload other than to the district the workload not in terms of mixing all types of cases. It would permit some specialisation. But Sir to relate only to the districts and when we hear all of the arguments which have been put forward about the quality of accommodation, which the magistrates have to endure, when we take into account the cost of travelling for a number of persons in the community, who have to go before magistrates' courts, it seems that a proper reform of our system would envisage more magistrates functioning in a completely different way from that in which we know them to function.

4.55 p.m.

I am not here talking about the quality of work inside the courtroom, I am talking about the number of cases which come before Magistrates. We have in this country still a long time between the time when a person is charged and the time when that person may find himself before the courts, and as I understand it from the practising attorneys, having to go from one physical jurisdiction to the other presents an insuperable problem which results in their having to ask for postponements, which in turn results in Magistrates and other judicial officers having to postpone decisions on cases which for the people who bring the cases it can sometimes be very perplexing, very confusing, and on the odd occasion without the requisite amount of justice, especially as seen by the person who brought the case.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to criticise the Judiciary in Barbados, I think Barbados is very blessed to have had men of quality and women of quality sitting on the Bench at all levels throughout our history and I hope that in spite of what the hon. member for Christ Church North Central said, that it will not be misunderstood to mean that we were looking for harsher penalties rather than we would look for a better enforcement of the law at the level of implementation so far as the Police Force is concerned, and we will continue to leave the dispensation of justice in the hands of the Magistrates who after all are the ones who deal with the cases in all their ramifications as they come before them.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes the judgments of varying Magistrates in the same kind of case can be very perplexing to the community as they observe them, and I believe that there is good and sufficient reason for us occasionally from This Place to remind those who dispense justice that all eyes turn to the courts, because when the political masters, whichever side they come from, tend to go too far, it is only the courts where the ordinary citizen can turn to find justice. I hope that we will continue in that tradition.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two observations with respect to comments made by the last hon. member, and particularly to do with the Judiciary and also to do with the Commissioner of Police, and to make my position, and hopefully that of the Government, clear.

I am glad that he said that in a society like ours that when all things seem to go wrong the people look to the courts, for I believe he wants to say protection, secured in the knowledge that the court is a place which at all times dispenses justice, and we will hope that the courts or the people who sit on the Benches in the courts will for ever be out of politics and cease to be in the arena of the day to day political activity as we see them in the country especially today. In doing so, I just want to make a remark, and I hope that the remark which I am going to make is certainly without foundation but the information coming through to me is that there are officers in the Judiciary at the moment who might be shortly seeking political honours, and I would hope that they will remove themselves from the Bench or cease to be actively campaigning. It is not healthy for the community as a whole, it is not healthy for the dispensation of justice that people who are deeply involved in politics should be sitting on the Bench.

The Barbadian people have a great respect for their judicial institutions, and we feel that the fountain of justice should be kept pure at all times and that those people who go into the muddy waters of politics should divorce themselves from the administration and the dispensation of justice in the land.

I hope that those few remarks which I have just made would go out, and if there are targets out there to be found that the targets would be found, and that those people who might be involved in political campaigning and yet at the same time sitting on the Bench and hopefully dispensing justice, that they will desist from mixing both since the public does not feel that politics and justice go together.

I just want to sound a note of warning in that direction, because I can be very caustic when the time comes if at all it is revealed that there are people who

are still sitting on the Bench who will be seeking honours when the bell rings for the next election.

With respect to the question of the Commissioner of Police, let me make the position abundantly clear. I do not think that much as we do not want a weak man, physically, to be a Commissioner of Police, that we really want a man of brawn. I believe the man you want is a man of brains. For the type of crimes you have to face today you need an administrator who is an intelligent, able and level headed person, a person who in the face of all the problems that are coming all over his head can sit calmly down and come up with the solutions to meet those problems.

It is my view that in the present Commissioner of Police you have such a level headed man. He is unobtrusive in his approach to matters, he is not a man who keeps a lot of noise, but you do not get good results, or the best results, from people who keep quite a lot of noise, you do not get the best from people who are show-offs, you get results from people who are quiet, dedicated and sometimes unnoticed in their approach to matters, and I feel that the present Commissioner of Police and the present Police Force as now structured, is moving towards the desired goal which this Government and country feel the Police Force should go, because since the strictures by the Malone Commission I believe that the Police Force itself has taken the necessary steps to put its own house in order, and I do believe that there can be no worse a time than now for anybody to say anything, no matter who that person is, which will adversely reflect upon the Police Force. The police have had sufficient, it is time now to lay off and give them a chance to renew themselves and to gather their strength.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West dealt with the question of a forensic laboratory. The Government Laboratory is equipped for that purpose, and much as he went further afield and said he thought the time had come when we should make a regional approach in this direction, I am not quite sure how these regional organisations will work. We have had our experiences with these regional systems, and we know that we hear today that we are all one, and tomorrow we hear that one person or one country is going its way and the other countries going another way and what have you.

With the limited resources at our disposal, and the present very modern laboratory we have with the necessary equipment to carry out such developments which will deal with normal legal and forensic work, I believe that all we need to do is to provide the staff, and we do not need quite a lot of staff, what we need is a forensic pathologist — and I think at the moment one is being sought and will soon be installed, if he has

not yet been installed. I give the hon. member the assurance that we are looking in this direction.
5.05 p.m.

The criminal today, Mr. Speaker, is more sophisticated. In the past it was easy to track down a criminal. Today, it is not so. In the past when someone carried away a sheep, pig or goat, you could easily track him down. Sometimes when he carried it away, you could easily go and see where it was.

Today, they are not concerned with that. Today, they have a system where something is shipped from Jamaica into the Port and the box, trunk, package or suitcase will remain there for a few days or even months. Then the man will go and tell a carter or freighter to go down into the Port with these papers or documents, and collect that item for him and you will find that unless they are very careful, you will find that the boxes, or trunks, or what have you will leave the Port and go out unnoticed.

When I was responsible for the Ministry of Communications and Works, I used to say that I did not think that at the Port anything should be auctioned unless it was opened. They were people who used to bring boxes with valuable items and refuse to pay duty on them but would leave them there until they came up for auction and then purchase them there. To me that was the wrong approach.

I have had recent discussions with Mr. Douglas, the Chief Customs Officer in connection with a number of things that are coming into Barbados through the new system of bringing goods into this country and he has given me the assurance that he will have a careful look whenever they are unpacking the items which are coming in. The criminal is always one step ahead of the investigators and therefore you must beef up your system as you go along and the Government is aware of this and we are taking every step to ensure that we keep very close to the criminals even though they may be slightly ahead of us and it is in this vein that this Government is moving and I want to say again that I have got full confidence and I am sure the Government as well in the present Commissioner of Police in the direction in which the Police Force is going at this moment.

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

HEAD 39 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head stand part. The note is self-explanatory.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I observe that the substantive Minister is not in his chair and therefore I would not ask a number of questions but I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House is in a position to tell us of the progress if any, that has been made since the so-called Simmons Report on the Government Industrial Schools.

You will recall, Sir, that there was a very serious breakdown of morale and administration of that Institution. I believe a Commission was set up and that Commission reported. I have not, to my memory, seen or heard any indication in this House as to what, if any of the recommendations made by this Commission will be followed and what other steps, if any, were being taken or had been taken to improve the quality of the administration of the Government Industrial Schools.

As I said, I observe that the Minister is not in his place. I would not presume that the Leader of the House would have the details or would have as intimate a grasp as the Minister but if he is in a position to shed some light on that matter I am sure we on this side will appreciate it.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Obviously I would not be in a position to say which of the recommendations have been accepted. I can say that generally Cabinet accepted the general tenure of the Report and that steps are being taken to improve the physical conditions at the Schools. From the reports that have been made to Cabinet, it is fairly clear that there has been improvement in the discipline at the Institution. A number of new appointments were made as hon. members will appreciate and I have no doubt that between now and the next Financial Year additional steps will be taken.

Only earlier today a sum of \$63,590 was voted for the improvement and accommodation in the kitchen, dining hall and other areas of the Schools during the current Financial Year. It was in the second Resolution. This is also part of the recreational room, waiting room and the provision of a Clerk/Typist. I believe one of the complaints that was set out before the Simmons Commission was inadequacy of staff as well as inadequacy of physical accommodation.

The fundamental decision of the creation of a Borstal type of institution is a matter which I am sure will not be dealt with on a Supplementary Resolution but that would have to be dealt with bearing in mind not only the recommendations of the Simmons Committee but also the recommendations of another Committee which was appointed with someone from the University, I believe, of the West Indies, a Criminologist from there on general penal reform in Barbados but having seen no

disturbing headlines or having heard no disturbing reports before Cabinet, it appears as though conditions have settled down and efforts are being made by Government to pass the necessary money for the physical accommodation and for the security system to be improved greatly.

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee to Mr. SPEAKER and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Dr. CHELTENHAM, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 24, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. JOHNSON: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, February 24, 1981 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.15 p.m.