
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th September, 1981

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, 15th September, 1981.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A. (Econ.); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Education); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Health); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A., (Minister of Labour and Social Security); Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A., (Hons.), M.A., LL.B. (Hons.); Hon. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M. A., (Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.); Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. L. A. WEEKES; Mr. M. A. KING; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.A.S., J.P.; Mr. N. K. SIMMONS; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were led by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 21st July, 1981.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 21st July, 1981 be taken as read and be confirmed.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by Hon. Members, let those Minutes stand confirmed. (PAUSE) Those Minutes are confirmed.

The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 8th September, 1981.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that the Minutes of Tuesday, 8th September, 1981 be taken as read and be confirmed.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: In like manner, if there are no observations by Hon. Members, let the Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 8th September, 1981 stand confirmed. (PAUSE) Those Minutes are confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received the Report of the Accountant-General for the Financial Year 1980–81. Also, copies of Accounts and Statements for the month of May, 1981 as prepared by the Accountant-General. Also, Statements and Accounts for the month of June, 1981 as prepared by the Accountant-General.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice of

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Hastings, Christ Church; and also Sir,

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Boscobel, St. Peter.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice of a resolution in the following terms:—

WHEREAS there is grave concern among the general public over the effect of the departures from normal procedures and of changes in the total electoral process from 1977 leading up to and including the General Elections of June, 1981;

BE IT RESOLVED that in order to restore public confidence in the democratic principle of fair and free elections that :—

- (a) the original practice of publishing monthly lists of registered voters and of displaying these lists in public places be restored;
- (b) the Register for Elections should be published sufficiently in advance of any election to give the electorate adequate time to ensure that their names are included in the Register;
- (c) adequate facilities should be provided for polling agents at polling stations.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following resolution:

"That this Honourable House of Assembly expresses thanks to His Excellency the Governor-General for the Throne Speech so graciously delivered to Parliament on Tuesday, 21st July, 1981;

Takes note of the contents of that Speech; regrets that the Government is still persisting in policies which are contributing to a serious deterioration in the economic, social, political and cultural position of the people of Barbados; and calls upon the Government to establish a highly competent and impartial task force to study the conditions prevailing in Barbados and make recommendations for their amelioration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. His resolution dealing with a crisis situation.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following resolution:

WHEREAS the economy of Barbados is in a crisis situation, and

WHEREAS the various measures announced by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning,

on Tuesday, September, 8, 1981 constitute a heavy burden on the entire community, particularly the lower income groups and their children, and

WHEREAS many of those burdensome measures take effect either immediately or in the imminent future, and

WHEREAS such measures are not relevant as a solution to the present economic crisis, but are likely to aggravate the situation,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House call upon the Government to abandon those proposals immediately, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Honourable House call upon Government to seek the assistance of available expertise in the search for urgent solutions and relevant responses to the current crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to seek leave of the Honourable House to proceed with this resolution today under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the Honourable Member clearly. He might repeat his question.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I said that I would also wish to seek leave of this Honourable House to proceed with the resolution today under Private Members' Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I think the equipment which you see in this august Assembly, Sir, would indicate to the Honourable Member that we on this side are quite willing and ready to debate any matter at all which any Honourable Member brings before the Honourable Chamber.

12.30 p.m.

I would like to assure the hon. member that he will have the opportunity to debate it today. This side is quite willing to hear from him and to get all the expertise and knowledge which they have at their disposal. One thing I regret, however, is reading in the Press, whether the hon. member had indicated it or if this was a very bad report in the Press, that we had denied him the right last Tuesday, according to the Press, to debate any financial matter. Nothing of that nature, Sir, was before the House and I would just like to draw it to Your Honour's attention, if it was an indication by the hon. member or if it was misrepresentation by the Press. It is just unfortunate, Sir, because you did not deny the hon. member and we on this side are always quite willing to accommodate them.

I wish to assure him that it is going to be debated today under Private Members' Business.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Transport and Works:

1. Is the Minister aware that on the 10th September, 1981, at about 8 a.m., a conductor of the Transport Board refused to accept forty cents bus fare tendered on behalf of each of two school children travelling on a bus of the Transport Board from St. John?

2. Is the Minister also aware that the father of two school children was severely beaten after he refused to pay more than what he considered to be the legal fare?

3. Will the Minister state whether the legal fare for school children is forty cents or more?

4. Will the Minister cause an investigation to be made of the above incident, whether the answers to number 1 and/or number 2 are in the affirmative or not and give this House an assurance that appropriate action will be taken?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question with respect to natural gas at Radcliffe Gardens etc.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following question to the Minister of Finance and Planning:

Is the Minister aware that there is no natural gas service available to the residents of Radcliffe Gardens and Reece Land, Brittons Hill, St. Michael South:

Will the Minister indicate his plans for making such a service available to the residents of the areas indicated?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question respecting diplomatic representation abroad.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following question to the Minister of External Affairs:

Would the Minister list all the countries with which Barbados maintains diplomatic relations, including the dates on which such relations were established, and whether representation to those countries is by means of resident or non-resident diplomatic staff?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. A diplomatic list is published showing all ambassadors whether resident or non-resident and Barbadian representatives abroad. Does not that question therefore infringe the rule which says that members shall not ask questions which relate to information easily obtained from public sources? I had a diplomatic list in my hands not an hour ago, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member for St. Michael South, his question about drainage problems at Jessamine Avenue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following question to the Minister of Transport and Works:

Is the Minister aware that there are serious drainage problems affecting the residents of Clarke's Avenue, Luke's Avenue and Jessamine Avenue, in Bayville, St. Michael South?

Will the Minister indicate what measures he proposes to take in order to solve the problems referred to?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, when we last met there was still a resolution which we were dealing with, which is Item No. 3, and I propose to call Item No. 3.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ROCKLEY, CHRIST CHURCH

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken at our last sitting, I am advised that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was then addressing the Chair. The Hon. Leader is entitled to continue his debate if he so desires.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, members will remember that when I spoke last week on this matter I brought to Your Honour's attention the fact that the beach at Rockley, as it is properly called, has a long history in this House, and I do not intend to go over it.

The main point at which I had arrived was the question of the area of land now sought to be acquired from the various adjoining owners, and I had pointed out that considerable erosion had taken place at Rockley

comparatively recently and that the beach at Rockley tends to recede and to have accretion from time to time in the kind of cyclical exercise which the tides carry out in that area. There was a time indeed, Mr. Speaker, when the water used to splash against the side of the road, and, as I pointed out, buses which had canvas sides used to lower the sides as soon as they got to the corner of the road that goes up Golf Club Road, which is Dalkeith Road or Dayrells Road, I believe it is now called, the road facing Sandy Beach Hotel.
12.40 p.m.

It is always admirable for a Government to acquire land for public purposes. This land is not being acquired for the purpose of access to the beach because there is need for adequate access to the beach at Rockley. It is a very popular beach. What I am concerned about is why should we — particularly after what we had been officially told, or what had been officially admitted for the first time last Tuesday here on the floor of the House, that the economy of this country is in a bad state — be going all over the place acquiring land from people who cannot sell it to anybody else. The property owners on the opposite side of the road have for a very long time been prohibited from selling any land, well not from selling it because they can sell it if they can find somebody to buy, but from doing any construction of any description whatsoever on that particular area of Rockley beach, and therefore all they have is a good view of the ocean.

No one has ever complained that there is any difficulty of access to Rockley beach. We now hear some discussion from the hon. member for Christ Church West that they wish to put up toilet facilities and matters of that kind at Rockley beach. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if they wish to put up toilet facilities at Rockley beach, it is a very laudable kind of undertaking, but there is adequate land next to the hotel which is now called the Accra Beach Hotel where a well designed facility of that nature could be constructed. To go now and to acquire land in the one area of the beach which is not fortified by any vegetation except ground cover — what I mean is that there is no landscaping of trees as there is on the portion which is now publicly owned — and to put up lavatory facilities on that area in my humble opinion would be a desecration of the beauty of the whole complete environment of Rockley beach.

I therefore submit that if the property owners cannot sell the land to anybody, the Government should not be the purchaser of the last resort to relieve them of land which they cannot use. I have never heard anyone complain that the amount of land which we have there is inadequate for the purpose. What you need, as in the case of Sandy Lane, is access to the beach. Nobody sunbathes on the land portion of Rockley beach. They use that for driving their motor cars on, a few vendors licensed, I

suppose, sell some clothes, under umbrellas, and there is the odd caravan which has replaced the traditional Barbados snowball cart. The hon. member for a St. Michael constituency who I understand is the snowcone king of Barbados — I cannot remember what constituency he represents, (*Asides*), St. Michael North East or somewhere like that, I suppose is going to have a big caravan on the portion of Rockley beach that we are now seeking to acquire. I do not think anybody is objecting to the snowcones being sold on the portion that is there already. It is not really overcrowded.

The other thing is this. The hon. member came in here with a money Resolution. I do not mean the former administration; it was purchased in the 1950s when the Labour Party Government was in. As far as I know there is no defect in any of the titles of the adjoining property owners on the other side of the road, and the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act in my humble opinion should only be invoked when there is some question of title or there is a question of the Government not being able to reach any amicable arrangement as to the market value of the land with the owners from whom they wish to acquire the land.

On this Order Paper here today we have numerous land acquisitions. Nobody knows if and when these Resolutions are passed what price the taxpayers will have to pay, and I think that some kind of indication should be given to members of the House as to the point where the negotiations broke down, the kind of price that was being asked and the kind of price which the Government offered, not only in this particular acquisition, but in all the other Resolutions which we have for compulsory acquisition of land.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had hoped I would not have to ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to refrain from referring to matters that are not properly before the House at the moment. Stick to the Resolution with which we are now dealing.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am serving advance notice so I would not have to do it again. I am saying that as a general principle in land acquisition that when you come in here you should say why you seek to acquire the land compulsorily. There are two justifications: one is a defect in title, and the other justification is that the Government has not been able to come to an agreement with the people who own the land as to the price of the land. That is what I am saying, and therefore we should be told why the provisions of the Act are being invoked in each and every case including this one in which the Government is seeking to acquire the land compulsorily. Perhaps I did not frame my proposition in as elegant a term as Your Honour would wish, but I think I have satisfied the rules of conscience and the Rules of

the House as well. So that is the position with which we are faced.

We come in here with acquisition after acquisition, we do not know what it is going to cost, and there is an omnibus sum, then supplementary votes will come and we will not know, and I am sounding a warning that some of these things may be prices which we are called upon to pay which, if hon. members knew, based on their experience of business and so on, we would be able to say that we do not think it is worthwhile acquiring it at that kind of price. That is the problem with which we are faced. But there seems to be a spate of acquisitions of this nature of which this is the most significant.

I was all in favour when the hon. member for St. James came for his acquisition of land at Fitts' Village; I think we all supported it because for years he has been dealing with that. I do not know whether what is being put up there is compatible with the character of the neighbourhood or not, but that is a matter of opinion. I do not know whether it would be adequate or inadequate, but the House passed it, so we cannot reflect on that now, but there are places in this Island where people have no access to the beach, and I think those places where there is no access to the beach should be given priority and then we can look at the places where we wish to enlarge on the facilities which already exist.

Mr. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to stand here this morning to say a few words on behalf of this Resolution. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that a Resolution such as this is long overdue in such an area as Rockley. Now we all know that three parts of the tourists that come to the Island of Barbados and most Barbadians visit Rockley beach at some time, and I am sure that in the last few weeks the Minister of Health had it very desperately trying to beat dengue fever and such like. So this morning I thought that all of us in here would hold our hands high and agree with a Resolution such as this.
1250 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the hon. member who has brought this Resolution but I hope that it will not only stop to the South of this Island. I would like to appeal to him as he knows that St. Lucy has four of the best excursion spots in the Island. It has Archers' Bay, Cove Bay, River Bay and Maycocks' Bay. Everybody south likes to go to the north of the Island at some time.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, that all of us could appeal to the hon. Minister that he would appeal to the north a little. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I met a few folks from the south and it really hurt my ears to

hear them complaining to me. They said, "Mr. Brathwaite, down here is a really nice place but when it comes to washing your hands you do not have such nice facilities as you have in the parish of St. John."

If you go to Bath, you have facilities. You go to Consett Bay and you have facilities. You go to Martins' Bay, you have facilities. If you go to the Crane you have facilities but when you come down to that lonely part over there that breakaway from the two, you know all the people in St. Lucy are used to getting is: "Win with the Dems". That is all they used to get.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to let you know that I am just in from the cold so I intend to come to the warm and the only way that we can come to the warm is for the hon. Minister to take some of the warm to St. Lucy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have two very brief comments to make. First of all, to the best of my knowledge, most of the land in that area is covered by covenants and it will be interesting to know whether the acquisition of an indefeasible title by this process over-rides any covenants that might exist in relation to the use of that land. That is a legal point that I do not know. The second point relates to a position taken by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, I think the member for Christ Church East Central where he referred to a whole lot of lands left derelict by people who bought those lands and left the country. Lands have been left in the most appalling state and I speak subject to correction but the suggestion was that Government should have the power to take over those lands even if it means through constitutional change. I believe that was the burden of his argument.

Now I agree with him in so far as something has to be done about those lands that have been left abandoned around the country and what I would like to suggest is that the Ministry should have the authority to go in and clean up those lands and bill the owners of the land so that that could become a registered charge against the land if they do not pay, because I do not think it is fair for people to have properties and to have house spots next door to them which create all sorts of problems for the occupants in houses adjacent to the derelict land.

I do not know at the moment whether the Ministry has the power to do so, but if the Ministry does not have the power to do so, after serving due notice and an appropriate lapse of time, even if it means legislation from Parliament, then I believe that this is the way to approach that particular problem. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, Sir, I would like to make a contribution to this Resolution. The Resolution seeks to acquire land, Mr. Speaker, at Rockley, primarily for the purpose of erecting beach facilities and also facilities for shops for the purpose of the vendors selling their wares on the beach.

When I was in the Ministry of Housing, Sir, it was an idea which I conceived. I conceived that idea because Parks and Beaches workers found themselves in the very awkward position every morning having to clean a beach that was used during the day and night by people and which would have put us in a very, very bad state in the light of an outbreak of some disease.

We therefore set about at that time, Sir, to acquire the land knowing full well what we wanted to do with it. We discussed the matter with the Ministry of Health. They made suggestions as to the sewage tanks and things of that nature but Rockley Beach is the most used beach all day in this country by visitors and by Barbadians alike, and vendors themselves there are forced to use places like Accra and Riviera Hotel.

There is the taxi stand. You have Chefette on the other side which even makes the density of Rockley Beach much greater. This is not like yesteryear when Rockley Beach was used by only a few people. All day and at night you find people using Rockley Beach and if you have facilities like at places at Gravesend or down by the Aquatic, how can you think that a beach not used as much as that that you will overlook the facilities at places like Accra.

As far as the acquisition is concerned, Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think I understood him to say, was not satisfied with the way in which we were walking around acquiring people's land and that we should come here with a different form of words, or words like that. That is what I understood him to say but the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be the last person to talk about acquisitions in here.

He bought the Pine Plantation House from Mrs. Cyralene Gale and never came in here, and Ilaro Court. He used the taxpayers money to spend on a plantation house, which is now a training centre, from Mrs. Gale and also Ilaro court and we did not know one single thing about it but I can assure the hon. House that every single acquisition comes before the Cabinet, Sir, and into the House before anything is done to it. I am amazed to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition getting up and talking about the way we bring acquisitions before the House.

I can appreciate his legal knowledge and experience would guide us along as he made mention of the one with Captain Fergusson and how he had more land or less land and I would like to see the titles and the boundaries and

so on. I can appreciate that. But he cannot come in here and talk about our method of bringing acquisitions here.

You walked about the country and acquired all sorts of plantations, Bath, you name them, all of them without even having the decency to bring them before the House and would state that you would rather go into the market place and discuss it before you bring it in here and discuss it with hon. members.

1.00 p.m.

So, you are not on a good wicket. I thought that your contribution to this entire debate was telling stories of your boyhood days. That is what I happen to understand, how the water splashed up on you as a school boy and how you used to swim...

Mr. SPEAKER: I know that the Hon. Leader wants to address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. I know, Sir, through you, Sir. That was your contribution. I reckon you were in a rather jovial mood last Tuesday and you were telling us of your boyhood days. Since it is the evening of your years, you are losing your power on the Other Side. You want to start to write your memoirs, you are trying to tell us all about them. How you used to go for crabs and how the Honourable Member for Christ Church West polluted the water and you could swim good. We know all of that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Plenty crabs at Rockley Beach, plenty crabs.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But, Mr. Speaker, to come in here and accuse the Government of not proceeding in a manner which is in keeping with Parliament, I think it is really an unfair criticism of the Government.

I am confident, Sir, that the facilities at Accra are going to be welcome, Sir, by all the people who use Accra. The vendors will have a place to sell their goods like you have it at Pelican and when the rain comes down, they will not have to bring out the umbrellas and get the clothes which they have for sale wet, Sir, trying to earn their daily bread. That was the whole idea behind the acquiring of the land for the purpose of building the facility and the vendors' huts or whatever you feel like calling them, Sir, and I think it is unfair for the Honourable Member to criticise the way we have set out to acquire the land, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to say just a few words about this area at Rockley from the public health point of view.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in most of the South coast and I mean the actual coastal region itself and particularly in and around the Rockley area, we have reached, from the public health point of view, saturation point. There is a very high water table not only on the south coast, it is true here in Bridgetown. Ligon said that in his early history of Barbados, it is true on the West coast, but on the South coast Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been exacerbated and it has been exaggerated because we have a very high density of tourist plant. We have hotels with fifty, sixty, eighty, a hundred bed capacity on the south coast and the fact is that the water table can take no more and that is why that at Rockley and particularly in and around the area where there is a certain fast food restaurant and other such facilities, you can actually see with the naked eye, Mr. Speaker, Sir, sewage running in the street, and floating in the sea at Rockley, raw sewage and that is why this Government has decided that the sewerage of the South coast has to be a priority once the Bridgetown sewage system is put in place and after that will follow the sewerage of the greater Bridgetown area and the West coast.

But the situation at Rockley and other areas of the south coast is now critical, Mr. Speaker, and this is the caution that I wish to issue to the Government, that if we are going to have a beach facility at Rockley either on and/or near these lands to be acquired, I am hoping that any septic tank which is going to be built as part of that facility will be of a sufficient capacity, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to truly alleviate the problem until the south coast is sewerage and the facility, not only the beach facility, but all of those facilities off the Rockley road can be hooked into the south coast sewerage system. It is critical, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is possible that an outbreak of one kind or another, it is possible that an epidemic can flow from the crisis situation which is now occurring at the Rockley beach.

Many of what are referred to as the mechanical, the packaging plants for sewage disposal which already exist not only in Bridgetown, but on the south coast, Mr. Speaker, Sir, are quite inadequate. They malfunction, they are not properly maintained and some of them frankly speaking, Sir, are not worth the money paid for them. I am sincerely hoping, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and I have this information, I know this of my own authority, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really hoping that any package plant or any septic receiving system which is going to be part of this facility will be able to cope. We have heard here various speeches from Honourable Members talking about the numbers of people both visiting and native who frequent the Accra Beach at Rockley. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we already have arrived at the saturation point and I am just hoping that this new beach facility will not make bad into worse.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a small contribution to this debate. Since I assumed responsibilities in the Ministry of Tourism we have been receiving a number of complaints from Barbadians as well as visitors to Barbados about certain conditions prevailing at some of the beaches in Barbados in particular the Rockley beach.

As has been said, Rockley is one of the beaches most frequented by Barbadians, as well as visitors, and Government has seen it fit to create a situation where Barbadians can earn a livelihood by vending on most of these beaches. It seems to me, however, Mr. Speaker, that this system has gotten a little out of hand because of a number of factors and, as a result of this, there is growing harassment by a number of people, I do not know whether or not they are Barbadians, or whether or not they are mainly people from the islands, Vincentians, St. Lucians, Grenadians, Dominicans, Trinidadians. But the problem exist at Rockley where many people who are in search of a little quiet, a little peace of mind have been harassed by a number of vendors. There are guys who sell from attache cases black coral, there are women who sell clothing to the tourists, there are vendors who sell other merchandise on that beach.

I am concerned only because tourism is perhaps our leading industry and there have been adverse reports concerning visitors to the island and I would want the Honourable Minister to be aware of some of these problems which are daily being reported and otherwise. Parks and Beaches has the authority to police these beaches, but it would seem to me that the wardens or the guards who work at Parks and Beaches are not able or are unmindful or are not capable of policing the situation on most of these beaches. We find that the tourists are abused, we find that there is so much competition among the vendors themselves that no one seems to be able to control the issue. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of the proliferation of drugs.

1.10 p.m.

I am not sure whether or not they are Barbadians, but the fact that drugs are being sold is a very common practice. The fact that tourists themselves are not interested in purchasing certain commodities and the fact that tourists are themselves being accused by these vendors is enough to cause concern to the Government and we should try to arrest the situation ere it gets out of hand.

We find that Parks and Beaches has issued a number of licences to people who they consider qualify to sell, but yet there are a number of people who come in perhaps on a vacation and they themselves get involved in the act of selling. It could be that it is these people who have no commitment to the country that give the tourists such a hassle.

I would want to suggest that the problem cannot be swept under the carpet and that Government should do everything in its power to utilise all the security forces in Barbados to put an end to this kind of behaviour, this deviant behaviour which is causing Barbados to lose some of its repeated customers who come here annually for a vacation. Not only am I speaking on behalf of visitors, I am speaking on behalf of those Barbadians who would want to go on a beach and have an evening of quiet without being molested by people who are vending. I feel that Parks and Beaches and other circles are doing an admirable job, but somehow they have fallen down in respect of security. It could be that Parks and Beaches does not have the facilities of properly training their guards and are employing people who are in search of just another job. It might not be the case, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know that Parks and Beaches would be fully cognisant of the fact that security in developing nations is a new game and we need to have the highest calibre of people with powers of observation, people who are perhaps robust, people who want to go out there and do a job for the country.

Another problem which is being experienced by wardens conversely is the fact that the cleaners of Parks and Beaches somehow try of ridicule the guards or the wardens when they want to make an arrest. They try to tell the people "don't listen to him, he does not have any authority," and that kind of thing. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a definite decision has got to be taken if we are to continue the good name for which Barbados is noted. When someone comes from a foreign country for a little peace of mind, they do not want to come to the same situation which they have left in their country, and if they have chosen Barbados, I believe that the authorities, the Ministry or the Government, should understand that there are other destinations in the Caribbean and in the world which have the same facilities, the sea, the surf and the sun. But if it is the friendliness of the people which we are selling to the would-be visitor, then we must do all in our power to protect that image, the good name of Barbados.

I have seen myself a number of these people being molested, I have seen a number of the guys on the beaches selling coral, and it would seem to me that the guys who are making their dollars selling coral are the very ones who have criminal records. They are not in a position to go to the CID in order to get a clear record from the police and as such they get their attache cases, go on the beaches, and they ply their trade among the tourists, but the end result when the tourists refuse to comply is not in the best interest of Barbados.

I would want the Minister to address his mind to these problems as they affect not only his Ministry, because the publicity which Barbados is receiving abroad as a result of some of these molestations

or harassment is not in the best interest of Barbados. If we as people cannot solve this, which I would consider to be a small problem, at this stage in our development, then I would say that in another 15 years Barbados would indeed only be a name to go away from and not really to come to for a vacation. I would urge the Minister to address his attention to these problems before they multiply fourfold and then we have no destination, we have nothing but a mere rock on which only Barbadians themselves would have something to hold on to.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get involved in this debate but the turn which it has taken, the very remarkable speech just made by a Parliamentary Secretary in the Government suggest that the debate is only the tip of an iceberg in a series of problems about which Government, if aware, is incapable of doing something or is uninterested in doing something about it. Or, more perhaps to the point, Government seems to be unaware of some of these problems as witnessed the statement made by the hon. member who just sat down.

I would like however to refer back to the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Education, late of the Ministry of Health, and based on what she had to say and what the hon. Leader of the House, late of the Ministry of the Environment, had to say on the origin of this resolution, that it was conceived by him in his Ministry in an attempt to solve a problem which had been put to him, it would seem to me that what is lacking in this whole acquisition is the planning which one would expect in this area of development, especially on the southern part of Barbados.

Now as I understand the Hon. Minister to be saying, the southern coast of Barbados has reached, as she put it, saturation point. If in fact that is so, I find it difficult to understand how the Government would be making a decision to actually build on an area of land along this coast which has reached saturation point in the context of the denudation of the coastline. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Government while obviously it is going to press ahead with this acquisition ought to spend some time and rethink the question of how they develop this part of Barbados. It seems to me that the whole question of the southern coast running from the tip of St. Philip back up to the harbour requires more than a brilliant flash of inspiration by an individual Minister from time to time.

There is a new science, if you will, Mr. Speaker, called beach management, which has been taken very seriously by a number of people in various parts of the western hemisphere and generally warm climates where there are beaches and where those beaches form a substantial part of the resources of the country. I think in a place like Barbados where the beach is so vital to our very survival that the erection of facilities on beaches, whether by the Government or by the private sector,

ought by now to have become something to be done only after the most careful and meticulous planning had gone into the exercise. It would seem to me that we ought to have by now a beach development plan for the entire south coast. It is obvious that there is certain information available to the Government that is not necessarily available to hon. members on this side in its entirety, but what is certain is that the agents of denudation as they affect the coast have been operating much more rapidly in the last 10 to 15 years than in the previous 100 years. 1.20 p.m.

The reason for that is very simple. There has been a greater incidence of people, and when people come they bring with them buildings, and these buildings in turn bring other agents which assist in quickening the denudation of the coastline.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Barbados cannot afford to be without proper beach management and beach control. I am not talking about beach management in the sense of having Parks and Beaches preventing vendors from harassing tourists. That is a fairly mundane problem. The larger problem is that of the destruction of the coast unwittingly by ill-planned or unplanned development along the particular area, and from what I hear coming from the front bench on the other side, the theme is that there is not as high a coordination of the programme for development of that part of Barbados as there ought to be at this time in our development. It seems to me that if we have not got the expertise in Barbados we ought not to be embarrassed to seek that expertise which could deal with the whole question of beach erosion, beach development, beach management, the whole question of tides on the south coast, how they move and how they affect the land.

Mr. Speaker, there is an institution in Trinidad and Tobago now, I think it is called Marine Research Company, it is a quasi-governmental agency, which has been acquiring and putting together a very large scheme of expertise made up from all the disciplines. A number of scientists are involved, and their whole task, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the coastline of Trinidad and Tobago as it is affected by the strip of water between Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela, the tide from which moves very strangely, their whole task, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that 100 years from now there would still be a coastline of Trinidad and Tobago that looks somewhat like the coastline that exists today, and I believe the time has come and I recommend to the Minister responsible for the environment that he examines this in great detail. He can check with some of the non-governmental agencies in the region all of whom are doing great work in this regard or have been attempting to do great work some time without resources, and I think we ought to approach this on a regional basis. We ought to be able to use these

non-governmental agencies and any assistance which they can get.

I do not see that the money which, for example, might be spent on the Port facilities at Bridgetown, not the existing port, but the additional construction, would be well spent if it does not form part of a total plan for the development of the coastline which the Hon. Minister alluded to earlier, and I think what she did not say is as important as what she said. It is clear that there is information available in the Ministry of Health by the expertise of the Ministry of Health which should be of interest and benefit to the Ministry responsible for the Environment, and I think that before the Minister proceeds with this development however desirable the Government might consider it to be, the Minister might give very serious consideration to a joint effort by the other Ministries concerned in the Government to ensure that when they do put up facilities, whatever those facilities are, that they are in fact achieving the benefit they seek rather than inadvertently destroying the land in precisely the manner they are trying to avoid its destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the point has been made, and I hope that we will come to regard such matters as beach control and the acquisition of land round our coasts as matters of which all hon. members feel very strongly and very personally.

Mr. Speaker, there is an abominable practice which is growing up on one of the coasts in Barbados now just off the Aquatic where some private club is seeking to send Barbados back fifty years. We are seeing imported into Barbados again a system that is not far removed from if it is not coincidental with and equal to the system in South Africa. We have one of our beaches which is being described as a private beach. That is an issue on which there should be no question in the minds of anybody in Barbados. No one ought to be allowed to even think that he can say that he has a private beach in Barbados; but we have a private club, a private beach and in spite of the fact that the Government will be happy always to insist that race ought not to be discussed on political platforms, we have private sector people in Barbados who are bringing the ugly spectre of race into this community by the exclusion of people subtly, one club called Carlisle. (*Asides*) It is part of the coast. Sir, the hon. member is heckling *sotto voce*.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair would not join in heckling, but the Chair would like to keep the hon. member as closely as possible to the Rockley Beach.

Mr. TAITT: I am making the point that in the development of our beach lands we ought not to allow the spectre of racial exclusion to form part of any policy

for development in this country especially of our beaches, and I am saying, Sir, that information has reached me that there are persons within a stone's throw of this Honourable Chamber who are again bringing the spectre of race on our beaches.

Mr. SPEAKER: That can be the subject of a substantive motion.

Mr. TAITT: Yes. The point is taken. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are a racist, you and your Party. You curse all the white people.) Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would not take the hon. member's intervention to be a suggestion that he agrees with private beaches in Barbados whether they were by blue people or green people.

Mr. SPEAKER: They are for everybody.

Mr. TAITT: We hope so. The Rockley Beach Development should form part of the development of the entire area from St. Philip right up to Paradise Beach. They all form part of the same kind of coastline, and the Government should indicate by its policies that it is looking at this matter within a broad perspective and not merely solving the problem with flashes of brilliance as it was indicated a former Minister might have attempted to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to exercise his right by making a contribution to the debate? The Hon. Minister may wind up.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to thank hon. members who have made their contribution to this debate. I find that there have been a number of areas which I have already addressed my mind to, and inasmuch as they caused problems in the past, I am hoping to find the relevant solutions to them. But one of the most serious matters that was raised in this debate was the question of sewage and the disposal of sewage and waste. I want to give this Honourable House the assurance that my Government, in a paper put forward by the Ministry, had made it a point of concern and interest that everything should be done to see how best waste and sewage should be disposed of, and it was made abundantly clear by Cabinet that, before the facilities were erected, sanitary engineers from the Ministry of Health should first be approached and asked to recommend how best the sewage and waste could be disposed of.

1.30 p.m.

Therefore, there should not be any concern over indiscriminate building on Rockley beach which would pose any health hazards or threats.

In respect of the permission to build, the Chief Town Planning office has given its consent to the build-

ing to be erected and I am sure that all hon. members will be relieved to know that all necessary steps have been taken to ensure that there is not any sort of *ad hoc* building and that all factors and considerations were taken in this matter.

I do not want to touch on all the other matters that were raised but very briefly I want to say that the Land Acquisition Act whenever it is invoked will be invoked when it is absolutely necessary. In my capacity as Minister of Housing and Lands, I will use my judgment to see that the Land Acquisition Act is not used at all times. I have asked officials in the Ministry to first try negotiating with those property owners whose lands are required by Government but it is customary, Mr. Speaker, for matters like these to come before this Honourable Chamber.

I am not here departing from precedent. It is common practice for respective governments to come before this Chamber and seek to invoke the Land Acquisition Act. It is a sort of backup measure but I want to give this Honourable House the assurance that negotiating aspects will be fully ventilated and I am hoping that it will not reach the stage where any unsavoury decision is taken.

When I introduced this Resolution I anticipated the endorsement of this Honourable Chamber and I am sure, judging from the gist of all the debates, that the Honourable Chamber has approved it.

Before I sit down I want to give the hon. member for Christ Church West the assurance that the two elderly ladies, Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Drayton will not be asked to move from the Graeme Hall area. Cabinet has already taken a decision that those two ladies in particular who have spent their lifetime on that particular spot will not be disrupted so I want to give him that assurance.

To the hon. member for St. Lucy I want to say that Government's policy is to provide facilities and develop all public parks throughout the length and breadth of Barbados. We have already approved the plans for the Northern end of Barbados and I am sure that in due course he will see positive action being taken in the North of Barbados. So it is a policy which the Government has already adopted and, given time, he will see that we are going to erect the facilities which he is now asking for.

I want to thank hon. members once again for their contributions.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 1.

Item No. 1 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$177,500 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1981–82 Part I – Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1981–82 No. 1 which form the schedule to this Resolution.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1980–81 No. 1

HEAD 40 – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Subhead 1: General Administration and Overseas Representation

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken a decision to upgrade and expand its representational consulate facilities overseas and has recently appointed a Consul General in Toronto. There are a number of reasons for the expansion of the consulate representation facilities in that area.

Toronto has been growing as a city in the last twenty years and the conurbia, the environs of Toronto and these have invited large numbers of Barbadians in that part of Ontario. As a result, Sir, there has been a lot of strain on the very slender representational resources of the Tourist Board and the small consulate currently existing in that City.

We have headquarters in Toronto of three of the biggest and active Barbadian organizations and they have been bringing pressure to bear on the offices in Toronto. In addition to this, over the past three years large numbers of Barbadians have been moving to Toronto for their summer holidays and there are a number of problems relating to immigration and the like that have been the result of this summer movement of Barbadians to southern Ontario.

We have also, Mr. Chairman, a lot of problems that are arising out of tourism and we have a number of Barbadians who are going to our offices in Toronto who are raising the question of ownership of real estate in Barbados. We have problems involving the Police in Ontario. I believe that everyone is aware that the Police are getting a little bit more active than they used to be in the activities in black people in Ontario and therefore

all of this adds up to a further stress on the very slender resources of our representation in Ontario.

We do have in our High Commission in Ottawa the facilities for dealing with most of these problems.
1.40 p.m.

But, hon. members are aware, Mr. Chairman, that Ottawa is some 285 miles away from Toronto and that Barbadian nationals find it far easier to go to our offices in Toronto than making the very long track to Ottawa. It is for this reason that we feel that we must strengthen our resources in that city. We have also taken the decision Sir, to do an integration on the offices in Toronto. You are aware, Sir, that there is a Tourist Board office there and there is a Consulate and we have taken the decision to bring the two together and integrate them, so that we can both optimise and maximise the existing resources. We are moving house, I believe we have already moved house, Sir, from the existing buildings. We are moving to more commodious, spacious surroundings so that the staff of the two offices will be able to work in greater comfort and have more functional quarters for the very difficult work they are undertaking.

This resolution, Sir, therefore seeks to get this money to meet the needs that are resultant on this coming together, this integration of our two offices and also to a limited extent to provide some facilities for the new Consul General who has recently been appointed and if I might just say, finally, Sir, that the importance of tourism investment and trade between Barbados and Canada so multiplied over the last two years that, indeed, we are going to have to be looking in the future to representation at the cultural level in the city of Montreal. Now this is somewhere down the road, Sir, but the increasing demand for this type of activity will make it necessary for us to be constantly reviewing the strength and quality of our representation in the eastern part of Canada.

I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that this Head stand part of the resolution.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Opposition, of course, has no objection to the proposals. We support the proposals that are being put forward in this particular resolution that is before us. For one, they are certainly in keeping with the trend in our overseas representation that such representation should be expanded in keeping with the pressures and demands which may be placed upon the existing resources. Of

course, it will be remembered that it was this Government which established diplomatic and other representation in Canada itself consequent upon our attaining independence and we, of course, also placed offices for the Board of Tourism and I believe under the able direction of my colleague and friend the hon. member for St. Michael West, the Industrial Development Corporation also had representation in that city. So, we are in agreement with this and in addition, Mr. Speaker, it is in keeping with the very broad policy laid down and set out by the Democratic Labour Party in its Manifesto for the 1981 General Election. Mr. Chairman, this is a document, I know you are very familiar with it yourself, but it will be seen to be a very prescient document and one which will still speak for years to come to the problems being faced by this country, it will turn out to be very prophetic.

But in terms of our foreign affairs and national security, we did make two points in particular, one was that we would protect the welfare and well-being of Barbadian nationals abroad by maintaining contacts with them personally, as well as, through their organizations and by keeping them informed of developments at home, by indicating avenues whereby they can share in the development of their homeland, by allowing them access to Barbadian and other financial institutions on no less favourable terms than those applying to resident Barbadians and by restoring to them once again their rightful role as participants in the continuing evolution of our island home. This, of course, Mr. Chairman, is a very important statement in respect of our nationals who reside in countries abroad and we are committed to their protection and we also committed ourselves to the restructuring of the role of our diplomatic Missions abroad and making them more oriented towards our commercial trade, export and tourism development interest, particularly the protection of the interests of our nationals abroad. So, this particular step will fall within the gross overall policy objectives which we commend to the Government and even though the Democratic Labour Party improved its electoral and parliamentary position, albeit not enough for the capturing of the Government, in our deep commitment to the welfare and well-being of this country, we commend our policy proposals to the Government for implementation. We would not mind because they are for the good of this country.

Mr. Chairman, we have some queries, however, and I hope the Honourable Minister can supply some information for us. I believe this is the first occasion on which he has been able to say something substantial on his new portfolio and I would like to congratulate him on speaking the words which he has spoken so elegantly, but we would like to get some information on this. I see in the note here in the Addendum, the final paragraph of the Addendum reads:

"The additional funds are required to provide for office accommodation, furniture and equipment, a motor vehicle and to meet the general running expenses of the Consulate General."

That is the Addendum to this particular resolution. There is another resolution on the Order Paper today which has an identical wording and I am not certain how you can get the same wording on two different resolutions dealing with the same topic. I do not know, one under Current and I believe the other under Capital, but these are motor vehicles and so on coming under two different resolutions which this Honourable Chamber will be called upon to decide. There is an error somewhere. If there is not an error, I am certain the Honourable Minister will point out how it is you can get that kind of wording. Something has to be reconciled and I do not know if this wording is correct or if the other wording is correct, or if you are going to have a Current car and then a Capital car.

1.50 p.m.

I want the Minister to explain how this is to work. We are raising some questions also, we would like to raise a question in terms of the fundamental relationship — and I did hear the Minister advert to this particular problem — that would exist between the High Commission in Ottawa and these new and more commodious offices that will be in Toronto. I think the least the Minister could do on this occasion is to tell us whether there will be a streamlining and integration of those operations. Will the Toronto operation be a kind of autonomous Republic? What will be the general relationship between the Consul General and his staff and the High Commissioner and his staff in Toronto? I think we would like to know about the *modus operandi*, as my colleague and friend likes to refer to these matters. I think it is important because we do not want any jurisdictional disputes developing between those two offices, and such can easily happen.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Hon. Chamber would like to know also what exactly will be the diplomatic status, if any, of the Consul General in Toronto. In fact will he be given diplomatic status and what will be the nature of that? It does not follow that because one is a Consul or Consul General that diplomatic status will naturally follow, and we would want to get some information in that particular area. We, of course, respect the right of the Government to make its appointment. It is now sending to Canada, which becomes a kind of a receiving country, the receiving country of our Consul General, and I would like to take this opportunity to offer my own personal congratulations to former Senator Randolph Field who is the Consul General to that particular State. It is not that I want to see him out of Barbados because I have worked both against him, or he has worked against me, and I have worked with him and

I found him to be quite a good person and a good member of the Barbados Labour Party, and I have fought elections with him I believe on three occasions, in 1971, in 1976 and in 1981 as well, because I was the only member who had two candidates running against him in 1981, Ranny Field and Senator Howell. Fortunately, you know, I always make it, but I think that the former Senator has the qualities to make a good Consul General and we look forward to that.

Talking about diplomatic representation as far as this country is concerned. I would like to raise a question here. It is many months now, Mr. Chairman, that there has not been appointed an ambassador from the United States to Barbados and I want to raise that question, and I would like to know if there is some problem, if there are problems as far as Barbados, the receiving country, is concerned. Is it that there are some problems in the relationship with the United States that no appointment has been made or no one has actually taken up assignment in Barbados? What is the problem? Is there something in the relationship between Barbados and the United States? We on this side are very concerned about that because we would like to know that the intercourse between the United States and Barbados is kept at the very highest level, and I hope that the Government or the Minister could make some particular statement on that, but we are concerned about that particular area.

We take it, Mr. Chairman, that the matters raised here in this particular Resolution will be answered. As I said, it touches upon a very important sector of our own economy. I am hearing some reference here, Mr. Chairman, also to the state of our relationship with Venezuela, but I believe we will have some time to talk about that, or maybe the Minister may be able to make some statement about that before he goes off to the United Nations. I note from the Press, I do not know if it is an accurate or an inaccurate report, I note from the Press that he is going off to the United Nations, but again we would like from this side to underline the point that we are particularly concerned about developments which are taking place in South Africa, Namibia and so on, which concern our diplomatic representation overseas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 2 o'clock. We must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman reported progress and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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 Questions ready. Consequently we automatically go into Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is at this point that I gave the mover of this Resolution, and I do not think that I may have even.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Resolution before the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I spoke with the Leader of the Opposition and gave him the assurance through one of his colleagues that we have no objection to debating this Resolution today and at this very moment. I hope that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder which Resolution is it the hon. member is referring to?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, notice was given of a Resolution today by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. In fact there were two.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now clear.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I refer to the one by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central who I know is quite anxious to debate his Resolution, and we on this side are very willing and well able to give him the opportunity to debate it, and I would like him to understand that we have stuck to our promise.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is desirous of debating his motion, I now call on that hon. member.

RESOLUTION RE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN BARBADOS

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker it is with great sadness that I rise to debate this Resolution in this Honourable House today, because the economic situation in Barbados need never have reached this critical stage if appropriate budgetary steps had been taken earlier in the year and if attention was paid not only to submissions by myself in this Honourable House, but also submissions by many of my colleagues on this side.

I must indeed thank all hon. members for permitting me not only to give notice of this Resolution today but to start the debate this afternoon, and particularly the hon. Leader of the House, the hon. member for St. James North.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:—

Whereas the economy of Barbados is in a crisis situation, and

Whereas the various measures announced by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning on Tuesday, September 8, 1981 constitute a heavy burden on the community, particularly the lower income groups and their children, and

Whereas many of those burdensome measures take effect either immediately or in the imminent future, and

Whereas such measures are not relevant as a solution to the present economic crisis, but are likely to aggravate the situation,

Be it resolved that this Honourable House call upon the Government to abandon those proposals immediately, and

Be it further resolved that this Honourable House call upon the Government to seek the assistance of available expertise in the search for urgent solutions and relevant responses to the current crisis.

Now Mr. Speaker, many persons have referred to that statement and the proposals contained in it as a mini-budget. I think I must protect my political integrity by making it quite clear that I do not consider it to be a budget of any kind. My views have always been that a budget should fundamentally be an instrument of social and economic engineering which should contain short term and long term measures, but certainly be designed to influence the totality of the society in a given direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these proposals do not even meet these lofty ideals, because indeed one would have thought that the least that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance would come up with would be proposals rooted in projected expenditures and projected revenues and to come up with fiscal measures to deal with these matters even in the short term. As it is, Mr. Speaker, these proposals do not even address themselves to the problems which he has outlined, and if you were to read the statement and the proposals, you would see that there is a tremendous gap between the problems which he has identified and the proposals which he has brought before this Honourable House. Requirements

such as the need to deal with inflation, to deal with productivity, to deal with increasing our exports, to deal with the tourist sector, to deal with the balance of payments etc. have been seriously lacking, and indeed apart from the administrative measures which we would wish him to spell out in this Honourable House which he referred to as having already taken, because I happen to know that many of them are already proving very burdensome to the poor people of this country, we would want them spelt out in detail, and we would also wish, Mr. Speaker, very important, that he should tell us how he can link the two parts of his statement and see how they mesh together.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, having reviewed and having studied those proposals in considerable detail, I have come to the conclusion that this is nothing but a fiscal hoax. Many of those proposals are nothing but red herrings across the trail and the major objective of that exercise is to raise money for the Transport Board and impose a transport levy with the introduction of other peripheral matters. Minor contact, Mr. Speaker, has been made with the element of protection of our balance of payments in terms of curbs put on motor cars, motor cycles, watches, jewellery and so on. That is very minor and I would like to have these quantified as I go through with my speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take no pleasure in saying that my diagnosis and forecast of the economic situation in Barbados earlier this year was correct. I feel sad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member did not find it possible to credit me with enough intelligence to bring to his attention certain serious trends within the economy and to act on them expeditiously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go through his diagnosis of the present ills of the economy. First of all he speaks of international market conditions. Then he goes on and blames the weather. He goes on, Sir, and he talks about deterioration of public finances, where, if time permits, and unfortunately in this debate one can only speak for half an hour in accordance with the Standing Orders, I would be able to demonstrate that the deterioration in the public finances both on current and capital account has been largely due to reflating this economy for the purposes of election and reckless expenditures on the part of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he talks about the sugar crop and a short-fall of \$43 million. I cannot blame the Barbados Workers' Union for taking a position that they were entitled to a given proportion of the increase in prices obtained from last year's crop. I cannot blame them for the fact that they had access to the long range weather forecast which made it clear that this year would

be an unusually wet year and that there was a need to start the crop at the earliest possible time.
3.00 p.m.

I wish, Sir, to place the blame exclusively on the shoulders of the Minister of Finance, who has an ideological position in relation to the use of the sugar workers in this country for the purposes of capitalizing the sugar industry — I agree that the sugar industry is in need of capitalizing but I do not think it should be done out of the pockets of the workers — therefore, for the delay in the settlement that cause the delay in the crop. The Minister of Finance in this country must take full responsibility because the paltry offer of some \$4 million, I think it is, which he made initially would have been clearly unacceptable to the union.

In terms of manufacturing he talks of a down-turn in the terms of our exports for the first part of this year and he is hoping that it would be even out by the end of the year. Now Mr. Speaker, there have been infinite positions taken, numerous positions taken by the Central Bank of Barbados as early as November last year that for this year this country would be largely dependent on the performance of the manufacturing sector if it is not to run into a serious balance of payments position. I have already read from one of those papers and I have already made it a document of the House.

He talks, Sir, of a downfall in tourism. He talks of the problems of energy. He talks of the problems created by over-heating in the construction sector which, indeed, Sir, were created by Government's own mis-handling of the capital programmes of this country where all those projects were left until the last minute, and you can look back from 1977, 1978, 1980 to 1981 and look at the amount of money spent on capital projects and see the trend emerging where they were all brought together at the same time with serious consequences, not only in respect of inflation but serious consequences in respect of our balance of payments, because much of the material used in the construction industry has foreign currency implications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he talks of an overall deficit of \$173 million, on overseas current account payments, \$173 million and he is beginning to wonder why this is likely to happen. He says that the inflation rate, Mr. Speaker, is 11%. He wishes to believe that. That is a matter for him. I am not going to get into any argument on whether it is 11%, 15% or 20%.

What I know is this, that I will advise the people of Barbados to look and see what daily increases in the cost of living they have to face and then work out for themselves what the inflation rate is in respect of the pockets of each and every person in Barbados. Otherwise, they might well run up in bankruptcy.

The measures Mr. Speaker, make no contact, do not speak to, do not address themselves to any of the problems which he himself has outlined and indeed, Sir, I am charging that the Barbados Labour Party, aided and abetted by the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and by certain news correspondents in Barbados, has seriously misled this country into believing that they never had it so good until a few months ago because all the trends pointed in the opposite direction but we, Sir, on this side, tried our best to point out that this was not the case but, of course, with the limited funds and limited access to the media for the purpose of information, the people of this country were overwhelmed into believing what, in fact, many of them suspected, that something was wrong.

I want to know, Sir, when I see in this statement talk of a reduction in crude oil output and natural gas, what has happened to the headlines which we have been seeing, Mr. Speaker, about new finds of oil? What has happened to all of that? Have they all suddenly disappeared?

Mr. Speaker, if you turn to page 6 of this statement, what you will find here? If you were to look Sir, at the current revenue positions between April and August for 1981 as compared with 1980, you will see that there is just about \$1 million difference; \$177 million in revenue in 1981 and \$175.9 million in 1980/81. However, Sir, if you look at current expenditure you will see that that has gone up from \$148.2 million up to \$186.3 million during that same period, an increase of \$38 million in a situation where the Government tells us that the inflation rate is being annualized to be 11%. Now it will be interesting to know where that money went and why it was spent in that fashion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to draw the attention of this Honourable House to what I consider to be a very serious matter. If you were to look, Sir, at the Central Bank of Barbados Economic and Financial Statistics, July, 1981, and if you were to look on page 53 at the Central Administration Summary on Government's operations and you were to compare the expenditure between October to December, 1979-80, January to March, 1980, April, May, June and July 1980 and then you look and see what has been happening in the year from January 1981, February, March, April and May, you will find exactly the reason why there is this major current account deficit. Public funds were being used to prime this economy for the purpose of winning an election.

It is straightforward. It is there and it cannot be avoided. Sooner or later, the arithmetic will all add up, and I have told the Government for a long time you can run a country by talk and public relations but the time comes when it will all add up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member should realize that you cannot in the course of a debate impute an improper motive to any hon. member and I must at this stage call on the hon. member to withdraw his imputation.

Dr. HAYNES: I am very happy to withdraw the imputation, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to withdraw the imputation. The reflationary trend in the economy is manifest in the revenue position during those months of 1981 to 1982 as compared with the corresponding months.

Now, the hon. member says that he has no intentions of tolerating a deficit on capital and current account of \$187 million this year, a bold statement. When the Estimates, Sir, of this year were brought before this Parliament, I pointed out at that time that to embark on any such programme would be disastrous to this economy and few people will believe that these Estimates, Sir, provide for an excess of current revenue over current expenditure of \$14.5 million. They provide, Sir, for a capital expenditure of somewhere in the region of \$199 million and it provides further for the financing of that deficit of some \$184 million exclusively by borrowing locally and externally.

What is he quarrelling about now? What is he quarrelling about when in point of fact the difference between the projected deficit last week is some \$2 million to \$3 million less than what we sat in this House and approved earlier this year.
3.10 p.m.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, on that score alone the Honourable Minister of Finance should resign.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few points, Sir. The hon. member says that there are no flaws in his economic strategy. My contention, Mr. Speaker, is that we are in the present situation because of basic flaws in his economic strategy. He has been able to survive because he has been able to escalate the public debt of Barbados to some \$527 million from the level of in 1976, average level of \$258 million, somewhere in that region, it was \$241 million, if I remember correctly in September, to \$527 million and at the same time he has more than tripled the foreign component of the Public Debt of Barbados whilst trying to survive on a stock hold programme of a credit squeeze in one direction or another of one degree of severity or another by imposing on the workers of this country unprecedented levels of indirect taxation while giving them the impression that they were getting relief in terms of direct taxation and has now resorted to a levy system that can only constitute a grave burden to the community.

Mr. Speaker, an economist has just warned him about the dangers of resorting to the Central Bank. Now, this has been a severe bone of contention in my Budget reply, I do not know what Government's overdraft at the Central Bank is today, the Honourable Minister of Finance will know, but what I do know is that if you take the periods 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976 and you look at claims on the Central Bank, I refer to the same document that I have already brought to your attention.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You might make a proper reference for the benefit of the Hansard Reporter, that is all.

Dr. HAYNES: Again, the Central Bank of Barbados Economic and Financial Statistics.

Mr. SPEAKER: What month?

Dr. HAYNES: July, as I said before, the document is the same document, July, 1981.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the total you will see that they ran somewhere between \$10 million and \$27 million. If you look at what is happening at the end of June, you will see that the total was \$111 million and what is very significant is that in the months of April and May of this year the Advances as distinct from Treasury Bills and Debentures were of the order of \$47 million and \$51 million. He talks of not using high powered money and not printing money and not competing for domestic credit, well I cannot think of any greater rate at which one could go. I do not know if there has been any decline between June and today, but perhaps, when he gets up to speak, he will pay us the courtesy of telling us whether that is the case or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are major flaws in the manufacturing area. The collapse of the IDC programme is evidence of this. The serious errors made, Mr. Speaker in borrowing money at uneconomic rates for building purposes in Barbados is testimony to that. The failure to establish those backward linkages within the manufacturing sector is further testimony to that; in the area of tourism, Sir, nothing to control the prime situation that is contributing to ruining the tourist industry; nothing to control prices. Indeed, I think it was utter madness after a year of decline in tourism to have had an increase in hotel rates in Barbados bearing in mind the same international economic situation to which he adverted in his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have called upon this Government again and again to review the fiscal incentives to the tourist industry to make sure that there is not an unreasonable expansion of plant which inevitably would

create further pressure for increases in prices if it is not checked. Now, the measures that he has slapped on the taxis are going to be a further burden to the tourists and is going to make it even more difficult for the tourists to come to this country to pay taxi fares.

His energy programme, the centre point of that programme, Sir, has been the unreasonable agreement signed with the World Bank which was placed on the people of this country, something like an increase in \$97 million that has to be paid for out of an increased rate over a five year period when Barbados should be a virtual laboratory for cheap and renewable forms of energy. The policy is completely chaotic and it is entirely up to the Government to recognise that something must be done and not to come in here moaning again and again and again about oil prices when it is not doing anything significant to correct it. It is a disaster, Sir, when you are talking of an increased activity in the construction sector to find that after some years of building more houses for the people of this country that now the National Housing Corporation in a matter of a few weeks has gone into complete chaos and workers who should be helping to build houses for people are being laid off.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as for motor cars, the \$10 million in motor cars as far as Balance of Payments is going to be neither here nor there. What is critical in that area is the serious imposition placed on people in respect of the size of the down payments and the shortness of the period of repayment. I do not see why that is necessary. If you cannot bring in more than a certain amount anyhow, I do not see the need for that particular measure. But, I would say this, whatever the directions are by the Central Bank to the commercial sector, those directions are being abused and many small people who are in fact businessmen cannot get loans in Barbados. For example, taxi drivers cannot get a loan from a bank in order to pay their insurance or to repair their car in order to get it on the road or pay their road taxes.

I would like to know how much money is involved with motor cycles, stereo equipment, cameras and jewellery? I think this is just fooling around with the question of the balance of payments where indeed the problem is to plan your capital expenditure programme whilst at the same time increasing your exports through greater productivity. I have already spoken on the Public Debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Transport Board. I have said that the object of this statement is to produce red herrings in order to raise money for the Transport Board. The Transport Board is in a shocking state. Its management is disastrous, the Chairman is a disaster, the Board is a disaster, it has had poor management for many years and indeed, Sir, underlying all of that, — and the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas should be able to attest to the

fact that I have brought it to his attention again and again — one of the basic flaws was a lack of a firm policy and low levels of subsidies during the periods 1977 and beyond that has contributed considerably to the present situation. I have not got time to go into all the details, but what I would say is that the present imposition on the school children of this country is one of the most brutal blows ever imposed on poor people in Barbados by any Minister of Finance.

We on this side demand that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance withdraw those proposals immediately in relation to the children of Barbados.
3.20 p.m.

We further demand that he cannot come in here and put a 1% transport levy on people who just walk on the roads. What are you going to call it now? A pot hole tax? A barefoot tax? What are you going to call it? It is the first time in the history of the management of Government that I have known that a Minister of Finance is going to put the onus on the National Insurance Board to act as a debt collecting agency for the payment of monies into the Consolidated Fund, and there is no guarantee anyhow that it will be used for the purposes for which it was collected. My colleagues on this side will deal more seriously with the burden, but what shows a basic flaw, Sir, in the thinking of the Minister of Finance is when he talks about bus fares constituting less than 1% of total expenditures of people in Barbados, or words to that effect. The question that he should have asked himself is what percentage of their income those who use the buses spend on public transport. Because you will have a situation now where, Sir, in some households people may be spending up to \$40 a week on buses, and in some of those households the total income may be only \$150 or \$200 or less. Surely, Sir, that represents a serious and disproportionate burden.

The taxi drivers, I feel very sorry for, because I know that a large percentage of them at the moment cannot even insure their taxis comprehensively and are running on the roads now on third party insurance. They cannot get credit, and now they face a further imposition, having had several other impositions placed upon them in the past, including the reluctance of the Minister of Finance to react swiftly to increase fares when there is an increase in the price of gasoline and in the price of diesel in Barbados. I am not saying he has not made concessions to them, but what I am saying is that the concessions do not match the burden that has been imposed.

The minibuses, particularly the small owner-operated minibuses, will be in a lot of trouble.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of the member's time, please.

Dr. HAYNES: Thank you. In closing, Sir, ...

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the end of the member's time, please.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Thank you.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I beg to second the Resolution, and I reserve my right to speak.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the hon. member for his more or less instructive speech which he has just made. We have not been accustomed to such calmness and relative lucidity from the hon. member during his contributions to economic debates in Parliament, and I think that we and the public of Barbados should all be grateful that Parliament has not started on a manic spirit that was demonstrated so often since the hon. member's entry into the House.

A number of points which the hon. member has made deserve serious consideration at the highest levels, and have received such consideration already, Sir, and will receive it in the future. However, the fact that the hon. member is lucid and calm does not mean that the hon. member is correct or accurate in his analysis. To begin with, he started out by saying that the island is in a crisis. When one considers that we took over the Government in 1976 when the foreign reserves of this country were scarcely enough for one month's imports and were declining daily, where unemployment at the end of the previous year had been running at 22%, where inflation had wrapped up 60% increases in the two previous years, I wonder what are the economic signs on which the hon. member relies at the present time to support a diagnosis of crisis. I will very freely concede that there is a crisis in a part of Government. There undoubtedly was a crisis in the area of transport. I will advert to that later, and my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael East, will deal with it at some length, but crisis is commonly measured not in the language of political hyperbole, it is commonly measured by facts and figures, it is commonly measured by those economic indicators which are published and accepted world wide now in every country.

The hon. member seeks to replace the perceptions of persons in supermarkets for the studied analysis of inflationary trends in Barbados. Hon. members on the other side continually suggest a general subjective view of unemployment and inflation and other things in the economy for the hard figures which are accepted by everyone except obviously the front bench of the Opposition in Parliament. I have taken the trouble to bring myself up to date with inflationary figures for this year. Last week I had the figures to the end of July, I now have the

figures to the end of August. The cost of living for August showed a very small decline, the first decline since January 1980, a very small decline. I am not saying that prices are not rising, some go up, some come down. To the end of August 1981 inflation for the year was running at 6%, the 12 month inflationary annual average to the end of August is 13.7%. From one year ago the point to point inflation is 13.2%. The annualised rate of inflation for the whole of this year is projected at between 9 and 10%. The rate of inflation has been declining for some time now. I put it out for what it is.

It is hard to have to pay 10% more per year, it is not quite so hard as having to pay 38.9% or 26% as the hon. member's party managed to lead Barbados through. It is the lowest rate of inflation in the Caribbean, possibly the lowest rate in the western hemisphere. I just mention these things. Everybody has inflation, Barbados just happens to have less than most countries in the world, in the perhaps overwhelming majority in the world.

Unemployment. Where is the crisis in the unemployment? The average rate of unemployment last year was over 12%. By the end of December it was 11.4%, at the end of March it was 10.5%, it is now 10%. If you look for crisis in the unemployment figures, unemployment in Barbados has been declining steadily for 18 months now. The boom in construction is the answer to that. I mean, the hon. member criticises the Government for building at Oistins, for building the Spring Garden highway, for carrying out the Democratic Labour Party's projects which he boasted of. He is criticising the Government for giving jobs to our boys and girls and keeping them off the street corners, because it is the construction effort of Government that has brought unemployment to the lowest level in Barbados for many years.
3.30 p.m.

In fact only twice has unemployment, so far as our records go, been lower than this — during the Barbados Labour Party regime in 1961, and during the Democratic Labour Party regime in 1971. It seems that unemployment goes in ten year glows, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way on a point of elucidation,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! I beg the hon. member not to interrupt at this stage. He will have ample opportunity to reply and not because the television cameras are present. Please take your seat. You will have ample time to elucidate and make any point. Please!

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the presence of the television does not alter the Rules of the House. An hon. member may rise on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to take his seat.

Dr. HAYNES: I will sit down although I am rising in accordance with the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member feels unfaired, he can bring a substantive motion against the Chair at any time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again, Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about crisis, we look at the foreign reserves. The foreign reserves have declined and I said so in my statement last week. Nonetheless, Sir, the foreign reserves at August 31 which is the last date for which I have confirmed information stood at \$118.7 million. At September 10, for which date I have provisional information they were \$118.2 million. I would like to point out to hon. members that four years ago when there was less talk of crisis the foreign reserves stood at \$30.1 million. They are now four times what they were four years ago. I do not intend to ride out this crisis on reserves. If there is any balance of payments crisis at all, I intend to take steps to fortify the reserves. But it is only reasonable in the middle of the exaggerated language to point out that the reserves are nowhere near rock bottom as yet, far from it. The hon. member speaks of what he said during the debate in the House earlier this year. I make no apology, Mr. Speaker, for quoting from the Budgetary Proposals of March, 31, 1981, which I made in the House. I went out of my way, far from saying that all was rosy in the garden at that time, within the first five minutes of my speech to say "Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that it is not my intention this evening to create an atmosphere of complacency in Barbados. Less than one minute later I said "the short term outlook for the world economy therefore remains sombre and, as on previous occasions when we have been faced with uncertainty, I feel it necessary to repeat earlier calls for the cooperation and restraint of the Barbadian public in enabling us to chart our way through these rough waters successfully."

I challenge any other Minister of Finance in Barbados to produce a speech which he made within ten weeks of an election warning people that things would get worse, and the newspapers — I am not blaming anybody in the Opposition for this for they at least, I believe, have been aware that the trend of argument in Parliament this whole year is that things are getting worse — but I blame the newspapers, I blame the lack of journalistic perception in reading the signs in respect of this particular matter. They have wickedly over-simplified the situation. I cannot believe that neither the Advocate nor the Nation has a leader-writer who is capable of seeing that things can be good in a country one year and bad in a country the next without implying that what led to its being good also led to its being bad, in other words, that there is nobody in the great newspapers of State who can comprehend that external conditions can overtly any country in the world, and I have been making this point for this

entire year in Parliament. If hon. members care to study, and I am sure they have the transcripts on the other side, the speeches which I made during the election campaign, they would have heard a whole abundance of speeches to the effect that things have been good and now we are faced with more difficult times for the future. At no stage have I ever suggested that things are only going to improve year after year in Barbados.

There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that you can survive bad weather and a \$43 million drop in sugar exports in this country and think that you are going to do as well as when sugar prices and sugar production are up. Experts calculate that that \$43 million we have lost in sugar is the equivalent of losing \$100 million in tourist receipts because the value added in sugar is so much greater than that in manufacturing or tourism. Sugar is fundamentally a most useful industry in Barbados because it takes less imports to produce the exports of sugar than it does in manufacture or tourism. To earn one hundred tourist dollars you have to spend \$40 outside Barbados. To earn \$100 in manufacture you have to spend \$33 or \$34 in imports. To earn \$100 in sugar you spend something like \$9 in imports, so when there is a fall back in sugar the economy is more desperately affected than at any other time.

Many of the problems of 1977 indeed were due to the short-fall of sugar earnings in 1976, a point which I made at the time and a point which is recognised when the Government had to take up a lot of the compensatory financing with the International Monetary Fund to make up for the short fall in earnings.

Now the hon. member said that my statement should have dealt with inflation, productivity, with our exports and with the balance of payments, but the hon. member really answered that before he even said it. He said he did not consider my statement last week a budget of any kind. I thank the hon. member. Neither did I. I did not say it was a budget. I believe that the Nation newspaper had a headline "Mini-budget next Tuesday". I made it quite clear that there were certain economic proposals that had to be made. The chief dealt with transport. The occasion of announcing hire purchase restrictions was also taken and I also took the occasion of imposing the Health Service levy which I do not think has attracted any controversy because it is a matter well understood over a long period of time. It was known that it was coming. If I was having a budget, I would have done the things that the hon. member wanted.

There seem to be different degrees of statements in this country. Some people make statements by the fire-side, if fires burn under the television sets of the hon. member for St. John who gave a fireside chat and imposed \$26 million in taxes. Your humble servant made a statement in here on certain measures which could have

been announced outside because I believe that the House of Assembly is the place to conduct the people's business, and that is why the statement was made in the House.

Now the question of transport undoubtedly has attracted more attention than anything else among the proposals, and the reason for the levy, Mr. Speaker, essentially arises out of the transport proposals. I am going to do something a little unusual, Mr. Speaker. I am going to go right back from the beginning and I am going to tell the House the actual course of conversations between the Minister of Transport and me over this whole matter of the bus fares, because we have been aware of it for some time.

Now in 1976 a very irresponsible thing was done in transportation. It was done in the name of quite a noble ideal which was to nationalise the transport industry and turn it into a social service. That was the policy of the previous Government.
3.40 p.m.

In carrying out that policy the previous Government ignored the realities of transport in Barbados and of public financing. We are not a country with abundant financial resources available to the Government such as Trinidad and Tobago or the United States of America. I mention two countries which happen to have much larger Government revenues than they can usefully spend on the machinery of Central Government. Barbados is not like that. Therefore, the first mistake was made in putting the fare at 25¢.

For some years the minimum fare had been 25¢. It was raised on the 1st April, 1976 to 30¢ and other fares were 45¢, 55¢ and 65¢. Now, if you want a measure which was taken for electoral purposes, such a measure was taken on June 15, 1976 when all the busfares were reduced to what the lowest fare had been for some years past. Now, that was an irresponsible thing to do. I make no apologies for saying so.

At the same time, it was agreed to take over the rolling stock from private Companies which had been unable to make money and therefore to replace the rolling stock so a lot of old buses were bought to maintain the bus services all over Barbados when it was known that those buses had never for years given satisfactory service. That was mistake No. 1 by the Democratic Labour Party Government.

Mistake No. 2 was made by the Barbados Labour Party Government. We were wrong when we allowed the 25¢ busfare to stay until June of the following year. We were wrong and I admit that we were wrong. The 25¢ busfare was uneconomic and was an unwarranted burden on the taxpayers from the start. It should have

been raised before the end of 1976 if only even back to the median of the levels that had existed.

We were also wrong to raise it only to 35¢ in 1977 and I think that we were wrong a third time when it was only raised to 45¢. We need a little plain talk in here and my measure of our being wrong is the fact that in 1975/76 there were no subsidy payments for buses for transport.

In 1976-1977, \$3.7 million of the taxpayers' money had to be paid out. Remember, it used to be paid to the private concessionaires too. It is not only the Transport Board that was losing the money. The private concessionaires were also subsidized.

In 1977/78, \$4.6 million was paid out. We bought some new buses. We tried to improve efficiency and we were rewarded the following year when we raised the busfare with a reduction in subsidy of just under \$4.5 million.

We raised the busfares in 1979 but that did not stop the subsidy going to \$7.3 million. There is a reason for that too. The Transport Board used to carry 17 million passengers a year when we took over. In fact, that accounted for travelling in all the services. But, by 1979, the number of people working in Barbados had gone up from 80,000 to 92,000 people and the number of journeys which were made had risen to 30 million journeys a year and, for that reason, since every journey costs the Government money, the subsidy had to go up.

Last year with 100,000 people working in Barbados and a lot of competition from the minibuses carrying people, the subsidy went up to \$11.9 million. That is an unacceptable figure. I am not going to dwell on it at enormous length but that is unacceptable.

Now, when transport is a social service, it has to be treated like any other social service. We have accepted the need to have some subsidy for transport because we are giving transport now as a service to the people in the same way as health and education. After all, there are probably countries with very little public education where private education still exists but we are taking that in as one of the social services.

The Minister and I sat down in my office and questioned how to finance it. First of all we considered whether to allow travelling on the buses to be free and to have a levy collected through the National Insurance for the purpose of meeting the cost of the Transport Board.

We debated that for a long time and came to the conclusion that it was not appropriate. We discussed charging an economic fare. The Minister made it clear that he could not show his face in the Island if an

economic fare was going to be charged on a standard-fare basis from the Ivy to Bridgetown because a full economic fare would be over \$1.20, and we then decided that the burden of the transport subsidy should be a general charge since it was being treated as a social service. Never did we anticipate that anybody would have said that it was the poor workers who were being affected by the transport levy.

The girl who is working on an industrial estate for \$80.00 a week who has to pay the new busfare will pay a transport levy of 80¢ per week. A Minister of Government who drives to work in his car will eventually be paying a transport levy when the National Insurance upper levels are raised, plus other levies of something like \$45.00 per month. That is what we have calculated as the general levies, and we anticipated that we would have complaints from motorcar owners who would ask why should they pay \$10.00 or \$20.00 a month so as to allow people to ride the buses for 60¢.

We never believed that even in a country where contradiction of the truth has become commonplace and where impressions are said to reign supreme, and truth is to be relegated to the pages of the Bible, we have never believed that anybody could think that the levy could be a burden on the lowest paid person in the society when the levy is intended to collect some money from the better off people in the society so as to keep the busfares low.

When I read in the Barbados Workers' Union Paid Advertisement that the levy is an atrocious thing and, using the words of the Communist Manifesto of Marks and Engels, that the workers must rise up, I wonder what we are coming to in this country. Again I am glad honourably to exempt the members of the Opposition from these unwarranted ideological strictures which have been emerging from the frustrated politicians of the Barbados Workers' Union.

As it happens, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union is on record as saying that the busfares were too low. What would he have preferred us to do, make the busfare 75¢ so that the poor girl who works on the industrial estate for \$80.00 a week would pay another \$1.50 a week or make it \$1.00 so that she would pay another \$4.00 a week or have a levy which affects the rich more than the poor.

I make no apologies for saying that the social services should be charged for as part of the general social security system of this island which includes, pensions, health and now transport but perhaps not education.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I reject with contempt any charge that there is any leakage of funds for electoral purposes.

The Party which three months before an election hired 260 people to Parks and Beaches and 250 people at the Transport Board to wash the buses and reduced the busfares to 25¢, all within three months of an election, no doubt thinks that its bad habits are general habits at large. It is simply not true.

It is also not true that the levy is going to be paid into the Consolidated Fund. It is going to be paid over to a Board. It will never go into the Consolidated Fund. This is one of the rigid conditions that we have set for it. It will go for the purposes of improving roads and buying buses.

I do not accept that the Transport Board is a disaster. In order to bring the highest counsels into the Transport Board I have asked the Governor of the Central Bank to serve as a member, also the Accountant General. 3.50 p.m.

Both of them have given sterling service to the Transport Board over the last twelve months or more and I resent on their behalf and in respect of the other members any suggestion that they are ignorant, that they do not know what they are doing and that they are running the Transport Board disastrously.

The Honourable Member also said that there was no need for the impositions to be placed on hire purchase in this island. The need is we wish credit to be given to the productive sectors. The reason why taxi drivers cannot get money for operating expenses is because too much money perhaps get taken up from time to time in lending for consumer credit. It is the policy of this Government to make sure that money is lent to people to expand their businesses so that they can employ others and expand the economy, not for consumption. This country needs investment and not consumption and that is the purpose of the credit restrictions which have gone back only to what they were a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, and they will not have the bite that might appear since the price of motor cars is projected to fall as a result of the rise in the value of the Barbados dollar.

The Government's overdraft the Honourable Member asked about. The Government's overdraft is fixed by law at 10% of projected Government Revenue for the year. The Honourable Member's speech contained a great deal of roundabout economics. I regret that he has aimed at a target that I do not think is sustainable. The economy is at a level at the moment of which most countries would be proud, low unemployment, low inflation, a moderate balance of payments, I would not for a moment say a balance of payments in good condition, a moderate balance of payments. The measures are intended to keep it that way in the light of unfavourable world conditions. We are raising money, we are cutting expenditure so that we do not go into a crisis, Mr. Speaker,

and the purpose of my statement last week in the Honourable House was to let Honourable Members know that.

When the time comes for a Budget, there will be a budget. Have little doubt that all the matters canvassed by the Honourable Member will be dealt with substantially in that and as from now, I will adopt the phrase of the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, I will warn you to fasten your seat belt because what was implied last week and what has been implied for some time obviously contains within itself the expectation that the Government will have to take revenue measure during a budget. I make no apologies for warning of that some months in advance, but last week was not a budget, on that the Honourable Member and I are agreed, it was a statement of certain measures necessary at this time before the country falls into crisis.

Honourable Members on this Side, Mr. Speaker, will not be voting for this resolution. (APPLAUSE)

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member for St. Michael South addresses the Chair, I want to make this one point particularly to the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I did not permit his intervention when he tried to interrupt because I know the Honourable Member, as the mover of the resolution, has a final right of reply. Consequently, all he needs to do is to take note of what each and every Honourable Member says and wind up and he can lace it on to them at the last point.

But, there is another point I want to make. When I tried to tell the Honourable Member, "Please take your seat", he was not pleased and he shook his finger at the Chair in a threatening manner. I take very grave exception to this and I am now warning this Honourable House that if at any time in the future, any Honourable Member attempts to follow the pattern of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to shake his finger at the Chair in a threatening manner, I will have to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw from this Honourable House for the remainder of the Sitting.

Please let us get on without having to resort to all of this. Please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South may address the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make my contribution to this debate on the resolution which I have already seconded and I will like to join with the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in congratulating the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in making a lucid and calm presentation. I go further and I say that the speech of the Honourable Member was incisive, it was cogently argued and it was in places very searing of the

Government's proposals and the Government's management of the economy. We on this Side are going to give full support to the terms of this resolution and we are still hopeful that there are Honourable Members on that Side who would lay aside narrow party considerations on this occasion, recognise that this country is facing an economic crisis and would look at the operative part of the resolution and join with us in putting together a body of persons who can do a serious analysis of the conditions in this country and put forward proposals which would be for the good of all Barbados. This is a constructive Opposition and these are constructive proposals being advanced, but we must start from a frank analysis of the present situation and I believe that the majority of people in this country are fully aware that things are not all bright and rosy in this country at this moment. On the contrary, that we are facing a crisis in spite of any argument to prove that we are not in a crisis.

Indeed, the foresight and the prophetic analysis of the state of our nation and the state of our economy was very well anticipated by the Democratic Labour Party in the policy document that we placed before the people of this country and those who would take time to read this document again would see it set out in very clear terms the nature of the problem that this country is facing now. I quote from the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party for the General Election, 1981 and on page 6 under the caption "FACING THE ECONOMIC CRISIS", we stated, and I quote:

"The Barbadian economy is entering into a state of deep crisis. In spite of the BLP rhetoric to the contrary the danger signs are there for all to see. The major problems facing the Barbadian economy are as follows:-

- A chronic and socially undesirable high level of unemployment manifested through increasing crimes and through disillusionment among the youth.
- An alarming upsurge in the level of inflation.
- A rapid decline in the purchasing power of the Barbados dollar accompanying the steep rises in prices.
- An impending balance of payments problem.

4.00 p.m.

"A burdensome increase in the level of indirect taxation that is especially oppressive on the poor in our society;

A rapid, persistent, and disturbing increase in the national debt;

Low levels of agricultural productivity and economic privation facing small farmers."

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to make this particular Manifesto a document of this Hon. Chamber and I commend it to all hon. members for their political education and edification. (Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Do you have the amendments?) I believe there is something in accounting circles called E. and O.E. — Errors and Omissions excepted.

Mr. Speaker, each one of those problems identified in this Manifesto is now patent for all to see. They are clear. It is clear that we are facing a crisis. And what is the nature of that crisis? There is no point in saying that we are not in that particular crisis situation, everyone knows it. If not, why do you come in the First Session after the recess to present what has been called a Statement of Financial Proposals and the Study of the Economy? The very fact that such a statement had to be made at that time is a sure indication that all is not well in the garden of Barbados, and people are asking how come all of a sudden the people of Barbados are being called upon to face further burdens, to face greater problems in combating this problem with the cost of living. What has suddenly gone wrong with us? Of course, those of us who have been following economic trends in this country were aware that in spite of the gloss that was put upon developments in this country, in spite of the fact that we were told over and over again that Barbados was doing better than its neighbours in the eastern Caribbean, was doing better than other developing countries in the entire Caribbean basin and in South America, was doing better even than the developed countries of North America and Europe — I do not know about Asia — that all of that led to a kind of euphoria, the feeling of contentment and rosiness in this country, and one sentence to the effect that we must not be complacent, in a sea of statements to the effect that we are doing very well, would certainly tend to change the balance of payments position.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals that were placed before this Hon. Chamber call for each employed person in this country to contribute at least 1% of insurable earnings to the National Insurance Board. Each employed person across the board must do that. In addition, bus fares have been increased substantially, whopping increases not only for the parents but particularly for the children, and we have the situation where persons are crying out. I do not know if the member for St. Michael East can now show his face in the Ivy after these increases, I do not know if he can find it, but I must say the problem he raised, according to the report by the member for St. Thomas, is a genuine one and one with which I share some sympathy, because those of us who represent constituencies within close proximity of

the City centre realise that our constituents, with the rise in bus fares, are being called upon to pay high bus fares for short journeys, and I must echo and I must give expression to the comments of some of my constituents who are concerned about what they have to pay for their children. Not only my constituents, but people in Barbados as a whole who have to use the bus transport system are concerned that they have to dig deeply into their pockets in order to meet the cost of transport which is now carrying a disproportionate part of their total income, and this is a problem, it is a problem. All of the goodies that have been given have now been wiped out by these particular measures.

I do not know about the Governor of the Central Bank serving on the Transport Board. I have my own view on that and I have expressed it to him and elsewhere. It is my view that the Governor of the Central Bank should not be serving on any Statutory Corporation in this country, apart from the Central Bank. He should be above involvement in the operations of Statutory Corporations as such. That is my view and I take it on a matter of the approach to the management of our entire economy. He should be outside of those operations altogether, just as I felt that back benchers should not be Chairmen or members of Statutory Corporations. Government may still see the wisdom of my comments in these particular regards, but the problem now about the Transport Board is that it wants a monopoly and when it gets competition it cannot stand up to the competition.

Indeed, I hear a lot of talk about minibuses, and I want to make it clear that were it not for the minibuses in this country the workers of this country who depend on public transport would be much worse off, they would be arriving for work and school and their other activities much later than they are arriving now. I would like to pay a tribute to the minibuses for the contribution that they have made to the economic development of this country. It is short-sighted, I think it is wrong for the Government to try by means of financial impositions on the minibuses to knock them out of the ring so that the Transport Board can make a profit.

4.10 p.m.

I say that that is wrong for providing a useful service. I want to say this much too, that if the Transport Board is getting competition from the minibuses, there was nothing and there is nothing to stop the Transport Board from itself acquiring minibuses and offering competition to the operators of the minibuses. If they are an efficient operation, there is no reason at all why the laws of competition could not operate and why they could not acquire some minibuses and run them on certain routes to provide services in this country if they believe that minibuses are making all of this money, but now you have put a financial burden on minibuses, and what a

burden it is. I believe when they started out there was no fee imposed upon them at all. I believe this Government has successively put charges on the minibuses, so that in the most recent impositions it is now something like \$5,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no heckling during the course of this debate.

Mr. SANDIFORD: There is a figure of \$5,000 that they would have to pay, but it is an imposition upon them that the Transport Board will not have to look for. I have not seen any similar imposition on the Transport Board, so clearly this particular device is one to reduce the number of minibuses on the roads. That will be the effect of it. I see my friend the Minister shaking his head in disagreement with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Michael South address the Chair?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am happy to address you, particularly on these matters, Mr. Speaker, because I know that your constituents in St. Peter are also grumbling about these impositions. I know you are concerned about that. This Resolution is one which we have thought about very carefully, and we are asking the Government to abandon the proposals that they have made and to put together a group of persons to study the nature of the financial crisis which we are facing at this time and to come up with proposals. We are not saying that there are not problems in the country, but we are saying that the proposals which the Government have come up with do not speak of the problems and that we need a different approach altogether.

Others may blame the Minister of Finance. I am not necessarily blaming the Minister of Finance. I believe genuinely that this is some misguided approach to the question of political economy and the management of public affairs in this country. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is an approach to public affairs which indicates that because of the fiscal and monetary measures available to a modern day Minister of Finance you can manage the economy in such a way that you can have a belt tightening now, you can talk about danger signs and on another occasion you can so use these fiscal, monetary and physical measures in a way to create expansion in the economy. I am not saying that the present Minister of Finance is in that particular mould. I am not saying that because that might be imputing improper motives to him. What I would say is that it is very remarkable that in 1976 at the outset there were grave difficulties in the economy of this country. We heard that the Democratic Labour Party left some massive economic crisis and balance of payments problems, and when we analysed the statistics, as other speakers will point out, it shows that the crisis of 1976 and early 1977 were created by

the free-for-all economic management that took place upon the assumption of office by the present Barbados Labour Party Government. The statistics establish that. So that what we are saying is that in 1976 we have "things are bad", and then comes to the rescue the Minister of Finance. Coming on to year four and certainly in year five we were on top of the situation and by prudent and skilful management of the economy all was well. We never had it so good, we were doing very well and one good term deserved another. Well, you have had a good term and we are now back into that position again. Things are not well. Do not make the mistake of calling this a mini-budget. Just call it financial proposals.

I don't mind what the two of them agree on, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the hon. member for St. Thomas. The two of them can agree that this is not a mini-budget, but those who use common-sense approaches to these matters like myself call it a mini-budget, and I do not mind how many definitions you bring from where, it is a mini-budget because it contains the same type of proposals that you get in a budget, and I do not know what is this ultra-sophisticated approach that the two of these financial experts are trying to put to the people of Barbados; two Barbados scholars talking about finances. One says that the other one does not know about economics and finance. Both of them tell each other that and both of them are agreeing that this is not a mini-budget. Well I will wait for the expert, the acknowledged expert, not only in terms of knowledge, but also in terms of experience to speak on these matters, and we will hear from the hon. member for St. John on these proposals. That is where we are going to get the analysis. That is where it is going to come.

Now we have a different position that we are dealing with. We are speaking on behalf of the people in this country, and we are saying in articulating the proposals that the people of Barbados are not satisfied with the proposals that have been imposed upon them. We are saying that the index of dissatisfaction with this Government is now at the highest point that it ever was. The index of dissatisfaction is very high now, but of course the Government believes now that the elections are behind them so they can carry a little dissatisfaction. Nothing is wrong with that. They can ride that out.

Mr. Speaker, we are a constructive Opposition. We have said that there is a crisis in Barbados and we have identified it. All of the indicators point it out. I can take up the Quarterly Report of the Central Bank for the period to June 1981 which says, and I quote "Economic activity in Barbados declined during the first quarter of 1981 when compared with the corresponding period of 1980."

420 p.m.

The Government itself has admitted that the nature of the situation involved a substantial fall in receipts from the sugar industry, a substantial fall in receipts from tourism, and a substantial fall in the production of crude oil in this country. I still do not understand this thing about going from shallow drilling to deep drilling. I do not know who is responsible for that and if the Government was not aware of it and why if they were aware of it, they did not do anything about it. Was the deep drilling due to heavy weather, the rains? I do not know the reasons for it, or are they allowing the multi-nationals to determine oil developments in this country.

They said in their Manifesto that they were going to do deep drilling so they are responsible for that particular problem in the fall of oil production. Maybe there will be some response. We will deal with that in a little more depth. But make no mistake about this. The people of this country are not pleased.

We in the Opposition are concerned as far as this nation is concerned and as far as the people whom we represent are concerned and we are appealing with the Government to forget party lines now. We are dealing with a national issue, a national crisis. I want you over there to be big enough. Look at the terms of the Resolution. No one is going to lose face on this. We are talking about the good of the country as a whole. Forget party lines. Let us do a serious analysis of the problems facing this country. Let us put together a team, put together the expertise, analyse the problems and come up with some proposals that can put us back again on the road to economic development.

I believe that level of statesmanship would be applauded in this country. You have people who can make a serious contribution. I am aware that some of their voices have been muted but I believe that someone like the former Senator David MacKenzie — I do not hear his voice any more now in the Senate and I have often wondered why. (ASIDES: John Connell?)

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have some order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I read John Connell every week. I read him. He is making his comments in public affairs. I read him. You may yet hear him again. I used to like to read the reports of former Senator Ken Hewitt. I am certain the member for St. Michael East is familiar with the contributions made.

We have a lot of expertise in this country and these are only two I have mentioned but we can put together the expertise to deal with this problem. We certainly do not wish this exclusive imposition on the school children of this country. We certainly do not wish that.

Mr. Speaker, I have considered this particular Resolution and I have spoken with all of the force that I

can in appealing to the Government and I would be very glad if in their contributions we can have a positive response in the national interest. Therefore I call upon a majority of this Parliament to give support to this Resolution so ably put forward by our spokesman in financial matters and which will be ably backed up by other speeches from this side.

(Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW and Hon. Dr. BLACKMAN were on their feet)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if both members would give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not know who caught your eye first but....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let me make this point clear. If all the members of the House should rise now and all caught the Speaker's eyes at the same time no member has any right to utter a word until called upon to speak by the Speaker. He or she has no right to utter a word in this Honourable House until called upon by the Speaker.

The hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I simply rise to indicate that this side is quite willing to extend Private Members' Business to allow one more speaker, Sir, which will be up to 5 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you are seeking the leave of this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You want to move that Private Members' Business be extended until 5 o'clock. Who seconds the motion?

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question that Private Members' Business be extended until 5 o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael East.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this debate affords us an opportunity to examine some of the more problematic areas with respect to the conduct of Government in this country. It takes place against a back-ground of an international crisis which has been precipitated since the unprecedented increase in the price of oil in 1973.

There has been no Government which has been called upon to manage its economic affairs, including some of the oil surplus countries, that have been able to recover completely from the storm and stress precipitated by this unprecedented development in the international oil market and therefore it is necessary, if wisdom and sobriety are to prevail, to recognize that it is impossible for any Government, any economy, including one as powerful as that of the United States of America, not to take into consideration the fluctuation of external factors beyond its control.

The experience of the 1920s and 1930s when the world experienced an economic crisis of cataclysmic proportions indicates that a relatively small reduction of 10% in the imports of the United States of America had reverberations within the economies of that country that caused untold sufferings and that is why, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to understand that, given the volatile nature of the international crisis, at one moment a Government may well experience a tranquil ride in its quest for economic development and at another moment almost without warning the same Government would be faced with the utmost difficulty of keeping the ship of state afloat. 4.30 p.m.

I do not believe at all that it is due to inept management that this particular difficulty has arisen. I hesitate to use the alarmist description of crisis, but it seems to me that given the nature of international economic developments, we can always expect unprecedented shifts and turns of the internal economies of any country that is a member, an integral part of the free market system. It is well stated that when major countries within the free market economies sneeze, other countries that are on the periphery such as Barbados catch pneumonia. I do not believe that we have reached such a stage. We may be suffering from a little tickling in the throat, but I do not believe that the patient is yet about to be bedridden.

Mr. Speaker, it is within this context that one must look at the monumental deficit that has been wrapped up by the Transport Board. Everybody in Barbados is an expert on transportation and debate and very often assumes the clarity of a tower of Babel as strident voices are heard prescribing nostrums to deal with the transportation problems of this country. It is therefore necessary for me to bring a bit of dispassion to this whole business starting with the question of conceptual problems that I believe to be at the heart of the transportation difficulties which confront this country. It seems to me that it has never been clear as to whether the transport system of this country was to be a social service which bore the characteristics of a charity or a business operation which is viable. I believe that before one can fly about making charges of incompetence, one has to be clear about the premises and the

assumptions on which the Board operates. I am trying to bring some conceptual clarity as Minister to the functioning of the Board.

This confusion, Mr. Speaker, is illustrated in the fact that the Transport Board has been asked to carry over 1.2 million passengers over the age of 65 without the payment of any fares from these people. At the same time, over the past two years or so, they have been expected to lose thirty cents on every fare for school children. Indeed, it is more like thirty-five cents since the Ministry of Education pays us only ten cents per child. So that, Mr. Speaker, is a problem. If we want the transport system of this country to be a charitable service then it is useless to talk about losing money because we will simply give the people of this country the service gratuitously. If, however, the Transport Board must operate a service that is viable, then the clear demand would be to insist upon the kind of fares which would ensure that, as a commercially run undertaking, the Transport Board would be able to generate the surplus which would make it self-sustaining. It has been said before that an economic fare is so prohibitively high that no Government with a social conscience in this country could dare to implement it. It, therefore, seems to me that we have to be content with an uneasy compromise between giving the public a charitable service on the one hand and running the Transport Board as an economic undertaking on the other hand. If we do this, this always entails a degree of loss. There must always be a deficit because fares at a particular level below economic fares must of necessity be subsidized.

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the issue before us is the quantum of the subsidy that is desirable in such circumstances. I do not hesitate to say that having regard to the fact that this Government needs to provide more and better housing for the aged, the indigent and the working poor, and must soon implement a free National Health Service, the Government must strike a level between the competing demands for social services in this country and must therefore limit the deficit of the Transport Board. I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to say what that limit is. It is an issue which I do not believe can be thought out within the two and half short months in which I have presided over this unfortunate Ministry. *(Laughter)* I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it will become manifest in time, as soon as we are able to provide the quality of transportation service for the people of Barbados. The level of the subsidy that the Government can afford to undertake having regard to the competing claims made on its scarce resources will become manifest. It is necessary for me to say a few things.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South spoke self-righteously as if to indicate that his Party was free from any blame for the present state of the

Transport Board, but I would like to invite him to consider this fact, that, during the Administration of his Party, over 100 buses were purchased that were lemons, and the cost to the public, the taxpayers and transport of this country have not yet been quantified. I refer to Seddon chassis. These vehicles have been giving trouble from the day they were first bought. It was a major error perpetrated on the taxpayers of this country and, therefore, when speakers have the audacity to declaim about the incompetence of the Transport Board, they need to be reminded that the Transport Board made a criminal and monumental error in wasting the taxpayers' money by purchasing these vehicles, vehicles which destroyed all of their tyres in a space of six weeks. You know what the cost of a tyre is. Unfortunately, we cannot yet remove these lemons which are a disgrace to our public transport system from our streets, but we are working on it.

4.40 p.m.

Since 1976 this Government has purchased 112 new vehicles and in this financial year alone there will be 38 more new vehicles added to the fleet. Some time at the beginning of next week I shall take myself to Miami and undertake personal shopping in order to increase the supply of the vehicles at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about the increase in the fares of school children. Before I deal with this, I believe it is only fair to consider these increases in juxtaposition to the following facts: that secondary school children now get free school books, children in primary schools now get free school meals, I repeat, free school meals, and children of secondary schools now benefit from \$100 per annum for their uniforms. We believe — and I admit freely, because I am no hypocrite — that there are some cases in which the new bus fares for school children have wreaked hardship on their parents. We estimate that between 4800 and 5000 of these school children, Mr. Speaker, have to use the transfer, but at the same time this Government, committed to the principles of egalitarianism, has made available increased national assistance to ensure that all of those parents who endure hardship as a result of the increased bus fares for their children can have these bus fares supplemented by grants from the National Assistance Board. It is not as if this Government were coldly, callously imposing increased bus fares upon hard working parents of school children and then doing nothing to ensure that the effects on the poorest of the poor would be mitigated. Let all those parents who experience difficulty in paying these fares go to the Welfare Department and there they will receive their supplementary cheques.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am as aware as anyone in this room of the stigma associated with receiving assistance from the Welfare Department. There is a history of mendicancy associated with this Department and that is

why I am going to begin discussions shortly with the Minister of Education to see if something can be worked out whereby the Welfare Department pays this money to the Education Department and children can receive the supplementary allowances from the Ministry of Education, preferably the schools that they attend. But it must be emphasised that only 4800 or 5000 children are involved in the payment of bus fares involving transfers, and we are prepared to take care of those who are in need of supplementary allowances.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other features about the Transport Board which involve hard thinking. Much criticism has been made of the transportation levy, and here I must take issue with those critics of the transport levy. The transport levy, Mr. Speaker, is designed to ensure the mobilisation of a sufficiently large amount of capital in order to ensure that not only the replacement of buses takes place as speedily as possible but also to ensure that all of the other capital projects which the Transport Board must expeditiously execute are funded and funded in the earliest time possible. It is not known, Mr. Speaker, that one of the causes of this huge deficit in the vicinity of \$17 million that the Transport Board will face this year has been the inordinate amount of overtime that staff is required to work. We have tried to pare this overtime, but earlier in this year this overtime was running at the rate of \$80,000, overtime caused by the necessity on the part of workers to try to keep buses that are barely road-worthy going, in order that a fleet of buses already inadequate will be available to service the needs of the people of Barbados. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, much of this money that has been spent on overtime has been spent on overtime to repair buses that the Democratic Labour Party through its Transport Board purchased with specifications that have caused the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars. It is a shame. Every day these buses are breaking down causing the public inconvenience. Every day mechanics have to park 30 or 40 of them in the various depots of the country and try to work on them as quickly as possible. Therefore I believe that if we are to bring balance to these discussions it is necessary to avoid the temptations of scoring cheap points because your constituents may be looking on. I would exhort the Honourable Members opposite to maintain the high standard that they are asking us to adhere to, and if they seek to maintain this high standard they would have to admit that the problems of the Transport Board are problems that have been chronic ever since there was a Transport Board.

There were about three or four transportation studies in the 1960s and all the problems that confront the Transport Board today were documented, enumerated and brought to the attention of the then Government and nothing was done to get to grips with the problems of transportation in this country. I face the cumulative effects of neglect of over decades in the Transport Board

system in this country. I believe that the task, however difficult, can be achieved, and it is my intention to do everything necessary to ensure that the people of this country have a first class transport system.
4.50 p.m.

We hope that in the next five years that this country will enjoy a transport system where hon. members of this House will be able to ride on the buses in dignity and comfort. It is the intention of my Ministry to improve the facilities at the depot, to increase the number of pits so that more buses can be repaired in order to save time. It is the intention of my Government to clean up the workshops to ensure that workers are employed in the best possible conditions, and it is the responsibility of my Government and it is my will, and I am confident that I will achieve the objective, to ensure that the people of this country enjoy the courtesy of the service that it is their right to demand.

Mr. Speaker, I seem to be running out of time and I regret that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has five minutes more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I shall touch briefly on the minibus question although there is a lot more about public transport of which I can talk. There is a long sad tale to tell, Mr. Speaker, but there will be other occasions within this august Assembly when I will have opportunity to apprise not only this Assembly but the country of the problems that confront us in public transportation today.

Now to the minibuses. There is no doubt that minibuses in this country provide an invaluable service. Only this year the Government of Barbados licensed 275 such vehicles and that ought in itself to indicate that the Government recognises that they constitute an integral and important part of our transportation service at this particular time. There are those people who claim that increases in the permit fees and the licences of minibus operators constitute an attack upon a deprived class. I believe this kind of critique, Mr. Speaker, is simplistic. It is simplistic because it fails to recognise that minibus operators are a diverse group of people. You have some poor people operating minibuses and you have some extremely wealthy people operating minibuses, many of them operating minibuses behind the veil of proxies, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, you will note the distinction in the licence fee required of persons who operate their own minibuses and those who operate the minibuses of others.

I think it is fair to state, Mr. Speaker, that those people who operate minibuses and hire others to ply the routes for them are people whom it must be assumed are

better able to pay the increased fees for licences. By the same token the Transport Board estimates that the owner operator of a minibus nets, this is after costs are deducted, something like \$30,000. Many of these people fail to pay taxes, Mr. Speaker. A renewal fee of \$1,500 a year is a miniscule proportion of the net profits that these operators make. I therefore cannot shed the crocodile tears that have been shed here today about the poor minibus operators.

The Transport Board on short haul routes has lost 35% of its income to these operators and that is how we have been able to get some estimates as to the net earnings of minibus operators. It is not guess work. We know exactly where the Transport Board has lost in competition with these minibus operators.

I must skip back now we are on the question of discussing class, and I hope to do it, Mr. Speaker, in the 120 seconds left. The responsibility of a Government is to ensure that its measures are equitable particularly with regard to the poorest of the poor within the society. Any time bus fares are increased, it is a simple matter to say that the working class have been attacked, because we know the better off in the society use private vehicles. So it follows as night follows day that it is the worst off who stand the burden of the increase. That is the nature of our transportation system. It does not require the acumen or the wisdom of Solomon to say that the working class are attacked because they are the only people who use the public transport system. What I want to say is this: that the Government is trying to grapple with an extremely complex problem to contain a deficit within limits. Given the problems of money to finance other social services, it then becomes extremely difficult for a Government to pay \$17 million a year in financing the public transport system.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister must grapple with his problem within the time limit.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the opportunity to say more on this problem and to educate the House and the public will arise in the future. In summary, I believe that the increases are supportable on the grounds (1)

Mr. SPEAKER: That the time is ripe for the hon. member to take his seat.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for today.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before we resume Government Business, I would like to indicate to all

hon. members on both sides of the House that we are prepared to have this debate televised until this Resolution is completed; so I would just like to assure hon. members who did not have the opportunity to speak this afternoon that they have until the debate is completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended for ten minutes.
5.00 p.m.

On resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. ODLE resumed the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. The hon. member for St. Michael South, do you wish to conclude your speech?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude very briefly. I made most of the points I wanted to make on this particular Resolution and I am certain the Minister has taken note of the points raised and in his reply will, no doubt, supply the information on the points requested.

I wish to conclude on the point that, certainly in Barbados, we should be very much concerned about the developments in Southern Africa. We are talking of overseas representation and we believe that there should be a very strong statement in relation to the problems in South Africa, Namibia, Angola and Southern Africa and the relationship of the contact nations to what is going on up there and I do hope that in due course when we have a full fledged debate on External Affairs we will be able to go into the ramifications of these points, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to make a contribution to this debate? Since no other hon. member wishes to speak, the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs may wind up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I may reply very briefly to the points made by the hon. member for St. Michael South. In respect to the Consulate in Toronto, it bears the same relationship to the High Commission in Ottawa as the Consulate in New York bears to the Embassy in Washington. The Consul-General will be subject to the overall

jurisdiction of the High Commissioner of Barbados in Ottawa and, as usual, he will report to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs via the High Commissioner in Canada except in straight-forward and routine matters. This is the answer to his first question.

The hon. member has also asked about the status of the Consul General. The Consul General is not a diplomat. He is a Consular officer within the terms of the Vienna Convention. This is the situation with any consular officer indeed in any part of the world.

The question was also raised about the United States appointment of an ambassador to Barbados. The hon. member well knows that there was a change in the incumbency of the Presidency of the United States at the beginning of this year. The Republicans superseded the Democrats and normally thousands of nominations and appointments have to be made by the incoming President and all of it cannot be done overnight. However I will let him know that we have had word from the United States Government about an eminent ambassador and you will know that I am not in a position to give any more details.

The hon. member also raised the question about Namibia, Angola and Southern Africa and he will recall that less than two weeks ago I made a statement in relation to the South Africa incursion into Angola in what they refer to as hot pursuit. Now, I know differently, as well as the hon. member, and I welcome the opportunity to have in this House a wide-ranging and comprehensive debate on foreign policy. I would hope that the hon. members on the other side, particularly the hon. member for St. Michael South, would not only make reference to it but would put down a substantive motion here, a Private Members' Resolution, and let us debate foreign affairs. I am anxious to get a debate on it. It is untimely in the context of a supplementary vote to upgrade the Consulate in Toronto that I should embark on any full fledged debate on the politics of Southern Africa.

The hon. member has rightly made the illusion to the fact that I will be attending for a short time the General Assembly of the United Nations next week and the hon. member will have full opportunity to hear what I feel about the problems of Southern Africa.

There is one other point, Sir. I take the point raised by the hon. member that something seems to have gone a little bit wrong in the Addendum to the two Resolutions. One Resolution deals with current expenditure and one deals with capital and I am sure that the hon. member will understand that these things happen from time to time. But he will understand where we are spending the money.

When we are talking about structures, acquisitions of buildings and so on, that is capital expenditure. The money that we are seeking to get for materials, supplies, stationery and so on, is current expenditure and I regret the minor mistake that occurred in the Addendum to one of the Resolutions (ASIDE). If you want me to tell you which one I will tell you. I thought you would have spotted it yourself. The one that reads Head 40 — General Administration and Overseas Representation — that is current expenditure and covers Utilities; Rental of Property, Supplies and Materials; Maintenance of Property; Operating Expenses; Plant, Equipment and Furniture.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And that is what we are dealing with now.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The Addendum to this Resolution should reflect the Items that I have just read out.

I beg to move that this stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Item No. 1(b) was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$858,084 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1981-82, Part II — Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1981-82 No. 2 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE NO. 2

Head 78 — Ministry of Communications and Works.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, Part 2 of the Resolution now before us under Head 78 is a culmination of nearly two decades of attempts on the part of those responsible for solving the problem of making the roof of the bulk sugar facility at the Port wind and water tight.

This seems to have defied the ingenuity of all those concerned during this period. For as early as 1961, when the facility was completed, the contractor was required to repair the roof but subsequent to the expiration of the Maintenance Clause in the contract, the roof again started to leak and representation was made by the Sugar Producers' Association to which the facility is sublet to repair the roof.

In 1972, the contract was awarded to Mitchell Construction Company for repairs to the roof and that company was charged with the responsibility of experi-

menting with two types of material. Some asbestos strips were used and a sealing compound was also used and it was found that both methods to repair the roof were reasonably successful.

However, the roof started to leak again in the repaired areas and others areas of seepages from the subway conveyors brought sewage into the bulk sugar facility from time to time causing a loss of sugar.
5.30 p.m.

That is right from the subway, when the water level rose sewage was swept into the facility. I am told that this sugar is not sold. In 1979, Mr. Chairman, this Honourable House approved a resolution for \$89 687.17 for the repair of this roof and at the same time agreed that \$227 000 should be paid from the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund also for repairs of the facility, and as happened so often in the past, some act intervened which caused the Ministry not to be able to carry out the work before the expiration of the Financial Year and the funds lapsed. We are making yet another attempt, Mr. Chairman, in this 20 year effort to effect repairs to the roof of the bulk sugar facility. I am earnestly hoping, Mr. Chairman, that neither force majeure nor any act of man will intervene in order to deny us the opportunity to bring about these much needed repairs. At a time when this country is losing \$43 million on the sugar crop, we can ill afford the wastage involved in having sugar contaminated or washed away by the rain. This Honourable House went over this matter before and I do not think that it is necessary for me to expatiate upon it.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore beg to move that this Head stands part of the Schedule before us.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 78 stand part....

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there are just a few observations I would like to make with respect to this resolution. By looking at this resolution, I have seen that the cost in 1979 seemed to be \$317 000 and the cost in 1981 now seems to be \$75 000 higher. I would like to enquire from the Honourable Minister if this \$75 000 is a reasonable increase for a year and a half.

The next thing that I would like to know is that since my information is that the Barbados Sugar Producers or the Sugar Factories Ltd. whichever you may have, have been using this bulk storage at a very reduced rate for a lot of years, I am wondering if they should not be asked to pay some of this \$75 000.

In this resolution, I notice that the second part of the fund is going to come from the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation Fund. Now, the McGregor Report with which the Government concurs, seeks to abolish this Fund, as well as some others. What I would like to know is, first, the reason that they gave was that the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, to a large extent, ameliorated the difficulties with the price stability as far as sugar is concerned. That was the reason they gave. I would like to know, if, as far as when we look at the situation with sugar today — because only today and last Tuesday, we were hearing that sugar is \$42 million down as estimated — I would like to enquire of the Honourable Minister if he thinks that, in view of the fact that sugar is going up and down because sugar prices will always move up and down, since you do not know what the stock of sugar will be and the competition from beet sugar, I would like to enquire from the Honourable Minister whether he thinks in view of these things, the abolition of this particular Price Stability Fund Reserve Fund is still on the cards or if the Government will have a second look at abolishing this. I will give you the proper name for it, the Price Sugar Industry Stabilisation Fund. I would like to know that from the Honourable Minister. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. KING: Mr. Chairman, there are just two small questions I would like to ask on this resolution. Firstly, the Honourable Minister made the point that sewage was flowing into the sugar store and that as a result sugar was being contaminated. I see the resolution talks about leaks appearing in the roof and on the face of it is designed to deal with the problem of leaks on the roof. Could the Honourable Minister perhaps tell us whether an effort is also being made at this time to deal with the problem of sewage seeping into the bulk sugar store. Could he also tell us how much sugar the country has lost as a result of the contamination by the sewage.

The second aspect of the resolution to which I would like a response is the question why should the Sugar Industry Reserve Fund bear such a large proportion of the cost of repairing the bulk sugar installation. It is true that the bulk sugar installation and the shipping of sugar redounds largely to the credit of the sugar factory owners and it would seem to me that it would be reasonable to ask them to bear a considerable proportion of the cost of repairing a facility which is used essentially for their benefit rather than ask the Sugar Industry Stabilisation Reserve Fund which, after all, is contributed to largely by the workers of the country to bear such a large proportion of the cost of the repairs.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise to give very strong support in principle to two very valid points raised by my colleagues on this Side. It is now an open secret not subject to prosecution under the Official Secrets Act that

the last Cabinet sat down and duly deliberated and decided that \$24 million of the accumulated funds of the various sugar levies should be so redistributed as to deprive the workers in the sugar industry current and past and their heirs and successors of their legitimate rights of inheriting what they contributed to those funds because of the basic principle that each year over the past umpteen years wages' settlement in the sugar industry were done, a consideration was given to the fact that both from the workers' side and the employers' side the money would be funded.

We would be very interested to know whether this new Cabinet, which has said it is more enlightened than the previous one still intends to persist with the reorganisation of those levies and of particular concern arising out of another matter before this Honourable House whether the hint in relation to bringing all social welfare under the aegis of the National Insurance Scheme, whether the sugar workers Provident Fund would also be absorbed into that scheme with effect from January 1st or when.

5.40 p.m.

We are very concerned about these things because what seems to be happening here is that consistent with a strong conservative philosophy, the capital stock of the workers is persistently being depleted and being handed over to the owners of an industry who find themselves short of capital, as I have said, and I have no doubt that capital is needed but once again it would seem to me that somewhere buried into proposals like this we are getting the transfer of capital from workers to employers.

I believe that if the Government is going to stick by those proposals agreed to by the Cabinet — the Cabinet Paper I will produce in due course, I think I made it a document of the last House so I think I am free to speak on it — but the principle here is important, Mr. Chairman, that is, when these monies are taken out and applied for this kind of capital project, what is the workers' stake in this exercise? It relates to the whole use of that \$24 million.

There is also another \$6 million which I understand is no longer in the Consolidated Fund, but I believe that quite rightly the previous Government have made a loan of some \$1.23 million — I would not like to be tied down to the figure because I do not have the report in front of me — to the Barbados Workers' Union in relation to their project, I think at Mangrove. I would not like to be committed to that, but that seems to me to be a good decision in that what was happening was that you were getting a redistribution of the capital assets of the fund in the direction of the worker. What is happening here in the re-organisation of this fund is that you get a reversed direction of the allocation of the accrued capital assets within the fund which in my view legitimately belong to both the workers in the sugar industry and the employers, not only the factories but the large plantations. In particular, Sir, as a small farmer myself, not that I am pleading

a case for myself, the small farmers of this country with the price of canes will, I think, also have been affected over the past 30 to 40 years by those levies. What amount of stake would they have in the use and the allocation of those levies? I think the person who has to answer that question, took the decision in the absence of the present Minister of Agriculture, because I cannot conceive of a situation where the present Minister of Agriculture would agree to that kind of arrangement. I am going to serve warning on his Government now that we will be making a major public issue if, as anticipated, at the end of this year any attempt is made to deprive the sugar workers of this country of their just dues in those arrangements when Government seeks to rearrange them. I believe we will get the support of the unions and we will get the support of all working people throughout this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If no other member wishes to make a contribution the Hon. Minister may wind up.

Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, this issue before us, as I indicated earlier, is one that has been with successive Governments for 20 years. The Sugar Producers' Association which has leased the bulk sugar facility from the Port refused in 1961 to sign the agreement until the government of the day undertook in writing to accept responsibility for the numerous holds that existed in the roof of the bulk sugar facility, and indeed this undertaking was not unequivocally given to the Sugar Producers' Association until in 1968, and that is the date when they signed the contract with the Government for the use of the bulk sugar facility. That is precisely why the Government is assuming full responsibility for defraying the cost of repairing the roof of this facility. It is an obligation that was entered into in 1968 before the Sugar Producers' Association would accept to enter into the lease of the building.

In so far as the seepage is concerned, it was found that the underground pipes, screws on the pipes were somewhat loose, they were tightened and the problem appeared to have gone away.

The other point raised with respect to the cost of the repairs today is one on which I have to rely entirely upon the technical advice vouchsafed to me within the Ministry. I suppose the member for St. Philip North might be in a better position to answer the question posed. All that I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that having regard to the technical advice proffered to me which I am in no position by qualification or inclination able to quarrel with. I accept and I believe that one would agree that roaring inflation has not escaped the construction industry and I believe that it is nothing more than a reflection of that inflation.

Mr. Chairman, in so far as the utilisation of the Sugar Price Stabilisation Fund is concerned for these purposes, it has always been recognised that given the existence of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement as well as its successor, the Lome Agreement, that this Fund historically has never been drawn upon for price stabilisation purposes.
5.50 p.m.

Indeed it was agreed as early as 1972, members of the then Cabinet might recollect, that the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation Fund could be used for purposes of repairing the bulk store facility. Indeed this problem has only surfaced with this administration, Mr. Chairman, because of the difficulties since 1972 that this Government as well as the administration between 1976 and 1981 faced in having this particular defect cured. As I said, it is a twenty year problem. It is nothing new, and if costs have become inflated as a result of delays, the members opposite will have in all fairness to accept some responsibility for the additional cost incurred by not having this work done before.

Mr. Chairman, not only did the Democratic Labour Party administration devote funds for work which was not completely finished in 1972, but the record shows that in 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976 there has been a continuing dialogue between the Sugar Producers Association and the Government on the rectification of this particular problem. I myself must confess that I find it difficult to understand why it was not done before, why it should have taken us twenty years to complete this task. I want to assure the House that it will be done in this financial year or I will know the reason why.

Mr. Chairman, the utilisation of the sugar levy funds for purposes relating to workers will not be abolished with the transformation of the levy system as it currently exists. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the component which represent the Labour Welfare Fund will still be used for purposes relating to improving the conditions of workers. One of the reasons why there are not enough Barbadians to reap the crop is related to the fact that we have failed miserably to humanise the conditions of workers in the field. In an age far beyond the forties, Mr. Chairman, it is too much to expect a Barbadian to walk the street with sweated and tattered clothing with a bill in his hand. I believe that it is the intention to ensure that a component of these funds will be used for ensuring that proper lunch facilities are available at places of work on plantations. These funds must be used also to ensure that people who work in the fields are properly protected, that where it is necessary for eye protection to be available, that it will be available, that their hands must be protected with gloves and that workers must be provided with boots, and at the end of the day if they want a shower, facilities must be available for them to wash themselves.

There is no reason why sugar workers ought to be expected to go to and from work in a state of indignity, and it is in our failure to humanise and modernise conditions of work within the plantations that Barbadians shun the task of cutting canes. We have failed to improve our techniques and conditions of work to keep pace with a society that is rapidly modernising and a society which is into the last two decades of the 20th century. If indeed there is not this component of welfare within the levy funds, then, Mr. Chairman, I would have voted to support something that is completely different from what I believe it is. I think that one recognises the precarious state of the sugar industry the need for capitalisation and the need for a complete rationalisation of the industry. This is what part of the funds will be used for.

Another portion will be used for research, and it is my understanding that a third component will be used for improving and humanising conditions of work. If the funds are established for purposes other than these, then I would have voted for something different from what I understand it to be, and therefore I must categorically reject the oft repeated insinuations that ordinary workers stand to benefit nothing from a reorganisation of the levy system.

Dr. HAYNES rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the hon. member rise?

Dr. HAYNES: I rise to exercise my right to speak again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have lost your chance.

Dr. HAYNES: In what way, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. I do not think it is necessary for me to explain to hon. members the Rules governing debate in Committee of Supply. Hon. members are allowed to speak for 15 minutes and an hon. member may speak more than once, but when the question is asked "does any other hon. member wish to speak" and no hon. member so indicates, and the Minister is called upon to reply, unless the Minister raises a new matter, there can be no other contribution. I submit that as Chairman of this Committee I have not seen any incidence of the Minister raising any new matter.

The question that Head 78 – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.00 p.m.

HEAD 80 – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this request here is for funds to meet capital expenditure consequent

on the regrading of the consulate in Toronto. Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South raised the question of the similarity of the Addenda of the two Resolutions. I believe that the Addendum to this particular Resolution is correct since it refers to additional funds being required to provide office accommodation, furniture and equipment, a motor vehicle and to meet the general expenses of the Consulate General. This one is correct.

I beg to move that this Resolution stand part. Before there is a vote on Head 80 may I say at this stage, Mr. Chairman, that I would wish at the end of Head 80 that Head 40 be recommitted if there is no objection. I am begging to move that Head 80 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Seconded, please?

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I intend to speak on the Resolution but speaking on the question which the hon. Minister raised before he sat down, it would seem to me that it would be more efficacious if he asked the Committee to recommit Head 40, let us hear what is going to happen to Head 40 before we proceed to debate Head 80.

We have no objections to the recommittal but it would seem to me that we would like to hear what is going to be the reason for the recommittal before we proceed to debate Head 80. If he has no objections to doing that, I would recommend that the Committee do it in that way.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I think it is entirely inappropriate to have Head 80 recommitted in the middle of the debate of a Resolution on Head 80 and I would wait until the conclusion of the debate of Head 80 before moving for recommittal of Head 40.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member wishes. Whatever he does we will stand by. These Ministers are very sensitive in these matters and I do not wish to interfere with his sensitivities.

I wanted to raise a question and you will see, Mr. Chairman, that when I raise the question it will relate to the point which I made. I see under Head 80 that they have purchase of vehicles: \$42,000. Is that correct? Is that a correct amount, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it?

Now the Minister talked about upgrading the status of the Consulate. One assumes that the Consulate is already in existence and I believe that to be the case, so what we are having is the addition of a Consul General. Am I to understand that we are going to be

purchasing more than one vehicle and, if we are, could the Minister explain what is the nature of the purchase and why it is necessary? I am not questioning the amount. I am just seeking information.

It says here Purchase and Improvement to Property: \$208,600. Structures is \$35,000? (*Asides: Structures is \$208,000*). Structures does not mean anything unless it relates to improvements to properties, I am not sure I understand what the structures are here. I would like the Minister to explain. It does not make sense to me.

It says here Purchase and Improvements to Property. Then it says Structures — \$208,600 and the supplementary provision required is \$35,000. Am I to understand that there is going to be structural improvement either in the office or in the place where the Consul General will be living? I am merely seeking information on this one.

There are a few points, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to make about the question of Consular representation. I think my colleague has indicated that we have no clear policy on the quality of the representation and/or the decision to establish consular representation in Toronto and I know also that the Minister has said that a request for supplementary provision will not be an appropriate place to have a fully fledged debate on external affairs but it would be perhaps worthwhile if he could indicate when we could expect of a full fledged debate on external affairs because he went on to suggest that such a debate would flow out of a Resolution on this side.

It is clear that a debate on external affairs brought by this side would more than likely only last two hours because we only have two hours for Private Members Business and it would be drawn out over a time plus, of course, it has to compete with other business under Private Members' Business and as I understand it from the quality of representation that we have on this side, there will be a lot of Private Members' Business over the next few years.

I would prefer the Minister to see a full fledged debate on external affairs as being in the national interest and I would prefer to see the Minister indicate his willingness to initiate such a debate. His predecessor in office had often promised such a debate, but, unfortunately, time caught up with him. His pursuits outside of the Ministry required him to depart sooner than later although I may say in passing he departed some two-and-a-half years late but the hon. member understands our position on that one, Sir.

The point is, Sir, that there are a number of matters relating to external representation which ought to be aired in this country and there are a number of myths

regarding external representation which have been allowed to fester because there is a great deal of — for want of a better word — Sir, ignorance on the part of those whose responsibility it is to inform the public of what is going on outside of Barbados on behalf of Barbados.

To give an example of what I mean, Sir. From time to time in the previous five years you would see the headlines trumpeting that Barbados had got an election to the Vice-Presidency at the UN General Assembly and it was treated as an event of great moment. The truth is, Sir, that in the operation of the United Nations, if you are a member, you are bound to become a Vice President some time or another because they appoint about 17 or 20 at every General Assembly session and then they rotate them. I am not casting aspersions on the fact that we became Vice President, Sir. That is in the nature of the game.

What I am saying is that too much has been made of a number of frivolous and trivial matters that have happened outside of Barbados and they have been given the weight of events of great importance to the well-being of Barbados whereas a number of other issues of serious import to Barbados have passed without any comment.

Now earlier under External Affairs my colleague referred to the question of South Africa's incursion into Namibia or South West Africa and, you know, not much was made of this by the Minister although he indicated that we in this Honourable House could wait until he made his speech in the United Nations and then we would hear his policy.

Well, I can appreciate that it being the first time as foreign Minister he would wish his speech to have some measure of freshness and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, when you are a member of the United Nations with over one hundred members and you are going to make a speech, it may seem like a great effort in Barbados but, in the United Nations, it really does not move too many people what Barbados says and so I can understand. It is also very difficult to find something to say that is fresh and new and different and so I can understand the hon. member wishing not to have his thunder stolen in the House of Assembly by revealing the draft of his speech. We are not asking him to do that, Sir.

6.10 p.m.

What I would ask him to do is to signal to the people of Barbados that it is important that we understand the role which the United States under President Reagan is playing in the world now and the way how the United States has said nothing while the white South Africans have been able to go with impunity into the heart of a country and attack them with weapons and come back out and nothing has been said. They have not even been rapped on the fingers by the rest of the western

world. Now, we in Barbados form part of that alliance, we in Barbados who had the courage — and in some ways, Sir, the politicians before us showed a lot more courage than we do because the politicians before us were perhaps less interested in debate in demonstrating how clever they are or were because it is over 20 years ago that Barbados took a stand on South Africa — Barbados is one of the first countries that, I think it is 20, 30 years ago, in those days, Sir, all the people of a certain ilk formed part of the same political party and Barbados took a serious moral position on South Africa. But, now, we laugh up in the face of the United States because they are the United States. Because they say they are going to give us some aid because the Embassy is here and people want to go to the United States, we allow President Reagan.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get back to Toronto and the Consulate General in Toronto, please.

Mr. TAITT: Precisely, the point, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are straying.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this is my difficulty, with all due respect, Sir, that not recognising that when establishing a Consulate General in Toronto, there is fundamental in the relationships to our attitude to our own people and peoples around the world is part of what I am complaining about, Sir, that we have not really as a people, in spite of our 13 or 14 years of independence, we have not really been as a people brought au fait with the reality of the situation in the outer world, so we are going to set up a Consulate. And we are going to issue passports. And we are going to have photographs in the newspaper — I know about this, Sir, we had it when I was there — showing that we are doing consular work, and that is the most important work we will do because our citizens when they go or live abroad have nothing else to look towards but the representation which we provide.

But, the point I am making, Sir, is if we do not take a stand in terms of what is happening to those persons who are striving for independence in Africa we are not signalling to our nationals in the United States and in Canada what is our position as a country. It affects our nationals living in those capitals what position we take and how we take those positions and we should signal to the mighty giant, the United States next door to us, and to Britain, as we signalled to Grenada, what our views are on certain matters. We are very easy and quick to signal to Maurice Bishop what he should do. We are loath to say anything that will affect our relations with the United States.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think we will get all this information from the Honourable Attorney General

very shortly, but let us stick with this office in Toronto. You are straying a bit too far.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this is a very disturbing issue and I shall not persist in it, Sir. I will merely say..... (ASIDES) Now, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure that when the time comes the Honourable Member is going to relish a debate on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TAITT: That is what I am asking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But, that is not it, today.

Mr. TAITT: I am asking the Honourable Minister to give us a clear indication when we can have that opportunity to discuss foreign affairs dispassionately, as the Honourable Member says, if we can bring a measure of dispassion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the Honourable Minister will do that.

Mr. TAITT: I would like to make another point, Sir. The Honourable Member says that he expects to have a consular office in Montreal down the road at least I think I understood him to say that. I think that when he is coming to the Honourable House to set up the offices, we ought by now to have some indication really of how much money we are spending, how it is being spent.

The Estimates, you will recall, Sir, took a change of form last occasion. The debate on the Estimates did not occur. Now we have supplementaries and we get supplementaries every now and again. In New York, under both Governments, we have bought about four or five houses and the officers who have gone from Barbados — and the Honourable Member for Christ Church West must bear some responsibility for part of this — the full story of the utilisation of space in New York by our Consulate, the IDC office and the UN Mission, that full story has never been told in Barbados. It has not been told, for example, how we rented space for an entire year — it has nothing to do with the Honourable Member, he is not a Minister — we rented space for an entire year in New York and it was not used at all for an entire year and that space could build about four houses at current prices — under the Hon. Minister for Housing, Sir..... (ASIDES). Talk to Philip and it would have been about eight under the Honourable Member for St. Michael North, Sir, it would have been about eight houses under him. You see I talked to him.

Mr. Chairman, we have not — and the Honourable Member for St. Michael East could probably shed a lot

of light on this, if he was wont to tell us, of some of the nonsense that has gone on under the aegis or guise of providing representation and consular work, the amount of effort that is wasted. We repeat errors year after year in the acquisition of real estate. I say both Administrations, Sir, so that no one will accuse me of being partisan in this matter, Sir. It happened under our Administration, but they came in and said that they were bringing new vistas to our representation abroad and the truth is, that pound for pound and dollar for dollar, our representation overseas has been much more expensive under the Barbados Labour Party and, with one or two notable exceptions, less productive. Now I wish to warn the Honourable Member that there have been decisions made in the past to close the Industrial Development Corporation's office in Toronto and no attempt of gainsaying and no amount of, shall we say, pettifoggery ought to becloud his judgment in terms of what precisely we ought or ought not to be doing in Toronto because there are a number of people who pay less attention to representing Barbadians than they do to being diplomats, Consular Officers, *et cetera, et cetera*.

I have a lot more to say, Sir, but I will wait for the debate in due course.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is...

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, normally, I would not rise so soon to speak on a subject for which I only recently relinquished responsibility. Normally, it is a precedent that a Minister allows a sensible and reasonable period of time to elapse so that his successor in Office will carry out the Portfolio and make any necessary changes he wants to. Whether from the frontbench, backbench or Opposition, and I have sat now on all three, I will never sit down and hear foolishness being talked in the Honourable House and statements being made in the wildest fashion attacking particularly the period during which I was in the Ministry of External Affairs on a baseless foundation such as those made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

In the first place, Sir, it is well-known that the last five years of Barbados' foreign relations, regardless of whether he likes it or not, have been a period of very high performance in this country at a minimum cost and the only Ministry in which the cost has as a percentage of the overall budget decreased has been the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

If the Honourable Member would spare a little time analysing the facts rather than just talking through his hat he would understand that.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir, the Honourable Member obviously did not understand what

I was saying. I made a specific charge that in the utilisation of space in New York the Ministry of External Affairs has an accountability to this Honourable House and it was an abominable mish-mash.

Mr. FORDE: I listened to his usual vacuous charges, Sir, and I want to deal with them when I come to that specific charge, but I begin by giving the context in which the Ministry operated.

6.20 p.m.

As a percentage of the total cost of this country's budget, Foreign Affairs is the only Ministry in which there was a lower percentage spent on running Foreign Affairs than at any time ever occurred. Now the hon. member should know that, and any wastage there was was reduced to a minimum. I would remind the hon. member that for the first time, during my period as Minister, rules were laid down for the purchase and leasing of property by this Government overseas. We stopped the scandalous habit where the then Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. member for St. John, would telephone that criminal, Jerry Bull, connected with the South African connection of which he now complains and tell Bull to purchase a house for a foreign diplomat of this country as happened with the purchase of the High Commissioner's residence in Ottawa. The hon. member did not open his mouth then when he was in the Cabinet. A.N. Forde was then Permanent Secretary and he was not even given any information about the purchase of a house, and Jerry Bull, who subsequently went to prison for the very South African shells which killed the very black people in Angola of whom he is complaining, was the man who was conducting the purchase on behalf of Barbados. Where was the hon. member then? He gets up with this pious nonsense in the House. He believes that because he was once Consul-General in those days he knows about foreign affairs.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I draw to Your Honour's attention that the hon. member says that what I was saying is pious nonsense. I draw to your attention that it contravenes the rules of the House. Jerry Bull and the hon. member are the same to me, Sir, do not talk to me about Jerry Bull, I do not know Jerry Bull.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. FORDE: And no sense either. Jerry Bull and the hon. member are the same. Why couldn't he do anything about Jerry Bull? Why does he want to do something about me? Why didn't he do something when he had ministerial responsibility and show his guts as a Minister and resign at that time?

Mr. TAITT: Like how you resigned on Pele?

Mr. FORDE: Do you see his characteristic bad behaviour? He cannot even take criticism but he can give it. Characteristic bad behaviour.

Mr. TAITT: You tell me about guts? You must be out of your mind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have this. We have had a wonderful day, please let it continue.

Mr. FORDE: You can give blows, you cannot take them. Sit down and listen to a reply to you. Now, Sir, when we were moving the United Nations Office our lease was coming to an end and the then Acting Consul General, Mr. Kellman, brought to our attention that it was possible to get a lease of the upstairs premises for a longer period of time at a rent which over the period of time would be favourable to this Government. That was analysed by a team from the Ministry of Finance and in those circumstances the present lease of the 18th floor where the Consul General was was acquired at that time. Those are the circumstances, Sir. The premises were not vacant for a year, Sir, no amount of protestation of the hon. member will get anywhere by saying they were vacant for a year.

The other thing the hon. member did not know, repairs were carried out to the premises and during the period of repairs the Government was not responsible for the lease. He does not know that, he comes in here with all sorts of rumours which he rakes from wherever he rakes them, the gutter or otherwise, and talks as though he understands anything about foreign affairs.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I object to the hon. member saying I come in here with all types of rumour, Sir, I got that information from the highest possible source. It was not a rumour, it was information given to me by officers in the Ministry which he was responsible for, officers who were concerned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Mr. FORDE: I couldn't care less whether it was given to him by the officer, he and the officer are the same type, they believe in gutter rumours, but when I deal with facts in this House I deal with the facts in the House. The hon. member can rest assured that I left the Ministry and never once in the time I was there was I characterised with larceny and stealing as happened under them in the very Consulate that he is talking about. I have never once had to get it explained by any officer under me that money was carried away from the Consulate. The hon. member knows what I am talking about.

The hon. member gets in here and says that no debate ever took place on foreign affairs. I sat on the Opposition benches for five years and the only time that

the issue of foreign affairs was debated was when I used any opportunity of the Estimates or any supplementary vote in order to discuss the issue of Foreign Affairs. I begged the then Government of which he was a Cabinet member for an opportunity to discuss foreign affairs but it was never allowed. I raised a Private Members' motion and as soon as it got on the Order Paper we always had the Standing Orders set aside and eventually the motion itself lapsed. If the hon. member wanted to discuss Foreign Affairs intelligently and sensibly, he had more than enough opportunity. I recall on the Belizean question coming to this House and making available to the House factual information on which the basis of debate could take place, and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke intelligently and sensibly on that debate, and the debate arose from the back bench of this Government at the time. I wonder where was the hon. member then? He had an opportunity if he wanted to speak, I would have welcomed the opportunity from the front bench to debate any question of Foreign Affairs with him any time, anywhere, front bench, back bench, inside or outside of this House.

The hon. member perhaps is a latter day saint on the side of the Namibians and the Angolans, I do not know if he knows that this Government had a very clear policy on this, as clear a policy as anything, if the hon. member really wants to know. The policy has been enunciated extremely clearly and we have a very competent Minister who could continue to expound that policy very clearly. There has never been any doubt in our minds. He wants a bit of headline to say that he has now called for some great thing to do with the Namibians and the Angolans. That is all he is here doing, Sir, he does not even recognise that his Shadow Minister, whom let me credit with a little bit of appreciation at least of the issues involved, has made his views felt and has spoken on this issue before, but he wants a bit of publicity tomorrow.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I really must take objection to the hon. member's insulting remark that I am making speeches in here for publicity tomorrow. It cannot be true, Sir, because you know, Sir, that those that are going to come out tomorrow are coming out already, so therefore the hon. member is struggling and he really should withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not find it offensive at all.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I think I have spoken enough. When the hon. member speaks intelligently and sensibly and stops casting aspersions that I could reply constructively to any constructive statement that comes from him, I will deal with those constructive statements, but when he gets up and starts a debate on that basis either to be funny or to be obnoxious, I am afraid that I intend to reply to him in equal terms on each occasion.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I raised the question on the Addendum to the previous Resolution, and on this Resolution here the Minister has said that this particular note is correct. It reads: "The additional funds are required to provide for office accommodation, furniture and equipment, a motor vehicle and to meet the general running expenses of the Consulate General." Now this is a capital item, and I am wondering, I raise the question how are you going to get the running expenses provided under a capital item?

6.30 p.m.

The Attorney General said he is going to recommit the Addendum on the previous Resolution. I believe he wishes to delete that particular part, but this particular note which is on the opposite side of the Schedule, Mr. Chairman, refers to the running expenses of the Consulate-General, and it is a basic principle that you meet capital expenditure from capital and running expenses from current provision, and I want to know how in this supplementary you are going, according to this note, to meet the running expenses of the Consulate-General. It appears to me that something is radically wrong in respect of this Resolution as indeed it was in respect of the other Resolution. Maybe there is some amendment to be made to this one as well, but there is some mix up somewhere, and I would be glad if the Minister would clarify that particular point.

Hon. Dr. D. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I wish merely to express my gratification at the change in policy enunciated by the hon. member for St. Michael West, because it was the Democratic Labour Party Government that is now representing itself as a champion of oppressed Africans that stopped Cuban aeroplanes from having landing and fuelling rights in Barbados when they were on their way to give their brothers in Angola support in their liberation struggles, and it is my understanding, and I have also got this from the same source that he has got his information, Mr. Chairman, and it is on good authority, that the Government of Barbados was instructed by the United States Government to discontinue.

It seems to me that a party with that kind of history is in a poor position to castigate a Government for being the client of the likes of President Reagan. Moreover, it was the said Government that is now professing to be enamoured of their black brothers in Southern Africa that failed to vote for a Resolution which condemned Israel for its collaboration with South Africa to further grind the people. (*Asides*) It was your Government's spokesman, and had access to the Prime Minister who gave him carte blanche to take this position. The man to whom all roads lead gave him word. Indeed he oftener pronounced although that man begged him not, to permit him to commit acts of folly in respect of Israel. Not only that. That same party committed a major

scandal by permitting a well known criminal called Jerry Bull to whom the hon. member for Christ Church West alluded to set up an operation here designed for one specific purpose, and that is to ensure arms were shipped to Southern Africa to be used against black people.

I believe that a party with that kind of record cannot come into this Honourable Chamber and assume a moral stance on the question of black people. I believe that you must first purge yourself of that kind of betrayal of black people before you can begin to talk to people and have them listen to you with any kind of respect. You can strain our credulity when you shed these tears about our brothers in Africa.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that the hon. member who just sat down provided perhaps a rare moment of levity in this House what he had to say caused me a certain degree of pain, because I know that as he was saying what he was saying, and he was looking at me, he could not possibly believe some of the rhetoric which he was talking in terms of this Honourable Member. This Honourable Member needs no purging on the question and that hon. member knows it. We spent long hours before he became enmeshed in the breasts of his present colleagues debating this same issue. We walked the streets of New York and in New York they did not have Bs and Ds in those days; they were Barbadians and it was only since the Barbados Labour Party came to power that New York got divided into Bs and Ds, but the hon. member was a Barbadian and the Consulate had responsibility for this protection among other things. But what is important is that he formed, along with a number of other young bright Barbadians, debating cadres that discussed these issues in some detail, and therefore if when the South Africans made an incursion into Namibia.....I would not accuse the hon. member of intellectual dishonesty because he knows that, whatever the South Africans have done in the past – and we are going to ignore the red herring of the shells made by Jerry Bull because all people in Barbados know by now that it was the Barbados Labour Party under Premier H. G. Cummins that brought Space Research to Barbados. The Barbados Labour Party brought Space Research to Barbados and they are in no position to talk to this Honourable member about purging Jerry Bull and Space Research and all that happened before my time. It happened perhaps before the Hon. member's time, but it did not happen before the Barbados Labour Party's time, and that is what we are talking about.

There seems to be a certain pristine honesty which must emerge from the breast of each one of the hon. members over there and over here at some time, and to keep putting up the red herring of Space Research is doing this country a dishonour. Space Research was a decision made by a Premier who believed he was doing well. When Dr. Cummins brought in Space Research he no doubt believed

that he was doing something well. When the experimentation about shooting into Space was done in Barbados, many Barbadians of both political stripes believed that we were making headway and making forays into scientific investigation. It therefore does not fall well from the lips of hon. members over there, some of whom might have participated in advising the same Space Research in their other activities, for the sake of cheap publicity to indicate that somehow to have been in the Government when Space Research was here makes us anti-black. I will take that from no one, least of all the hon. member. He knows, individually over here and collectively, hon. members on this side in whichever forum they have been have always taken positions that can be identified with the small man. I do not want to say the black man because it goes without saying. Except for one or two hon. members over there, I believe that most of them take the same position vis-a-vis the black man. After all, Sir, it was never stated by any of us that we are white men. I shall not go any further on that. Do not ask us to purge ourselves before you first take the mote out of thine own eye.

What I am saying is that South Africa for the first time broke International Law openly. (A VOICE: For the first time?) Let us say for the first time in relation to the particular problem.
6.40 p.m.

They have been breaking the law continuously. No one has said anything to them but this time they blatantly and without any reason or cause made a straight incursion into another land. All one said was one did not accuse them of not saying anything and one is disappointed that they allowed the debate to take the turn of criticising them for not saying anything.

I recall specifically acknowledging that I believe the Minister would have something to say when he got to the United Nations so it is not fair to suggest that we were accusing you of not saying anything. All we are saying is that we look forward to the debate on foreign affairs so that together we can enlighten the people of Barbados as to the facts.

Now, Sir, finally the hon. member for Christ Church West who believes that until his arrival foreign affairs and all other matters did not exist stood up and made much of nothing. He said that there was a lease but it was not for a year. I challenge him to give us the specific time that we were paying for empty space in New York.

He said further, and I notice his colleague did not essay to join him in these matters, he said further that the space was being repaired and they did not have to pay for the lease. Mr. Chairman, what is disgusting about the situation is that it occurred at a time in New York

when people were literally giving away real estate and the amount that we paid is a scandal. I believe that the Government, if they wish, could acknowledge what happened, tell the population that an error was made.

When he talks about an officer advising him to do that, if any officer had advised him to do that, both he and the officer should take the blame but, unfortunately, it is the Minister who has to answer Parliament, not the officer and before taking that advice, he should have taken the advice of his then Ambassador. His then Ambassador would not have advised him or did not advise him on that property. They were at 1866 U.N. Plaza — Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to go into detail. The hon. member knows the facts and knows that it was a great error we made. It was not the first error made in external affairs but we made that error and we should acknowledge it.

All I am saying is that when we are purchasing properties and when we are getting new offices we ought to take some cognisance of what has gone before. We made some errors in Brussels too. The hon. member should get up and tell us how much money we have spent in Brussels and he should tell us what benefit it is going to be to anybody in Barbados to have that office in Brussels and he should tell us what is the benefit that we have received so far that is different from when we had someone moving from London to Brussels. I look forward to the debate when it comes, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was very far from Toronto.

Hon. Dr. D. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman I shall merely state that I am happy to report that the hon. member for St. Michael West has with unexpected promptitude complied with my request by publicly confessing that he disassociates himself from those serious mistakes made by his Government with respect to black people in Southern Africa in the past.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if I may just briefly say something on this Resolution. The hon. member believes that by repeating something more than once makes it true.

In the first place, the lease on the premises at the consulate on the 18th floor was debated here in this House and the necessary Resolution brought down to this House.

In the second place, the same thing happened in relation to Brussels. If the hon. member said nothing then and does not remember what was said in the House, then he cannot blame me for his lack of memory or his lack of comprehension in those respects, Sir.

Let me again repeat, Sir, that the lease on the premises for the permanent Mission to the United Nations was coming to an end. It was necessary to acquire the new lease. The rent being offered was out of proportion, the rent being offered for the 18th Floor at the Consulate upstairs.

It was also felt that it would be better to house both Missions under the same roof because there were some benefits to be gained by sharing certain joint services. That aspect of the matter was investigated by a Civil Service Team. I was satisfied with their report. I do not have to disassociate myself from anything that the Government has done and for which I took collective responsibility during my term of office.

It is only a coward who runs away from mistakes that they sat down and condoned and in the last moment would deny their responsibility in that regard. The hon. member could now, *ex post facto* disassociate himself from decisions taken by his Government in relation to that Government's foreign policy. He either does not understand ministerial responsibility or.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I really ignore the ranting and the raving, Sir, but at no point did I disassociate myself from any decision made by my Government. At which point? Let him say when.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.....

Mr. FORDE: So he agreed with his Government voting at the time against black people who wanted to get a Resolution condemnatory of South Africa in Israel for their actions against the people of Namibia. He agreed with that policy, Sir.

The hon. member has the habit of getting here and pretending and this is not the only time I have seen him try to get out of collective responsibility for when he was in the last Cabinet. He either does it *sotto voce* or he gets up and says that this was then and that was then.

The point is that he was a member of the Government and he knows very well the past Government's policy on Southern Africa and that the one it adopted was topsy turvy. He knows very well that we in this Government reversed that policy and set a clear policy in relation to matters towards Southern Africa, an unmistakably clear policy. He does not know what it is, Sir. He must be the only body in Barbados who still remains ignorant of the foreign policy followed by this Government towards Southern Africa up to this day. Either he cannot understand, his head is too hard or he is being deliberately evasive on this issue. It is left for the public to judge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. member wish to speak on Head 80? I would ask the Hon. Minister.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I was not present but I have been informed that the allegation that the Barbados Labour Party was somehow responsible for Dr. Jerry Bull being here has been raised again. I really think that hon. members should refer themselves to a publication by the Government of Antigua outlining Barbados' involvement in the Space Research matter. Space Research would have to be relevant to this because I believe the hon. member for Christ Church West has already mentioned that we used to use Dr. Bull as a real estate agent for buying properties in Canada. God knows how much the hidden commissions were, but that is only by the way, Sir.

Hon. members perhaps are satisfied obviously that the Government of Barbados' money went to support research that went to kill black people in South Africa but it is quite untrue that anything ever came here with Jerry Bull in our time. Space Research came here in 1960 as a weather research project. It then became a satellite project run by McGill University. The American Army was approached for financing and when the American Army came McGill moved out and by that time the Democratic Labour Party was in power in Barbados.

Jerry Bull had close connections with the Americans, although Canadian, with the American Military. Senator Goldwater was Chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee personally moved a Bill in the American Senate to give Jerry Bull American nationality. 6.50 p.m.

Jerry Bull was always connected with the surreptitious side of armament manufacturing and armament research. I never heard Jerry Bull's name at all in connection with the High Altitude Research Project. Who was at Space Research before Jerry Bull was Carlton Brathwaite who also had close connections with the South African matter, as well as, with the Democratic Labour Party. A lot of water has passed beneath the bridge now and, I believe I can freely say it, Carlton Brathwaite personally told the Honourable Member for Christ Church West and me that he knew it was true that certain of the arms had gone to South Africa and plainly suggested to us that he also had gone in connection with the radar van and found it at Capetown docks. That is the indictment against your Party, that a man so close to the Rt. Hon. Leader of your Party could have carried on the space research connection with South Africa and your Party remained oblivious, some perhaps out of knowledge and the others out of ignorance, because there is no doubt that the Space Research chapter was a disgrace to Barbados. It is only

the fact that the Barbados Labour Party Government got elected in September, 1976 that stopped the shells being shipped from here instead of Antigua.

For the benefit of new Members of the Honourable House, as these things never get to the papers, Colonel Gregory sat down in my office and told me that when the North Point was bought the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition and he had agreed that it could not be used for some years in connection with the Cement Plant but that it would be leased to Space Research. When he came back to my office for the next meeting, because we were trying to get him to take it off our hands and we were negotiating, he asked me for a lease for the North Point and, after a lot of circumlocution about bringing lumber from Belize and so on, he told me that it was exceptionally well-adapted for the carriage of shells and that they had a NATO munitions contract for which they wanted to use the North Point. So have no doubt in your minds that either the wool was pulled over the eyes of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition in respect of it or, an even worse conclusion which I could not properly ask you to draw in here, a transaction of which Carlton Brathwaite well knew, the North Point was bought to carry shells to South Africa.

I tell you that and I was most surprised because at this meeting to which I refer, a joke really, I asked Colonel Gregory when he talked about the armament when I heard Space Research was an armament firm for the first time because we never knew it — the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John knew it because he knew about the shells that were to be fired from the Golan Heights to Damascus, he specifically approved the transfer of that contract from the Belgian Space Research to the Barbados Space Research — but none of us knew it, and when I was told about the armament work I asked Colonel Gregory as a joke: "No atomic artillery work?" and it turned out, as I subsequently was told. I was once interviewed by journalists in Britain and I was asked if I had privy knowledge, I, to the fact that Space Research had helped the South Africans to build an atomic shell. The whole thing was extraordinary to me because I had even forgotten that I had made the joke about the atomic artillery, and it turns out that subsequently the notes of the meeting with Sir Carlisle Burton and others — thank goodness, I never saw Colonel Gregory alone never in life — but all the others who were present at the meeting revealed the source of that, and so you were dealing with some very nasty customers indeed. Taking them to your bosom and using them to buy property in Canada and using them for the airport radar and everything, very, very tricky customers, indeed, you are dealing with and it cannot be any secret that the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, even if the shells are a secret to him, it cannot be a secret that he knew that Space Research had done the radar installation at

Johannesburg airport, that cannot be a secret because that was the qualification that Space Research offered for doing the radar installation at our airport. So it is impossible for the Opposition to say that it came as any great surprise to them, the connection between Barbados Space Research and South Africa. It is impossible to say that and if Honourable Members are trying to put it on us, well, you can try until your faces are blue. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West was not in Barbados at the time. You can go on trying.

Everybody remembers when HARP guns came here, they used to fire into the air about satellites. When Jerry Bull came here, he brought in ordinary cannon, some are still up there, ordinary cannon. He dug a big cave underneath the eastern end of the runway at Seawell airport and put a lot of shells inside that cave. There is an ammunitions store constructed by Space Research, it is still there now. I remember where it is, the Honourable Member for St. Andrew whispering in my ear when we toured the site, "where is this ammunition store", and he stepped aside. (LAUGHTER) All of that we had to go through before we could get Space Research out of the island because we wanted to get them to buy back the North Point. All of that we had to go through in connection with those people. It was a thoroughly, thoroughly bad business, Mr. Chairman. It is most unfair to suggest that we ever had anything to do with it other than to wind up the operation with no great loss to Barbados, and for what it is worth, I do not think this has been announced yet, the Government is acquiring all the assets of Space Research in Barbados to get rid of them totally and finally.

We had even considered what attitude we should take towards the company that had been convicted in the United States for illegally conspiring to send arms to South Africa because it is the Barbados company, not any of Bull's other companies, it is the Barbados company which was prosecuted in the United States for sending the shells to South Africa. Carlton Brathwaite's name is there on the papers for the case as one of the Directors. It is Balmoral Investments Ltd. which was formerly Paragon Holdings Ltd. or the way around which is the guilty company. (ASIDES: Who was their lawyer?) Who was their lawyer? Clyde Turney I suppose. Clyde Turney organised it all. Clyde Turney set up the company, organised the legislation to get them exemption from the Law of Nuisance, from the Law of Injunctions, was their man totally and entirely. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, they really must not put it on us and we are buying all that land up there for the Barbados Defence Force. We even had a lot of trouble getting the land. I mean these people who are powerful enough to send shells to South Africa are also powerful enough to want to fight the officers of the Barbados Defence Force when they are going on the Government's land which is the only training ground for

artillery, small artillery that we have and so on. We are acquiring all of the land, Mr. Chairman. We will eliminate the memory of Space Research from Barbados once and for all and, hopefully, we will eliminate the infelicities that were associated with Space Research and the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Minister wish to wind up?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I will only take about ninety seconds, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West expressed one error of fact on which a lot of this debate today was based. I want to clear that one up, Sir, because he took on the last Ministry of External Affairs and got bloodied and savaged as a result. The only point he made in relation to the new Ministry of Foreign Affairs relates to the fact that no statement was made. Well, he said Sir, "as a result of the South African incursion into Namibia." Now, as far as I know South Africa made an incursion into Angola and they say there were in hot pursuit of SWAPO Forces, but it is not true for the Honourable Member to say that he did not hear anything from this Government, because some two weeks ago, I issued a statement here in Barbados that was quite condemnatory of the South African incursion into Angola and at the same time condemnatory of the United States use of its veto in the special meeting of the United Nations Security Council, they were the only country who vetoed the resolution that was condemning South Africa for making this incursion into Angola.
7.00 p.m.

So the hon. member is quite mistaken in saying that no statement was issued from the Government, because I personally issued a statement some two weeks ago.

I think that is the only point of any substance that was made in relation to this matter. The others that he raised about the previous Ministry of External Affairs were so adequately answered by the hon. member for Christ Church West I need not get into that, Sir.

I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 7.00 o'clock. I shall report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 7.00 o'clock. This sitting stands suspended until 8.00 o'clock this evening. 7.03 p.m.

On Resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLI in the Chair.

HEAD 82 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, Head 82 subhead 5 is for the sum of \$400,000 to meet expenses incurred by the Caves Authority. Harrison's Cave at Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, is expected to open officially on the 28th November. The interior work is completed and there is some exterior work which involves the administrative building and landscaping etc. now to be finished. The sum of \$400,000, therefore, is to meet such expenses as will complete the Cave for the time being. I say for the time being because I was made to understand that there are some areas in the Cave which are yet to be explored but due to the finances of the Government it was not thought wise to pursue any further exploration of the Cave.

I would like to bring this Hon. Chamber up to date with the expenses incurred on the Caves from the time the exploration started. Some \$4,293,390 was incurred. That does not include the \$400,000 for which this Resolution now asks. It would mean therefore that the total expenditure on the Caves so far will be short of \$5 million. It is about \$4.7 million in total expenditure.

It is hoped that the Cave will be a very major tourist attraction and Barbadians will be welcome to visit the Cave. I myself have had two trips inside the Cave and I must say that I am rather impressed with the work done there and I join the Minister of Finance in congratulating the Barbadian workmen who have assisted in excavating the Cave. It is indeed a joy and a wonder to Barbados and it has been my understanding from professional reports that the Cave is a very outstanding Cave and it rates among the most eminent Caves to be seen anywhere at all. We hope that we will be able to realise income from this Cave which would help to go a long way towards meeting the operating costs. Everything is all set, all systems are set to go, there are two electric cars that were purchased from the United States and the cars are already operating. They have had their

demonstration runs and so forth, and, as I said, the official opening is slated for November 28. 8.10 p.m.

I hope, as the Minister responsible, to have the invitations extended to all hon. members from both sides of the House, because I think that it is a matter which does not confine itself to partisan politics.

I beg to move that Head 82 — Ministry of Housing and Lands — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, the Head really does not pose very much of a problem to me since, as was rightly stated, the project was started by the Democratic Labour Party, but there is one query to the note that I want to draw to the Minister's attention, and that is the note under Head 82 which reads "Supplementary provision in the sum of \$400,000 is required under the Capital Estimates Head 82, Ministry of Housing and Lands, Subhead 5 — Caves Authority to meet expenses until the end of August on the development work of the Harrison's Cave Project." Now this vote, it is specifically stated, is to meet expenses to the end of August. We are already in September and I heard from the Minister that there is still some work to be done on the exterior, and he said in conclusion that this was to be the last sum of money that was to be voted for this particular project. If this is so, the Addendum is not accurate and I want to know one or two things: if the note is inaccurate and if it is not, what is the projected additional expenditure that would be required to cover the continuing work and that work on the exterior of the cave that was mentioned that has to be completed for the opening on the 28th November.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am sorry that the hon. member is somewhat misled on the explanation here. When the estimate was given at that time, the cave was supposed to be completed before August or up to August. There will be no further expenses incurred. It is just that the work is being dragged on. It was held up, but this sum of money will take care of the expenditure, setting aside the dragging on of work beyond August, but there will not be any additional sum incurred. This sum of money will take care of the final work to be done on the cave.

The question that Head 82 — Ministry of Housing and Lands, stand part of the Schedule, was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, with the leave of the House, I should like to recommit Head 40 — Ministry of External Affairs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There being no objection, leave is granted.

Head 40 — Ministry of External Affairs — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Head 40 deals with the current expenditure and relates to the utilities, supplies and materials, maintenance of property, plant, equipment and furniture. I am asking leave to delete "office accommodation and motor vehicle", so that it will read "The additional funds are required to provide for furniture and equipment and to meet the general running expenses of the Consulate-General."

I beg to move that the Head as amended stand part of the Resolution.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO SUBHEAD 5 — OF HEAD 73 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House to move the passing of a Resolution to amend the Explanatory Note to Subhead 5 — Treasury — of Head 73, Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. Dr. CHELTENHAM, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

8.20 p.m.

Hon L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Order No.9 be the instant order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9 is the instant order of the day.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BAY STREET,
ST. MICHAEL**

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is an acquisition of two properties known as Savoy and Cliff Cot. Both dwellinghouses are the property of Mrs. Una Thelma St. Jour.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a typographical error in the Schedule to the Resolution. It should be "Savoy" instead of "Savory" as appeared on the Addendum.

The Child Care Board which was formerly housed or was part of the Welfare Department was severed from that Department in 1978. Last Parliamentary Session this hon. Chamber passed legislation which enabled the Child Care Board to undertake certain additional functions.

The extra responsibility of the Child Care Board then added responsibility. It became necessary, therefore, for the Child Care Board to have more spacious quarters or accommodation and as a result of this the Government has acceded to a request to provide this accommodation for the Child Care Board.

The Resolution therefore is to facilitate the Child Care Board and to provide headquarters for that particular organization.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. Dr. D. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with this Resolution. As Minister of Community Services, I am particularly concerned that the Child Care Department should have proper facilities in which to pursue its work.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, there is a new thrust in social development which has resulted in the hiving off of child care activities from the Welfare Department and this has been done in order to devote exclusive attention by specialists to the whole issue of parenting in Barbados which is becoming a very serious problem.

Within recent years there has been a rapid increase in emotionally disturbed children as well as children in

need of care and protection as a result of incompetent biological parents or the absence of any biological parents whatsoever and, therefore, given the growing dimensions of this problem, it has become necessary to make a special thrust on the problems relating to parenting.

The Child Care Board is charged with the responsibility for making this new thrust. Historically, Mr. Speaker, the issues relating to child care normally fall, even to philanthropists, or to governments whose solutions rested in the provision of mass residential homes for abandoned children or children of incompetent biological parents.

The mass residential home for children such as that in Newcastle, Sterling or the Old Nightengale Complex has proven to be totally inadequate for the problems of children in these last two decades of the 20th Century. This is because mass residential institutions tend to provide a totally impersonal ambience and very often are a poor substitute for the warmth, love, affection and comfortable domestic setting which we believe is necessary for the production of a well-balanced child.

In the 1970's there was a move away from the mass residential home by the development of small group homes which have recently been extended. The group home represents an improvement on the mass residential home in that it provides accommodation for a maximum of 8 children with house parents as against a home with 40 or 50 children but while it constitutes a significant advance on the mass residential home, it still has a quasi-institutional flavour and, with the best will in the world, house parents are acting *in loco parentis* for money and when they find it necessary to go on vacation, they are replaced by substitutes and very often their charges experience very great distress to find that these people whom they have been referring to as "Daddy" and "Mummy" were bogus "Daddys" and bogus "Mummys" and substitute bogus "Daddys" and bogus "Mummys" replace them for short periods before they come back.

This wreaks untold psychological damage upon these children and our researches indicate that much of the disorientation among youth, youth who are prone to deviant behaviour in this society, is largely the product of child care institutions and this problem is aggravated by the fact that as yet this society does not offer any after-care mechanism which would facilitate transition from institutional life to integration into the social mainstream.

The Child Care Department will, among other things, be charged with responsibility for developing proper aftercare mechanisms, in other parlance described

as half-way houses, to make sure that transition from institutional life to normal life takes place with as little friction as possible. But over and above this, we believe there can be no substitute for a family setting in which a child, if it is to be psychologically healthy, can be raised.

8.30 p.m.

Consequently, legislation was enacted last year to empower the Child Care Board to develop a foster care programme. The foster care programme will enable young people who can benefit from experiences within a normal domestic setting to do so. Now, we have invited philanthropic and public spirited Barbadians to enter into foster care agreements with the Child Care Department in order to take these children into care. These people will be given an allowance of between \$35 and \$50 per week per child and we have warned that all rip off artists and charlatans should stay far from this programme. The lives of our children are too precious for them to be set up for sale by people who believe that, by taking in a child, they can rip some money from the Treasury of this Government. In order to preclude these undesirable developments, Mr. Speaker, the Child Care Department will increase its staff effectively to monitor children who are in fostering circumstances in order to ensure that the standards of high quality which we expect of children in such circumstances are adhered to and maintained and the other terms of the agreement between the Child Care Department and foster parents are carried out in a satisfactory manner.

But, in the absence of biological parents, the next best situation for children would be to function in an adoptive situation where the bond between themselves and their parents is legally irrevocable. A foster parent can terminate the Agreement with the Child Care Department and once more the child is without a home, but, in an adoptive situation, there is a legal commitment by the parent in order to look after the child. That is why the amendment of the Adoption Act earlier this year facilitates adoption in Barbados today.

So, with these increased responsibilities devolving upon the Child Care Department, and with the acquisition of more staff, it becomes necessary for them to leave their cramped quarters. This building which the Government plans to acquire is adequate spatially for the purposes of the Child Care Department and I, as Minister of Community Services, am committed to ensuring that we move as swiftly away as possible from an institutional setting of child care which corrodes the mind and deforms the personality of the child and support with enthusiasm this resolution before us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Item Number 10.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item Number 10.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE LEASE OF
LAND AT BAGATELLE, ST. JAMES TO
TROWEL PLASTICS (BARBADOS) LTD**

Item Number 10 was called – To move the passing of a resolution to approve of the lease of land at Bagatelle, St. James to Trowel Plastics (Barbados) Limited.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, in 1961, the Government leased some 20 acres of land to Quarry Products Limited at Bagatelle. This lease ended in 1971, but the lease was renewed on a year to year basis. In 1975 the lease expired. Quarry Products sub-leased part of the 20 acres to a company known as Trowel Plastics Limited, but, when Quarry Products went out of operation when the lease was finally concluded, Trowel Plastics did not pay any further rents to Quarry Products. There was a question, therefore, of who to pay rent to? Trowel Plastics did not pay any rent therefore from 1975 and, as far back as 1977, when this matter was taken up by the Ministry of Housing and Lands, Trowel Plastics suggested that they were quite willing to pay all the arrears provided they were told what the rents were. Trowel Plastics – the correspondence from the Ministry revealed, that Trowel Plastics was then offered the land on lease which they have accepted. Cabinet agreed that, before the lease be granted to Trowel Plastics, that they should pay up all the arrears from 1974 which they have done.

This resolution, therefore, is to give Trowel Plastics the right or to give Government the right to lease the area of land which Trowel Plastics had from 1969. The rent is \$300 per month or \$3 600 per year, the lease is for 15 years, but there is a clause relating to the periods of time at which the lease will be reviewed. Every three years, the lease will be reviewed. Therefore, this resolution is asking for the approval of this Honourable Chamber so as to enable a firm which has done Barbados tremendous good in the field of export – Trowel plastic is a product which had got not only CARICOM recognition, – this resolution is to enable that company to continue on sort of a permanent basis, to give them permanency to operate at Bagatelle.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Order Number 11.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item Number 11 is the Instant Order of the Day.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHURCH
VILLAGE, ST. MICHAEL**

Item Number 11 was called – To move the passing of a resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Church Village, St. Michael.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall not be long in introducing this resolution because it is somewhat self-explanatory. It is an acquisition of a parcel of land in Church Village to make way for the Church Village redevelopment project there, Church Hill and Church Village in St. Michael. All of us are aware of the development that is about to take place in that area and it has become necessary to acquire this portion of land. 8.40 p.m.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of this House there was a Resolution that was carried over to today's sitting which was finally passed, but at that time, Sir, some comments were made on the Land Acquisition Act. Some time ago the Government published land acquisition notices in respect of properties in Church Village. I assume, Sir, that this is part, in some respects, of the notices published at that time. If I am correct, Sir, it included at that time virtually all the properties bounded on the east by Crumpton Street, Church Village, by Constitution Road and Roebuck Street and so on. It is possible that Government has subsequently abandoned the acquisition of some of those properties, I am not so sure about it, I believe that those are some very valuable properties.

The important thing about this, Sir, is that very often Government publishes acquisition notices which have the effect in a way of making impotent the land owned by people whose lands the Government is going to acquire. In other words, there is nothing once those notices have been published that those property owners can do with those properties, and very often it takes Government a considerable time. It is not always the fault of the Government but very often it takes Government a considerable time before the negotiations for the purchase of those properties can be finalised. The point I am

raising here, Sir, is to impress upon the Government that what in fact they can do, and I think this was touched upon last time, is to speed up the process of acquiring these properties. Sometimes Government might decide against purchasing the properties and is not quick enough so to inform the owners of these properties, but at the same time these property owners could receive other offers which they cannot accept because of the acquisition notices published in respect of these properties, so I think this is a matter which the Government should look into to ensure that these acquisitions can be done as expeditiously as possible.

There is nothing in this Resolution that we on this side are going to oppose, we are going to support it, but I think these are things that should be borne in mind.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just want to draw one very important fact to the attention of the Hon. Minister for Housing. I am afraid, Sir, that this is another chunk of the constituency known as the City of Bridgetown which is going away from the representative of the City of Bridgetown. But, Mr. Speaker, there is another little area in the constituency of the City of Bridgetown which may not be known to hon. members, but, of course, it is known to me. It is a little area known as Riverside just off Constitution Road. There are not more than 11 and not less than 7 houses. These houses are just above the bus stand which is to the north of the Constitution River and whenever there is a heavy downpour of rain, and certainly whenever there is any weather forecast for flash flooding or flooding in low lying areas, the water courses through the houses.

Mr. SPEAKER: From Church Village over to these houses.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with Church Village.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker. When I canvassed those houses in May and June of this year the people who live there appealed to me to put a case on their behalf to the Government that they should become part of the Church Village redevelopment project. There are just a few houses and they really do want to be re-located in an area which is not so easily prone to flooding, and I wish very much to draw this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister for Housing, and I am entirely in agreement with this.

I am sure that I am within the bounds of this Resolution. In fact the people who live there go to Church Village for their recreation. The young boys, and there are very few of them, who themselves live in Riverside go to Church Village to play dominoes, they have girl friends in Church Village, they go to Church Village to the shop,

so they think of themselves as already part of the Church Village community, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know of much recreation in Church Village.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I do, Sir, and so Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw that particular situation to the attention of the Minister of Housing, and I really do hope that he gives it his especial and prompt attention, because this is really a case of my bringing to the Hon. House of Assembly a message directly from those few people who live and reside and have their habitation at Riverside.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I take the point raised by the Hon. Minister and I wish to give her the assurance that I will pay some close attention and consideration to it.

The point raised by the hon. member for St. Michael North, I tend to support his views on the question of land acquisition and the problems associated with this. I am very concerned about the length of time that drags on between the actual acquisition, or the intention to acquire, and the time it is actually completed. I have asked that everything be done. I will have to examine the system because sometimes it is through no fault of the Ministry, sometimes it is the fault of the landowner and there is a disagreement on the price of the land, and these are problems I am hoping that I will be able to address myself to and find solutions.

I take the point, I think it is a very valid point, and I give the Hon. Chamber the assurance that I will try to resolve it. I do not think there were any other points raised.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 8.50 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO COMPULSORY ACQUIRE LAND AT MY LORD'S HILL

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 18 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at My Lord's Hill, St. Michael.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, the Addendum to this Resolution is very simple. It calls for approval of this Hon. Chamber to enable the Ministry to acquire 0.792 hectares of land belonging to the late Julius Clarke of My Lord's Hill, St. Michael.

I look forward to a very interesting debate. I anticipate a debate on housing on this particular Resolution,

and I wish to say that I feel very capable of handling any matters relating to housing. It is the intention of the Government to provide more housing accommodation for the people of Barbados. It has been realised that with the limited land area, especially in the St. Michael area, the Government must, wherever possible, acquire lands on which they can erect a number of terrace units. Terrace units in some cases are ideal because of the scarcity of land and the size of the area of land.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I look forward to hearing some interesting comments on this particular Resolution, and I would prefer at this stage with that outline on the Resolution to bide my time until I make the appropriate reply.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is rising to second the passing of the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this Resolution gives me very great pleasure to support. This land is being acquired in My Lord's Hill in the constituency of St. Michael East, and it is for some time now that I have been pressing vigorously for the improvement of housing for the people in that constituency. This land that is about to be acquired, Mr. Speaker, is the site of the relocation of people who now live in Thompson Land Licorish Village. I do not know how many of you in this room know of Thompson Land, Licorish Village, but I recall, a few days before the last election, the Leader of the Opposition accompanied by a candidate who apparently had sent out an S.O.S. was seen walking around Thompson Land, Licorish Village, and I happened to be in a house and I heard the amazing confession by a man who led this country for 15 years that he did not know there was a place in Barbados looking like this with such deplorable conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step to extricating the unfortunate people of Thompson Land, Licorish Village, from the unfortunate circumstances in which they find themselves. Living on the side of a hill without paved roads, with very few houses enjoying any running water, very few houses with any electricity, the conditions can only be described as primitive. Committed as I am to ensuring that the people of Barbados in general and the people of St. Michael East, in particular, are elevated to a better quality of life, this Resolution I support. It has come not a moment too soon, Mr. Speaker, and I would want to press the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands to bend every effort to ensuring that the people of Thompson Land, Licorish Village, are removed from their present state at the earliest opportunity.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, that affords the Ministry of Housing an opportunity to embark upon a programme which would reverse what I call the trend of scatter housing. In the past the policy has been to move people from communities in which they have spent most of their lives and send them into other communities to live. This has created a condition which sociologists call anomic disorder. Many people have a feeling of rootlessness in having been placed in such a situation, and in Pinelands for example, we have had experiences of a great deal of crime resulting from anomies suffered by people who had been brought in from a multiplicity of communities and forced to live together. Through the efforts of the Ministry of Community Services, some cohesiveness is now being brought into that fragmented area, and Mr. Speaker, we hope that a situation that lends itself to crime and other kinds of anti-social behaviour would be avoided if housing is brought to people in the area where they live for their benefit rather than uprooting them and taking them into other districts where they find it difficult to settle down and where they still have a point of reference in the communities from which they came.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to protest vociferously should any cattle barbers be brought into the My Lord's Hill area when people there are living in dilapidated conditions. I do not believe that the people in this area would take kindly to that situation, and I am hoping that the Minister of Housing and Lands hears me and hears me well and ensures that the plight of these people is ameliorated without delay, and that this project be set up at My Lord's Hill for the benefit of the people in Licorish Village. Thank You, Mr. Speaker.

9.00 p.m.

Mr. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is the best news coming from the Ministry of Housing for a little while since the news that has been reaching us on the housing situation over the last couple of weeks speaks of stoppages of projects, laying off of workers and possible escalation of prices at the West Terrace Housing Development.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the topic of housing is one that should be very close to all of us since it is the desire and ambition of both sides of the House that the housing stock of Barbados should be improved and we all look forward to the day when we can look with pride to the quality of the houses throughout this country. The Government's part in the total development of their housing situation in Barbados has to be very carefully thought out.

The development of housing in Barbados has to be seen as a combination of Government's efforts and that of private enterprise, with that of private enterprise given the necessary encouragement and incentives by the

Government and, therefore, I am saying that, as far as the Government's thrust in housing is concerned, of necessity they will have to look at the lower end of the social strata, the end where we see the squatter and, as was so amply said earlier, the areas of depression in housing which really at this time of the development of Barbados we should be ashamed of.

To this end, I would like the Minister in his reply, since I have not had the privilege of seeing the projection and total Governmental thrust in housing to say what the proposals are for the future housing development in Barbados. At the moment, the Government's housing development falls broadly into two areas, (1), the construction of houses, more properly called row houses for rental purposes and (2), construction of houses now mostly in the middle income category for purchase by private individuals. If we should.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now the hour of interruption and I should enquire if the matter under discussion is of a controversial nature.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on this side there are some of my members who would wish to speak on this matter and I am advised that the matter is likely to be controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not concerned with what is likely to be the position at a later date.

Mr. SANDIFORD: The matter is controversial, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do we understand that hon. members are likely to vote against the Resolution?

Mr. SANDIFORD: That is a possibility, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I personally do not see what is controversial about this Resolution, what is likely to be controversial, Sir. It is rather a straightforward Resolution set out to acquire a portion of land for housing but since members on the other side -- I think we have had a very cooperative day. The Minister himself said he expected a debate on it.

Mr. Speaker, it is the moment of interruption. Since it is indicated that it is controversial, then, Sir, the power now lies in your hand.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I raised the question of the membership of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board towards the end of our sitting last week. I think there was agreement on both sides that there would be an amendment to the membership as recorded on the Order Paper and I therefore wish to move that the name of the member for St. Philip North be deleted

and the name of the member for St. Philip South be substituted on the Sugar Production and Export Control Board.

Mr. GREAVES: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, is seeking leave of this hon. House to substitute on the Sugar Production and Export Control Board the name of the hon. member for St. Philip South for that of the hon. member for St. Philip North as it now stands. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, it may be substituted, St. Philip South for St. Philip North.
9.10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Tuesday, 22nd September, 1981 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

The question was put and was resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker accordingly adjourned the Sitting at 9.14 p.m.