

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 - 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th January, 1982.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House); 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); Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Minister of Housing and Lands); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Transport and Works); Mr. M. A. KING; and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, the 15th day of December, 1981.

Messrs. W. O. FRANKLIN, L. E. SANDIFORD and Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of the 15th day of December, 1981 of this Honourable House be taken as read.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received copies of Accounts and Statements for the month of November 1981 as prepared by the Accountant General.

Likewise, I have received copies of the Auditor General's Report on the results of the examination of the Accounts of the Island for the year ending 31st March, 1981.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, the Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for six months ended 31st October, 1981.

I also, lay, Sir, on my own behalf, the Post Office (Inland Letter Post) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; The Post Office (Overseas Letter Post) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; The Post Office (Private Letter Box) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; The Post Office (Mail Notice Service) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; The Post Office (Miscellaneous Service) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; The Post Office (Overseas) (Parcel Post) (Amendment) Regulations, 1981; and the Post Office (Surface Mail) (Gratuities) Regulations, 1981.

On behalf of the Minister of Trade and Industry, I am commanded to lay the First Annual Report of the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation for the year ended 31st March, 1981.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Fire Service (Allowances) (No. 2) Regulations,

1981; and I beg to lay the Report on the Probation Service for the year 1980.

Mr. B. M. TAITT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Education Regulations, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

A Resolution to approve the abandonment of acquisition of a parcel of land the property of Texaco West Indies Ltd. situate at Spring Garden, Brighton, Black Rock, St. Michael.

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

A Resolution to approve the lease of property at Government Hill, St. Michael to Mr. Wilbert Callender.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of several parcels of land at Bonnetts, Christ Church.

A Resolution to approve the Education Regulations, 1982.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Probyn Street, St. Michael.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$186,075 from the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$7,320,855 from the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, Sir, I beg to give notice of a Bill to make provisions respecting the extension of a franchise granted to the Barbados Light and Power Company.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to make provisions respecting the extension of a franchise granted to the

Barbados Light and Power Company was read a First Time.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I wish to state that the proposed Statement which was to be made to this Honourable House, as mentioned by the Prime Minister, in relation to games rooms, or what have been in recent months referred to as casinos, or whatever you call them, will not be made. The Prime Minister no longer proposes to make this Statement, Sir, since he has dealt with the issue in the way it should have been dealt with and by way of a Cabinet decision. I think that a statement relating to that issue is not necessary at this time. (Asides)
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have some order.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Orders of the Day, I have received a Message from the Other Place respecting amendments to the Copyright Bill.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you mentioned that you had received a Message from the Other Place which relates to the Copyright Law governing similar or related matters. It has been sent back to this Chamber with a few amendments on page 8, page 14 and page 39.

I beg to move that this House do now concur. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order. I am to enquire whether the proposed amendments have been circulated.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have just received these and that is why I indicated to the Clerk that I should like to discuss this matter probably a little later in the day, so that they can be circulated. I have just received them and that is why I was passing information between myself and the Clerk. They have not received them, and I would be grateful if the House would decide to let us deal with the matter later today. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this matter can be disposed of when the amendments are circulated to honourable Members, and I would like to ask that you get the Clerk to have these amendments circulated to Honourable Members in the correct way.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is how long will we continue to teach the Clerk from the Chair in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are certain basic facts by which Your Honour will have to be guided in acquiescence to the request, if it is such a request, from the Leader of the House. Your Honour informed us that the Other Place had sent us certain amendments to a particular measure which had been passed by this House. It is a question of fact. Fact No. 1, Your Honour said it and therefore it has got to be so. Fact No. 2 is that we have not seen the amendments. Fact No. 3 is that the honourable Member has got up and asked us to acquiesce in the passage of something that we have not seen. In other words, it is a game of blind man's bluff and we are not in here to play games. He cannot pre-suppose that when we have seen the amendments we are going to concur in them, so we can get on now with the business of the day. That is all Your Honour needed to say.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I think this matter has been aired. I myself have just received the amendments and I was under the impression that they had received copies of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the Hon. Leader of the House wants to make a motion that we deal with them during the course of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is what I intimated, and I now move a formal motion that this measure be dealt with later in today's sitting, after they have received copies of course and if they are satisfied. That is as much as I can do. I am not the Clerk of the House. I can only go by what I receive from the Clerk. I have just received them and I was under the impression that you yourself had received them. There is nothing more I can do at this stage but to ask that they be deferred until later in the day.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to request your guidance on a point of order. The motion that it should be dealt with later today can only be properly entertained when we have seen what we are being asked to deal with later in the day. There was a point which I should have made before I sat down on the last occasion. I am not in a position to say that there has been any negligence on the part of the Clerk because I do not know whether the Clerk was supposed to distribute these amendments before Your Honour had informed us that you had received them; so I am not getting into that. I think that is an administrative matter which Your Honour is fully competent to deal with, so I do not know what the honourable Member is jumping into this row between you and the Clerk for. That is none of our business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW Not "row" Sir, probably that is an unfortunate word.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please withdraw the sentence "row between the Chair and the Clerk" immediately.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I withdraw without hesitation. What I mean to say is getting into administrative matters which are exclusively within the competence of the Chair and nothing to do with them. When I said "row", I meant discussion, and I withdrew it, and I have no intention of getting into any kind of discussion on administrative matters. I am not even a member of the Debates Committee.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am going to second the motion for the postponement of this matter until later in the day. There is one thing I want to say and it is that Parliament is a serious place, and when we come here we come to do the business of the people, it is the duty of everybody concerned, from the Speaker down, to see that everything is put in order when we come here to do the people's business.
12.35 p.m.

I think we are having too much of this and I hope that in 1982 the problems which we might have encountered in 1981 will not be seen. When I come here to work, I come here to work and to see that the people's business is done. The people are not expected to have amateurs put in the office of professionals no matter what post or position it is and I want to see a situation within this Parliament and nobody can tell me what to say.....

I speak in here with a full sense of my public duty and responsibility and I speak with the conscience of the electorate of the constituency of St. Andrew and therefore I say what I have to say. I say this without fear and I defy anybody to deny me the right, unless I misconduct myself in here when Your Honour will have the right to ask me to leave.

I wish to see in the future that all efforts are made to ensure that the machinery of Parliament is so conducted and geared that the work of Parliament can be carried on without interruptions and in the best interest of the populace of this country.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the Motion before us, I think that we should try and bring a measure of efficiency to the operations of this House of Assembly and I am not talking about the rulings from the Chair or anything like that because you do carry out your duties as efficiently as possible but we

cannot start 1982 giving the impression that somehow or another, it is not known what is to be done.

The Senate, I suppose, had its last Meeting sometime towards the end of last year. They have made amendments as you have announced today to certain complicated and complexed Bills which were passed by this Honourable Chamber. There were lengthy debates on those Bills.

It is really asking too much of the legislators of this country to come in here and at very short notice, or merely on an intimation, and on the first day of the sitting, without having time even to see what the amendments from the Senate may be, to take a decision on those amendments which relate, as I have said, to complexed Bills. We do not know whether they relate to substance or whether they relate to style or form.

I am asking that this House, during this year, follow step-by-step, the procedures as laid down for dealing with these matters and we should not be hurried or rushed into dealing with such matters because we will only end up passing bad legislation.

The Opposition is going to vote against this if the Leader of the House persists with it and I am suggesting to him, I am appealing to him that in the interest of sound procedure in this House, not to use your members merely to push this through but let the House have time to study the matter. Let us deal with it next week or at some other time after we have an occasion to see what the amendments are and to study them.

I am appealing to the good sense of the Leader of the House. I think we co-operate when it is desirable that such co-operation should be given. We cannot cooperate on this measure and we are appealing for the matter to be deferred until a future sitting of the House.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I respect the honourable Member who just sat down and what he has said, believe me, is exactly what I have intimated – that I am asking for a postponement of it and we do it later in the day.

If they feel that it is such a complexed matter substituting the word “is” for “are” and the word “anthem” for “emblem” and the figure “17” for “15”, I am prepared to let us do it next week. I have absolutely no objection. This big long-horn water speech is over something which I think is really not that great to deal with.

The amendments were not circulated. We accept that and we ask to have it deferred until later in the day. When the honourable Leader sees the amendment, I am quite sure he will say, “let us do it now,” because it is simply that

where the word “is”, “are” should be: where the word “anthem” is “emblem” should be and where the figure “17”, is “15” should be. That is what it is about.

I realise however, Sir, that he is actually saying that some other time when they may be something of greater substance he would like us to make sure, Sir, that we do not rush it through and you can rest assured that I am not one who would try to rush through legislation unnecessarily in the interest of the people of Barbados. That is the position as it is. If he wants us to wait until next week to do it, Sir, that is your problem, “is” for “are”, “emblem” for “anthem” and “17” for “15”. That is it.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Honourable House is called upon to deal with a procedural matter. Procedures must make for the smooth functioning of Parliament if when followed there are found to be good but they must first be studied by all of us.

It is incumbent upon us, in this Honourable Chamber, on receiving a message or request from the Other Place, before we proceed to deal with our own business, to dispose of the request of the Other Place. This is what is before us at this present moment.

If it is found, however, that we cannot so dispose of it in a moment, it is for the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, perhaps, to liaise and agree on an appropriate time for disposing of any business which ought to have been dealt with before we enter upon our own business. I cannot and will not undertake to be a teacher from this Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS and Mr. N. K. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took their seats.
12.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung.

The question that the request of the Other Place be deferred until a later hour during the course of the Day's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing itself as follows:-

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. A. TRUSS, Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. J. G. ODLE – 14.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES,

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. N. K. SIMMONS — 9.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Sir, that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 17, 18, 20, 42 (5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting.

And Sir I would like to tell other honourable Members on the other side of the Honourable House Sir, that during the course of the day's Sitting, if time permits us, I can assure them of dealing with questions and any business which they may have. If time permits us, Sir.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The question.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the motion. I am not aware that it has been seconded, but, I am not rising to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been seconded.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you for your information. The honourable Member said that he would give us time to deal with questions. What he means is that he will give himself time to answer questions which are put to the other side. So, that kind of dispensation does not impress us over here, at all.

Under the Standing Orders, Private Members' Business is a very important aspect of Parliament. Due to the frequent suspension of Standing Orders, we have had no Private Members Business and debates thereon. I am particularly affected because there is a current debate in progress and I have a Resolution, under Private Members' Business which if not dealt with within the next three days suffers the fate of expiration by defluxion of time. Your Honour will understand what I mean, according to our Standing Orders. What I would like from the Leader of the Honourable House is an assurance that at some time today that Private Members' Business will be dealt with. If not necessarily at the statutory time, at some time during the course of the day's sitting. To say, that if time permits any other different matter other than questions would be dealt with is not a satisfactory undertaking as far as this side is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of forgetfulness, because the rules of the

Honourable House do not allow me to call it "hypocrisy" from certain people sitting opposite, over the last month or two. And, this is yet another example.

I have been in this Honourable House for 16 years and I venture to suggest that during the 10 years I was in Opposition, three quarters or four-fifths of all meetings of the House of Assembly opened with the suspension of Standing Orders, with no time being allowed to the Opposition for Private Members' Business. Indeed, questions were seldom answered. We used to see a situation with 40 unanswered questions on the Order Paper. Today, there are three. We would see a situation with 11, 12, 14, 18 resolutions. To deal with that problem, the Rules were changed, to limit Your Honour — because you were the one who used to bring resolutions in great numbers Sir — to limit Your Honour to only three resolutions at any one time, to limit all honourable Members, but it was acknowledged that the rule was directed against Your Honour. (Aside) It was acknowledged by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He stood in this Place, Sir, and said they were bringing in rules to deal with field marshals and so on. (Asides).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Rt. Hon. Member was on the Committee that made.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition rise?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of personal explanation Sir. The Rt. Hon. Member has made a statement Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:.....which is incorrect Sir, but I will speak after.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you Your Honour. The Rt. Hon. Member is correct in saying that I was a member of the Committee and he was not. But, the Rt. Hon. Member will also recall that when we set out to appoint people to the Committee and I nominated Your Honour to be a member of the Rules Committee, he queried the nomination on the grounds that you were the field marshal of disorder and we were putting you on the Committee to make Rules for order in the Honourable House (ASIDE: And, you agreed.)

But, the point is that you and I sat on the Committee to deal with the time table of the Honourable House and gave access to Private Members — which mainly meant the Opposition — to Parliamentary time to debate their resolutions. Since I have held this position, Your Honour, I have been very strong and it has led me to clashes with the Hon. Leader of the Honourable House and with the former Hon. Leader of the Hon.

House that Standing Orders should be suspended, as little as possible, because the Private Members deserve a fair crack of the whip. On this occasion, the Hon. Leader of the Honourable House, with the concurrence of all of us, thinks it necessary to suspend the Standing Orders.

The issue raised by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition is really an issue of detail and not one of principle. In the days when he was Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, he seldom attended the Honourable House, and, therefore, he is not aware that all that a Private Member who sees one of his Resolutions about to expire by the fluxion of time has to do is to request, even on a suspended day, five minutes to move that the Resolution stays on the Order Paper. I have never known such a request refused.

If the Rt. Hon. Member, despite his 31 years less 18 months in the House of Assembly is unaware that it is a practically unshakeable convention of the Honourable House that all you have to do is attend and ask that your resolution be preserved, that is no tribute, either to his memory or to the attention that he pays to his parliamentary duties, parliamentary conventions, and parliamentary principles. I have not the slightest doubt that the Hon. Leader of the Honourable House will, in due course, make it possible, both for the Resolution of the Rt. Hon. Member standing in Private Members' Business No. 2 and the amendment which I fully intend to move thereto in due course, because I no more wish to lose the opportunity of moving an amendment congratulating the Chief Electoral Officer on the conduct of the election than the Rt. Hon. Member wants to lose the opportunity of abusing the electorate for rejecting his party. And, later on in the day, I will fully support any move to extend the period during which this Resolution can be debated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

12.55 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I could not sit here, Sir,....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon.

DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. A. TRUSS, Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. J. G. ODLE — 14.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING, Mr. B. M. TAITT, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. N. K. SIMMONS — 9.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the Instant Order of the day. Item No. 1.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1981-82, No. 10

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Addendum speaks as fully as perhaps this matter needs. It is an amount required to settle a claim by consultants who were responsible for the work done at Grantley Adams Airport which was recently completed.

The matter has been analysed fully by the Attorney General and the Government has come to an agreement that a certain additional sum in the amount of \$88,835.88 should be paid, and we therefore need to supplement the vote by some \$62,000 in order to meet the appropriate sum, and I beg to move that Capital Head 77 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we are very concerned on this side that the Addendum to this Resolution certainly does not provide the kind of information sought when one considers that a considerable sum of money is to be voted for the purpose suggested in the Resolution. Indeed, Sir, it seems to me to be another example of the sloppiness of the administration of the Government, headed by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, that an Addendum to a Resolution can read as follows:

"During the final year of construction of Terminal 1 at the Grantley Adams International Airport, International Airports Consultants of Montreal Ltd. (CAIM) and Cansult Ltd. Management and Electrical Consultants respectively to the

Airport Development Project Office (ADPO), made representation for additional fees for work performed by them which they described as extra to their terms of reference for consultancy services to the project."

Now, Mr. Chairman we are being asked to vote this money by consultants who described that their work was "extra to their terms of reference". It would seem to me that if you employ consultants you give them terms of reference and if there is an increase in cost in respect of duties carried out within their terms of reference, that can be a legitimate matter for re-examination for further payments.

1.05 p.m.

To come in here with an Addendum to a Resolution virtually saying that the Government is not satisfied that the work that they did was within their terms of reference ... it does not say that the Government is satisfied that it was within their terms of reference; it does not say that after an examination it conformed with what they perceived to be a reasonable commitment on the part of those persons; they say that the consultants described it as being outside their terms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe it would be helpful if the hon. Member would read the second paragraph.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am continuing. I am saying that it is highly irresponsible to come in here asking for over \$62 000 and have within that Addendum a phrase saying that a group of people described it as so and so. I would even go further, Mr. Chairman, and say that they have not even got their arithmetic right, because if you look at the amount remaining in the Estimates and when you add the amount now requested, it certainly does not come to \$62 196. I make it twelve cents less than that. (Asides)

You may consider it ridiculous, but there has been so much wastage of money in this country that I consider it my duty as the chief spokesman on this side on matters relating to finance to be the main custodian of the public purse in Barbados. Over \$200 million have been thrown down the drain by this Government in the past five and a half years, and the time will come when they will be totally exposed to the public of Barbados as a consequence of gross mismanagement. As I have said before, I will be taking a strong position on every single cent of expenditure within this Parliament because in the long run, it is the people out there who are faced with massive increases in the cost of living who have to find this kind of money to pay for the incompetence of the present administration. If it is one dollar or one cent, it is going to come under scrutiny as far as I am concerned, and I perceive that to be an important function on my part and on the part of this Opposition in this Parliament.

This in my view represents mismanagement. It represents mismanagement not of the order that we have seen in relation to CARIFESTA and the white elephant out there in St. Peter at Heywoods Development, but it is part and parcel of the total mismanagement and carelessness on the part of the Government in respect of the expenditure of public funds.

No wonder, Mr. Chairman, that at a time when the tourist industry in this country is going through serious difficulties, at a time when all the major carriers which bring people to Barbados are running at a significant loss on their over-all expenditures, at a time, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister responsible for Aviation should be out there trying to persuade the airlines to reduce their fares to Barbados, we find the ineptness of this administration in the most cowardly manner announcing a further tax that would constitute a disincentive to any efforts on the part of Government to try to reduce the fares of passengers coming to Barbados; and to do so by virtually abandoning their responsibility both as Minister of Finance and as Minister responsible for Aviation and leaving it to a senior civil servant to announce or misrepresent a tax that relates to the utilisation of the airport.

I consider it to be a most reprehensible abandoning of duty both by the Prime Minister of this country and the Deputy Prime Minister, and it must be said on the floor of this House. Not surprising, Sir, that the over-runs on capital costs and the poor management structure at that airport have resulted in considerable inconvenience to many passengers coming into Barbados.

Very stupidly, they changed the system of immigration officers up there where the Royal Barbados Police Force performed a very good and commendable duty and one that was well recognised throughout the world as one of the smoothest immigration services at any airport that anyone can go to anywhere in the world. That has been changed, Sir, and the immigration officers up there work extremely slowly and they cannot process the passengers with the efficiency with which it was done by the Royal Barbados Police Force when more people were passing through Grantley Adams Airport.

Perhaps an even greater scandal is the failure of the Government to make proper provisions to get the baggage off the aircrafts when they arrive here in Barbados and many persons have to stand up in the arrivals section of the airport often from one to two hours waiting for the baggage to come off the aircrafts if two or three aircrafts should arrive at the same time. All these things are relevant for discussion when this kind of matter comes before Parliament and we have had the rather sad situation

where when financial matters are brought before this Parliament that they are not properly examined and very often inadequate information is given, and we would want to have some further information.

I am calling on the Minister of Finance to tell this Honourable House how it is that you have had to spend another \$62,000 and to give us a break-down of these costs, what the people were actually doing, what were these duties that were extra to their terms of reference, and why it is that you are now asking the taxpayers of this country to underwrite expenditures which were extra to the terms of reference which you gave to consultants from outside to work in Barbados. What is the \$62,000 all about?

Do not just come in here so because the days are finished — whether we are dealing with this or loans from the Caribbean Development Bank, or loans from the World Bank, there will be no more tricks inside here where you can come and tell us one-tenth of the story, and then when we discover later on, we realise that the public of Barbados has been taken for a ride again and again because of the gross incompetence of the Minister of Finance of this country.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side are demanding further information as to how this over-run took place, what it was spent on. Was it spent on travelling? Was it spent on entertainment? Was it spent on bribes? What was it spent on? We do not know. There is nothing at all about how it was spent in the Addendum and you expect us to sit down here and support this Resolution. We are going to vote against it unless we get further information.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief because I have a very simple request to make. Consultants are paid on a percentage basis for work which is done on any project for which they have been employed. Consultants sell services; their services are their professional skill and experience. By my calculation an additional fee of nearly \$100,000 is going to mean an expenditure of somewhere in the vicinity of \$350,000 to \$400,000, and what I would like to make — I am not making any accusations or anything like that.....I was responsible for hiring these consultants in case you do not know. You may not have been under the Queen's peace at the time because 1976 appears to have been the beginning of creation for a lot of people, but I certainly had a hand in hiring these consultants and in approving the capital project for the airport and getting the arch hall built, the runway extended and the parking apron and everything else, and awarding the contracts for the work. If additional work was done, it was work which was not in the original project.

1.15 p.m.

I am not saying that there is no additional work but I just want to know what the work is and then I would be in a position to agree with the people from the Ministry of Finance who examined the amount of additional work. Maybe it was design work. Maybe it was some other kind of work which the consultants were called upon to perform. I just want information. That is all.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that today, not the Leader of the Opposition so much, but the aspirant to his office, is in a very truculent mood. I believe the Opposition obviously assumes that they are on an up-swing in popular favour and one will witness the division of this House on trivialities, whether it is matters of procedures or matters of substance.

I know the honourable Member who has spoken has taken what I have considered as a mature sort of approach to the matter. It is obvious on any contract, building contract, in any part of the world that I know, that you will anticipate some extras to contract and in some cases, cost over-runs. There are not necessarily the same thing, Mr. Chairman. You may get extras to contracts because you get deletions and omissions or you may get additions.

The contract for the Grantley Adams International Airport involved an expenditure in the region of \$28 million. It was one contract that came in within the figure basically and the figure was originally, I believe, negotiated by the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John. The cost over-runs for the Grantley Adams International Airport were minimal.

The work was done under a series of sub-contracts to various persons and I think we can be reasonably satisfied that the expenditure at that Airport was an expenditure justified. The conception as it was by the Democratic Labour Party was correct as indeed we had shown in the way we approached the airport and the seaport and it is not a matter on which I expect, in this day and age, one should be seeking to make political capital.

I heard Mr. Frank Walcott once said in reply to an expirant to a political office in this House who said that Christ Church had the only airport in Barbados. "You have to put it some place. Why the hell do you think they should put it any place else. We could not have 12 Airports in Barbados. We are not big enough for that purpose." So I do not believe that the two great political parties in this country should be arguing about trivialities and we should both accept that from time to time we will have to project the development of the main entry points of communications in Barbados to deal with the developing countries such as ours and with an expanding economy.

I do not think that any of us can quarrel about the expenditure of the \$28 million at that airport and I do not think that any of us who are being reasonable would suggest that there was either money being paid for bribes by the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party in relation to this contract and I regret very much, no matter how much my friend the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central may seek to adopt this style by slipping in a word to throw out by way of innuendo in this House, any suggestion at all that there was any corruption or any bribes being given on any contract and I am speaking as a Member of this Parliament and as a member of the Government. I resent very much that type of approach to issues such as this.

I am sorry that the Hon. Minister for Civil Aviation is not in his place because I would hardly think that he would sit and allow such a suggestion to pass by. If there is one person in public life when it comes to corruption who can be above suspicion it is the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, the Hon. Minister of Civil Aviation and Tourism and I want very strongly to say that if the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central continues to make this type of debate in the House, the House will become more fractious and he will find that he is not the only one who can start casting aspersions. He must begin to lift the tone of his debate and deal with issues if he is serious about them.

Now, Sir, he says that it is irresponsible for a Government to say that consultants described the work performed by them as extra to their terms of reference and to their contracts. What is wrong with that? You can use the word either "describe" or "claim". There is nothing on that. He is being a sophist today. He is really looking for little things on which to launch an attack regardless of whether they have substance in them or not.

Obviously, that is what they are putting forward in their case and what did the Government do? The Addendum said that the Government examined their claim with their consultant and having examined their claims came to the conclusion that the original claims were not justified and agreed the amount that they were going to offer.

I understand, Sir, that the sort of items involved expenditure where they had to be changes made as a result of some of the airlines being dissatisfied with the designed areas that they have, one expenditure, and obviously if the consultants find themselves doing additional work over and above what were in their design pictures they would have to be paid for that design. Sixty-two thousand dollars is not a gross amount of money.

The honourable Member takes the point that the Resolution calls for 12 cents more than the amount to be paid in the vote. That is the point he is making. The honourable Member should know because he is talking to the public of Barbados. He has obviously never have been near a Minister of Finance long enough to see how the Estimates are prepared and what is done.

If I came to you as the former Minister of Home Affairs who acted as Minister of Finance I would tell him that it is usual in Estimates to round off in round figures. It is usual because if you do not pay out the cheque — I see the Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party smiling because he knows it, Sir. He has been in the Cabinet and he knows how these things happen if you do not pay out a cheque, if the Minister warrant is not signed for the amount, the 12 cents lapse. It is not paid out. Nobody gives away the money. The 12 cents lapse. The honourable Member aspires to be a Minister of Finance and he had better get some instructions from his former Cabinet colleagues who are more seasoned in how Government is run day-to-day than he appears to be if he is going to get up in this House and seriously put forward in a debate in the Estimates for us to try to answer his problem about how 12 cents is being voted over and above an amount.

The honourable Member says every cent. The honourable Member is no big safe-guarder of the public's purse. I could tell the honourable Member this, that if he was so solicitous of the public's purse and the money which he says has been lost, he would have looked back at the Public Accounts Committee Report for the years 1966 particularly to 1976, look at some of them and he should see where you get comments. His Leader, the Rt. Hon Member now looking.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of elucidation. I am Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I am in the process of trying to get some Reports out. As a point of information, I would like the honourable Member to tell me where I can find these Reports because I know my predecessor in office, like me, had great difficulty in getting quorums in order to bring out the Reports. We have had reports from the Accountant General but we have not been able, as far as I know, because I have to start with 1972. There may be Reports from 1966-72, but we are now trying to get from 1972 on to 1981 together. Just a minor point of information that I would really like to see some of the reports. I am not criticising anyone because I know the difficulty of getting these reports together.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not know. The Rt. Hon. Member's predecessor in that office was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and I do not believe that he ever called a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee whilst he was in office. That was the Hon. F. G. Smith. When he was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, no meeting was held. And I am glad to see that the Public Accounts Committee has now revived its meetings, that adequate notice is being given to members and I promised the Rt. Hon. Member that I would be present at the next meeting, because I am very anxious to participate. (ASIDE: We did not get a quorum.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On that Sir, I would very much appreciate when honourable Members cannot attend the meetings, that they would just let me know, so that I can let the public officers continue to do the public work. And, that applies to the honourable Members on this side, with more stringency than to the honourable Members on the other side.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I formally attended a few meetings, when I first came into the Honourable House, — I am not going to move away from the issue Sir — of the then Public Accounts Committee. But, we had great difficulty, certainly during the period that we were in Opposition, getting a meeting of the Committee convened to meet at all. And, one of the ways of scrutinising public expenditure, although it might be *ex post facto*, is by virtue of having regular, sensible and scrutinising meetings of such a committee. The honourable Shadow Minister of Finance should know that. He should become aware of that.

But, let me deal with some of the other points which he has raised Sir. In 1980, the United Nations Development Programme, at the request of the Caribbean Group for Economic Development and Co-operation did a survey of the airports in the Caribbean and looked at the rates that they charged for the services which they were rendering at the time. It also looked at the physical conditions provided at the airports in the Caribbean and for this purpose included not only the English Caribbean countries but, included the French, the Dutch and the Spanish speaking countries as well along with some of those on the South American and Central American Continent. That study is available to the public and it shows quite clearly that Barbados, in many aspects of its airport development, was the leader among the other Caribbean countries. There were one or two areas in which we had weaknesses and, those areas, I am told are being attended to. But, regardless of whether it was providing fire fighting services at the airport or a tarmac that was reasonably acceptable and up to the standard of the International Civil Aviation Organisation, Barbados got reasonable ratings and a pretty high standard of marks.

The consultants went on to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that the fees being charged for services at airports in the Caribbean, both for landing fees and the other services provided were below the average level of fees in airports of a similar standard throughout the world. And, the consultants advised Caribbean Governments that if they wanted to create a sufficient capital fund, in order to renew their airport stock from time to time, they would have to look very closely at raising their landing fees and raising fees of a different nature, not necessarily landing fees *stricto sensu*, in order to get enough revenue to have a reasonable rate of return on their investment.

And, one of the areas in that report, in which it said that Barbados was behind hand, was in the level of fees being paid by airlines coming to the country, particularly, in these days when they were getting increased services such as security services at the airport. And, in my view, there is nothing at all wrong in charging additional fees in such instances, and one is finding that the battle lines are being drawn unnecessarily, because I make a statement here that even the present landing fees being charged are reasonable and Barbados is not being priced out of any market, as an international airport. The airlines knew it. And the documentary evidence, the hard facts and figures are there in the possession of the Government and I am sure that the Ministry would be willing to make it available to the airlines to argue their case, if they have a case now.

What is the Honourable Member going to tell me? That, an additional \$1.50 which is added on for the upgrading facilities at the airport is going to make Air Canada or British Airways come here less. I expect their spokesman to argue that case. Instead, the honourable Member should be arguing with the airlines and ask the same airlines where they are paying higher charges — at Kennedy, at Miami and in Toronto — higher landing charges and fees calculated in a similar manner to the one we have just instituted. Why is it that those airlines are charging their consumers a lesser price to get across the Atlantic and penalising Barbados and treating Barbados as an up-market place of tourist destination?

When we argued against the airlines and told them to bring down airfares they came back by saying Barbados attracts a market tourist — tourists in the high income bracket and therefore, they can take the increases. And, the Government had to use International Caribbean Airways.... (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That you opposed.)....in order (Asides).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order Please. Order please. I must not have these interruptions.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: had to used International Caribbean Airways....(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which you opposed.)....in order to force down the fares on British Air-

ways and in order to have some competition on the European haul. The honourable Member should know that.

The Honourable Member must recognise that IATA itself, as the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition will tell him, is one of the biggest cartels with very little control on the restricted practices which they indulge in. And, they give Third World Governments such as ours a hard time to try to extract from them
(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Why did you oppose it?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: to try to extract from them, a proper level of funds. The honourable Member is a die hard conservative posing as a socialist. (*Aside*) He does not understand how he has to stand up and fight for poor black nations such as ours in the battle against multi-nationals. He comes in here with a speech that is characterised.....(*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order Sir. I must call to Your Honour's attention, Sir, the behaviour of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. If Dr. Mahy is not in Barbados to give him an injection to keep him quiet.... I mean, he can conduct himself in better order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. I must warn the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he is interrupting the proceedings.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The most charitable manner that I can be to the honourable Member is to say that he displays utter nonsense of the economics of international air transport. That is the most charitable I can be to him. Or alternatively, he is not prepared to look at the principle of fighting against multi-national companies who use their strength in order to subject and frighten us because they know that tourism is soft, frighten us, in relation to getting a reasonable rate of return on investments of the people of Barbados. The honourable Member has to wait, Sir.

I had to face that with Mr. Ortiz, the United States Ambassador. When we told them to roll back their fares because they were in breach of the rules of the Barbados regulatory authority, Ortiz called me, came to have a meeting with me, and told me that the United States had the ability to stop American Airlines and Eastern from coming in here and if the American Press got hold of the fact that we would have prosecuted them for breach of Barbados Laws, that would be the end of our tourist industry. I told Ortiz that this country is poor but we have had a proud history and if that is

the view of the United States, I would recommend it to the Cabinet that he be recalled. I told him not to come into my office with that foolishness.

The honourable Member must get it straight. Do not misuse short-term political advantage for showing a division in the stand which we take on issues such as this in making sure that the interest of Barbados is defended against the multi-nationals. He must not misuse it. I want to finish on this point, Sir. I am going to speak again, Sir, on another point. I would not finish my speech, but I know time is running out.

The honourable Member is not cognisant of the fact that discussions have been going on for a long period of time with the airlines about ways and means in which we can give them added facilities. And, they have got them. The cost of security equipment alone, at the airport more than exceeds \$62,000.
1.35 p.m.

The honourable Member should know that our airport, although it is not under a Statutory Board, is showing a better or as good a rate of return as is shown by the Port Authority, and therefore if we are to maintain a rate of return that would provide additional revenue for the country and minimise taxation on the citizens of Barbados, we cannot quarrel about miniscule tax such as the honourable Member is quarrelling about.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I at first did not consider it desirable to enter this debate because the questions which have been asked and which are relevant would not require the long continuous debate which we have heard. However, Mr. Chairman, in the course of the response from the back bench, a practice which is becoming more and more prevalent in recent times which might suggest that the honourable Member who has just sat down either ought to be returned to the front bench — but that is another matter.

The response brought in a question which may lead persons to misunderstand the debate which has been taking place on the whole question of the so-called arrivals tax. Mr. Chairman, there really is no need for a dissertation by the honourable Member on the necessity for the airport to provide a proper rate of return, because I do not believe that that matter is in contention. I do not believe that it is doubted anywhere that IATA is a cartel or that the airport landing fees have to be commensurate with the landing fees at other airports. That is not the question.

The Government has to accept the responsibility for being inept in the manner in which they announced this so-called arrivals tax to the people of Barbados. That is the only issue, Sir. They sent the Manager of

the airport, according to the public information which we have, we are not privy to what goes on in the Cabinet at this point, we do not know how the Government functions, its methodology is not always apparent — indeed there are those who might say it is never apparent — but the fact is the public information indicated that the Airport's Manager called in the airlines a few days before the beginning of the new year and told them that there would be a new tax imposed, and the impression given to all citizens in Barbados who can read was that the tax would be imposed on the passengers. That is a fact, Sir; that does not require any contention.

Questions were raised by the Press itself and by citizens and by this Democratic Labour Party, each one of whom can be said to have the interest of this country at heart, and ought to have the interest of this country at heart. The question was raised whether the Government was imposing a tax on arriving passengers. There were a number of reasons why that question should be raised. One, if it were so, the Government would have been imposing a tax via the Airport Manager; two, the Government would have been imposing a tax without coming to Parliament; three, the Minister of Finance would not have indicated the basis on which he intended to collect the tax.

Mr. Chairman, that is not outside the realm of discussion, because in this Honourable House not very long ago we were called upon to make legislation retroactive to a particular date in order to validate a decision made in the area of finance which would have been wrong had Parliament not passed legislation retroactively. Therefore, Sir, it was perfectly normal for citizens of this country to raise questions about the tax which at the time it was announced, appeared not only to be less than efficacious, but possibly illegal.

Then the Government announced that it was all an error, the GIS had made an error. We have a Prime Minister Sir, who according to his own announcements, never seem to make any errors at all. Some inept person in the Attorney General's Chamber according to his public statement, caused the problem. Mr. Chairman, have you ever stopped to think how many inept people there are, according to the Prime Minister, in the various Department? Every time he is behind the eight ball he finds some inept person in some obscure Ministry or some Department to blame.

On this occasion, however, he found one of the crabs in a barrel — I am using his words, Sir, — in the Attorney General's Chambers. That is how he has described him, Sir. I am told that he subsequently described him even better than that, but he said it was the ineptitude of the Attorney General's Chambers which led

Barbados to have been misled so massively and caused the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation to make a fool of himself by taking a personal attitude in a public matter, a position which I hope that he now regrets.

I am sorry he is not in his chair, and I shall wait until he is to raise this question in a little more detail, because his statement in response to a legitimate query leaves some very serious questions in the minds of right thinking Barbadians as to whether if you become a citizen of this country legitimately, if you can then be debarred from taking a position on a public issue because you were born outside of Barbados. Those are questions which will have to be canvassed. (ASIDE). I am defending a principle. That is the whole point, I am defending a principle, and whether a person is born in Britain, in India or in Africa, once you as a Government determine that you are going to make them a citizen of Barbados, from that day forward they ought to have the full rights of citizenship but that is a side issue which we shall deal with.

Mr. Chairman, say to the former Attorney General — I cannot even say that he is an aspiring Attorney General because no one ever knows what he is aspiring to these days, but he responds regularly from the back bench — I say to him that the dissertation on airports and the UNDP publications, all of these things were quite unnecessary. We would like the Minister responsible for Finance, the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation, to tell us a little bit about why there was the extra work by the consultants.

While I am on my feet, Sir, I would like to ask him a few more questions about the airport. I read recently that the air conditioning at the airport has never been extended to certain, shall we say, entrepreneurs who are functioning, certain offices within the complex of the airport. We would like to know if that is so, what is the cause, what is the problem. Is it a technical problem? Is it because the air conditioning system is dysfunctional, or is it because of the design of the airport? We should like to have some information on that, and Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to tell us whether the whole question of flooding at the airport has been alleviated and if it has not been alleviated what steps are being taken, or if steps are intended to be taken.

1.45 p.m.

I think it is a tribute to my political party when the honourable Member for Christ Church West is able to speak with such clarity on the glowing reports which have come on the airport. I believe it is fair to say that the airport is something of which all Barbadians are proud, but there are some teething problems which have remained.

They are no longer teething problems, they are serious problems and they ought to be dealt with, and the Government has the responsibility to tell the population how these problems are being dealt with.

There is another problem, Mr. Chairman. Those who walk in the terminal of the airport, if for some reason there has been liquid thrown on the surface, find walking extremely difficult, and I know that unless something is done about that soon, it will only be a matter of time before we have in this Honourable House, requests to pay for damages to individuals who use the airport. It is not enough to have signs which say "Be Careful — This Place Is Wet". I believe that the authorities ought to take some steps to arrange for a better surface at the airport especially in the more frequented areas surrounding the counters of the various airlines, etcetera.

Mr. Chairman, having criticised and having raised the question, I think it would be unreasonable not to take this opportunity to indicate that a number of other problems at the airport which were rampant in the early stages of its opening, seems to be in the process of being solved because of the commitment of those persons who work there. I would like to take the opportunity to suggest that the whole question of the taxi system seems to have become better and I believe it is due to the commitment of those whose responsibility it is to work out these problems at the airport, and I think that since many of them are so-called little people, it would be a good thing if they could hear that from this Honourable House that they were congratulated for the amount of commitment and work which they have put into the airport.

I notice too that in spite of the fact that at first it might appear as patronage, that the appointment of one gentleman at the airport to solve some of the other problems seems to have worked out well, because a number of little people are reporting that the airport system is working a lot better since he has been appointed. I believe if you swap a common man for a king sometimes, you can still win the draught game, and if the man is in the Senate one day and he is at the airport the next, so long as he is doing a good job, he has still served. Those who work at airports also serve.

Mr. Chairman, there is one last point I should like to make however. I believe that the security arrangements for the arriving passengers need some assistance. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind based on the information which has been filtering through at the constituency level that the whole question of dope, marijuana, cocaine and other similar hard drugs is one which can find a solution in this country through a better system of security at the airport. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that too much marijuana is able to pass through our airport. I do not know about the system for

policing the arrival of marijuana, and it is my understanding that the customs officers who work at the airport are quite efficient in this regard. I am told that the police have a special squad that is dealing with this matter, but Mr. Chairman, if one peruses the newspapers on a daily basis, if one examines the court cases and if one talks to people on the street, one becomes aware that a substantial amount of marijuana is still available in Barbados.

Now, Mr. Chairman, irrespective of one's personal attitude on the smoking of weed, and without reference or without attempt at condemning the particular position taken by any individual on the question of the smoking of marijuana, I believe that it is a social problem where young people including school children in Barbados are being exposed to the ravages of the dope culture, and Mr. Chairman, I therefore feel that it is the responsibility of the Government to take all steps possible to alleviate the problem. No Government is going to be able to solve the problem totally and no one can hold out against a Government if they do not solve the problem totally because I wish to believe that the Ministers can be like Caesar's wife, above suspicion in this matter, but I think the Government has a responsibility to take that extra care to ensure that in so far as it is possible, they have done all that they can do.

I believe better security at the airport, is desirable in the question of the arrival of this cargo by whatever form and in whatever means. If therefore the Minister responsible for Civil Aviation and indeed if the Prime Minister will take the opportunity to re-examine or cause to be examined the whole system of arrivals at the airport, I believe that we will go some way towards lessening the drug traffic.

I am told that the Prime Minister himself goes to the airport from time to time and does not go to the V.I.P. lounge. He goes into the Arrivals Terminal. I wish however that when he does that, in making his public statements about whom he sees there, and what he says to them, he would try to let his memory be more accurate. I am told from reliable sources that his public statement that he discussed the question of Dominica with the Leader of the Opposition is far from the truth as his other statements.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you very much. I will have another chance.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable member wish to speak?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to these speeches. The first thing I would advise the honourable Member for St.

Michael West is, don't defend the honourable Member for St. John. He will not defend you. You get out of that. I mentioned to the honourable Member that I made a remark to the honourable Member if we are being very sophisticated, and seeing that since he did not reply there was no discussion, you are welcome to say that, but I made a remark and my memory, I have a lot of reliance on it...you consider whether you have the same reliance on the memory of the honourable Member for St. John. Give that a little consideration. But that is only by the way.

I would not like to decry the speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael West. It is clear that what they have is an extension of the debate, which should properly be taking place in George Street between the aspirants for the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party, being brought into the House of Assembly. When two people neither of whom knows a great deal about the subject decide to talk, you realise they are not really talking against the Government at all, they are talking against each other, and on this occasion I must congratulate the honourable Member for St. Michael West. He has come out better in the exchange. He displayed knowledge, he displayed concern, he was not hysterical he was not untruthful, he was not ignorant, he avoided giving unnecessary offence or any offence to anybody whether it was a former Senator, whether it is the Leader of the Government or whether it is the smokers of marijuana, he refrained from condemning them. Whoever it is he avoided giving offence, and he raised a number of points which I much regret that I am not competent to answer.

1.55 p.m.

I am concerned about arrivals' security at the airport. Evidence available to the Government would suggest that marijuana which enters the island perhaps does not pass unnoticed through the airport, if you get what I mean. It does not come in and go through a fence or get out through the car park. There may be other areas that need investigation in the matter of security but not, I think, physical security.

The matter of air-conditioning, the substantive Minister will have to answer that. I have no doubt that he would give permission for an air-conditioner to be put into an office or that we would put an air-conditioner into an office subject to an adjustment of the rents. I am sure that all these things can be handled by the substantive Minister but it is really the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that I would like to deal with now.

Mr. Chairman, there must be some limit to indignation and some choice of mode of address that bears relation to the thinking complained of and is appropriate

to the House of Assembly. The honourable Member could not have been any more severe, vehement, boastful or noisy if he had discovered that a substantive Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and I were carrying on a conspiracy to murder people that arrive at the Airport and were arranging to have \$62,000 voted to dig a pit to have the bodies thrown in because in a contract of \$28 million, he took this \$62,012 and he fought for that 12 cents, Sir. He fought for 12 cents.

Now, ignorance is always a dangerous thing because it leads you into a *cul-de-sac* and it leads you into judgments which can show you up in a very bad light when the basic premises on which you are working are exposed as false.

I have been studying this file very carefully. It is not my file but I have been reading it and I have observed from a letter written by Mr. Matthews on August 4, 1978 to the Vice President of the consultants concerned, that the work out of which his claim arises was authorised in July 1975. Now, in July 1975 the Barbados Labour Party was not in power and the changes in the preliminary design work which have occasioned all or most of these claims, are referred to in that letter as dating back to that month.

On the list of things, perhaps the biggest item relate to concessions; duty free concessions, \$2,223 claimed for extra design work; port concessions, \$5,126 claimed for extra design work. That work was apparently undertaken over and above the original work as a result of the Ministry of Civil Aviation when it was under the control of the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for St. John in 1975, commissioning an ATB concession brief for Can. \$6,000 extra and \$1,500 in expenses and a reference is given to a Project Manager's letter dated June 25th, 1975. The object of that concession study was to expand the shopping facilities for the new Airport to include not only duty free shopping in the Departure Lounge but shopping for the general public as well.

The Honourable Member has talked about mismanagement, wickedness, bribery and looking on to the Press benches, I wonder how the honourable Member can talk about bribery when I see the representative of the *Advocate* present, when the honourable Member has made all those accusations, he is not accusing me, he is accusing the Leader of the Opposition because it is the Leader of the Opposition who presided over the commissioning of the preliminary design work, the changes.

Now you may say that I have special knowledge because I have the file in front of me but I will tell you, I do not have special commonsense, only ordinary commonsense and ordinary commonsense must tell you that if you are dealing with a claim from consultants for

design work that that claim must pre-date the construction work. You would have to be an idiot to believe, if there is no claim for additional construction work but a claim is for additional design work, that it is a cost overrun for which people who came in at a stage after the design work had been completed, could be responsible.

Commonsense would have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that these are claims against the people that designed the Airport and that the Airport was designed in the Democratic Labour Party's time and that therefore it is merely a matter of having taken a long time to settle the people's claims. Do you think that the House deserved a speech such as we were treated to from the honourable Member earlier today?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we can stop the Prime Minister from going further down that road, Sir. The Addendum does not make reference to design work. It says "For additional fees for work performed by them."

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe, the honourable Member is trying to damn his colleague with faint praises or praises me with faint damns. He is now encouraging me and I will accept the encouragement. Thank you, Sir, to point out that consultants design. They do not build. That is the whole point. They design. These are the design consultants and are we now to hear that a political party which was in Government when those designs were being done is going to come into Parliament to say that they did not know that consultants design? And they did not know that it was design work? Commonsense again would ask you, what construction work on a \$28 million job could have a \$60,000 overrun?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I believe that the honourable Member even if he is angry, must bear some relationship to what is being debated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you on a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I am drawing to the honourable Member's attention that the Addendum says, "During the final year of construction of the Terminal," etc. "by International Airports Consultants of Montreal Ltd. (CAIM) and Cansult Ltd. Management and Electrical Consultants," What designs do Electrical Consultants do? Do they design electricity?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Take your seat. That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry, I did not hear. Did you say something about electricity? There is

an outstanding claim with the Consultants' local Manager from when he first came to Barbados for certain things, Rentokil, electricity and one or two things to be paid for at his residence and there has been an argument about that from the time of the Leader of the Opposition right through to the Deputy Prime Minister's time and if the honourable Member wishes to see the correspondence.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The honourable Member must not interrupt the proceedings.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is not dealing with one of his patients who he can order around and tell to take this drug or do not take the next drug. The honourable Member is dealing with a Government. The people put us here twice to govern and they put you to make noise in Opposition. Do not give orders to anybody over here. Go and give your patients.

2.00 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order Sir. I do not care about the persistent stream of insults by the Rt. Hon. Member, but, we want to know, on this side, what the \$62,000.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: is for and if he cannot tell us, then defer debate on this matter until later on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: because up to now, he has not got down to answering that question yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Please take your seat. Order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order Sir. I think that the Rt. Hon. Member ought to be asked, by Your Honour to withdraw that remark. The Rt. Hon. Member could not possibly wish to call the name of a newspaper reporter.

Certain remarks made by the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas were ordered to be expunged from the record, by Mr. Chairman.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But Sir....(Aside)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS:.....there comes a point where, in the public right of this country, somebody has to cry, "halt"..... (*Aside*).....to the mean and evil charges that we have heard here today about bribes and...I will leave out the mismanagement. Anybody can say that. It is easy to say.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. I asked whether that was one of the possible purposes for which the money was spent because in introducing this Resolution, as he does in every single money Resolution in this Honourable House, he just ignores Parliament.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He treats Parliament with gross disrespect.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, this is not a point of.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He should have told Parliament.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is making a speech.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: when he introduced this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. (*Asides*)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman I am winding my speech up. It is the function of the Public Accounts Committee to go into details. The Government spends £500 million a year. I do not have....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is consistently and persistently rising on points of order which are not points of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not made this point of order. I have risen on a point of order. May I make the point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have heard nothing coming from the Government side which I consider would require a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman what I am saying is.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES:..... that it is intrinsic.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. (*Asides*)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman I beg to move Sir, that you do now report progress to His Honour the Speaker and ask for leave to sit again.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chairman has reported progress and has asked for leave to sit again.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move Sir that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock today Sir.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER accordingly suspended the sitting at 2.10 p.m.
2.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes Sir. Sir I think that I have said as much as can possibly be said on the substance of the Resolution. Perhaps, I could just say that design changes relate to changes made at the preliminary design stages dating back to 1975, as a design improvement to alleviate traffic congestion for passengers getting off airplanes. We had to move the security check office, the departure hall had to be widened, the check-in counters had to be made longer, and the airlines had to

be given more ticketing space. All of this happened under the previous regime, Sir. Some airlines had to be shifted. There were some changes in the design of the Post Office, the VIP Room, the Met. Office. I dealt with the duty free concessions already. International Air Radio demanded \$35.00 in the design work, a temporary roof was built due to some interruptions in proceedings and the design had to be paid for that. That is the kind of triviality, Sir, which adds up to some \$80 000 or more.

The real point is that Sir. There was no cost over-run of any sort in the airport project. None at all. It was done within the money. There is not even a cost over-run on Head 77, because savings on other parts of Head 77 exceed the sum that we are asking for under this vote. This Government carried out a design which it found including the design changes for which we are now asking money.

I misunderstood the honourable Member's question about electricity. Necessarily, when for example, at an early stage, you change your design for the conveyor belts for baggage, you have to call in electrical consultants because you have to remove the electrical wires. They have to change the places where the electrical wires are going to go. I thought the honourable Member was asking about charges for electricity which do not appear in the Addendum and which I thought might have arisen in the debate.

The manager has asked, for several years for a sum of Can. \$1 500 to cover various electric charges — propane gas, termite proofing and so on that he thinks he should have been paid. We have never agreed to pay it and it really is quite irrelevant. It arose only because when I heard a query about electricity, this was the only possible area I could think it referred to. I could not think that the honourable Member believes that when you are erecting a building that the structural consultants can make changes without calling in the electrical consultants to shift the wires. It never crossed my mind for a moment, that the honourable Member in questioning electrical consultants did not understand that if you make a design change in a structure, that sometimes, you have to move where the light switches and basic wires will go. This is what I mean, perhaps, by inviting persons not to be vehement from a view point of ignorance pure and simple and lack of understanding in the first, second and third degrees.

The question of the airport tariffs. What can I say about that, Sir? The tariffs at the Grantley Adams Airport are comparatively low. Airlines have to pay an arrival tax at the International Building in New York with BWIA of US \$7 per passenger, in addition to landing charges. That is much more than the same airlines pay in Barbados.

The honourable Member said that I have never admitted to being wrong. I accept the charge. I am very humble in the face of it. I believe that I have been wrong, and more than that, I believe that I have admitted it. I am not like the honourable Member, in a position to bury my mistakes literally, and unfortunately I have to live with them.

3.05 p.m.

As far as the matter of the air charges is concerned, I will tell you where the Minister of Finance went wrong. It is undoubtedly my duty to see to it that subordinates understand my instructions and if down the line a subordinate misunderstood the instructions relative to the airport charges, the fault has to fall on my shoulders. I am not prepared to punish the Airport Manager because at second or third hand, maybe even fourth hand, he did not understand the tax. My impression was that the Airport Manager was to be given instructions to call in the airlines to discuss the matter with them, to notify them, to ask them if there were any difficulties. Evidently, at third or fourth hand, by the time my instructions reached the Airport Manager they had been misinterpreted; by whom, I cannot say, but I am not prepared to pillory the Airport Manager in that regard. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just call for the files, the files should tell you).

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South is suggesting I call for the files. I believe in working in writing and when people ask me a question I invite them to put it in writing, because I do not wish to give anybody a word of mouth answer, not even my colleagues in Cabinet. I do not ever believe in dealing with anything by word of mouth. Any public officer who deals with me, and any of my colleagues will tell you that I do not take decisions across the desk with Permanent Secretaries.

Unfortunately on this particular occasion the decisions relating to the airline charges arose out of a meeting in my office with the Minister of Civil Aviation, myself and others. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: With a disagreement between yourself and the Minister of Civil Aviation). No issue has arisen between myself and the Minister of Civil Aviation. When the matter was reduced to writing I took full blame for not investigating it carefully enough to make sure that no misunderstanding could arise, and the Airport Manager is therefore not to be accused or abused because he got things wrong.

The matter of the Counsel in the Attorney General's Office is a different matter which was canvassed by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, and he did not understand correctly what he heard. He listened to an Aside and thought it was connected to the matter under review and perhaps I had better set out

what it was, because it is indirectly related to the airline charges.

There are certain annual charges which are made in Barbados and which start on January 1. I therefore had asked that a certain package of annual charges be reviewed for January 1, 1982. We have increased the licence fees to the telephone and electric companies from \$200,000 a year to \$500,000 a year from January 1; we have increased by quite a substantial margin the fees for gambling machines and betting shops, also starting from January 1; we intended to increase the landing charges from Jan. 1 and we intended to increase the licence fees for banks from January 1. The gambling charges and the electric and telephone charges have gone through, we are talking about the airline charges which have been postponed for a month or so.

The banking charges would have required an amendment to the Banking Act and instructions were given, reaching the Attorney General's Office on November 21, to prepare an amendment to the Banking Act. Now, the amendment only involves changes of two figures, the fee for a main branch and the fee for a sub-branch, and they were warned that it should be available to go through the House before the end of the year to meet January 1. The House was meeting for the last time on December 12, but an officer in the Attorney General's Department did not start to deal with the matter until December 10, and therefore that officer is directly responsible by tardiness and indolence — officer or officers — for the loss of \$200,000 in Government revenue, because it is a loss of fees for 1982. I am not going to make them retroactive because the people had no notice. Even if it was introduced in the House in time and given a first reading, that would have been enough, but they were not introduced in the House last year and therefore it would have been most improper to make them retroactive.

Now, I cannot take blame for a Crown Counsel receiving urgent instructions for a matter with two weeks to spare that would take a quarter of an hour to do, taking two weeks to do it, and I do not believe the Attorney General can be called on to take blame for that either. That is a default by a civil servant pure and simple, and appropriate steps have been requested to deal with any disciplinary matters which may arise out of it. I just wanted to clarify that so that whatever civil servant dealt with the landing charges in the Crown Law Office would not feel that any criticism of him or her was intended.

There may be something else to add if honourable Members wish to speak further on this matter. I would imagine there is not very much more time, Sir, the limit for this debate is three hours, including this and what has gone before, and I do not want to deprive honour-

able Members if they wish the opportunity of talking about \$66,196.12 from spending the rest of the time doing it, but the material is all here, Sir. Any honourable Member can see the Airport and Air Navigation Facility Tariffs, if he wishes to see them and if he wishes to realise that Barbados' landing charges are very moderate and modest. I think I have outlined as completely as could be reasonable the details of the supplement required for the design changes in this matter, and I can merely leave the debate for the rest of the time available for honourable Members, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I will not be very long on this occasion, and the length of time which I will speak has been substantially reduced, because it is quite clear that the Minister of Finance has at last got the message that we are not prepared on this side to approve any expenditures unless there is some reasonable attempt to explain the basis of those expenditures to this House.

There are a few points I would like to respond to. We categorically reject the suggestion made in his speech that the proper place for scrutiny of expenditures of this nature is on an *ex post facto* basis via the Public Accounts Committee.
3.15 p.m.

We feel that the place to do it is up front when the House is in Committee of Supply. We therefore wish to re-emphasise at all times that Parliament must remain the supreme body for the control of public expenditures and for the levying of taxes in this country whether it involves our citizens or it involves our visitors.

Mr. Chairman, the former Attorney General I think was a bit insulting when he suggested that I was not aware of the role of IATA in fixing international fares. I would just like to inform him that both he himself and the Prime Minister have accused me of being a shareholder in a Bahamas based company about 12 years ago, and that was not true, and the object of that first exercise by the Democratic Labour Party was to set up a company in association with Swedish interests similar to Caribbean Airways. That effort fell through. When Caribbean Airways was set up, the former Attorney General and the Prime Minister himself bitterly criticised the previous Government because of the structural arrangements of the company and other related matters, and I was very pleased today....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, if the honourable Member would give way, I have never criticised the setting up of Caribbean International Airways. I wish the honourable Member would cite the occasion, the time, and date and whatever.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All through the City by-election in 1976. There are too many dates. It was a regular

thing. As a matter of fact you all only stopped criticising after you won the Government and Freddie Laker became Sir Freddie Laker; that automatically stopped the criticism. But the essential point that has been made and I am responding to the point made by the honourable Member on the other side which is an integral part of the debating process, is that the successful introduction of Caribbean Airways into Barbados had an immediate impact on the fare structure between Barbados and the United Kingdom and within about six months I think it was followed by the early bird fare. The results of that very well thought-out move by the Democratic Labour Party is reflected in the fact that whereas we have had a decline in tourists certainly last year and as far as I know this year from our traditional North American sources, the number of arrivals out of the United Kingdom if not out of Europe as a whole this year certainly has been on the increase, and that has been largely due to the influence of Caribbean Airways.

I would certainly support the Government in the statement which I saw published recently whereby they are interested in maintaining a majority shareholding in Caribbean Airways because I feel that in that way you would be able to use that asset to help determine the fare structure on the routes that Caribbean Airways flies on and any additional routes that they might fly on in the future. So I do not have to be lectured by the honourable Member for Christ Church West on the role of IATA or the importance of having a national carrier on this area.

It was the Democratic Labour Party that carried the flag, and in spite of the fact that I myself because of my connections over the years with the aviation division of IATA have been able to establish important structures for that airline and other airlines without taking any advantage of the facilities offered to me on it, the Prime Minister of this country a year after they won the elections informed the Board of Directors of Caribbean Airways that they should terminate my facilities on the airline although I had worked on the airline for about four years without even enjoying one ride on the airline. They would have had to compensate me for a considerable amount of money. That is the kind of thanks that you get from the kind of person who gets up in here today now defending Caribbean Airways.

I would not like to resort to the recent incident at the airport at all, but I know about it. It is an unfortunate incident. It was a serious error that was made, and I do not think that Laker Airways would certainly have viewed the matter very kindly, but I think it falls in the area of security and I would refrain, Mr. Chairman, from referring to this matter. (Asides) If you all do not know, it is up to you. It is not a matter for me. It falls under the area of security.

I believe that we have got a little more information now. It is quite clear that the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Aviation was not competent really to deal with this matter. He attempted to introduce it with his usual contempt not only for the Opposition but also for his backbenchers, because the one backbencher that got up and tried to defend the situation was clearly at sea and not really able to spell out exactly what the money was all about.

If you listened to the Prime Minister very carefully, Mr. Chairman, you would realise that he too is still a bit in the dark as to what the \$62,000 is all about. He has not really come down the line and told us, and I do not think he is in a position to do so. It would have been better to come to us and say I do not have all the information but we would ask you to trust us and recognise that we did not waste the money, that there was no improper usage of the money, that we are not in a position to inform Parliament in detail as to how this increased expenditure took place, and we as reasonable people on this side do not expect the Prime Minister to know everything. But to launch out on the kind of abuse of myself and of the press in the way in which he did was totally and thoroughly undignified, Mr. Chairman, and not worthy of any Prime Minister of this country now, in the future or in the past.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the honourable Member has accused an honourable Member of this House of abusing someone. Now you would never allow abuse from the Chair without asking that it be withdrawn, and I suggest that his last sentence is unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did accuse an honourable Member of abusing. Withdraw it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I withdraw the remark. I deeply regret that a member of the Press was accused of being bribed by a Member of this Honourable House.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say this. I think that the general public should know that there was a major disagreement between the Minister responsible for Aviation and the Minister responsible for Finance in respect of the increased charges at Grantley Adams International Airport, and it was as a consequence of that disagreement that these increased charges were not announced either by the Minister of Finance or the Minister responsible for Aviation, and it was left to a junior officer.....

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refute the allegation that there was a dispute between the Minister of Tourism and the Minister responsible for Finance and that there was con-

tention about the implementation of the airport terminal charge. There is no truth at all in that accusation and I would ask the honourable Member to withdraw it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that at a meeting between the Minister responsible for Aviation and the Airport Manager that the Minister responsible for Aviation said that he was not in agreement with it and that the Prime Minister and the Manager of the Airport could do what they liked. I have said that that took place at a meeting and that is the reason why it was not announced by either Minister. (Asides) You were not there.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I cannot have two honourable Members on their feet.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. Will the honourable Member enlighten the House as to when and where this Meeting took place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now I do not think I will permit debate in this strain any further because it is totally irrelevant to the matter before the House. Please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: When I started off, Sir, I said that we would not support this in the absence of further information. We have got a little information. We have not got enough information but I would like to discuss this with my colleagues and we will determine the position that we will take collectively when we vote on this matter. Thank you very much.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into the general debate but I find it necessary to make intervention in respect of certain comments that have been made in respect of the Attorney General's Chambers.

Now it was brought to my attention only yesterday morning, Sir, that criticism was made of a Parliamentary Counsel over the weekend. I was not around, I was out of the country, Sir, and criticism was made of a Parliamentary Counsel in respect of the drafting of legislation in respect of the banking charges. As I said, the first time it was brought to my attention was yesterday morning and I not only mean the criticism, Sir, but the fact that the bit of legislation was even referred to my Chambers was only brought to my attention yesterday morning.

Now there is a Departmental investigation in this matter and therefore, in a way, it is a matter that is *sub judice*. It is important, therefore, that I do not make any statement that would prejudice whatever

investigation is being carried out but I think it is unfortunate, Sir, that the Attorney General's Department, Sir, overburdened as it is with the volume of work, Sir, should be given all the blame for negligence or whatever it is in these matters.

I would believe, Sir, that if the matter was of the urgency — (ASIDES) I do not need your support. I believe that if the matter was a matter of urgency as has been described, that perhaps people in the Ministry of Finance and Planning might have used the opportunity to check with.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL:.....to check with the Ministry of the Attorney General to find out why the matter had not been referred back. I do not want, Sir, to get into any more detail on that, Sir, but I think that it is necessary for me to just put that in perspective.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that at twenty-five minutes to four a single measure seeking the approval of Parliament for \$62,000 for the Consultants at Grantley Adams International Airport for services done prior to the opening of the Airport, we would have been still debating this issue, and out of it has come a number of accusations without foundation.

We have heard that there are a number of problems at the Airport in relation to baggage from aircrafts, that passengers have to take up to two hours. We have heard from the Opposition that the immigration system is the worst in the world. We have heard that the Government had imposed a tax on the Barbadian would-be passenger, people travelling from Barbados and to Barbados. We have heard of problems of flooding. We have heard that the security arrangements at the airport are the worst in the world. We have heard of dope from the Opposition.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable Member may be using loose language in his words but the fact is that since I referred to the security and to the flooding and never indicated that they were the worst in the world and I thought the Prime Minister had taken the point and dealt with them at the level at which the queries were raised. I think that if the honourable Member is going to refer to them he ought to use language that would allow them to remain at the level at which they have been so far.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I use language in the context in which it was given to the Honourable House. The antics, mannerisms of speech, everything

suggested that the Grantley Adams International Airport is the worst run airport in the world as far as the Opposition is concerned. My contribution to this debate is my involvement in the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation and I know that that Ministry is doing its best to maintain adequate international airport standards right here in Barbados at our airport.

On the question of airport operations and the Immigration, Mr. Chairman, the problem that we are having is a weekend problem usually when they are two 747s on the ground, when there is American Airlines in from New York, where there is Wardair in from Canada and there is an influx of passengers on the ground utilising the existing service that would work quite perfectly under a normal situation.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that passengers have to wait up to two hours to receive their baggage but this is not a problem unique to Barbados, Mr. Chairman. Those of us who go to certain cities of the United States, particularly Miami and Puerto Rico would know that the waiting time for retrieving your luggage is in excess of two hour. The airlines have not yet devised a system whereby even though you might arrive first at the airport — your luggage might have gone on first into a container — there is a guarantee that that container at your destination is going to be opened first and these are the facts behind the delays in retrieving your luggage whether it is here in Barbados or whether it is in Miami, or Russia, or Cuba. You simply cannot allocate a system whereby first come, first serve, receive their luggage on airlines. The problems are aggravated, Sir, over the weekends when there are four or five aircrafts on the ground.

Some mention was made of flooding and the Member wanted to know what the Government was doing to alleviate that problem. On the occasion to which he was referring, there was an unusual downpour of rainfall when not only the airport was flooded out but other areas of Barbados were flooded out. But the good thing about that flooding was that after the rains had subsided, all all the flood waters suddenly wore off at the airport. They went into the wells but the persistent problem that we are having with a few wells at the airport is the fact that we cannot find people to clean the wells.

The old wells which are choked are the ones which cause the problems but the new wells which have been sunk at the new Terminal are working quite effectively. I would like the honourable Member to know that we have no control on weather, when heavy rainfalls will come down, but we maintain that our services are quite adequate to take a normal rainfall.

The question of air-conditioning is another one which was alluded to. Some six months before

the airport was opened in 1979, the consultants of the airport requested of the various operators of the airline authorities the kind of systems which they would like implemented for air-conditioning of the airport. And, having given the consultants this information, the consultants continued with what was a perfect system to adequately meet the air-conditioning requirements at the airport until 1982. But the problem Sir, is that most of the users of the airport's facilities have altered the original plan. They have made apertures in some parts of the building which have caused a strain on the existing air-conditioning units. As a result, there is an outflow of cool air going through these apertures, windows and doors which the airlines refuse to keep closed. Originally all these plans were to be kept intact, there were to be no apertures made, there were to be no doors open, and, as a result of this, it has caused the air-conditioning system to malfunction. The Government is quite aware of the problem, Sir, and the airport authorities have requested the airlines to make good these openings which they themselves made within the building and, as soon as this have been rectified, the Government will itself rectify the air-conditioning problem at the airport.

3.35 p.m.

Over the past five years, the people of Barbados, contrary to the Opposition, have witnessed the opening in 1979 of the most modern airport facilities in this part of the world. The Grantley Adams International Airport is perhaps comparable to any airport, in any part of the world. It is fully operational Mr. Chairman. It is an airport that is operated 24 hours. It is an airport that any aircraft of any size can land on. The people of Barbados during the last five years have also witnessed the development of a cargo carrier in the form of CARICARGO. They have seen the development of more cargo facilities. They have seen the replacement of old navigational aids and the communication systems, the streamlining of facilitation services including Immigration, Customs and so on. We have implemented what we would call an airport guide service to meet the demands of passengers who do not ordinarily speak English, to upgrade our services at the airport.

The terminal charge which was introduced by the Government, Mr. Chairman, was done only in consideration of the fact that the airport is working. The facilities are working and the taxpayers of this country have had to meet considerable cost in maintaining these services so that they function at a reasonable level. The terminal charge is not a novel charge. It is a charge which has been implemented by airport operators all over the world — the United States, Canada, Jamaica, Costa Rica the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom wherever there are airlines you will find terminal charges in one form or another.

But we are made to believe that because the Government has seen it fit to implement a \$1.50

charge to the airlines which use the facilities at Grantley Adams Airport that the Government is over-burdening the people of Barbados and would-be passengers who would use the facilities at Grantley Adams Airport. But, Mr. Chairman the facts are that a terminal charge has been implemented successfully by many Governments all over the world.

Drugs has been mentioned by the honourable member. In relation to dope, I am satisfied that the Customs officers are doing their best within the limitations of their ability and the services which they have at hand. They are communicating with INTERPOL, the FBI, Scotland Yard and regional Governments to come to grips with the ever increasing problem of drug trafficking which in itself is not unique to Barbados. It is an international problem and the people of this country will have to realise sooner or later that Barbados has been caught up in the international melee of not only drug trafficking, but things such as casino gambling. These are things which we will have to live with Mr. Chairman. Barbados is no golden calf. We have got just as much crime as anybody else any part of the world. But our services are working to combat it Mr. Chairman. (Aside)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time. One minute more.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, the \$62 000 which is being sought here today is for services which the consultants to the airport have rendered to the people of Barbados over the last five years. I want to join the Government and in particular, the Hon. Minister of Civil Aviation and Tourism — who is fully aware of all the problems which we are having at the airport — in approving this sum of money to be paid to those consultants who have given Barbadians the finest international airport in this part of the region.

The question that Head 77, sub-head 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolution was read a first, and second time and agreed to.
3.45 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF A GUARANTEE GIVEN BY
THE GOVERNMENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR
RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR THE RE-
PAYMENT OF A LOAN OF \$23,000,000 TO THE
CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this Resolution of a guarantee refers to the necessity on the part of the

Government under the general conditions applicable to loan and guarantee agreements which the World Bank imposes as a condition before it makes certain loans.

The sum of \$23 million is being lent by the World Bank to the Caribbean Development Bank for various projects in the Caribbean. Within Barbados there are two projects which are going to be financed out of this sum of money. One is a loan to Barbados Sugar Factories Limited of US\$3 million, and another is a loan to Building Supplies Limited of US\$1.7 million.

In the case of Barbados Sugar Factories Limited the loan is for the purpose of assisting in the building of the new factory to be called Portvale, situate at Blowers in the parish of St. James. In the case of Building Supplies Limited, the loan is for machinery principally to be supplied as part of the modernisation of the clay brick factory situate at Greenland in the parish of St. Andrew aimed both at the domestic and export markets under which the production of clay products will be modernised and export sales improved.

Perhaps I had better deal with the clay product factory first. The total project cost is US\$2.5 million, Bds. \$5 million. There is an extensive project document, a great number of things are needed, clay processing equipment, front end loaders, box feeders, driers and so on. It is estimated that 31 jobs will be generated, it is anticipated that the new factory will export 20 per cent of its output to neighbouring Caribbean countries and there will be considerable foreign exchange savings. The project has a financial rate of return after tax of 16 per cent a year and an economic rate of return of 26 per cent.

The Government has been pressing for years on Building Supplies Limited to expand the production of clay blocks, clay bricks, tiles and other clay products in Barbados. There were some ownership difficulties in the initial stages and the Government actually held itself out ready to buy the shares of shareholders who were unwilling to participate in an expansion scheme. Those difficulties have all been got over and I am very glad to be able to say that without direct cost to taxpayers that there should be a great expansion of clay products within Barbados. Certain pledges have been made on prices, certainly up to the end of next year, and I really am very much hoping that this will prove to be a particularly useful and outstanding scheme in Barbados which taken in connection with the cement plant will domesticate to a very large extent our supply of basic building materials. It is anticipated that 50 per cent of the building blocks will be exported at a slightly cheaper cost than they will be sold locally, Sir, but I do not think the trade secrets of the company are any part of my business to disclose in the House of Assembly. Fifty per cent of the floor tiles will also be exported.

I certainly can recommend this project to the House, especially as it should not cost the taxpayers anything and since I think it most unlikely we will ever have to take up the guarantee.

The sugar factory, Sir. It has become obvious over the years that Barbados cannot continue with the existing plant in the sugar industry all of which is around 50 years old, or more than 50 years old. Our sugar factories have done miracles of improvisation and replacement of machinery without the cost of a new factory, but the process perhaps has been carried as far as it possibly could at Vacluse sugar factory, and at Porters where although the factory may not have been so antiquated there are good and sound reasons why the land should be released for use more suited to the immediate environment and a new establishment altogether prepared for the grinding of canes.

I am speaking at some length, Sir, because although this is not specifically a Government project, the Government is the largest single shareholder in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited, taking the central Government's holdings along with those of the Agricultural Development Corporation, and I think that the House will want to be satisfied that this new sugar factory is a wise and viable project before it passes this guarantee to the World Bank ultimately to be advanced to the factory.

The financial rate of return, Sir, is calculated at 14 percent before tax and 11 percent after tax, even at current sugar prices. The economic rate of return of course is higher, it will be 19 percent.

The capacity of the factory is 24,000 tonnes per year, which will make it of course, very much the biggest as well as the most modern of the modern factories. The total cost of the factory is just under \$28 million. Barbados Sugar Factories Limited is providing \$18.9 million from its own resources, local borrowing and the accumulated capital, including the sums which have been put into the factory in the course of the Government buying shares on behalf of the small farmers of Barbados. 3.55 p.m.

I am not going to spend any time dealing with the present wages dispute in the sugar industry which is at a very delicate stage. I believe it will move on from the Chief Labour Officer to the Minister very soon and I hope that honourable Members will not expect the sugar negotiations to be part of discussions here in the House of Assembly today. At some stage surely they will be, but it is only fair that I should say a word or two about the claims which have appeared in the Press with some frequency and which I am very sorry to say, I have even had reports that some have been canvassed on the platforms of opposition political parties.

The Government is undertaking the reorganisation of the Barbados sugar industry. There is no doubt that it has to be done and I intend to do it at the lowest cost possible to the taxpayers. An essential part of that reorganisation is the making of Government the biggest shareholder in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited. Our motives and intentions in so doing have been grossly and maliciously represented in many quarters, and the most dangerous of all the remarks made perhaps, Sir, because this more goes directly to the likely morale of the sugar workers, is that the Government took the workers' money to put into this sugar factory.

Not until the year 1981 did I ever hear the argument raised that the proceeds from taxing the production of sugar in this country were any part of the workers' money. The tax of \$40 per ton of sugar was always regarded as a tax just as much as the income tax which those few sugar plantations which were lucky enough to make money paid or any other tax on earth. When my money is taxed at a certain percentage, when 40 per cent, 50 per cent, 60 per cent or 70 per cent is taken out by the Cabinet Secretary and paid into the Consolidated Fund it ceases to be my money.

Not until recently when an artificial case was sought to be made out have I ever heard it suggested that the Sugar Levy remained the property of the sugar producers far less of workers, the sugar producers whose money it was before they were taxed.....the sugar producers' money, had it not been taken away by a sugar levy and the Government putting it into levies with certain purposes and for certain uses.....and at different times these sugar levies were loaned to International Seafoods Limited. I never heard Mr. Walcott make any attack on the Honourable Member for St. John for taking workers' money and giving to Kyffin Simpson which he has said a lot of worse things about our buying the shares in Barbados Sugar Factories.

I never heard any attack made on the Government for taking the sugar workers' money to support the incomes of persons engaged in the fishing industry, but all of a sudden when we take the sugar levies to buy the largest shareholding in Barbados Sugar Factories for the people of Barbados, we are told that that is something wrong. I have never heard in my life so upside down a piece of logic as that argument. Never in my life could I have imagined that the first Government in Barbados to determine that the people should become the largest owners of their own sugar industry would be attacked for interfering with the workers' rights. When we reach the stage that you have to descend into the abyss of bankruptcy of political argument to recite that and to find that, we really are in a sad way indeed, Mr. Speaker.

Nonetheless it is a fact that that portion of the levies has been applied to the purchase of shares in

Barbados Sugar Factories Limited and another \$1 million has been applied to purchasing equipment to help small farmers harvest their crops. It is a fact that the Government has decided it and no amount of misrepresentation can change the nature of the transaction. We will have to write off the debts due from International Seafoods to the sugar industry. I do not believe we will have to write off this debt or that it will ever be called.

Barbados Sugar Factories is building a factory and I have appointed two Government directors to the Board of the company. For the first time in the history of the island the Government has a say in the disposition of our principal agricultural endeavour, in our most important traditional industry, and I am proud of it. All that I am not proud of is that a lot of wicked and malicious people have joined with persons in the Barbados Workers' Union to misrepresent the Government's efforts in this matter. The people are now part owners of their own sugar industry. This Government has brought it to them and the people who suggest in any way that that achievement should be compromised should be ashamed of themselves.

Clearly however, the sugar factories at a time like this may be seen as an undertaking as a step into an unknown future. I would point out further that the aim of the Government and all concerned effectively is to make Barbados Sugar Factories Limited a cooperative company. It is owned by its suppliers. What they do not get in dividends, they will get in sugar price, and what they do not get in sugar price they may get in dividends though I think it will be many years before a dividend is paid again. Certainly the primary call on any potential profits which the factory would make will be in the direction of servicing the loan.

The loan is not an onerous loan. It does not come from the soft window of the World Bank. It comes from the window of ordinary funds, but it does have interest rates and repayment rates which are more generous than those available at the present time. I do not know the exact rates that are available commercially at the present time. I could not tell you what the exact rates are, but they are World Bank standard rates, probably something like eight per cent with a grace period and an extended repayment period. It is not estimated by the World Bank that even with modest prices that the factory will have any difficulty repaying because the factory has the price which it will pay for sugar under its control.

I therefore recommend this guarantee to honourable Members, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I am a little more pleased about and it is that on this occasion the Minister of Finance having been adequately chastened earlier in the debate has sought to expand a bit for the benefit of Members the implications of this Resolution. I have found, Mr. Speaker, that this Honourable House, and I wish to give examples, has been called upon from time to time by the present administration to guarantee loans for various governmental or non-governmental agencies not only without proper information, but without a proper examination of the implications of those loans.

4.05 p.m.

On this occasion it is quite clear that this loan is part and parcel of a total package to the sugar industry and the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited in particular. I wish to make it clear from the very outset that whilst we would be critical of certain aspects of that financing that we share the view that the sugar industry is of importance economically to this country. We also share the view that any benefits and concessions made for the further development of that industry should be shared not only by the owners of capital in the industry, whether it be Government of private owners or a partnership of both, but also by the workers in the industry.

We feel, Sir, that the Government has made some very serious errors in relation to the capitalising of the sugar industry. I want to deal first of all with one or two aspects of this Resolution. This Resolution starts off by saying that "Whereas by a Loan Agreement dated 9th January, 1980 the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development agreed to lend the Caribbean Development Bank the equivalent of twenty-three million U. S. dollars (\$23 000 000 U.S.) to be on-lent for the purpose of financing approved investment projects located in eligible countries." That is the first point.

We are talking about a Loan Agreement of January 1980 and this is the first occasion where the financing of a major sector of the economy of this country comes up for Parliamentary scrutiny before this Honourable House.

Later in the Resolution, Sir, it states that the Minister of Finance and Planning signed that Agreement on October 2, 1980. Again, I must complain and I must request that when Barbados is being committed to these kinds of loan agreements, and I shall point out by example what can happen, that Parliament should be kept informed and it is not satisfactory to come to this Honourable House and say that when you have signed an agreement that part of that agreement is subject to Parliamentary approval. It falls, Sir, into the category of the mentality that I heard evinced on the Floor of this House to the effect that Parliamentary scrutiny of expenditures in Barbados should be relegated to the *ex post*

facto system by using the Public Accounts Committee in which I think a very unfortunate situation has existed in Trinidad and Tobago and elsewhere.

Now, Sir, you will note very carefully that we have not even had a firm statement on the interest rates in relation to this loan. We have not been told about the other charges which are involved in this loan. It just occurs, stating in the Resolution, as "Other charges" and indeed, Sir, I would feel that certainly from the wording of the Resolution..... I am very glad that on this occasion in his presentation that he was not seeking a blanket approval from Parliament for a guarantee which, when it constitutes a contingent liability, might well in this kind of investment become a real liability and a charge on the Consolidated Fund, sooner or later.

Our feeling, Sir, is that the Hon. Minister of Finance has been guilty of gross mismanagement, not only of the total economy but that his judgment in relation to specific projects have been defective and this has been clearly evinced in his attitudes towards the allocation of the proceeds consequential on the disbursement of the various levies.

Now, Sir, I wanted to make this important point because it infringes on the basic question of Parliamentary control, not only of expenditure, direct liabilities, but also contingent liabilities.

During the last Session of Parliament and, these are just a few..... Sir, I am just using these as examples to support the point that it is important that the totality of these measures must be examined by Parliament if all of us are to be informed and be involved when we are making decisions that not only affect the economy but in the long-run would affect the taxation policy of this country, affect the utilisation of our foreign reserves and a whole lot of other serious consequential factors can flow from it.

One outstanding example, Sir, is the guarantee approved by this Honourable House in a previous Session, I am not reflecting on a vote of this House in this Session, where as a consequence of that World Bank Agreement, I think that even the present Administration would now concede that it was an unwise Agreement because it has undermined the entire thrust, not only of the policy of the previous Government but also their policy in respect of the development of industry in Barbados. Even little did they know, Sir, when that Agreement was approved late in the evening in this Parliament, the impact that it would have had on rent, the impact on the ability of small businessmen to benefit from the facilities of IDC.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it that the Honourable Member is.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am trying to establish the point that it is important not to look at piecemeal financing of major projects but to look at the totality of the thing because this contingent liability that we are examining today relates to a massive investment in the sugar industry and I am trying to establish the reasons why I think these should be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: But can the honourable Member do so without reflecting on a vote of this Honourable House? I am submitting that that is exactly what the honourable Member has been doing up to the time that I interrupted.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: For your guidance, Sir, does this relate to the previous Session of the House before the Elections? I am talking about matters before the Election of the previous House, not a vote of this House, I am referring to the previous House in relation to all of these matters. *(Pause)*. I really would like some assistance in this matter, Sir. I am talking about matters that took place in a previous House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to advise that when you listen to some of these Asides, listen, but please do apply a little commonsense. We are dealing with this House. There is only one House. It is this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you very much, Sir. I appreciate the significance of your ruling. I do not propose to reflect on the vote but would point out that that decision, Sir, taken by us has had a ripple effect right through the industrial development process in Barbados which we could not have foreseen at that point in time. But I think that if it had been subject to a total debate in Parliament where for example, I believe that the Member for Christ Church East Central would have been interested in making a contribution because at that time he was Chairman of the IDC I am sure that he would support my view that that commitment to that World Bank Loan is not necessarily in the best interest of the industrial sector in Barbados.

4.15 p.m.

Another example, I would like to quote, Sir, and here I do not wish to go into any details, is when we were asked to approve what would be a contingent liability, as in the case of this Resolution the loan to the Barbados Light and Power, of some US\$6 million. None of us were told, Sir, and none of us were aware that as a consequence of that loan, that in the year 1982, electricity rates would go up by 3.8 cents per kilowatt hour, in 1983 by 3.1 cents per kilowatt hour, in 1984 by 2.2 cents per kilowatt hour and in 1985 by 4 cents per kilowatt hour. Nor were we aware Sir, that there was a commitment fee of some three quarter per cent to one per cent on the part of the loan that was not drawn down. Nor were we aware Sir, that there was a precondition to that loan for expensive foreign finances which would have to be paid

for out of the common foreign reserve pool which we all share, whether it is in the private sector or the public sector. Nor were we aware Sir that that company would have been required to maintain somewhere between five per cent and nine per cent of its cash reserves which would have immediate implications in respect of rates. And, of serious importance Sir, none of us were aware that there were certain restraints and dividends, particularly in the light of the fact that National Insurance funds were injected into the capitalisation of the Barbados Light and Power Company. Nor indeed were we aware that there would have been alterations to the debenture deed which might compromise the security inherent in the investment in terms of National Insurance funds. Nor were we aware of the contents Sir, of the side letter which I do not want to get into now – but, just to establish the important point that we cannot just simply look at piece-meal financing, we have to look at the totality of it.

Another bad example Sir, was the Orion Bank Loan, and up to today, we do not even know what the true interest rate is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that the honourable Member is trying to tempt the Chair.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:.....to make him take his seat. I do not want to do this. I do not want to do this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will continue on the question of.....I will like to make some general comments on contingency.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member has a case to make about the Government, I would advise him to consult with the Rt. Hon. Leader of his Party and bring a no confidence motion against the Government.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No Sir, this is not a matter of no confidence. I am talking about this Resolution and I want to deal specifically now with the status.....

Mr. SPEAKER: And, I am going to warn, if the honourable Member continues to reflect on votes of this Honourable House, I will have no alternative but to ask him to take his seat. I do not want to do this. Please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with the status of contingent liabilities and part of this Resolution is a contingent liability.

Firstly, they must not be dismissed, as just being contingent liabilities because contingent liabilities today can become real liabilities tomorrow. And, when you are talking about the financing of a major industry, with all the various variables involved like the sugar industry, then there is a real chance that what starts off as a contingent liability might become a real liability and in due course to protect your initial investment, you might have to be pumping more and more funds into the capitalisation of that particular industry.

Contingent liabilities Sir is one way of side stepping, as has been done in the United Kingdom, as done in many countries, the reality, Sir of your true national debt. But in the long run it affects the credit worthiness of any country or any individual business and, indeed, Sir, many of these contingent liabilities, those to which I cannot refer by fiat, all have foreign exchange implications. This present Resolution before us is a classical example of this.

As I said at the beginning, and I do not wish to be misquoted, we are committed as a party not only to the further development of the sugar industry in Barbados, but, we regard the development of agriculture, as one of the major priorities in this country. We are also committed not only to making sure that there is a fair deal for the owners of capital, but an equally fair deal for the workers in this country.

I shall present evidence before this Honourable House Sir, to show that the Government, rightly or wrongly has taken a step to produce considerable concessions for the owners of capital within the industry, whilst, at the same time, an unfortunate statement made by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance, I do not think will help the present difficulties, in relation to wage negotiations. I would not wish, Sir, to follow his bad example, in referring to the current wage negotiation, but, I would like to say this, that if concessions had been made on one side, largely in relation to capitalisation and taxation; I would believe that apart from the genuine increases which should be accorded to the workers in the sugar industry.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, may I put it this way? I would believe.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would advise the honourable Member, do not put it any way at all.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: All right. I will discard the question of increases. And, I would say this that I will seek to establish a case whereby a simple amendment to the Income Tax Act, the Government would be showing extremely good faith, in relation to all involved

in trying to get the sugar industry going again in Barbados by making this year's wages for the workers of Barbados completely tax free. One has nothing to do with wages.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree that it has nothing to do with wages.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to ask you to withdraw it because I would then have it struck from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in 1980, the Government of Barbados, by a Cabinet decision which has not yet come before this Honourable House, but, which forms part and parcel of the package referred to by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of this country, endorsed a recommendation by a group of consultants, by two consultants, G. V. Hagelberg and Andrew McGregor to the effect that certain changes should take place in respect of the levy system in Barbados.

To sum it up, the Government of Barbados agreed to the abolition of the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund Levy, the Price Stabilisation Reserve Levy and the Labour Welfare Fund Levy. Cabinet agreed to that. This has not come before this Honourable House as yet. The Government, however, did not accept the recommendation to abolish the Sugar Export Levy Act, although they felt that it should be amended and I will assume that this is one of the Acts which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister referred to when he introduced the matter.

They agreed to the creation of a cess of 1.2 per cent more than recommended by the consultants and Sir, also that the \$24 million or so which have been realised from those levies should go largely into the capitalisation of the industry with insignificant trade off to the trade unions, to the workers and to the small peasant farmers in Barbados. To be precise Sir, the Government accepted the recommendation that consequential on the abolition of the Capital Rehabilitation Levy, or the termination of that levy, with the projecting capital expenditures in the sugar industry over the next four to five years — when that is taken into consideration, against the new straight line methods of depreciation introduced as a budgetary measure in this Honourable House — that the funds could be removed, and, at the same time, the depreciation would have the same effect providing the same level of investment, or an accelerated level of investment takes place within the sugar industry as envisaged in the proposal set out by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

4.25 p.m.

The abolition of the Price Stabilisation (Reserve Fund) Levy, Sir, will have the effect of removing some \$7 million which was lying in commercial banks in Barbados allegedly on low interest rates and making it available to the owners of capital in Barbados in respect of the sugar industry.

The Provident Fund, as I understand it, would have been absorbed in due course into the National Insurance Fund, and the other funds would have been applied largely to capitalisation of the industry.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I really have difficulty with this matter. When an honourable Member recites as a long recital the Government's intentions, recites what is in a document and in fact is inaccurate — I have listened very carefully to the honourable Member, I think it is a lack of understanding rather than deliberate misrepresentation — there is a great danger when I get up to reply that these things somehow would have soaked in or would not be noticed, but I want to say that what the honourable Member is saying is simply not true. Some of it is true, but his interpretations are nearly all inaccurate and he has just misinformed us of some of the facts and he is reciting allegedly from a document or something which he states is in existence and commenting on the Government's decision in respect of it.

It is a very complex matter which I do not think he has fully grasped, and he really has not got it all right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Point taken and I think, Sir, I am on the right track. I have spent a lot of time not only studying Government's proposals but also other proposals in relation to this matter.

The fact is that there is some \$24 million immediately available for disbursement from those funds. Part of it would be used for the purchase of small holding equity in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited, or has been used. I would not know, because the decision was taken in 1980 and up to now it has not come before this House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, with great respect, Sir, I have said in the House a dozen times that we are going to spend \$3 million of the equity in small holdings. In the last Parliament I said so over and over. I have heard the honourable Member criticise this matter, so how can he say he does not know?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I did not say I did not know, what I am saying is that it was not a matter for debate in this Honourable House. Here is a matter where you

have had accumulated levies for various reasons in the sugar industry over a number of years, and it is just my feeling that in your capacity of Minister of Finance that you should have brought this matter before this Honourable House for debate so the whole matter could have been debated, and we would have had a much better understanding of Government policy and then you could not claim that you were being misrepresented.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, if the honourable Member really does not mind. I really am not being contentious over this matter, Sir. It has never been the policy to bring a Resolution relating to individual disbursements out of the sugar levies. The honourable Member for St. John gave the same \$3 million when it was worth a lot more, in July 1976, to the sugar producers to support the sugar price, because he said they lost money that year. I have never criticised him for not bringing it to the House, I may have criticised doing it or said something about it, but it is not a matter on which it has been the practice to deal with it in the House. The Seafoods matter was never brought to the House, giving Seafoods \$1 million either. So he is criticising the system, not the Government.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Again, thanks for your elucidation, but I think it is not a matter of disbursements here, it is a matter of abolition and a completely new direction in the financing of the sugar industry, and this is what I am talking about, the package. I am talking about the package which should have been brought to the House, but this is a matter of opinion, and I should be free to express my opinion on that matter.

Now, Sir, there is some concern about that \$3.7 million on behalf of small farmers. I have heard figures quoted of 10,000, I have heard figures quoted of 15,000, and I was very interested to know that if the Government takes up \$3.7 million and puts in Barbados Sugar Factories on behalf of 10,000 or 15,000 people, how would those people know that they as individuals have a financial interest in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited? Will they get a share certificate? When a dividend is paid, if one is paid in 500 years, would their heirs and successors get that dividend? How would they be identified?

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered to be expunged from the record by His Honour the Speaker at this stage.

What I would like to say is that the Government would have great difficulty in being able to identify and make sure that the proceeds from that investment go to the small farmers whom they may find some difficulty in identifying.

There is another figure, Sir, which has fluctuated — I have seen figures quoted between \$13 million and \$18 million — out of that levy fund which remains available to the Agricultural Division of the Barbados Development Bank for the purpose of financing partly the sugar factories in Barbados. If one were to look, Sir, at the relationship between that sector of the Bank and the primary producers, I would believe that this is virtually a non-refundable gift when you look at the performance of the industry and you look at the possible projections over the years. I would think that the funds through the Barbados Development Bank would be more in the form of a gift.

There have been token concessions made towards small farmers in the region of I think \$1 million, supposed to be related to a mechanisation scheme for small farmers, through the ADC, of all places. If I may be permitted to reflect on the ADC, the ADC is not capable of managing its own affairs far less managing a pilot scheme for small farmers in Barbados in respect of mechanisation.

4.35 p.m.

The question of the financing of smallholders' mechanisation by \$1.5 million is unlikely to become a reality. The further investment initially quoted as \$13.6 million but now somewhere in the region of \$18 million as I understand it, will inevitably mean that that package would ensure that Barbados Sugar Factories would already have had substantial inputs from those levy funds. Now it is a matter of argument. The Union takes a position and I support the position of the Barbados Workers' Union in this matter, that these levy funds have been accumulated over the years by contributions not only from management but by contributions from workers. The burden of their argument, Sir, which has been very well set out in a document which they have had professionally prepared, makes it clear that they have a moral right to about at least half of the funds or some \$12.5 million of the funds available for disposal.

It is my feeling that the case as articulated by the Union is correct; it is my feeling that the case that I have heard put forward by the Minister of Finance in which he argues that disbursement of that money to the Union or to the workers would represent a disinvestment process within the sugar industry has some merit. I think however that justice should demand that the Government should keep an open mind on that matter, and I feel that the impasse that is developing in relation to the further development of the sugar industry could probably be partially assisted by paying attention to the just processes and the appropriate consultative processes that should have been gone through in relation to the distribution of those funds that have accumulated over the years. My feeling, Sir, is that the counter proposals put forward by the Barbados Workers' Union.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What proposals are the honourable Member referring to?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I refer to a document "Rationalisation of the Sugar Industry in Barbados — Response by the Barbados Workers' Union to the Government's 1980 Proposals", the proposals which I referred to earlier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those proposals are now before this House?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will make them a document of the House. It is part of the financial package. On the one hand virtually the whole \$24 million, not all of it, would have gone to the sugar producers in the argument put forward by the Barbados Workers' Union on behalf of their workers. They feel that they have contributed and contributed directly because over the past 20 to 30 years when sugar negotiations have been completed from year to year the actual amount paid to the worker always took into consideration

Mr. SPEAKER: Please desist. Sail away from this. I am asking

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am talking about 1947. I am just trying to establish that the Union's case is that way back in 1947 or thereabouts when these levies started there was a presumption when a wage settlement was made at the beginning of a year that what the worker got was reduced by X amount in order to meet their contributions as workers towards the levies in the same way as the employers accepted a reduction in their profits by X amount, and it was the amalgamation of the two amounts that has resulted in the happy position where you have \$24 million available to you today.

The proposals which the Union did put forward, Sir, referred to additional benefits under the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund: a scholarship for sugar workers and their children, a housing programme for sugar workers, supplementary pay benefits, compensation payments to enhance those which already existed under the National Insurance Scheme and also some \$12.5 million made available to workers right at the beginning at the point of disbursement. I am sure they would be able to decide among themselves or through their Union whether they wished to invest in Barbados Sugar Factories or invest in the area of primary production or in some other aspect of agriculture or how they wished to disburse of those funds.

The point that I have been trying to establish and I think I have done so with some degree of success, is that

we have had a situation where substantial benefits have flowed not only by the reorganisation of these levies and the disbursement of those funds, but also by the new method of depreciation towards the owners in the sugar industry who had a bad year last year and who will have a bad year this year; but when there is a bad year in the sugar industry, it is not only the plantation owners and sugar factories owners that have a bad year, but everybody. I cannot call the name of the others, but everybody has a bad year.

Since that bad year last year substantial steps have been taken to correct the position of the owners and if we are to maintain some kind of social equity and social justice in Barbados, I believe that any deliberations about the future of the industry should take into consideration what has taken place in that area on the investment side, and I would believe that tax incentives in relation to those who are not the owners of capital would go a long way into solving the present problems relating to the sugar industry, but not overnight. It might avert possible crises on the horizon, but I think in the long term, and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture who has been listening very carefully would certainly support not only fiscal incentives in that area.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair is listening very carefully, and the honourable Member is suggesting that since so much has been done for the industry on one side, that if you are to have social equity, you are to have these incentives and what not. In other words, the suggestion is that something has been done for one side and not for the other.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not said that, Sir. What I have said.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Don't say it please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am trying to make.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to give the honourable Member the opportunity to say what he has not said.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The capital structure in the sugar industry, Sir, consists of machinery, it consists of management skills, it consists of brains and it consists of muscles and bones. That constitutes the total capital in the industry, and I would like to see the same incentives that go towards machinery, management, brains, muscle and bones go to sweat and go in all directions, and I would like to see such incentives not only in relation to the sugar component of the agricultural policy of Barbados, but also to the non-sugar component of the agricultural policy of this country.

Now with respect to this Resolution, Sir, there are one or two other areas that are of concern to me. It is generally noised abroad that certain aspects of the sugar industry are responsible for the escalating cost where the cost of producing sugar locally is lower than what can be obtained either within the EEC or on the world market.

4.45 p.m.

It should be stated that there is no price indexing of the components that go into the cost of sugar in Barbados and all the evidence that has been adduced today would indicate that the escalation in cost in the sugar industry has been more related to mechanisation than to labour by hand, if I may say so, so that the subtle attempt..... I think the ratio, Sir, over the past 12 years is somewhere in the region of a 600 per cent shift in relation to the cost from mechanisation as distinct from the cost of the manual labour which probably has declined comparatively within the industry over the years because although you have had increases, you have had a reduction in the total number of persons working within that industry.

We are concerned, Sir, that we have not been given any proper information on the assets and liabilities which are supposed to be pledged, if I remember correctly, to the Caribbean Development Bank. If we are going to agree to a contingent liability and if the assets of Barbados Sugar Factories Limited is to be pledged to the Caribbean Development Bank, we would want to know not only what their assets are, but what their liabilities are because if anybody is going to ask me to back a note for him, there is no way that I would sign that note which would constitute a contingent liability unless I have some idea of the viability either of the project or of his own financial status. I therefore hope that when the Hon. Minister gets up to speak that he would be in a position to let us know what are the assets and what are the liabilities and not just trot out the kind of figures that are completely meaningless when you talk about a 14 per cent return before tax, a 11 per cent after tax, an economic rate of return of 29 per cent and that kind of thing.

That kind of thing means absolutely nothing to any single one of us inside here unless we have had the opportunity to seriously study the feasibility studies, the projections and above all, have some commonsense and some knowledge of the industry because very often these feasibility studies and whatnot can be way out and could lead you up the garden path. When I hear anyone in Barbados saying that you can invest \$67 million in a hotel and expect to get a return on it and tell you that feasibility studies have been done, I can only say that such a person, Sir, would have to be crazy because there is no way it could happen in one million

light years in a population of a quarter million people even if that is multiplied three times over the next ten to 15 years. I do not need to see a feasibility study on that kind of capital investment because commonsense would dictate to me.

Now, Sir, commonsense would also dictate to me that this kind of figure here of 14 per cent and 11 per cent after tax, with this kind of investment, bearing in mind the run-down state of the factories as described by the Minister of Finance himself.....and I understand that the factory itself is not even a completely new factory. I may be wrong on this matter but I understand there has been some removal of equipment from Porters and Vauclose which have been transferred up to that factory.

Now, Sir, I have great difficulties, great difficulties in coming to a conclusion in relation to this, very great difficulties. I believe that I have tried to do my duty to this Honourable House, under very great difficulties, because there are other aspects that should be explored without compromising any current problems in the society or creating other problems which are of great importance but, unfortunately, I cannot deal with it.

It would have been nice to present a more composite figure by looking at the other aspect but I am insisting that as long as I am responsible for this portfolio in the Opposition and as long as I rise to speak, I should try to get as much information over to Parliament and present as balance a picture because I spend weeks and months and sometimes a year, for example, on this one researching the kind of problems relating to the present re-financing of the sugar industry.

I feel there is room for manoeuvre to prevent a major problem in this country but I believe it is an attitude of mind and I wish I could, on the Floor of this House, be persuasive enough to get across to the other side certain techniques or approaches that could remain to the advantage of all within the industry.

One other problem Sir, that immediately faces us — I understand that that factory will not be available until sometime in March or thereabouts. I do not know if this is true. (*Asides*). Pardon.

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no cross talk. Kindly address the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe the Central Bank and all Barbadians have been hoping that the crop would be able to start in full force by the middle of this month. This factory will not be ready at the beginning of this month and will not be ready for some time. I believe it means that all the canes, small and large, in the North will be served by only one factory and I shudder to think

of the kind of cost that will be involved in transporting canes say from St. Lucy probably to Bulkeley or Carrington's or one of those other factories because I believe that Andrews is behind schedule as well. I am not quite sure.

I understand that there are only about four factories and that a desperate attempt is being made to get started within the next seven to ten days so that any delays which might occur in starting the crop at full speed, Sir, might not necessarily be attributable to those who can be easily harassed, those who are relatively defenceless within the society and those who can be blamed for all the ills attendant on the industry. As in the past year, much of the blame can be attributable to those who are in a better financial position and in a position to dictate when the crop should start and have elected to do otherwise.

Now, Sir, one other point. This guarantee takes place against a projected investment of some \$5 million per year over the next five years and if you were to take into account inflation in this particular area, you will probably find that this investment, the total investment to the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited as distinct from this particular factory might well reach a stage where this becomes a direct liability to the taxpayers of this country unless there is a *pari passu* increase in the number of acres under cultivation and the amount of sugar produced and the target of 150,000 tonnes is reached, not in 1985 because if that it is going to be reached in 1985, you are going to be in a lot of trouble with this investment long before that.

The best accounting advice that I have got is if you take into consideration basic investment at that level and you take into account the inflationary cost of further development in the sugar industry, you would have to reach your target of 150,000 tonnes somewhere in 1983 at the earliest, otherwise this investment could be in some trouble.

4.55 p.m.

One final point Sir. The Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance, when he is exposed, as he has been exposed, takes very unkindly to the logical presentation of financial argument. He must understand that the days are finished when he can come in here and make statements and get away with them because he will have no protection from this side. We shall relentlessly, based on the experiences of this country in the past 18 months pursue every single avenue of argument and make sure that enough pressure can be brought on him, by those sitting on that side, in order to bring a more balanced judgement on the affairs of this country either on the macro scale, and the micro scale or sectoral scale within the economic management of Barbados. That, I perceive is our duty here.

Consequential on this investment, some of the immediate sufferers will be the primary producers in Barbados. I particularly refer to the small peasant farmers and also Sir, to those plantations that are not part of the Barbados Sugar Factories Group, because those who are knowledgeable about the basis on which sugar prices are computed would know that before a cent is paid out or before a price is arrived at domestically, that the cost of production and the cost of producing sugar, after it has been delivered to the sugar factory, has to be computed first and then you work backwards to decide what you are going to give to the primary producers and, unless you are a shareholder in Barbados Sugar Factories and, at the same time, a shareholder in the other extended facilities and maybe a shareholder in the massive deposit that they hold overseas, including South Africa and elsewhere, you could be in a lot of trouble.

So the small farmers and many of those marginal estates in Barbados will find that the price for their primary product over the next one to five years will be compromised because of the capital investment involved here. All these are dimensions Sir that need to be considered, all these are dimensions that should have been considered when the decision was taken for a re-allocation of the accumulated levy of the \$24 million. All those should have been taken into consideration. But, have they been taken into consideration? I venture to suggest that they have not been taken into consideration. And, you will probably find that your objective of 150,000 tonnes would be seriously compromised because the small farmer, those marginal estates and those estates which are not shareholders in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited might find that they are unable to meet production cost.

And, we have sat down here and agreed to the iniquitous financial system, where those estates that are worse off would now have to pay a higher rate of interest from this year on, in relation to the management of their estate.

Now Sir I believe that the total spectrum ... not in total detail, there is a lot more detail, in this matter. It is a complex matter and, one tries to deal with it. But, I try to highlight those areas that should certainly be brought to the attention of this Parliament. And, I would like to wind up by repeating the need for fiscal incentives to all of the sugar industry, a tax free year for the sugar industry, particularly the workers in the sugar industry. Increased incentives and increased benefits all round and, I believe that we would have sowed the seeds for a revitalisation of this industry.

I wish Sir, that the full component of this matter could have been dealt with, but, at my age Sir, and so early in the new year, I really am not prepared for certain types of activity. I think I have sold Parliament

a bit short in my dissertation by not being able to examine the cost of labour in relation to this exercise. I feel deeply hurt that after a considerable amount of research, I have had to neglect a vital part of my presentation, because I feel that a balanced picture presented to Parliament who are ultimately the legislators — and who might ultimately have to legislate on the matter — would be the best thing that could be done, at this stage. But, God willing, *Deo volente*, I have done my best, in the circumstances.

Thank you very much for your kind indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope Mr. Speaker, that I do not have the benefit of the kind indulgence which the honourable Member enjoyed because my speech is going to be very short. I wish to deal specifically with the introduction made by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance, in vindicating the request which he is making to this Honourable House for us to approve the guarantee of a loan agreement by the Government of Barbados, of the principal, interest and other charges with respect to the loan to the extent of the amount of the loan which was withdrawn for financing sub-loans to approved investment projects in Barbados.

The Caribbean Development Bank is securing, we were made to understand, a loan of some \$46 million from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I do not wish to deal with the IDRB here today because I have dealt with them in other cases on other occasions in Washington and elsewhere in the presence of all the Governors, Directors, the President of the United States and the President of the World Bank, Mr. McNamara. I have my reservations about the IDRB.

I have never had to place the Government and people of Barbados, in the hands of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which was devised to re-establish the European economies and was never meant as an instrument for the development of ex-colonial territories. The Government now finds itself in a position that is always in the red. That is the position that the electorate of Barbados has placed themselves in. So, I am not quarreling with that decision. But, I have to deal with this as a Member of the Honourable House and as a taxpayer in Barbados and examine whether we are justified in underwriting the payments of the principal sum, the interest and other charges with respect to such parts of this \$46 million as might be allocated to projects in Barbados.

There are two projects specifically mentioned. So, my first point is this. It has not been stated anywhere in

the Addendum to the Resolution that there will not be other projects in which the Government will not feel itself constrained to return to the Honourable House to say, "well, out of the \$46 million, we are now doing something else."

5.05 p.m.

That is the first point I wish to make, and I wish to underline that and underscore it, because I do not want to hear on a future occasion that the House of Assembly approved a Resolution which guaranteed the repayment of the principal, interest and other charges with respect to the loan of Bds \$46 million or any part of it, and that the two projects which were mentioned in the Addendum were only an illustration of the kind of projects which the Government immediately had in mind and contemplated at the time the Resolution was brought.

But I will now turn to the two projects which have been mentioned, and let me dispose of the first one first. There have been rumours for some time that the company which is known as Building Supplies Limited had been in some kind of difficulty. Building Supplies Limited is a company that I have had dealings with, and I would like to see more companies engaged in the kind of activity, using local resources, that Building Supplies now utilises. I want to make my point abundantly clear. I, for instance, think that until we get our own cement plant established, that Building Supplies using local clay from St. Andrew or St. John or any other part of the country should be supplying the bulk of the building material to the building industry in Barbados. I think it was a point made by Mr. Douglas Lynch some time ago. Why should we be using so many concrete blocks when by the mere addition of water to the clay with a certain amount of heat we could be using up 100 per cent Barbadian products?

So the kind of activity that Building Supplies is engaged in is one of which I heartily approve. It does not mean that I approve of their business practices, or their price fixing mechanisms or anything like that, but I approve heartily of any industry which is going to use 100 per cent Barbados raw materials, Barbados labour and Barbados technology. Technology, of course, we can always import, or we can buy, or we can rent, but certainly Barbados material would save us a lot of foreign exchange, and I approve of that. But the least that could have been done in here today, if we are going to be asked to guarantee the repayment of the loan, is for us to have been told the nature of the approved investment project that Building Supplies is now embarking upon. That is not a matter of idle curiosity, it is a matter of public and general interest. We want to know what is the nature of this investment project.

Let me put it this way. The gentlemen — I say gentlemen, Sir, because we are not supposed to use indecent language in here — of the profession of which I have the honour to belong, the gentlemen of the legal profession will tell you, Sir,..... and they always criticise me because they say I am always running down the profession. I am not running down the legal profession, but I can speak with authority on the legal profession because I am a member of that profession, so I am not running them down, I am running down myself. The gentlemen of the legal profession will tell you that when they draw up company rules — we call it the Articles and Memorandum of Association of a company..... you may wish, Sir, just to sell sno-cones in this company, but do you know what you put down in the Articles of Association gives you power to build aeroplanes, battleships, submarines, nuclear plants, take in laundry, and sno-cones will be a very small thing somewhere down in about the 55th line of the Articles of Association. You know that is a fact. Any company that you establish they make it so wide and they say they are protecting you so that just in case you wake up one night and you see a good little business next door that you would not have to go back to the lawyers to get a new Article of Association.

The point that I am making is this, Sir. When you say that Building Supplies is going to get money from the World Bank for an improved investment project, it may not be related to building at all, it may be related to making Jamaican patties, and I guarantee that if I got a copy of the Articles of Association, knowing how the members of my profession operate, that I would find somewhere in there that they have authority to make Jamaican patties. Does anybody want to bet money on it? So I am saying that in a serious matter like this you cannot come into the House, in an important industry like the building industry, and say we are going to guarantee a loan for a private company owned by one of the largest, or the largest, conglomerate in Barbados, as far as I know.....(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There are other shareholders). I know there are other shareholders, but what I am saying is that Barbados Shipping and Trading is one of the major, or the major shareholder in this company and they should not need any guarantee from us at all. But that is the way the World Bank operates.

I want to know what it is they are going to do with the money. Do not come and tell me that you do not want the private business of Building Supplies to be ventilated in public, because as soon as they get on to this level of activity that they are going to the World Bank and they are asking the taxpayers of Barbados to guarantee a loan for them, all their private business is then public business. There is no more private business when you drag in the taxpayers, as far as I am concerned.

There is no more secrecy or breach of secrets, or business dealings or anything like that, it is all public business as soon as you come on the Floor of this House, so that is all I have to say about them. I would like information on what the project is because it is something that some of the wealthier members on the other side may even want to involve them, let the World Bank put a little money in, because it might be a good investment, but they did not go to the public of Barbados. It might be such a good thing that the general public might want to assist them by putting in a piece of change as a good return on the few savings that they cannot spend on washing machines and refrigerators and that kind of thing now. The public wants to know.

Let me leave that aside. That is the point I am making, and I will come now to the sugar factories. When my grandfather used to run a little sugar mill at Mount Pleasant in St. Lucy, he used to manufacture sugar. He did not have a single partner. There were about 134 families of people manufacturing sugar in Barbados. You look at Aspinall's History and you will see the whole list of them, who was manager, who was owner, who was attorney, and you will find about 134 sugar mills. When I left this country round about 1940 there were still at least seven small factories owned by small people manufacturing sugar.
5.15 p.m.

When this crop starts I do not think there are going to be more than eight sugar factories in Barbados grinding sugar cane. There is none in St. Lucy; there is none in St. Andrew. There is Haymans in St. Peter, that is one. There is Porters in St. James, Vacluse in St. Thomas; that is three. There are two in St. Philip, Carrington and Foursquare; that is five. There is Andrews wherever that is because I never know whether it is in St. George or St. Joseph, but it is on the border. They have more St. George people working there than they have St. Joseph people. That is six. They have recently closed down the one at Lower Estate. There is Bulkeley; that is seven; and I cannot really remember any more; but I know there are not more than eight sugar factories which are going into production this year, and I doubt there will be eight because if they have closed down Porters and closed down Vacluse, there will be five or six.

Now, one of the things about the sugar industry in this island is this. You come from 134 factories or how many I mentioned just now, they have been decimated in that short time from 1913 to 1982, a period of seventy years. Ninety per cent of the factories have gone. We do not produce less sugar; we produce more sugar. Our failure to produce sugar in Barbados has not been due to shortage of factories. Our failure to produce sugar has been due to a shortage of sugar cane.

When the World Bank offered to lend the sugar industry in Barbados \$10 million and they came and put the proposals to me as Minister of Finance, I told them I could not guarantee the repayment on that money because I could not guarantee after they had spent the \$10 million and the rain did not fall that Barbados would be able to produce 500 tons of canes more. After that factory is built, Barbados will not necessarily produce more sugar because if whoever is responsible for the distribution of the rainfall — which they claim is the Almighty, and they try to blame him for everything — decides not to distribute the rainfall in the proper areas or not to distribute it at all, you can build a million factories but you will not be able to produce 50,000 tonnes of sugar. That is my argument.

At no time in the history of Barbados from the day we brought the people here from Brazil and Drax Hall mill was erected, have we ever failed to produce sugar because we did not have the capacity to grind the sugar cane. Now where you would have this difficulty is if our factories used to work 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but the starting of the sugar crop and the ending of the sugar crop is entirely in the dispensation of the people who control the sugar industry and to a lesser extent the accredited representative of the workers of Barbados. Once the crop starts however the question of disposing of the amount of cane that you have is entirely a matter for the people who own factories and not a question of lack of capacity.

Now look at the nonsense we are doing here today. I do not mean in here, I mean that the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited are doing: sending Lower Estate to St. Vincent. St. Vincent should be producing all the vegetables that we need in the Caribbean right through the year, but the Prime Minister of St. Vincent has decided that he must have a sugar factory as if there is something magical in having a sugar factory in a country. All of the eastern Caribbean islands went out of sugar production a long time ago because it paid them better to do other things. Sir Alexander Stuart's Company was called Antigua-Syndicate. That factory was closed down at least fifteen years ago. The difference between that factory and the 138-707s — 138 is the number of the type, not the number of the planes — the 707 series 138 that B.W.I.A. bought from Braniff was that at least Braniff had them in moth balls, and the Antigua sugar factory was not in moth balls. When I say in moth balls, it means that the engines were inhibited by putting fluid and so on in them and probably grease. So Antigua-Syndicate goes out.

We are told now that we are going to get a new factory in Barbados. What we are getting, Sir, is what we in the north, the parish which you represent, call 'a next sugar factory', not a new one, 'a next one' because the machinery that is coming into the factory

at Blowers, a lot of it is coming from Antigua. Some of it is coming from Vacluse and some from Porters.

Now who is going to pay for it? In the last analysis the House is being asked to pay for it, the House meaning the taxpayers, but I am saying that the people who are going to pay for this sugar factory are the small cane growers who only got \$45 a ton for their canes, and the honourable Member for St. Lucy can tell you, I understand as it was election year.....I withdraw unreservedly before I even say it.

I understand from my fellow parishioners that the honourable Member was charging \$1.00 a ton less than anybody else for freighting. It happened to be election year, not because it was election year. Ask him what the price was. He was probably losing money even at that price. \$18 a ton to get your canes to the factory, that is, if you are on the level like the honourable Member. When I say on the level, I mean in every sense of the word; on the level with your customers and on the level coming from St. Lucy down to Haymans. But suppose you had to come from down underneath the hill, do you think some of the ex-members of Parliament who no longer have any obligation to their constituents were going to bring canes from down there to Vacluse for \$18 a ton? And what were the sugar factories paying out? \$45 a ton. So what about cutting and loading? What about your cultivation expenses?

The lock-ups on the sugar estates in Barbados to date are \$15 million. That is the money which is owed to the banks by the sugar estates in Barbados, sometimes going back three, four and five years before they even got a new cultivation loan. That is the state of the industry, and we are going to build a next factory at Blowers whereby they are going to get less money for their canes. Do you know why they are going to get less money? Not because of the EEC price, because Sugar Factories Limited which is the cartel takes out \$700,000 for industry-wide expenses. The money goes to them.

The price of sugar is not fixed by any negotiations between sugar cane growers and the people who buy sugar. It is the one commodity in the world where the price is fixed by factory owners and by Governments who negotiate on behalf of their purchasers. So you start off with an EEC price calculated in units of account that would be something like \$720 a ton, and Barbados Sugar Factories whether they produce one ton or they produce 100,000 tons are going to take out \$700,000 for what they call industry-wide expenses. It is only one company, so they are covered right away, and then they do not say let me see what it would cost us to grind this cane.

It is a beautiful industry from the point of view of energy saving because you buy the cane and the people

who sell you the cane are selling the fuel at the same time. You are buying fuel to process your cane when you buy the sugar cane. You buy the bagasse through the process, so what do they do? They cannot say, we want a fuel adjustment charge like the Light and Power Company does with us, the poor consumers in Barbados. Oh no. So they cannot go on this basis of what it cost them at all. They have a better formula. Their formula is that no matter how the corn is selling or how the sugar is buying — we say how the corn is selling in Barbados — they must have 26 per cent before they do anything. The seven factories would have 26 per cent of whatever the EEC pay them for sugar plus \$700,000 and whatever is left they would give to the poor cane producers and we are being asked, now, to guarantee a loan to these cartel people, to use a different word, so that they can pay the cane producers less money this year and next year and until *thy kingdom come* because when they have a loan of \$28 million to service an interest rate like what we have been told up in the 15 percents and 18 percents, we know that that is not going to come out of any 26 per cent because that is a new ball game.

5.25 p.m.

They say now we have a new factory and we have to take out the interest charges. We have to amortise this loan and before we pay you any money for your sugar cane we have to see that because the law allows it, Parliament has approved it and that is what they have left over for you. That is the position.

My contention is that Barbados needs a little more mechanisation. We need to rationalise the cutting supplies of canes in the factories by task force, amalgamating and rationalising, putting it on the computer, moving people from one area to the other, giving them proper accommodation and so on, not only to imported workers but your task force must be fed, they must be given canteen facilities.

I had the privilege with the President of the Other Place and the Clerk of the Houses at the Table, of going to Fiji and seeing a sugar industry there which sociologically, economically and otherwise was working beautifully and even with our low production now, did not have the yield per acre that we enjoy here in Barbados. But the reason why that industry is a credit to the country is that the people who are sending canes to the factory are doing it on their own behalf.

They are leasing the land in ten acre lots from the Government and this Government could set an example with the 5,000 acres of land that they have that is causing all the Ministers headaches and causing frequent changes of Ministries.

The workers should be given leases of the land, they should organise their transport on a cooperative basis as they do in Fiji and that the Government, instead of

buying shares in factories for the sugar producers to do as they like, should be undertaking proper control of the operations of these factories in the general interest of the industry, rather than a few factory owners.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate thus far has ranged far and wide and has concentrated a great deal on some of the many issues facing the sugar industry in this country.

I think it is perhaps unfortunate that it has come at this time because we, on this side, will not be able to join issue with the Opposition as vigorously and as effectively as we would like to because of the fact that the present negotiations both with the Sugar Producers and the Barbados Workers' Union are at a delicate stage, Sir, and we would not like to say anything on this side that would be regarded as provocative or likely to interfere with the smooth outcome of those negotiations.

Having said that, however, I think there are several points to which we must give a quick answer and what this debate highlights more than anything else, more than my view, is the large difference in outlook between the Democratic Labour Party and Government in relation to the sugar industry.

I think the story given by the last Member who has just spoken, the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, as to how he was approached by the World Bank and offered \$10 million for investment in the sugar industry, if only Government would underwrite it, and his failure to do so because he was not sure that the rain would fall and that the sugar producers would have enough canes and enough sugar to pay back, and obviously he feared that the taxpayers of Barbados may, in the end, have to repay the loan, reflects, I think, his narrow view of the sugar industry as a private industry of national concern, national implications and national importance.

Arguably it was a mistake for him not to have taken the money or rather agree to underwrite the loan so that the sugar industry then could have benefited from the capitalisation and the modernisation which it badly needs. Our outlook is quite different. We on this side view the sugar industry as a national industry even though we have not nationalised it so that all of this talk that we are dealing with a few white people who owned the industry for the most part and so on, makes no sense.

It is a national issue and that is why, to a large extent, one of the principal aims of the Sugar Act when it is introduced in Parliament is to ensure that the sugar industry is a national industry owned by Barbadians rather than a private industry of national significance. If the Rt. Hon. Member had viewed it that way, perhaps he would have regarded it as the Government's responsibility to underwrite the loan and to make sure

that what in effect was a national industry would have been given the help which it badly needed at that time.

I continue to be struck, Mr. Speaker, with the extent to which the new members of the Democratic Labour Party in Parliament have been able to cut themselves loose from the performance, the achievements and the records of their own Party, the Democratic Labour Party in office.

I agree that a legitimate point was made to the effect that enough information was not given with respect to the terms and conditions surrounding the money which is being borrowed and which the Government is asking Parliament to agree to underwrite the guarantee. For example, in relation to the guarantee involving the sugar industry, we could do with some information with respect to the grace period; information with respect the frequency with which we would have to repay the loan, whether four times a year or twice a year; the rate of interest and so on and I have no doubt that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in winding up will give that information.

But I do not quite understand how the honourable Member, for example, for St. Michael South Central could speak with such force with respect to what he regards as a faulty system when in truth and in fact in recent years in this country many major projects were entered into by Government and no opportunity was given to the Parliament of this country to debate the pros and cons of the wisdom or lack of it of those investments — International Seafoods, Golden Mile, the North Point and Carib West. In the end those projects cost the taxpayers in this country millions upon millions of dollars.
5.35 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party Administration used to use a device, in the Estimates called Special Projects. They never told anybody what these "Special Projects" were. (Aside) Purchase of Assets, I am sorry. They never told anybody what these "Purchase of Assets" would be, they never gave any description or any identification, but, all we would know is that there would be a large sum in the Estimates called, Purchase of Assets. After we would be told that we have the North Point or that we have bought Bath and, that the Government is involved in Golden Mile and nobody in Parliament had the opportunity of knowing before hand what that category, "Purchase of Assets" was and what were the assets that the Government was getting itself involved in.

So even though the honourable Member has made an important point that we are entitled to know, and to know more than we have been given, it is not in his place to speak as though they have a clean record as a Government in relation to the purchase of assets, and major Government investment, in this country.

Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central complains that even though the guarantee Resolutions relating to the World Bank Loan for the IDC and for Light and Power came to Parliament somehow the full implications were not known. Well, that is to some extent, a reflection on him. Indirectly, he tried to involve me, by saying that I, as Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation then, would have agreed with him that the loan was perhaps a mistake. I do not share any such view. I certainly knew as Chairman of the IDC that the loan would have involved a revision of the rental structure, in relation to IDC's estate. That was obvious. We had reached a point where cheap money was no longer available and, the rents at IDC for the estates were too heavily subsidised. IDC should be at a point now where the estates are to a large extent, self sufficient.

When the Government guaranteed that loan for the IDC from the World Bank, the Government did it with its eyes open and we knew what would have been the implication. If he did not know, he should admit to his innocence, or ignorance, as you may wish to call it, but he must not involve us on this side. The same thing goes to the guarantee in relation to the Light and Power. There is not a single implication of that loan which we, on this side, did not know about before the loan was agreed upon and signed. It is no fault of the Government or anybody on this side, if he is now becoming aware of implications which at the time, when the matter was debated, he did not appreciate.

The basic point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Government did the right thing and the Government brought those Resolutions before Parliament. If, because of certain inadequacies on their part, they did not raise certain questions, or certain dimensions of the matter were not discussed, that is not any concern of ours.

Now, he says Mr. Speaker — I am referring to the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — that, at all stages of these negotiations, the Government should keep Parliament informed. Well, that sounds very good in theory, but even in jurisdictions where Governments cannot enter into treaties with other countries, except they bring these treaties to Parliament for ramification, no attempt is made to involve the country through the House or the Senate or whatever be the name of their Chamber during the course of the negotiations. What they are asked to agree to Mr. Speaker is the final product.

Government would be impossible, if at every stage of a negotiation, you had to pause and go to Parliament, either for discussion, or for information. So, though he seems to have persuaded himself that he has hit a high point of wisdom, in truth and in fact, Mr. Speaker, it would make no sense and would virtually paralyse an administration, if at every stage of a negotiation of the

working out of an agreement, you had to come before Parliament and discuss every next step. So, in truth and in fact, Mr. Speaker that suggestion ought to be dismissed as really quite unworkable and even unworthy.

The whole question of the levies Mr. Speaker and the collapse of the levies in the sugar industry to which the Barbados Labour Party Government is committed will be the subject, I have no doubt of a full scale debate, when the new Sugar Industry Act is brought before this Parliament sometime perhaps, in the next four or five months. I want to say, however, at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the original purposes for which the levies were established have all vanished. For example, Mr. Speaker, when the levies were established about 30 years ago or more, we did not even have the beginnings of a decent social security system in this country and it was felt that special provision had to be made, by way of pension funds for the workers, in the sugar industry.

In truth and in fact, Mr. Speaker, we have today a fairly — though not fully — comprehensive social security system. We still have some steps to make but, there is no need to have a separate fund providing for pensions for the workers in the sugar industry. Take the Labour Welfare Fund. For years, Mr. Speaker, that fund was not used for the purpose for which it was set up and the money has been used by successive Governments to finance housing in this country. It was the present Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he was Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance and Head of Government in this country, who used some of the money from the funds to give back to the sugar industry. I think it was in 1975, perhaps, money was also used by that Government to assist International Seafoods; \$1 million which has since been written off. A dead loss. And, they took the \$3 million and gave it back to the sugar producers a few years ago, when they were in office. So that, there has been a recognition on all sides for a long time that the funds were no longer relevant for the purposes for which they were established and, it is simply that they either did not have the imagination or the guts to determine that the funds should be collapsed and put on a rational basis.

But it is a matter of fact that the levies outlived their usefulness and that it made no sense continuing to put aside money into levies for purposes which were no longer relevant. All of the countries in the area which established the levy system in the sugar industry about the time that we did so, have long since collapsed those levies. That point has got to be made to the people of this country. The levies have outlived their usefulness and it was the responsibility, as indeed it is the responsibility of this Government to look at that system, and to put it on a rational and sensible basis and when the Act comes before Parliament you will see what is being proposed and the extent to which we propose to give

new meaning to the levy system which will still be retained in part, but for a very limited purpose — research and development of the sugar industry.

5.45 p.m.

The Workers' Union has been making a very emotional argument, that a lot of the monies belong to the workers, but I think the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has made the fundamental point that after your taxes are taken out of your money and goes back into the Consolidated Fund you are in no position to say that that money belongs to you any more, you are in no position to say that, and if you were to give back the money to the sugar workers, how would you do it? A lot of them have since passed away.

The money is being spent on national projects, that is the important thing. All the money which has been generated from a national industry is being used for national projects, and I think that that is fair. I myself do not appreciate the lot of quarrelling that has been generated about the use of the funds, and the Workers' Union ought not to forget that some of the money has been used for the development of the Labour College, some has also been used for the development of the housing project at Mangrove, and some will be used for small farmers and to help the very sugar industry that helped to generate it, so I do not understand what we are quarrelling about. But the time for a high scale debate on the collapse of the levy system, the use of the money and what we will put in place of the levy system, will come in a few months.

If we are to say all that could usefully be said in a full debate I think that Mr. Frank Walcott may seize upon certain things that are said and claim that we have provoked him and that is why there is no settlement in the negotiations, why there could be no settlement. He would then turn around and blame the Government, so at this point there are limits to what we can usefully say.

Mr. Speaker, the point has been made that the factory in St. Thomas, the new factory, Portvale, just above St. Thomas Church, in truth and in fact is not perhaps as useful and will not be as useful a factory as we are claiming it will be. No large claims have been made on this side, but apart from the fact that it will be producing a million units of electricity a day which will be sold to the electric company, there will be a considerable saving in terms of the distances which people have got to travel to bring canes to that factory.

The Rt. Hon. Member for St. John seemed to be concerned about the fact that in the last 30 or 40 years there has been a dramatic reduction in the number of cane factories operating in this country, but that is nothing that has started yesterday or for which the

Barbados Labour Party is responsible. When he set up the Farley Commission around 1962 to look into the sugar industry, they recommended that there be no more than four or five sections in Barbados. They pointed to the centralisation of factories in Barbados, they said it was bound to come, that therein would lie the viability of sugar factory operations. It is true that his administration did very little about implementing the recommendations of the Farley Report, but the very Commission he set up when he first came to office told him that that was virtually inevitable, so I do not see why he is now seemingly complaining about the dramatic decline in the number of factories in the sugar industry.

I agree with him, Mr. Speaker, even though the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made the point that mechanisation is more costly than labour. Perhaps that is so in the short run, because the harvesters whether they are imported from Australia or they are the ones which are produced here, are expensive and so in the short run they are more expensive than labour, but the industry has no choice because the industry cannot get labour to reap the canes. So I agree with the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John when he says that we need more than mechanisation, because we cannot rely on labour, and I would very much hope that there would be a dramatic speeding up of the process of mechanisation in the sugar industry. We need more mechanisation for sure.

He gives the view that there is also a need for a co-operative among small farmers. That may be so, but co-operatives have not had a very successful history in this country and I am not now, at this stage, entertaining too much hope that we are going to organise the small farmers within the framework of a co-operative. I would like to think that we can, but the history of the co-operative movement in this country would not lead me to believe that we are likely to be too successful in that effort.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was making the point that the sugar industry needs fiscal incentives. I am not necessarily sure that I agree with him, because it is a little late in the day, to give an industry incentives after 300 years. Incentives are normally applied to infant industries and industries that you want to get on their footing, but the sugar industry is now 300 years old and he is now in 1982 calling for fiscal incentives for the sugar industry in this country.

I agree that there is need for a fiscal incentive package in agriculture, but not in all agriculture, and certainly I was not thinking in terms of the sugar industry when I spoke of the need for a package of fiscal incentives in agriculture. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I think that agriculture has suffered a lot in this country,

certainly a lot under the Democratic Labour Party administration, precisely because of the view which the former Prime Minister, the now Leader of the Opposition, expressed today and indeed expressed on previous occasions in this House that agriculture has little to do with planning — and this is now my paraphrasing of what he has said on previous occasions — it has more to do with God sending rain than anything else, because if you do not get any rain the crops cannot grow.
5.55 p.m.

All farmers begin with that. They know that some days the sun may not shine and some days the rain may not fall. That is a given in life and in agriculture, but you do not stop there and say that because you do not know for certain when the rain will fall or when the sun will shine, you will not make plans and invest in agriculture and put it on the same footing as industry or tourism or any other national industry. That has been the dominant view for the 15 years that the Democratic Labour Party was in office. Every farmer knows that, that is his working premise, that some day the sun would not shine and some years you will get rain and some years you would not get rain, but that does not stop him from going ahead with his work.

I myself Mr. Speaker, would like to know a little more about the guarantee in so far as it relates to Building Supplies. I had a little to do with trying to interest Building Supplies Limited into putting a heavy investment into the clay industry in this country when I was at I.D.C. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that clay is a major national resource which we have and that to date we have not been exploiting it as vigorously and as effectively as we ought to, but I have had several discussions with Barbados Shipping and Trading with respect to a major investment and a major modernisation thrust in the plant which they have in Greenland, St. Andrew. We had reached the point where they were thinking of buying about 12 acres near St. Matthew's Church and putting down a major plant making not only clay bricks but a lot of other products, ceramic tiles and so on with the assistance of Italian technology. It was going to be a major investment involving a large sum of money, but it is now some while since I last heard anything about the proposals, and I myself would welcome hearing some more about what is involved in relation to Building Supplies Limited and this guarantee which the Government is seeking on their behalf.

There again that is a national resource and the Government is rightly taking an interest in the clay deposits in this country, in the same way as the sugar industry is now a national industry and the Government is taking a much more active interest in its development and the direction in which it goes than the Democratic Labour Party took when it was in office. Yet we are making it a national industry without nationalising it, and

that is the big distinction. I hope that it is not more than my friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael West has been able thus far to grasp. I know that in the end it will not be above him, but it may take him a little while.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was concerned to know how many factories we are likely to have ready in another week or two, and I can only say that the advice which I have received is to the effect that by mid January four factories would be ready for grinding operations and that by the middle of February the new factory will be ready. That is the best advice I have been given. I do not know if there has been any change in that, but certainly four factories, I do not remember the four now, but I know that Carrington, Foursquare and Bulkeley are three of the four, will be ready for operations by mid January. So that if there can be some accord reached between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation, there will be four factories ready for operation by the middle of January.

There is not much more on this point that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, except to express the faith that the Government will not have to repay these loans or the guarantee. The Light and Power Company is an efficiently run company, the sugar factories are efficiently run, and I have no doubt, Sir, that the \$3 million and it is no more than that but they are behaving as though it is \$30 million, will be repaid by the sugar producers themselves.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this Resolution. I believe it is increasingly important that private industry and the private sector in the Caribbean should have ready access to funds in order to promote economic growth and development and to create employment opportunities, and I recognise the long negotiation which the Caribbean Development Bank has been having with the World Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and with the Inter-American Development Bank to have a ready available source of funds for on-lending to the private sector. Indeed not only do we want to find funds on what may be considered hard terms, although in this case the rate of interest being charged having regard to present day rates of interest is certainly not prohibitive, but we wish as well to find funds at reasonable concessional terms so that we can expand the private sector including and most importantly the small business sector so that Caribbean nationals can have ownership of their own resources.

I think that anything that Governments in the Caribbean can do to underwrite the effort of the Caribbean Development Bank in this regard should be

supported by all people in political life. It must not be felt that the Caribbean Development Bank in making loans of this nature is engaged in an exercise of throwing away either the money which it is borrowing, its own money or the taxpayers' money, because these projects are properly appraised, analysed and their rates of return are looked at with the greatest of care before financing is approved and arranged. I have no doubt in the case of both Building Supplies Limited and Barbados Sugar Factories Limited that the repayments will pose no difficulty for either of the two companies or indeed for that matter for the Government of Barbados that our contingent liability will not have to come into account. 6.05 p.m.

The Barbados Sugar Factories Limited is a viable corporation. As a matter of fact, it was only some weeks ago in this Honourable House that honourable Members on both sides of this House paid tribute to the late Sir Erskine Ward for the foresight which he showed in leading the rationalisation of the sugar industry, particularly the manufacturing side of the sugar industry and particularly the formation of the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited.

I had some small part to play alongside himself and Mr. Douglas Lynch, as I was then Legal Adviser in doing the Articles of Association of this company, advising them on the rationalisation itself. I had some small part to play there, and I saw then and I think events would prove me right, that it was nonsense having over 13 factories in an island the size of Barbados to grind the sort of crop that we expected, a crop which never exceeded 150,000 tonnes. I saw that one had to first reduce the number of factories and secondly to build factories, if we were going to build new factories that were much more efficient, that would be able to save cost, which avoided some of the difficulties and some of the ill-effects of the old factories like pollution and soot and one which was acceptable to the sugar producers both large and small at different points in Barbados.

I believe that Erskine Ward envisaged then that Portvale, although not necessary by that name, would have been built in that part of Barbados and that Porters and Vauclose would in due course be closed and I believe that I really must disagree with the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John on this point. I think his speech showed a great deal of restraint and he made some points that were worthy of consideration by this House and by people dealing with sugar as a whole but I disagree with him when he says that the small holders will be paying for this exercise. I do not think so at all to the extent that this factory will help rationalise the production of sugar, increase the efficiency of the sugar industry, increase

output and productivity and make a contribution to the nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for what I thought was one of the best speeches that I have heard him make in here. I know his friend and colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael West, does not think so. The two of them have a special arrangement between them, Sir, the sort of arrangement that he says the honourable Member always says I have with the Member for St. Michael South, an understanding of quiet banter, we stick to the principles of our Party. We disagree but we could remain friends but I think he brought a sensible approach to looking at Agriculture and the sugar industry in the state of which it is today.

Mr. Speaker, if the sugar industry did not have a large proportion of white people in it, we would not hear a lot of the criticisms of the industry from some of the people as we are hearing today. In many ways we are still suffering from the psychological legacy of slavery and the ownership of lands in Barbados. What, however, we must bear in mind is this: In the first place 93 per cent or more of the Sugar Industry is today locally owned by Barbadians. Regardless of their colour. That is a significant factor. It is not a foreign-owned industry. The second point that has occurred — and has occurred particularly since the 1930's, in fact since the first Labour Party Government in particular came into power and started reclaiming the ownership of assets for the people of Barbados — is that the Government today is a significant land owner in the sugar industry and somewhere about a quarter of the agricultural lands in Barbados are today owned by the people themselves; and of that about 16 percent of the overall lands....in other words, in excess, I believe, 75 percent of all of the lands owned by Government today are in sugar or are slated to be in sugar itself.

Therefore, the public of Barbados, the taxpayers, have a built-in vested interest in maintaining the viability of the sugar industry because of the direct ownership in sugar and we must remind the people that the sugar industry is becoming more and more owned by a wider section of the community than some of us have cared to think about.

And, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a third point that has escaped too many people because nobody has taken the trouble, particularly of sitting down and documenting this. I would expect in particular some of our economists at Cave Hill who talk so glibly, to try and look at the facts in the changing pattern of ownership in Barbados.

A lot of the sugar industry or the companies which own the sugar industry today, a lot of that ownership is

now in pension funds. The pension funds belong to the workers who are either in the stores in Bridgetown or who themselves are in the sugar industry and the workers at all levels because pensions are being provided for people who are working in this industry. These pension funds sometimes through the mutual funds and through the insurance companies have been buying into the ownership of companies such as Bulkeley's Estates Limited and Barbados Shipping and Trading Limited and if the real owners of the wealth of this country are not prepared to become its Managers — that is a failure that ought to be corrected — they ought to be reminded that there has been a significant shift in shareownership in this country in the last 25 years without people really catching on to what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the biggest shareholder in Barbados Shipping and Trading today, not a private family at all, but is an insurance company in which there are mutual funds owned by the policy owners themselves. That escapes the notice of a lot of us and this shift in the pattern of ownership has a significance for anybody who is planning policy and thinking about the future of equalising patterns of ownership in Barbados.

I have spoken about it on a few occasions, both in and out of this House and I believe that perhaps the time has come for me to try and get some of the figures and put it down and hamper it in the country because the new logical step is for the true owners to begin to manage their resources and a lot of the present disagreement is because they do not feel that they are moving fast enough to manage those resources and a lot of it is partly their fault.

Very few of us who are owners, let us say of the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society, being its policy holders, turn up for its Meetings and have a say in the governance of the company. Likewise very few of us who own part of the pension funds that own some of these estates turn up to have any say in what happens in the administrative direction of the company and yet we complain and continue to say that the industries are being dominated by a few people of long time ago, of a plantocracy that is now past.

What a lot of us fail to recognise that the old plantocracies of the 17th and 18th Centuries and some of the new plantocracy are now minority shareholders in a business owned by the majority of us and who are running it because we are taking no sensible attitude towards it. Instead we get up with the rhetoric of trying to use easy division in this country of colour as justifying a way of looking at matters such as this nature. I think that Erskine Ward recognised this point and frequently in my conversations with him he would advert to the changes that were taking place without the people recog-

nising the changes themselves. Now I believe changes took place under both political parties.
6.15 p.m.

We listen to a few people at Cave Hill who have *a priori* theories and a few who write in the newspapers because they believe the only political system for change and social democracy comes out of Cuba or Russia or Lenin, Marx or Martizung without recognising that Demas has said that we in Barbados have been paid servers under both political parties in evolving a political philosophy that has achieved democracy in the economic sphere without creating a revolution and cutting people's necks off. And, it hurts me that we do not recognise this, Sir. And, we find ourselves sometimes quarrelling among ourselves about peripheries and on the trivialities and hammering only colour because it might be an easy, vote-catching device without grappling with the substance of developments that have taken place under both parties. Let me say that.

The sugar industry in this country has to be maintained. Any Government that is worth its salt, regardless of whether it may appear unpopular temporarily on this issue, has to ensure that we keep the sugar industry viable and going for the future. It is the main arm of agriculture. I know of no country in the world that has progressed without a vibrant agricultural sector. I repeat, as I have said before in this Honourable House that the greatness of the United States is not the fact that it is the leader in technology and nuclear development, but the fact that it is the greatest agricultural producer in the world today. That is why it can face its industrial development. And, our industrial development in the 18th century in sugar, Mr. Speaker, was spurred on by the fact that all sugar agriculture in those days was cane.

And, I commend the Government for having the courage of its conviction to guarantee this loan. I believe that the loan would be repaid without any difficulty. I see no problem about it. I do not see why the Government should have hidden as the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition did, by talking about whether it was going to rain. He did not know whether it was going to rain. If this were so, we would not build any hotels at all because we may go through a panel of rainfall and have rain all year round and tourists may not come either. We would not bother about it. The people in Ontario would not develop a tourist sector because they can have snow all year round. You have to take such things as given and build on them. And, I express one hope — I do not want to get into the current negotiation — I believe that all sides of the Honourable House, if we are interested in the economic future of Barbados would wish the negotiations quick speed — not only God's speed, but quick speed — and that a rational approach would be brought to bear on these matters.

Let me give you an example. One year or two years of not cutting canes in this country and the growth rate would not only be zero, it would be minus a lot of things. And no matter what political party comes to power, it would take a very long time for this country to recover. That is why I am saying that the issue of the sugar negotiations is not a partisan, political issue; it is a national issue, on which we need a national outlook and a national approach — and it should not be seen in terms of whether or not someone believes that the Government stands to benefit from a quick start of the crop or not. I think the country, Barbados stands to benefit from the crop beginning and being reaped without cane fires. And, I regret that we have already started to have cane fires in this country. I regret it bitterly. I think it is a waste of economic resources, and whoever is responsible for it whether deliberately or casually is a traitor to Barbados — I feel so strongly on an issue such as this. We have to be sensible, if we are to get anywhere. We are a democracy. We are not like Cuba or Grenada where you would bring out the so called People's Army and jail people. I hope we will never come to that.

But, at the same time, I think we should use our positions here in Parliament on both sides of the Honourable House to appeal for restraint and a sensible approach rather than just getting rid of the crop, by burning ruthlessly and senselessly, as has already begun. I know that there have been one or two fires already in the constituency of the honourable Member for St. Philip North — I think that is where it has occurred. I follow these things, Sir. I drive around the country to see what has happened and keep my ears attuned to what is happening in my colleague's constituency.

Now Sir, I want to make a few remarks about Building Supplies Limited. I was happy to hear the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John say that he has no quarrel against anything that would maximise the use of local resources, and on this issue all he is really asking for is to be told something of the nature of the produce.

When we came to power, we recognised that there was not enough use being made of local resources and, one of the exercises on which the Government set out — through the Planning and Priorities Committee of which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is the Chairman — was to try to get an inventory of all of the local natural resources including the clay resources. We got a British firm to do a survey of the clay in St. John, St. Joseph and in that area of St. Andrew, and, it was revealed to us quite clearly that there was a sufficient bank of clay resources that we could expand the production of clay bricks and, at least probably tackle another five industries as well one of which is producing, I believe, ceramic tiles. Sanitary ware? That is a possibility.

The Government also recognised that Building Supplies Limited for various reasons, had not expanded or improved its operation. Discussions started between the Government and Building Supplies Limited and we had to say to them, either you acquire the technology and the machinery and upgrade your enterprise and expand, or the Government would be forced to do one or two things — either — take you over or to form another company and try to do the development itself. The company was obviously suffering from a shortage of capital. One of the reasons why we joined the International Finance Corporation, the IFC was to see whether we could have encouraged the International Corporation to come in, as a partner with Building Supplies Limited in this type of expansion programme and I am happy to see that the World Bank considers the company viable and the project a feasible one. It is using local resources and it would save an outflow on foreign exchange, as well.

There is no point coming in here and saying Building Supplies Limited is a private company, owned by Da Costa and Mussons Limited because although it is an inter-locking of companies — BS&T is a private company — its shares are traded in the market and anybody can go and buy some of them, Sir.
6.25 p.m.

They are there. If you want to buy them, they sell quite easily. I believe those of us who are Attorneys-at-Law will tell you daily that there is access to them and when the Security Exchange is formed they will be trading on the market and people can buy them. So it is not that they are reserved for a few people who are putting the money in their pockets, some of the profits flow right back to the very pension fund of which I spoke a little earlier.

To the extent then that we are using local natural resources, to the extent that we are expanding the ownership of local people in their own enterprises, to the extent that we are expanding opportunities for employment and growth and to the extent as well as we are strengthening this company to become an exporter of building materials within CARICOM and beyond, I think that this Resolution is worthy of the support of the Government, and I hope it will be seen in that light, Sir.

I want finally to say this, Mr. Speaker. Although the figure of \$46 million is mentioned, the full \$46 million is not necessarily being used for Barbados, the \$46 million is to be used in the member countries, as I understand it, of the region to invest in equities and to assist in loans. I would like to appeal to the international financial institutions to make more equity capital available to the Caribbean countries, and particularly to the private sector in the Caribbean, on more rational

and easier terms, if they are serious about strengthening private enterprise in the region. We are still finding it a little difficult to get proper technical assistance and proper equity funds to sustain some of the projects which will help create employment in the region.

A task force on private sector investment made a report just over a year ago, a report which I commend to honourable Members on both sides of the House. I am willing to make my own copy available to anybody who would read it.

Two outstanding Barbadians, the Governor of the Central Bank, Mr. Blackman, and His Excellency Mr. Charles Skeete, our Ambassador at Washington were on the Committee which dealt with that report and I am told by the leader of the task force, another distinguished West Indian, a former Governor of the Central Bank of Jamaica and Permanent Secretary, Finance, Dr. Arthur Brown, that the Barbadians made an outstanding contribution to the ideas which were in that report. I had the honour, on behalf of my great country Barbados, of being Chairman of the Caribbean Group at that time, and to look at the results of that report, and I am glad that some of the propositions, proposals and recommendations flowing from that report have already borne fruit in drawing forth from one financial institution, the World Bank, some support for private investment. I hope that the Inter-American Development Bank, the Venezuelan Trust Fund, OPEC and a few of the others will see it fit as well to make similar funds available and that the Governments of the region will therefore find it easy to go to their respective Parliaments asking to guarantee this type of investment in the future.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may with some diffidence and humility say, Sir, pass a judgment on the speeches of other honourable Members, today started very badly with the first principal speech that we heard, but I think that nobody can complain of the quality of the public life of Barbados if they came into this House after tea and heard the speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Agriculture and the honourable Member for Christ Church West who has just sat down. I think they were the first three powerful contributions to the debate and I am glad to be able to participate in a House of Assembly which reach these standards. (A VOICE: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central). I did not hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central's speech clearly. He was talking but I could not actually hear what he was saying. Honourable Members should not tease their colleague, because that is what they are doing.

Now to deal with the speeches both of the Minister of Agriculture and the Leader of the Opposition, it is clear that the House perhaps does need some exposition

of the matter of the clay products investment, because as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, this is ultimately, although the Government is not concerned with the disbursement of the funds, a guarantee ultimately of repayment by a private company of a loan made to a development institution. The loan is coming through the World Bank, not through the Government, and it is World Bank funds.

There is very little that I can add to the history of the matter after hearing the speech of the honourable Member for Christ Church West. When we came into power aware of the fact that there is much more building in clay bricks and clay blocks throughout the world than there is in concrete blocks — Barbados just happens to be one of these little geographical oddities where a particular style of building has caught on — but normally houses that are said to be built in stone, in the great majority of countries I believe are built in clay blocks. Knowing this, reading in a geological study which we had in our possession at the time, and observing the apparent commercial viability of the clay blocks, in other words blocks that could be sold at prices less than and no more than concrete blocks, we resolved that the industry should be developed.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West has indicated studies which were undertaken. We had a great deal of trouble with the company. The company was basically started to provide building materials for a particular individual who had a construction firm, and when his construction firm lost its fiscal incentives, apparently he had very little interest in the company thereafter. After long pressure by the Government, we did come to a situation where a minority shareholding company, which is Da Costa and Musson Limited, purchased the major part of the company's equity and proceeded with a project whose objectives were:— to improve the quality of clay blocks in the country; (the clay blocks at the moment are too brittle, they are not always even and not as square as they should be and not as smooth as they should be); to increase the volume of what was being produced at the company; to reduce fuel consumption; and to improve the quality of the management.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked about details of what the money will be spent on. It is a very proper question and it should be indicated that not only is there a list of machinery items that have to be bought, but that all goods and services which are being bought will be procured in accordance with the Caribbean Development Bank's procurement guidelines. The distribution of the funds will be carried out by the Caribbean Development Bank, construction work will be done on the basis of tenders in accordance with established Bank procedures, and there will be no possibility of the funds being diverted to other use.

I could give a list of the things it is intended to buy. Two box speeders, an electro-magnet, a destoner, a wet pan, a boiler, drier fans, a full heating system. There are at the moment 475 drying racks for the clay blocks, these will approximately be doubled. There will also be a transport loader, dump truck, fork lift truck and there will be the construction of a new storage building. Obviously this will be extended and there will be additional warehouse capacity. Very important also, there will be consultancy services; project management and other technical assistance services to improve the general quality of sales management, stock control and other business matters relating to the company. I think that these matters should satisfy the Leader of the Opposition's query as to what will be done with the money.

6.35 p.m.

At the moment I believe when they dig in the clay pits they dig and they load the material on to some kind of truck, and then they have to push it up by hand to get it towards the sheds. The money will be used to mechanise that. They expect that following this the blocks will not be so brittle, they will crack less, because it seems that the present mixing arrangement and grinding arrangement are unsatisfactory and there will be more even mating of the blocks so that they will not break. The blocks also will be cut square. I do not know how many of us have worked with clay blocks, but when you lay them and they get very uneven, the masons then try to fit them as though they were concrete blocks and they chip off a big piece and you have to face it with concrete, so in the end you pay more for labour and more for material as well. It is anticipated they will be making them much smoother.

Export is very important, Sir. I do not think I am revealing any company secrets that cannot be revealed, but it is known that in Trinidad clay blocks are the universal building material and more universally used in Trinidad than concrete blocks are used here, and they cannot get enough clay blocks in Trinidad. That is one of the reasons for the high cost of construction there. Trinidad blocks, I believe, are price controlled at \$1.25 a block of 8-inch building size, but it is said that this is one of the things on which price control is really a total failure — that they are sold on the black market for \$2.00 each, and even then you cannot get them unless you are prepared to pay in advance to get them delivered in three months. This is an obvious market for a clay block factory in Barbados. If the price has to be perhaps a little lower in order to meet the Trinidad price control, that is just one of the facts of life, but there is a lot of building in Trinidad and the company would be encouraged to export.

The Government is satisfied that this is an adequate project and it is most unlikely to occasion the World Bank to have to call the guarantee. The Caribbean

Development Bank of course is the primary borrower although the Government does commit itself to repaying the loan directly if called upon to do so.

Some honourable Member I cannot remember who, asked for details of the terms and conditions. This is a very generous loan also, Sir. There is a two year grace period and repayment in ten years of forty quarterly instalments. The interest rate is nine and a half per cent on the reducing balance, which would work out to between three and four percent if you assume you were paying it on the whole balance over the whole life of the loan. There is a commission rate of one per cent and there is a commitment fee of three quarters of one per cent.

I heard a great deal about how we entered into this agreement a long time ago and now come to the House. The money has not yet been paid out. It is not to be disbursed until later on this year. We signed a general agreement with the World Bank that we would seek guarantees for any loan that their funds were financing within Barbados and we are now coming to the House to guarantee the outstanding loans to move from the building projects loan to the sugar factory loan. The sugar factory monies should have started to be disbursed on December, 1981, that is twelve days ago. I do not know whether they have been disbursed or not. They are not to be completely disbursed before June. That would reflect payments for machinery and so on. The repayment period there is twelve years in half yearly repayments and the interest rate is 9.3 per cent on the reducing balance, quite generous terms when all is said and done.

There is a popular belief that because sugar is a volatile industry in terms of price that it means that the industry does not have any long term future. On the contrary, of all tropical agricultural products it may safely be said that sugar is the most reliable. Sugar is still the most efficient converter of solar energy into a vegetable product known to man. Sugar cane grows bigger and taller with a greater energy content in a shorter time than any other crop known, and it grows well in the Tropics. It is most unlikely ever to cease to be one of mankind's crops. Crops that compete in making sugar with cane can compete only on the basis of domestic production, artificial prices to farmers to produce alternative sucrose or glucose or dextrose sugars from corn, beet or other plants which contain sweeteners. Sugar industries can very easily be destroyed by failure to manage them properly, as in the case of the Leeward Islands and in Antigua, St. Kitts and in the Windward Islands of the Caribbean, but the trend in the world is towards expansion of cane sugar growing, not shrinking.

There are many countries which did not produce sugar from cane at all 20 years ago, or produced it only

in small quantities that now produce it, many African States — the Sudan, Nigeria and so on, and there are countries that produce sugar from cane that we do not think about such as India which is one of the three or four major cane sugar producers in the world at a very low level of efficiency, but nonetheless they produce. I do not therefore share the belief that the sugar industry is doomed. Far from that, the Government is committed to increasing the output of sugar in our island.

I share the views of my friend and colleague the honourable Member for Christ Church East that it is a great pity that when the World Bank was ready to assist in the building of a sugar factory some years ago, the then Government did not take it up. The present situation with this sugar factory since honourable Members are raising the question of interest repayments absorbing the profits of the industry is that of the \$27 million the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited have provided the greatest amount from their own resources. They have a loan of \$6 million, this loan, \$3 million from the Barbados National Bank, the whole amount paid for shares by the Government which was \$3.7 million, and I believe there is some small amount of \$1 million. The remainder has been provided from the funds of the factory itself whether derived from sale of assets or from contributions to equity from existing members. I would need further analysis and further notice to determine, but indeed the benefits of having a new factory will be so considerable that the argument has been overwhelming for a very long period of time.

Porters Factory has the highest cost I believe in Barbados of actual operating cost \$148 a ton. Vacluse Factory also has operating costs much higher than the average operating costs in the island. I am saying "has", Sir; I mean "had". The chief reason for this is the amount of time that these factories are out of commission because the machinery is old and needs repairing. The system by which canes are delivered to factories in the north is a very unsatisfactory one.

The new factory coupled with the re-organisation of cane blade roots — and I know the honourable Member for St. Lucy will be interested in this because you would not have quite so far to drive to the factory from Friendship and from the plantations even in eastern St. Lucy — is estimated to reduce the number of ton miles that cane has to travel to get to be ground by 128,000. In other words, it is equivalent to 128,000 ton miles to go to Portvale because the St. Lucy plantations, the northern plantations will all divert their canes to Haymans.

6.45 p.m.

The canes to go to Portvale will come from St. Andrew and St. Thomas and so on. It has been worked

out that the distances for many plantations to get their canes to be ground will be over a mile less and the turn around time of the new factory will be much less so the savings of the new factory are estimated to off-set any interest payments which will have to be made. That is, the savings in operations and the savings on freight will be very considerable especially to the small holders of the northern parishes. They are the technical points which had been queried, Sir.

On the large points sufficient has been said, certainly during the last three speeches, for me not to need to canvass them at any length but I would only say this on the point which the honourable Member for St. John made about the — I should apologise to the honourable Member. At the last meeting of the House which I attended I misunderstood something which the honourable Member said in relation to tenants and estates and so on.

I thought the honourable Member appeared to be putting himself in the position that we should hand over the plantation tenancies to the tenants and I was contrasting this with his advocacy on an earlier occasion of opposition to the Plantations Tenantry Bill. I have been told that I misunderstood his speech and I owe him an apology, so if he reads the debates he will see that I missed the point.

The point he made then is the point which he made now — that it is possible to have a substantial peasantry which leases cane lands and does away with the plantation system. This is undoubtedly a point of view which can be taken. There are one or two sugar industries which operate on this basis but there are very few. Sugar has remained a large unit crop, a large unit relatively labour-intensive crop, in most of the countries where it is produced from cane.

In Trinidad there are many smallish cane farmers, larger perhaps than the cane farmers in Fiji and there is a certain multiplicity of ownership there. In Fiji, I think due to the social conditions of the country more perhaps than to the virtues of cutting up estates into small pieces, there is also a pattern of relatively small units producing sugar.

Honourable Members may perhaps note that the Government of Barbados is also experimenting with the same matters for which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is calling because the Springhall Land Settlement Scheme in St. Lucy is doing exactly what the honourable Member has called for. We have shrouded it of the bungalow development that was in it when we inherited it. We negotiated the loan, reduced in some cases the size of the plots and we have advertised for tenants and are carrying out settlement. We will then be in a better position to see how far there is a demand in

Barbados for land to be leased in eight, ten or 12 acre lots for the growing of canes.

What I would venture to suggest is this — the standard of living in agricultural Barbados is now such that there will be very few people who are going to envisage their entire livelihood being derived from the leasing of ten acres of land to plant cane in it but I do not wish to anticipate the development of the Scheme. The fact is that the Scheme is there and in a few years time we can go to it and see how it works.

The point is that it is not an alternative of building this sugar factory or it is not the alternative to improving the ownership structure of Barbados Sugar Factories Limited. It is not an alternative to taking such steps as to make the sugar industry more efficient at the present time for those who have to work in the crop of 1981. It is, at the shortest, a medium-term alternative and the Government has not rejected it. The Government is merely at the present time doing what is necessary to deal with the problems that face us today.

There are only a few things arising out of what I heard in the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central which deserve comment. The honourable Member was analysing very carefully the fate of the Price Stabilisation Fund. It has not yet been abolished. When it comes to the House we can debate it to our heart's content because a Sugar Bill will come to the House presenting a structural framework for the re-organisation of the industry and we can deal with all that. But the honourable Member spoke about \$7 million, it is a lot more than that lying idle in the commercial banks.

It is not lying idle in the commercial banks. It is in the commercial banks being lent out to buy motor cars, and hi-fi sets. The Government's plans are that it will go into the Agricultural Division of the Barbados National Bank — not to be lent for financing ordinary sugar crop financing, but to be re-lent for useful agricultural products primarily to small holders. That is the whole point.

It is now being used for purposes quite unconnected with agriculture. We have earmarked \$10 million of it, I hope we have \$10 million less, Sir, by the time we come to it, for developing agricultural banking. That is the essence of the scheme which perhaps the honourable Member will not grasp and understand if he merely takes these leaks from persons who have caught sight of documents and cannot fully understand them. It is a very great problem when you only learn half a story. All the talk that there will only be tangible benefits to the workers certainly forms no part of any Government Paper that could have been leaked to the honourable Member. That is simply not in it. The funds have a specified state of destination.

It is not true that the Provident Fund is to be absorbed into the National Insurance Fund. The Provident Fund is one of the pension funds which can be received along with National Insurance. The sugar workers have had specific deductions made, well, the sugar industry has made specific deductions to furnish a Provident Fund payment to the workers and far from abolishing it, this year we are seeking to increase the levy so as to increase the Provident Fund pensions and this will be an on-going process. In fact, not that we are seeking — but we have done it so far as I know. I do not know what date the Provident Fund pensions went up from but certainly I agreed to it some months ago, perhaps in the beginning of 1981. The Provident Fund will remain the Capital Rehabilitation Fund which owes the sugar producers something over \$10 million and is being abolished.

There is no money in the Capital Rehabilitation Fund out of which the sugar producers can get their rebate so if anybody had a quarrel, it is not the workers. It would have to be the sugar producers who are losing the benefits that were prescribed for them under the Capital Rehabilitation Fund.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition perhaps has had more years dealing with the Capital Rehabilitation Fund than I have, and he, I believe, is more familiar with it than me because it must be two years, perhaps three, since there has been any assignment of funds under the Capital Rehabilitation Fund for the assistance of the sugar industry. It is therefore a serious misrepresentation to suggest that there is any direction in which these funds are going that it is detrimental to the interest of the workers.

It is an open secret, Sir, that if we did not lend the plantations money last year to pay the bonuses that the workers could not have got their bonuses. We have to make loans out of the sugar levies. Loans, not grants as were made in 1976.

Sir, I submit that this is an excellent guarantee that the Government is offering and that the House can well support it. There are two worthy causes, the modernisation of the sugar industry and the improvement of a vital aspect of our building industry and I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

6.55 p.m.

NATURAL GAS CORPORATION TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS ACT, 1981

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 3.

Item No. 3 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the Natural Gas Corporation Act and make provision for certain matters consequent on the repeal.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir I was attacked for speaking too short early this morning. Normally, I believe that I am a long-winded speaker and not a short speaker by any means. The attack, Sir, will not make me inflict a long speech on the Honourable House on this occasion. This really is a very simple Bill. We want to amalgamate the functions of the Natural Gas Corporation with those of the Natural Petroleum Corporation and assimilate the two corporations. I do not know what I can add to these few and simple words. Effectively, it amounts to changing the name of the Natural Gas Corporation Act and assimilate its functions with a corporation that already has an Act.

We have to keep Parts V and VI in place because they relate to accounting procedures and royalty payments and they lay out specific accounting procedures that are now being followed. They will go at some time in the future when a new Act is passed, Sir, relating to taxation generally of the proceeds of petroleum exploration procedures in Barbados. We have had a great deal of technical assistance for this new Act, but, it has not yet emerged from the Ministry of the Attorney General. I am not going to assign blame, on this occasion, and therefore the Hon. Attorney General will not have to worry that he will have to return to the Honourable House suddenly, to defend his officers, Sir.

But, those sections will have to await the new measures dealing with taxation of natural gas and petroleum. The sections that we are retaining are Sections 22 to 26. The Natural Gas Corporation, Sir, pays Income Tax and, there are long sections about how you tax it.

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

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

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon L. S. CRAIG Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Clause 1 be recommitted.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Clause 1 Sir, I beg to move that the date 1981 be deleted and 1982 substituted.

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

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

On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with amendment and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I learn that it is the pleasure of the Honourable House to revert to Private Members Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Private Members' Business Sir. The Resolution which the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition brought will be treated with the courtesy that he is entitled to, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker under Order 26, Rule 3, I should like to request leave to let Order No. 2, under Private Members' Business, remain on the Order Paper.

I understand that it is unlikely that we will proceed with debate on Private Members' Business at this late hour. I think that honourable Members are much more prepared to continue later on.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir I do not know if the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite clear. I am merely pointing to the fact that that particular matter.....not to debate it. That is what I mean, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no objection. The Rt. Honourable Member is granted leave.
7.05 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, earlier in the day you did announce that there were a number of amendments coming from the Other Place, and at that time these

amendments had not been circulated. Since then they have been circulated and I have the assurance from the Leader of the Opposition that they are satisfied with them.

If there is no objection, I beg to move that this House do concur with the appropriate amendments.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just on a point of order, Sir. We will concur in the amendments, we will not find it possible to concur with them.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have no objection, but it is not my fault. We are all in here together. That is all it is, Sir.

The question that the amendments from the Other Place be concurred in was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now stand adjourn until Tuesday, January, 19th 1982 at 12 noon.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion before this Honourable House, I recognise that it is the Leader of the House who has to determine when the business is most efficaciously carried on, but we would hope that bearing in mind those Bills and/or other matters which received First Reading, that when we come back to this Honourable House a week from today that there will be no Bills coming down on that day with a little assistance from the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go into any great detail, but it seems to me that bearing in mind the debate which took place earlier on our need to be ready, I hope that the Leader of this Honourable House will not be prevailing on us to assist him with Resolutions and/or matters which come down that same day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just to answer the honourable Member, I gave notice of a number of Resolutions here today.

The question that the House now stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 19, 1982 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.12 p.m.

C

.

.

1944

.

.

.

1945

.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th January, 1982.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House); 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. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Minister of Housing and Lands); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Mr. N. K. SIMMONS; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Hon. L. R. TULL and Mr. B. M. TAITT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, January 12, 1982.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, January 12, 1982, be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by honourable Members.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have a few observations. In terms of the accuracy of the Minutes, on

page 2, "Orders of the Day" at the bottom of the page, the three last lines of that page reads: "Mr. L. E. Sandiford spoke. Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow spoke. Mr. Speaker spoke."

My recollection is that the Member for St. John spoke before I did, but that is my recollection. I may be wrong on that. I seem to think that he spoke before I did and I would be glad if that particular matter could be checked so that the Minutes may be accurate. I believe my powers of recall in this regard may be pretty accurate, so I believe that the Minutes should be corrected in that regard.

The second matter I wish to draw attention to is at the top of page 3 of the Minutes which indicates that the Member for St. James North spoke, and after that Mr. Speaker spoke and then the Minutes continue "The motion that consideration of the amendments to the Copyright Bill 1981 be deferred was put and resolved in the affirmative....."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minutes remain as they are, it would give the impression that those who voted "No" were asking for the matter to be dealt with there and then; so I believe a few words are missing, that is, that the amendments to the Copyright Bill 1981 be deferred 'until later in the day's Sitting.' I think that was the motion which was actually moved, because it would give the wrong impression as the Minutes are presently worded. *(Asides)* I am saying that the Minutes as circulated read "The motion that consideration of the amendments to the Copyright Bill 1981 be deferred was put and resolved in the affirmative.....", so the Minutes would give the impression that those who voted for were saying that the matter should be deferred and that gives the wrong impression, and I believe a few words should be added to the Minutes, namely, "until later in the day's Sitting", which would give an accurate reflection of what took place.

And then on page 7 "Private Members' Business" this reads: "Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams asked leave that the item of business appearing in his name be allowed to remain on the Order Paper." I do not believe that it would have been proper for the honourable Member to have any item under Private Members' Business, and he certainly did not have any business on that day. I believe it should be in the name of the honourable Member for St. John, and I would suggest that the Minutes be amended to reflect the proceedings a little more accurately.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I surely recall the last two matters which the honourable Member raised. The first one I am not sure about, but since it appears that he does quite a bit of research and gives careful attention to his duties, I do not know what is the procedure at this point in time. In the light of the first matter or the three matters, do we have to get this determined by the Reporters?

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

I beg to move that the Minutes of Tuesday, 12th January, 1982, be deferred in the light of the observations of the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has moved that the confirmation of the Minutes for January 12, 1982 be deferred. I need not put the motion to that effect because I am sure it meets with the full leave of the House that the Minutes be deferred.
12.30 p.m.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am committed to lay the following:-

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eight months ended November, 1981.

The 30th Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Natural Gas Corporation for the period 1st April, 1980 to 31st March, 1981.

The Twelfth Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1980-1981.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to grant the sum of \$347,780 from the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 14 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$255,179 from the Consolidated Fund and to 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. 15 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Police Act.

FIRST READING OF BILL

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE a Bill to amend the Police Act was read a First Time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 3 is ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

I will also like to give Members on the Other Side the assurance that if it is possible that we get through Government Business, Sir, we will give them the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to deal with Question Time and Private Members' Business. I would like to give them that assurance Mr. Speaker.

The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the Instant Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

Item No. 1 was called – To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of this Island.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 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 1981 – 82, No. 12

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Subhead 8 – Treasury.

Subhead 11 – Data Processing.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a straightforward matter, Sir. The Data Processing Department has been carrying out a number of new programmes and although the cost of electricity has declined in Barbados, the activities at Data Processing have been extended.
12.40 p.m.

The computerisation of the Waterworks Accounts have been completed, there was a great deal of work to do in connection with the General Election and continuing programmes are being written for the Inland Revenue. Indeed there is a whole series of new programmes of Government which can be anticipated over the next couple of years. The National Insurance data would have to be co-ordinated with data and persons, on the basis of the new identification system, and Inland Revenue will be fully computerising its accounts within the next two years. It is intended to computerise the Immigration Accounts. Some preliminary work has been done on all these things, and it is anticipated with the expansion required to handle these new matters – I could also mention that Rates and Taxes are now computerising details of all private vehicles in Barbados and will soon be handling commercial vehicles – the Treasury Building and the National Insurance Building utility bills will be substantial, Sir.

In respect of the instant matter which is the Treasury Building itself, the Central Bank occupies offices in this building and pays half the cost of the electricity

which is used in the building. So, the supplement is in fact to be met with the half by the Central Bank.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister to indicate whether it is his intention yet, or if he foresees down the road placing the Customs Department, as it is affected by deportation, under computerisation. I am speaking of a system similar to that of the U.S. Treasury Department where the passing of warrants, *et cetera* is considerably eased by the computerised system which has been implemented.

If I recall, not very long ago – sometime in 1975 – some consideration was given to this by the Hon. Minister responsible for Trade as a method of assisting the easy flow of trade at the Port. As you know Mr. Chairman, sometimes because of delays the cost of an item is considerably increased because, of payment of the moorage and so on, although the moorage is a result of the ship not being able to turn around. Sometimes the additional cost at the Port has to do with the movement of documents *et cetera* and, indeed the task of importation – it is an extremely tedious and difficult task because of the system we now have.

I wonder if you are able to tell us whether we could look forward to a computerised system in the immediate future?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, just one short question for the Rt. Hon. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Rt. Hon. Minister could tell us whether the amount for utilities was the amount requested by the Department and projected by that Department for spending during this current financial year or whether there was a reduction in the amount requested by the Department, let us say, at Estimates Committee or wherever.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the answer to the question raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is that I cannot remember. We may have asked the people in the Treasury Building to reduce their consumption of electricity, but I cannot remember, Sir.

We are not supplementing it by very much, Sir. The original sum was \$200,000 and indeed Sir I have let it come through for \$5,000 because it is part of a general Resolution. It may very well be that I am merely taking a precaution because the figures for the first part of the year included a period when electricity charges were higher than they are now. Also, during the year, we have introduced some energy saving window blinds that

are meant to reduce the cost of air-conditioning. All of this was envisaged at Estimates time. I do not know to which public officer the honourable Member has been talking. It may very well be that there are public officers who, when things are reduced at Estimates time, find it difficult to accommodate the demand for services to the exigencies of the vote. The honourable Member has indeed put his figure on a very sore spot and I think he does but know.

I certainly have no recollection of the honourable Member seriously expecting to have what was demanded for the vote for utilities and what was actually granted. That is information which is buried so far in the file of the Ministry concerned that even a Parliamentary Question, were it a proper one, would require very considerable research. So, if the honourable Member really thinks it important to know what the Treasury estimated its utility needs at, he can put a Parliamentary Question to that effect and, I hope that the same public officer with whom he keeps in contact will be the public officer who will help him do the research to discover the answer to his question in a form in which it can be presented in Parliament.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman if the Rt. Hon. Minister would give way, I would set his mind at ease. I have not been in contact with any of his officers on his particular matter. So, there has been no disclosure.

I know in the United States, that President Reagan seems to be concerned about leaks. So the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister need not get worried that there has been any leak, certainly to me, on this particular matter. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Leaks, on this particular matter).

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: To some extent, Sir, I am playing for time with the answer to the very cogent and sensible question raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West because some time ago when we were purchasing new cash registers for the Customs Department, the idea was put forward that we should have registers which could feed the information directly into the computer at the Data Processing Department, so that we would have instant information on imports and complete information — the category of imports, its value, the duty charged and so on.

I know that we did purchase the new registers, but, whether they have been effected, in obtaining the information involved which I think the honourable Member is suggesting which has been presented — and, on which I may say there is a complete congruity of ideas between the honourable Member and the Ministries of Finance and Trade. I cannot adequately answer whether we have had success in this until I make enquiries from the public officers concerned. So, perhaps later on in the Debate, I may be able to give the hon-

ourable Member an answer. But, as a matter of principle, we certainly do want the Customs to be equipped with cash registers which, either instantly or by replaying the disc on which the information is stored at regular intervals into the computer, we can achieve the results which he requested are desirable.

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

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

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

12.50 p.m.

HEAD 20 — REVENUE COLLECTION

Subhead 1 — Inland Revenue Department — was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, again this is a very straightforward matter. During the year the opportunity was taken to get these acoustical divider screens so that noise at the Inland Revenue Department would be reduced, but I also think, Sir, that the basic vote was used for payment for the window blinds which I mentioned earlier to reduce the heat in the Treasury Building, so it really is a very straightforward \$6,000, Sir.

Subhead 2 — Customs Department — was called.

Under Customs, Sir, as a result of negotiations with the Unions concerned, there has been an increase in allowances to the Customs staff assigned to shift duties at the airport and the sea port as set out in the Addendum, and we therefore need to supplement the original provision to take account of the increased allowances; again another very straightforward matter.

There are one or two small bits relating to the Customs as well, a relatively small point, Sir. I am sure that honourable Members will have no difficulty with them, and I beg to move that Head 20 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the requests under this Head are modest for this time of year, Sir, and we are not really contending the numbers, but I think because the Head is here the opportunity should be taken to ask the Prime Minister a question.

I have seen information to the effect — I do not believe the information myself, Sir, in the form in which I have seen it — that there has been a complete freeze of movement of staff in some Departments of the Government. The impression given by the report suggests in most Departments of the Government, and it indicated that

this would include vacation leave, sick leave and other similar things.

Now, we are dealing with the Customs Department, and in recent times there has been a lot of concern expressed about the efficiency of our Customs Department, and that that efficiency be maintained. I wonder if the Prime Minister is able to assure us on this side that the stringencies brought about, perhaps by his own doing, have not or will not impale themselves on the Customs Department and other similar essential departments of administration. I think of the hospital and other similar institutions, but we are dealing with the Customs Department.

I believe that it would be useful for the Prime Minister to assure us that the report is not as accurate as it appears to be and that in fact his cutting down on staff and the laying off of people is an attempt to prune the administrative system in the light of the stringencies which he indicated earlier in the year. I would like to hear from him if it means that when somebody goes on vacation leave in the Customs Department that he is not going to be replacing that person, and when somebody goes on leave in the Customs, what is going to happen. I do not believe what I saw, so I am going to let the Prime Minister tell us.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I congratulate the honourable Member on the healthy skepticism which he shows about what he reads in the newspapers. I fully agree with him that it is most unwise to believe what you see in the newspapers, and certainly in respect of the matters of layoff, I am glad that the honourable Member does not believe what he sees.

Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took his seat.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

HEAD 35 – MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Subhead 1 – General Administration – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, it falls to me to move that Head 35 stand part. The Addendum indicates the nature of the supplement, which is similar to that under the Customs Department.

There has been some regrading and expansion within the Ministry of Trade and Industry, Sir. I regret that I do not have the documentation which would make it possible for me to say exactly who has been regraded and what temporary staff has been increased. I have some knowledge in respect of Energy, that there has been a little expansion of staff of the Energy Department now transferred to the Ministry of Finance.

But the amount is \$17,000, Mr. Chairman, Sir, and I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1981–82, No. 13

PART II – CAPITAL – HEAD 74 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for a supplementary arises as a result of the Government's decision to defer the commencement of the construction of a new BMC headquarters at Lower Estate.

As you are aware, Sir, it is some years now since the Government was thinking of establishing a new Barbados Marketing Corporation Headquarters away from the present site, and it was hoped that construction would have commenced last November on the new headquarters at Lower Estate. Because of the current financial difficulties, the Government has had to defer the commencement of the project, and as a result we have had the presentation on the part of the architects and the other professionals involved in the project of their final biddings which come to more than the amount of money which was provided in the Estimates.

At the time of the preparation of the draft Estimates in October 1980, an amount of \$200,000 was included to cover the cost of professional fees for the project. At that time there was much uncertainty over the size of the project and whether the entire project would have been constructed in a single phase. There was uncertainty too over the availability of the Caribbean Development Bank's finances since the terminal disbursement date had passed. It is now clear, Sir, that we will not be able to start the BMC headquarters in the next financial year, perhaps not before 1983.

1.00 p.m.

A sum of \$200,000 as I said, was provided in the Estimates. Of that sum, \$43,000 was spent and the final

billings come to \$199,000, so that at this point we need an additional \$157,000 which necessitates a supplementary of \$40,000. No expenditure will be incurred on capital works on this project, and it is not expected that we are going to have to actually get any new money in order to pay the professionals, because what we are really doing is adjusting one Sub-head to provide the \$40,000 that is now necessary.

I should just like to assure honourable Members that no hardship is being experienced by the farming community as a result of the fact that the BMC headquarters have not been commenced and indeed will not be started until perhaps another two years from now, because the Barbados Agricultural Society has taken on a large marketing role in the agricultural sector. Between their efforts and the BMC's efforts, I think the farming community is quite satisfied now that the marketing of their produce is fairly well in hand.

With those remarks, I beg to move that Head 74 — Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs — stand part.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: I beg to second that.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, when I looked at this Addendum to the Resolution, the first thing that caught my eye was that at the time of preparation of the Draft Estimates 1981-82 it was not possible to obtain an accurate assessment of the level of professional fees associated with these projects. Now I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister concerned, the reason why it was not possible to obtain a more accurate assessment of the level of professional fees associated with the relocation and expansion of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

As far as the Barbados Marketing Corporation is concerned, we in the Democratic Labour Party envisaged that this corporation was brought in for two basic reasons. The first reason I believe, Mr. Chairman, was that there was need for storage. What I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, is if the storage facilities at the BMC are adequate for the job they were expected to do, because I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if your storage facilities are adequate, this will serve as an incentive to farmers. This will also provide security for family food, and the fact that your storage facilities are adequate will also provide a means of improving your seed stocks, and it will also provide an opportunity to manage part of the market system.

I would like to question whether the storage facilities at the BMC are adequate because from the reports that we have been getting, I seem to come to the conclusion that the storage facilities at the BMC are not

adequate for the job undertaken. I would like to hear from the Minister in his reply if this is so or not.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. Chairman, the next basic reason for the Barbados Marketing Corporation being set up by the Democratic Labour Party Government was in the area of price stabilisation, and by this I mean stabilisation to the producer and to the consumer, and I will say that if the basic reason for setting it up was to make sure that the prices to the consumer and the producer were at a proper level, then the Barbados Marketing Corporation has not performed its job in that manner.

I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why you need a certain measure of stability in your price to the producer is because of the instability of agricultural output caused by the changes in the weather patterns. Only last year, Mr. Chairman, in Barbados we had a large amount of rain and it not only affected the sugar crop, but the fact that it affected the sugar crop also meant it would affect the other vegetable crops.

I am asking if stabilisation is realisable where you have a Statutory Marketing Board given a monopoly to export and to import. I am asking if that is realisable, because in my opinion, fixing the producer price of a product by any marketing board does not guarantee that the small farmer will not be exploited by the buyers and by the quality inspectors of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, especially if the Marketing Corporation has a monopoly on buying. Of course, some of the malpractices and the unfortunate incidents which may occur can be relieved by setting up cooperatives which will act as agents for the Marketing Board in order to purchase and to collect the crops, but until such time, Mr. Chairman, as you can have a cadre of trained, efficient and honest personnel, wouldn't it be worthwhile to look for parallel organisations of buying and selling? This is what I am asking at the moment.

If private traders are allowed to compete with cooperatives, I believe that this competition may at least ensure that small producers receive fixed prices for their products. What results, Mr. Chairman, is that since you do not have this sort of competition in Barbados with the cooperatives and the BMC, you get the prices of vegetables and other crops vacillating up and down, and obviously producers are not going to produce unless they are sure that they will get a fair return.
1.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if the administrative and political machinery is inefficient, a Marketing Board Scheme will always prove completely ineffective when, for example,

you are unable to obtain the high calibre of people needed. I will say this, that the success of the Barbados Marketing Corporation lies not in relocation. It does not lie in expansion. It lies in attracting personnel of a certain calibre who will carry out the job that the Barbados Marketing Corporation would put them to do in the first place.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, speaking on Sub-head 17, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, I believe it would be too tiresome for there to be a repetition of the debates which occurred in this Honourable House in the past, although in recent times the Government steadfastly did not allow the Barbados Marketing Corporation to appear in debates, and particularly when we anticipated it, but we will wait until the Estimates come up to deal with certain aspects of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. We have a new Minister, we have a new Leader and we have new times but, Mr. Chairman, we could not allow the Barbados Marketing Corporation to come up in this Honourable House without my asking a few questions.

I would like to know, Sir — what is the amount? Forty thousand dollars. I would like to know — this is significant. This \$40 000 rings a bell in my head, Sir. I do not believe that this is the identical \$40,000 that the Minister is looking for but I wish the Minister to tell this Honourable House what progress has been made in finding the \$40,000 which disappeared from the Barbados Marketing Corporation safe, for which the Police had been called, for which investigations have been going on for a long time and for which no report has as yet graced this Honourable House. (ASIDES)

It is not *sub judice*. Do not let him mislead you, Sir. It is money that is lost and that is being investigated. It is not *sub judice*. It is if they find the person who steal the money and it goes before the Courts. That is when we cannot talk about it in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think you can expect the Minister.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is an administrative problem, Sir. I am not asking him whether anybody that he knows stole the money. That is not what I am asking him. I am not even asking him if anybody that he knows is assisting the Police with the investigations. The Minister understands what I am asking him, Sir.

I wish to know what progress has been made, whether the Police has reported back to the Barbados Marketing Corporation on the \$40,000. I wish to know, in essence, Mr. Chairman, if we can expect the matter to be dealt with or if it is one that is going to disappear

because, Sir, and this is the reason — the administrative arrangements at the Barbados Marketing Corporation including a very....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. No interruptions, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I cannot. Kindly ask the honourable Member if he will stop interrupting me from behind you, Sir.

I am talking about stealing money. I am talking about corruption and you want me not to speak about it? Mr. Chairman, the safe was a peculiar safe.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Why do you not behave yourself? That is not fair (*Asides*) But not from the BMC. That is not fair. Do not call the man's name.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the safe is one that was not cut, according to my information. It is a safe that when you opened the first door, you almost had to get a crane to open the second door. The \$40,000 it is alleged had been put in the safe and locked. It disappeared. The last person that went into the safe, Sir.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. Since the honourable Member is well aware, as he says, that you could not cut the safe, you could not lift it up and so on; I would submit that the honourable Member assist the Police with their investigation because he seems to know quite a bit about the safe and the money and how many persons — so he should try and help the Police. That is what he should do.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, my name is Taitt, Sir, not Johnson, so how can I assist the Police? I was not Chairman of any Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are referring to the Hon. Member for St. Michael West?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, no, Sir. Not the Hon. Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In any event, I do not think we are getting anywhere. This is a matter which is being investigated, I am informed, and I would ask the honourable Member to continue.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, Sir. I feel that where a Minister has the responsibility for a Statutory Board and Reports indicate that that Statutory Board's affairs are not being run in a

manner consistent with what the mandate given under the Act requires, that it is proper for Members of the House of Assembly, or any lower House, to ask the Minister if he is in a position to assist in clarifying.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you are asking again and again, over and over again. That is the point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, The relocation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, if I may move to another aspect of the Corporation, is a matter which exacerbated the Prime Minister on one occasion to high flights of oratories as to why the decision was made to change the location which had been agreed upon and recommended by the Caribbean Development Bank. I believe that this is yet another case where, in an attempt to make a political point, we lost the opportunity to make a very strong and decisive economic point. (ASIDES).

The honourable Members, when they came into power, found a decision already made about where the Barbados Marketing Corporation would have been expanded to, not relocated — expanded to — and they made a decision to have the matter re-examined.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are certain circumstances surrounding the acquisition — not the legal acquisition, the general acquisition — of the land which have been dealt with in the McGregor Report. The McGregor Report indicated that it was a very negative decision. The McGregor Report is well-known. It is a document of this Honourable House. It was a very negative decision to take the lands which would now be taken from Lower Estate, high quality cane producing lands, to use them for the purposes which are intended by the Barbados Marketing Corporation's relocation.

This differs significantly from the Caribbean Development Bank's recommendation, and their reasons for that recommendation, of locating the Barbados Marketing Corporation at the Industrial Park where there is already a Meat Processing Plant, albeit a rather small Meat Processing Plant, where it was felt that the location would be useful to the farmers who operate in the middle of the island, to the east and to the north, I speak of the industrial park or the industrial area in St. Thomas where BARPAC is located. The question has to be asked, what informed the Government, what led the Government to take Lower Estate, when the Government continues to talk about agricultural production.

1.20 p.m.

Recently, I heard the Hon. Minister himself indicating that in spite of the fact that River Plantation has the poorest soil of all the plantations in Barbados, perhaps, a categorisation of P6, I believe, that Government will take all steps possible, according to the Hon.

Minister's statement to try to keep at least 200 acres of River Plantation in agricultural production. And, yet, they are prepared to list a substantial part of the Lower Estate Plantation and make the Barbados Marketing Corporation headquarters at that point.

Now it is a specious argument which suggests that since the Barbados Marketing Corporation deals with agriculture it is alright to use that agricultural land for that purpose, unless it is part of their plan, to produce the foods which they would be selling and marketing at Lower Estate, in which case, Mr. Chairman, they will be defeating the primary purpose of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, as outlined and adumbrated by my colleague, the distinguished Member for St. Philip South.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

It would seem to me, therefore, that if they are not going to be using Lower Estate as a production unit for agricultural produce and it is only going to form part of the new and modern complex to whit a building, Mr. Chairman, that far from deferring the project that the Government may well serve this community if they would re-examine the implications; if they would examine it from the point of view of a national issue as opposed to a purely partisan issue because, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the question of agriculture cannot forever continue to form the basis of political argument on one side or the other.

I believe that agriculturalists have the right to anticipate from the Government of a small developing country like Barbados, a pristine interest, a new interest, if you will Mr. Chairman, in their development. I believe that the small agriculturalists in Barbados have a right to feel that he is at least equal with other persons in the society who enjoy a reasonable status. At the same time, because we are a small economy we cannot afford to have the ravishes of capitalist competition exercised without call to the larger plantations, as compared to the smaller plantations. For those reasons, it becomes necessary, it is desirable that there be some catalyst in the market place that will assist in bringing a fair price to the consumer while adequately recompensing the producers. It is a very difficult task, Sir. It is not one that has been successfully solved in many countries in the world, but, because it is difficult and because it has not been solved, it does not mean that we ought not to try. And, that was the rationale behind the establishment of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

So, I am asking the Minister, on this Head, while he has only come for professional services. While no one is going to question the desire to shift from one

Subhead within the broad items to another, one feels that the professional services ought to be exercised towards looking at a rational way for the Barbados Marketing Corporation to function within the society without at the same time, decimating the very high quality land at Lower Estate. Perhaps, there is information which I have not got which the Hon. Minister will be able to give us.

Generally speaking, I am disappointed that the last Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation or the Government apparently took the decision to reduce considerably the development aspect of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, misled by a philosophic face which has been put out in this country which speaks of Statutory Boards, in the same manner as they speak of private enterprise. They expect that a profit must show, they claim a profit must be shown and they push the philosophy sufficiently that political decision makers become afraid. And, then as a result, the Marketing Corporation has been adjudged in this community, by unfair rules. The Marketing Corporation is no less an input into the development of the society or it ought not to be any less an input to the development of the society than any school in Barbados or the markets, the so-called markets at Eagle Hall and Fairchild Street. It is generally accepted that where a corporation is functioning in a commercial area, it ought to operate on commercial lines. For those reasons, if the Barbados Marketing Corporation has what they call a supermarket, it would be strange if that supermarket consistently registers a loss in its profit and loss statement.

But, if the Barbados Marketing Corporation is attempting to assist farmers in developing new products and going in different directions, if the Barbados Marketing Corporation, for example, attempted to produce certain items to carry them beyond the primary stage into a secondary or even tertiary stage for consumption in Barbados, it stands to reason that the Barbados Marketing Corporation or some similar agency can become the research and development arm of our agricultural development or part of the research of the development arm.

Mr. Chairman, because a small group of people, in this country have been able to inculcate their ideas into the concept of what constitutes good Government, the Government allows fear to dog their feet and the Hon. Minister the Hon. sub Minister, the then Chairman announced with a great degree of fanfare that he will be closing down certain aspects of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. As a result, Sir, we saw the complete decimation of a number of embryonic ideas and concepts which had started to take on the body of a serious development in our agricultural sector. Those are now, I am pleased to see, being re-activated by the current Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, or

perhaps, by the current Hon. Minister. I think, it is fair to say by the current Hon. Minister because if he is to take the blame when he fails, he should take the praise if there is any credit.

Let me say, the current Hon. Minister has apparently directed or re-directed the Barbados Marketing Corporation into the paths and directions for which it was established. I do not know who is responsible Sir, but I notice that the abattoir at least has been dealt with, in a manner consistent with a society at the level of Barbados. I do not agree with the system — but I am not sufficiently informed and therefore will not criticise — where the butchers would be required to pay for the offals because in the end, the consumer is going to have to carry that cost.

I believe that if an attempt is being made at linkages and this attempt has been again something which was there since 1975, 1976, and the Honourable Minister is uniquely placed because he has now had the experience of both places — where for example the hides from the Barbados Marketing Corporation which have been consistently thrown into the sea may in fact, be used for a small cannery and an attempt for the extra fish that was caught through — International Seafoods and/or any other agency could have been used to try a curing system.....salt fish, Sir, not salted cod, but salt fish. They have done it successfully in Guyana.

1.30 p.m.

We attempted in the Barbados Marketing Corporation between 1973 and 1975, a number of new ideas which started to take root, and Mr. Chairman, I now hear the Minister saying that we are going to have a collection centre of a certain kind at Oistins in 1982, when his administration between 1976 and 1982 virtually closed down the collection centres which had been established throughout this country and designed primarily to assist the small producer to get his produce to market. We had little outlets for produce in Speightstown, in Lodge Hill and in other areas, when the plan was accepted in principle by almost everyone in Barbados as spreading across the country so that the producers would be able to find outlets, we find subsequently that they start to close the outlets down and they offered them for sale to private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, while that might be monetarily nifty, while it may demonstrate that they are capable of showing a profit at the bottom line, it also demonstrates a certain lack of capacity for understanding

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time has expired.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am winding up now, Sir. It shows that there is a certain lack of capacity for dealing

with development and development possibilities even at the risk of incurring the wrath of those who insist that a profit and loss is the only measure that one can find in the development of a country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me remind the Committee that we have three hours allotted for debate on this supplementary, and I would also like to inform the Committee that I believe that every member has in his possession an amendment which has been circulated, which I believe will have to be dealt with.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, perhaps it is a good thing for Barbados when there are issues of policy dividing the two sides of the House in important matters. I am very glad that the honourable Member who has just sat down has got away from the earlier part of his speech worrying about who carried away \$40 000 from the safe and so on and gone into areas where some debate is necessary.

There is an enormous amount of uninformed comment in this country about agriculture, and it has been going on for years. I am not the Minister of Agriculture but I have a larger responsibility to the country as a whole, and this is why I am going to make a contribution on this particular matter.

There is a general public perception that we import a lot of food into Barbados which we need not import; that our agriculture is being neglected by the Government and there is something the Government can do to improve our agriculture; that there are a lot of small people in agriculture who need help from institutions such as the BMC and that insufficient is being done to help them; that successive Governments have not understood the needs of the agricultural community and do not give sufficient incentives to farmers to produce.

Now, almost all of these perceptions are wrong, and the longer I have been Prime Minister the more I have become totally convinced of the virtual completeness of error with these perceptions. I am constantly being told, or I was told up to a year or so ago, how we do not give farmers any incentives, and some element perhaps of that was present in the speech of the honourable Member for St. Philip South. Now, I happened to read something very indicative of the incentive which is given to vegetable producers in Barbados. *The Times Newspaper* about a week ago published a sort of front page story on vegetable prices in Britain. It said that the severe weather in Britain was causing farmers great distress and this doubled vegetable prices in many areas, and it gave the prices at the beginning of December and the current prices.

I noticed that English potatoes cost about the same in England as the controlled price of English potatoes in Barbados, about the same 10 pence per pound; not very

much difference, assuming that one penny is four cents, but I noticed that the price of cabbage which has doubled as a result of severe frost, breakdown of the roads, inability to harvest the cabbage and so on in Britain, went up to only 25 pence per pound under the influence of the weather. Now, that is one dollar a pound in conditions where the trucks cannot drive to carry the cabbage to market. What possible incentive could a farmer in Barbados need to produce cabbage other than import control which we now exercise to prevent cabbage being imported into Barbados, where cabbage is sold in the field at \$1.50 a pound — and God knows what price when it reaches the hawkers and the supermarkets — and it has had its effects, because this brings me on to the point about the import of food. We import very few vegetables into Barbados now.

We have said in this House over and over again that Barbados is now 85 percent self-sufficient in vegetables and the other 15 percent consists of potatoes, onions one or two months of the year and pumpkins from the Eastern Caribbean. There is no doubt that the exaggerated prices two or three times as much as are paid in northern countries for commonly used vegetables there and here are a sufficient subsidy to farmers. They have proved sufficient because farmers now produce to meet the demand. Mind you, I think that if prices were cheaper the demand would be more. If cabbage in Barbados was price-controlled at something like \$1.20 a pound at the retail level, I believe that more cabbage would be eaten. I believe that you could price control it at less for other periods of the year.

The agreements which now exist between the producers of cabbage, carrots, beans and so on not to plant too much acreage would still exist, but the acreage would have to be more in order to maintain the level of sales. They would have to get their profits from volume rather than from mark up, and I think that the expansion of production of all kinds of vegetables is a sufficient answer both to the criticisms which are being levelled against the BMC for its not being a developmental organisation sufficiently and against the general criticisms which are levelled about not giving farmers subsidies.

If cabbage can be sold in Barbados in good times at \$1.50 in a field in a country where there are no frosts, if it can be sold at that price you do not need a developmental scheme. The consumers are providing their own developmental scheme by agreeing to pay much more for vegetables than what the vegetables could be imported for into the island.

The argument about the small man who needs collection points.... who are these small men that are carrying out food import substitution programmes? Small men like Wakefield Plantation? Small men like Edgecumbe Plantation? Small men like Constant Plantation and the Valley?

Are these the small men who need the collection points that have been shut down in Speightstown and in Oistins? Because all the examinations of production make it absolutely clear beyond any doubt that just as plantations are dominant in the production of root crops, so too they are dominant in the production of most vegetable crops. There are small men who produce specialised vegetables, or who in a very small area produce perhaps a higher quality vegetable than plantation farming manages, and there are a number of peasant farmers of, I believe, eight to ten acres, and when I say a number I think I am talking about 20 in the whole island of Barbados.

1.40 p.m.

It is time that we woke our ideas up, to use an expression, over this question of non-sugar agriculture and the role of the BMC and what is actually being achieved. I have said over and over again — but it is impossible to get into the heads of those who write in the Press and talk about these things — that imports substitution for food undoubtedly can go further, but we must have some recognition of the fact that the principal imports of food into this country cannot be substituted by local production. We cannot produce rice or wheat, and that accounts for perhaps ten per cent of food imports into this country. We cannot seriously think that we can substitute in Barbados the production of the \$5 million of beef that comes into the country every year. There just is not enough land in Barbados to do it, and if you sought to raise cows on food lots by feeding them the feeds that are currently available, expert opinion is that imported feed to raise cattle herds to the levels where we could be self-sufficient in local production of beef would cost more than it cost to import the beef in carcass. We must have some realism over these things.

If you want to substitute the import of the \$3 million in corned beef and other tinned foods, there is only one way to do it. You have to tell the people that they cannot have corned beef, because there is no local substitute possible for corned beef. I believe that we can produce more fish, and the \$3 million in tinned sardines and other tinned fish that come into Barbados — although our waters in Barbados are not abundantly in fish — could be substituted though by higher prices, Mr. Chairman, because that is a point that the pundits do not often mention.

All locally produced food is going to be more expensive than imported food, the only exception being sugar, but other than that there is no food product that you can name that I have ever been shown in my capacity as Chairman of the Import Licence Review Committee that it is not cheaper to import into Barbados than to produce. You produce in Barbados as a deliberate act of fostering agriculture, not even to save foreign exchange, because in some cases inputs into food cost more

than the food itself would cost. There are times when it might be cheaper to import than to grow chicken locally. These are a few facts which are the realities of the situation and which never seem to be canvassed by those who talk or write about agriculture.

Agricultural production in most countries that are successful producers is artificial. We are a successful agricultural producer, don't fool yourselves. Compare us to the other islands of the Eastern Caribbean who are better blessed by rainfall and perhaps better blessed by volcanic soils which have a fertility that ours do not have and you will find that our agricultural output, with the fundamental basis of a large and continuing export of sugar, is superior to any of the Eastern Caribbean Islands, and of course we have long ago left the MDCs — with the exception of Guyana — far behind in terms of the development of the people's income by a flourishing agriculture, and it is time that we stop knocking what we have achieved, and time that we apply a little serious analysis to what we are trying to do.

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

I heard some talk about the abattoir. The honourable member for St. Michael West would be interested to know that the losses at the abattoir when he left office as Minister of Trade, were according to our calculation, sufficient if divided among the farmers to exceed the profit that the farmers were making from the animals slaughtered at the abattoir. It would have been cheaper to pay the farmers not to raise the animals than to have them at the abattoir. Farmers would have got more money, and the Government would have been saved money. Of course you would not have had the benefit of the carcasses, and there may have been a foreign exchange drain, but you cannot run an abattoir for \$500 000 to produce \$400,000 in profit for farmers and the animals are actually killed there. This is effectively what the honourable Member was asking the BMC to do. So when we asked the BMC to turn itself into an organisation that had a commercial side that was profit oriented and to reduce its losses, we were pursuing policies that have been proved over the last six years to have been correct policies in so far as they have elicited greater production at no cost to the taxpayers as taxpayers. Undoubtedly there is some cost to the taxpayers as consumers because we do pay more for domestically produced foods than for imported foods. There is no doubt about that, and it is a decision which I am prepared to defend. I do not think that we have to pay that much more, but I am prepared to defend it in the interest of maintaining an agricultural sector, but we have to cut through all the cant and the obvious mistakes and look clearly at these things.

I suppose that one of the most pervasive myths about Barbados and indeed about tourist industries everywhere — people have got Ph.Ds and write this nonsense — is that you find when you have a tourist oriented economy that you import large quantities of food to feed tourists. Not even five per cent of Barbados' food import bill goes to feed the tourists. The tourists do not eat corned beef. The tourists do not eat tinned sardines. Tourists do not drink evaporated milk made from a powder imported into this island at perhaps greater cost than the milk can be imported in tins. The tourists drink fresh milk from Barbadian cows. They eat fresh vegetables; they eat freshly caught fish in many cases, and I am sure that if an analysis were carried out of tourists eating, it would be found that the tourists' diet has a greater percentage of locally produced food in it than the diet of the locals. People do not believe that rice is an imported food. They do not believe that corned beef is an imported food. That is the only conclusion to which I can come. There is talk about eating imported foods, and when you go down to a hotel you see there is nothing but Barbadian there. You look at the buffets, Barbadian vegetables throughout, many imported delicacies perhaps, but the actual foods, the chicken and so on which is eaten is Barbadian.

Tourism is not, as far as the Government is concerned, any particular contributor to our heavy food import bill, and the sooner we realise this and realise that food imports in the main are not high priced imports — they are cheap imports for not necessarily the better off in society, but primarily not so well off in the society — the better it will be for us.

Now with this background, Mr. Chairman, it would be obvious why the Government is not going to accept the strictures of the honourable Member for St. Michael West about trying to stop the BMC from losing money. The honourable Member's eloquence never ceases to astonish me, and the fact that it is exercised at its most fluent in bad causes is, I think, a tribute to his capacity for his newly chosen profession. I have never heard an argument put up with so much cogency for the BMC to go back to losing money again. The honourable Member has castigated us because we have stopped the BMC losing money. He has said how wrong it is to follow a policy that would stop the BMC losing money. The BMC must lose money or Barbados will be destroyed....that is the gist of the honourable Member's speech. Well I do not agree with that. I am proud to think that the Minister for.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, the honourable Member said and I heard him, "The BMC must lose money or Barbados will be destroyed." That was the gist of the honourable Member's statement. Those are the exact words. I think the honourable Member ought to withdraw that. That is not what I said. I did not even

talk about Barbados' destruction. He obviously has Barbados' destruction uppermost in his head, but I did not speak about it. I wish the honourable Member would be a little more accurate when he is referring to what I said.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I said it was the gist, Sir. I do not have Barbados' destruction uppermost in my head. I have the defence of Barbados against destruction by the honourable Member uppermost in my head. I have to be on the look-out for the honourable Member not to destroy Barbados. The honourable Member knows perfectly well that is nothing to be withdrawn. The honourable Member put a case for BMC to lose money. He cannot deny that is a fair construction to put on his speech, and I would like to congratulate the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, the Minister of Labour, on his enormous success at the BMC when he was Chairman of the Board at stopping BMC from being a drain on the Treasury. I would like to congratulate him on that. 1.50 p.m.

I think it is one of the great achievements of the last Barbados Labour Party Government that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was able to look at the things it did when it first came into power, reducing the price of chicken parts that the honourable Member for St. Michael West had put up shortly before the General Election of 1976. Chicken parts are still cheaper now and that is a result of the BMC's activities, controlling the activities of local producers.

As far as I am concerned, everytime I hear a local producer of a commodity criticise the BMC for importing things at some cost in price to the local producer, I assume that the BMC is right. I assume that because I assume that it is only when you make the producers understand that they have a responsibility to the consumer that the producers will only be acting totally in concert with the needs of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, obviously I did not anticipate having to say some of these things but I do, in closing, wish to urge upon the Press to get somebody who understands the facts of agriculture in the island. It really has become a scandal that nothing that is said, nothing that actually happens can dent these false perceptions of the Press and public as to the achievements of agriculture in our island.

In an economy that is as developed, you are not going to expect agriculture to contribute much more than ten percent of the GDP. As the GDP's expand, agriculture may expand in volume but it is not going to expand as fast as the rest of the economy and therefore any figures you produce about agriculture's share in the GDP necessarily is going to show a decline. That is part of progress. As countries get richer they agriculture sometimes can get richer but the share of agriculture in

the GDP is going to fall. That has happened in Barbados. It is inevitable but it does not mean either the country is getting poorer or the farmers are getting poorer. In fact it is a corollary of both of them getting richer.

Instead, the public should be having its attention directed to the fact that we are achieving self-sufficiency. I daresay the Minister of Agriculture will say something about the Fruit Programme. I regard this as an area where we are dreadfully placed. It really is a disgrace to get so little fruit in Barbados and have to pay so much for it. There are areas where we must necessarily advance but we have achieved great advances in other areas.

I do not want to dwell on sugar, Sir, but I just made a note that sugar, as far as Government is concerned, is still the under-pinning of a prosperous agriculture because if we have to import \$150 million in food we should be aiming at exporting \$150 million in food. I do not know if Barbadians know that sugar is food. That is another one of these mistakes. Just as they do not think of rice as imported food they do not think of sugar as exported food. (ASIDES) Especially in the constituency of St. Michael West. These are the points which an informed public opinion deserves to be helped with, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael South. I have to stop at 2 p.m. You have five minutes. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would speak briefly on this Resolution that is before us, Subhead 17, dealing with the relocation and expansion of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

That particular Corporation has had a very sad history. It has been like a kind of albatross around the necks of successive Ministers and a kind of many-headed hydra which Ministers have found very impossible to tame. As I studied the Government benches, I believe there have been three and a half Ministers out there and they have not been able to deal with this question of the problems of the BMC. (ASIDES) Do you want to know who is the half?

Agriculture is a most important subject. It is a most vital one and we cannot look at it solely from the point of view of the profit and loss or the dollars and cents in terms of importation and exporting and the balance. I think we have to look at it from the point of view that the good Lord has given us land as one of our resources and it is incumbent upon us to put those hectares of land that we can cultivate to see that those hectares flourish.

It is also necessary for our national security because even though we may be able to import cabbages or tomatoes much cheaper than we can grow them, from the point of view of national security it is vitally necessary that we maintain a flourishing agricultural sector.

I would like to congratulate the Minister for making what we consider to be a very good appointment to the chairmanship of the BMC and that type of leadership which he has put at the Head of that Corporation should go somewhere towards bringing sound management principles and improvements to the Corporation. I would like to give him the assurance and the Chairman that he will get the full support from all Barbadians and certainly from the Opposition as he goes about his task, but of course, the Minister must allow the Chairman to be Chairman of the Corporation. This has been part of the problem with a number of our Statutory Corporations — that the Chairmen have not been allowed to exercise their particular expertise as far as those Statutory Corporations are concerned so we just gave that particular caveat.

I know the Minister's heart is in the right place but all of the programmes that he wishes to implement are dependent upon the provision of funds, including the relocation of the BMC. It is a question of money and he can have whatever grand plans he may wish — he may be able to articulate them with very good rhetoric and to the satisfaction of the farming community — but unless he can prise some money out of the Ministry of Finance for his projects, all of that talk may come to nought.

2.00 p.m.

I am not saying that the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance is a scrooge. It is not that at all. It is that he is managing the financing and, he has to tell his Ministers "no", and, from all reports, he has been telling them, "no".

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture can confirm that. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I have not asked.) You can confirm that he has told you "no", on a number of occasions. He has had to because we all know that the times are hard. We were telling the Government that from over here. They are now admitting that the times are hard. And, you may well be saying — I am referring to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture now, you have been called upon to put agriculture right. Somewhere I believe, it must have been Shakespeare, I do not recall where, but they correct people if they say — I do not understand the nonsense of language when they say, "little man doth thou know who made thee?" (Hon. L. R. TULL: William Blake) Correct him and say it is lamb. (Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not Shakespeare, Blake)

It is Blake, William Blake, "Little lamb", "not man". The times are out of joint. You are finding that now. They are finding it on the Government benches — and particularly the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the times are out of joint and you may very well say to Shakespeare, at this time, "Oh cursed spite that I have been called upon to set it right", because you cannot get the funds.

Now, I would like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, perhaps (*Asides*)... Let the Hon. Minister of Finance ask him, he told me. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please go ahead.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: There are a number of persons out here to speak in addition. I would suggest that we take the luncheon break now. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is your suggestion?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, I am suggesting it. I know that you take suggestions. I am suggesting it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, the debate, carry on.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would like the Hon. Minister to tell this Honourable House, not only that this BMC cannot be relocated until perhaps, Financial Year 1983 — 84, (Mr. B. M. TAITT: 1986), but I would like him to explain the position and, in fact, to go back from first place and indicate whether we, in fact need an elaborate Barbados Marketing Corporation, a new Barbados Marketing Corporation. I believe he should start from base and set out the reasons and arguments for it. I am not saying that we do not need it, but I am saying that the Hon. Minister must start from zero again and set out those... (*Aside*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk, please. (Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: He is playing for time now.) You have just a minute.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am asking him to start right there, because we have a lot of projects and it is quite clear, from past record, that the Government does not know how to place these projects. They go and try to do everything at the same time, and now, we have a lot of problems of management. He must start from that base and tell us whether it is necessary and what are the arguments. If he still accepts the argument for this new BMC at the cost... and he must come with fairly reasonable projections, as far as costings are concerned because a number of projects which they have ventured upon have been subject to very great over rise.

This question of re-examination is particularly important because the Hon. Minister has indicated that the farming community has suffered no hardships whatsoever as far as the marketing of commodities is concerned, through the non construction or non relocation of the BMC. I think we are entitled to ask. If, the Hon. Minister can say that the farming community during these very difficult years have had no difficulty or have suffered no hardship in spite of the fact that we have not had this new BMC whether in fact, we need the new BMC. I think, he must sort out that problem.

He himself — I am concluding now, Mr. Chairman — has said that it is due to the work of the Barbados Agricultural Society that hardship has not been experienced. I would agree with him, as far as the work of the BAS is concerned and I would make an appeal to him — I know his heart is in the right place because I heard his inaugural address to that particular body and, it was a good speech — I would ask him if as much as the BAS is doing such a good job that he should ensure, not only say, but ensure that the Barbados Agricultural Society is given substantial support in carrying out its marketing and other functions in the interest of agriculture in this country. (*Asides*)

I will admit, one of my colleagues reminds me, I am a member of the Barbados Agricultural Society (Hon. Dr. CHELTENHAM: Any conflict of interest)..... I am just drawing that to the attention of the Hon. Minister and I hope that he can persuade those who hold the first strings, that this particular body, in as much as it has done such a good job should be given the resources in order to do an even better job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister wants to reply.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir I am grateful to.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other honourable Member who indicates an interest in speaking? (*Pause*) You may speak again. Please, take your seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, we are in Committee, Sir, and as I understand it the honourable Member is not winding up, he is speaking. And, I believe that your eye caught him Sir, and therefore the honourable Member has full time to give another address to the Honourable Chamber. (*Asides*) Winding up what? We are in Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Would the Hon. Minister indicate if he is making a speech, continuing his debate. He can do so and he can also wind up the debate afterwards.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I was anxious to respond to the points raised by honourable Members. (*Asides*).

I am grateful, Sir, to all honourable Members who have spoken and, in responding to the points made, Sir, I would like to address myself, first of all to the question relating to the decision to locate the Barbados Marketing Corporation at Lower Estate and whether that decision trespass on good, arable land in the St. George Valley and whether the decision was taken on any narrow, political grounds and for the wrong reason.

I ought to say, Sir, that when the Barbados Labour Party came into power in 1976, there was a decision taken, by the previous administration, the Democratic Labour Party to erect a new BMC headquarters at Edghill in St. Thomas. That decision involved purchasing some five acres of land from one Mr. Packer, who I believe is well known to the Democratic Labour Party, at something like \$120,000 an acre. The project as conceived was a monstrously vast project that had no relation whatsoever to the scale of the agricultural produce in the non-sugar sector in Barbados, and the Barbados Labour Party decided to review this decision and they had several sites in mind, Sir, including a site near the Pine Hill Dairy, one near Chapel Gap, one near Fairy Valley and one near Lower Estate, and in the end the decision was taken to locate the new BMC Headquarters at Lower Estate, because of the centrality of Lower Estate in relation to the farming community in non-sugar agriculture.

2.10 p.m.

The bulk of the vegetable produce comes out of the St. George Valley and out of Christ Church, and it was a question of easy accessibility; also the land there was something like four to five thousand dollars an acre. In addition, the land at Lower Estate which was earmarked for the project was marginal land, it was not prime agricultural land, and in any event, a BMC Headquarters which is an agro industry, you may say, Sir, is agriculture. So in any event the land, even if it were prime land, would be used for agriculture nevertheless, because the BMC Headquarters may be regarded as an agro industry plant, and that is agriculture too, Sir. So the decision was not taken for any of the wrong reasons as was hinted at by the honourable Member for St. Michael West.

We have reached the point now, Sir, at which we have got to re-think the whole rationale of the BMC Headquarters. I agree entirely with the honourable Member for St. Michael South when he suggested that we ought to go back from stage one in trying to justify the need for a new BMC Headquarters. Indeed, I think it is safe to say that we have lost the financing for the project, because USAID through the Caribbean Development Bank

was going to be one of the principal financiers of the project along with the Barbados Government. They committed themselves to financing this project ever since 1977 and we never got off the ground. As a result, Sir, I think it is fair to say that we have lost the participation of the Caribbean Development Bank, and behind them USAID.

I am not suggesting that we cannot renegotiate a commitment from USAID acting through the Caribbean Development Bank, but at this stage it is fair to say that we have lost the financing, and the marketing environment in Barbados has changed in the sense that one or two additional institutions have come in to fill the void, in particular the Barbados Agricultural Society, so that we may have to ask ourselves afresh whether there are now the same compelling reasons for a new BMC Headquarters as existed, let us say, five or ten years ago. I have not settled my thoughts finally on this question, and so at this point I cannot say to the House whether or not I am of the view that there does not still exist a need. But it is a fact that the situation has changed to the extent that that as a question must be put on the agenda first when we come to give our thoughts to a BMC headquarters in another two years or so when, hopefully, the financing of the country will permit us to put that question on the agenda once more.

I would just like to say, Sir, that at the time when the decision was taken that we should have a new BMC headquarters there was a major problem in relation to the grading, storage and handling of fresh vegetable produce. There were large deficiencies in these areas, and the loss was unacceptably high to the farming community. At that time too, Sir, it was felt that we needed a new and expanded abattoir provided by the Government as a service to the farming community, but more and more there is the feeling now that the private sector would like to be involved in a project along with the farmers, along with the Government. This seems to be the dominant view in Barbados today with respect to abattoir facilities — that the farmers along with private money interests and the Government should all be involved in a new abattoir. In any event, I believe that the arrangements that we currently have at the abattoir at the BMC are so satisfactory that even if we did not have a new BMC headquarters with a new abattoir for many years, the present abattoir, modernised and staffed with properly trained persons — because we brought in two experts from Canada to train the new staff which we recruited a few weeks ago — I am advised is giving very satisfactory service indeed.

There seemed to have been some inconsistency in the stand taken by the honourable Members on the other side. I got the impression that the honourable Member for St. Philip South was making the point that perhaps we did not need a new BMC — certainly the honourable

Member for St. Michael West, and indeed the honourable Member for St. Michael South — I got the impression that they were in favour, indeed it was their administration that first took the decision to talk about relocating the BMC.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way, Sir, on a point of elucidation, I think the debate has perhaps gone too long and the honourable Member did not make his notes consistently. He himself just said that he agrees with us that there is need for a rethinking of the project. What I said in fact, was that the project has taken so long to get off the ground, and the fact that you have taken a decision to relocate at Lower Estate, that what you need to do is to rethink the entire project in the context of development, so that there is no inconsistency on this side.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I had credited your colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, with making that point. I did not credit you with that, but I am prepared to give way and concede that my memory may have been faulty on that point.

The plain truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the Barbados Marketing Corporation has suffered almost too much as a public institution from the lash of public criticism, and in the same way as excessive hostile public criticism will interfere with the performance of the individual in public life, I believe that the same thing goes for an institution.
2.20 p.m.

I am very much hoping that we will give the BMC an opportunity now to prove its worth and to see whether it would get on to a new start and a new direction. I have gone out of the way to constitute as good a Board as I can put together, and I can give honourable Members the assurance that I will not be a Minister interfering in any day to day activities of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. I feel that the same way that men stand tall when they stand alone, so public institutions stand tall when they are allowed under directions of policy to get on with their own business. I think that it is counter productive for Ministers to be interfering from day to day in the activities of the public corporations that fall under them, and I do not think that you are likely to hear that I as Minister of Agriculture will be interfering with the day to day activities of the BMC.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South made a point that the problem at the BMC is a problem of staff. I would not like to suggest that there is any one explanation for the problems of the BMC. There are many problems at the BMC, but for one, they have never had as far as I can gather an effective management team, and if you have been reading the newspapers you will see that strenuous efforts are being made to constitute an

effective professional management team. We have had some success with that, but that exercise is not yet at an end. We still need a personnel manager and we still need an overall general manager, but strenuous efforts are being made to populate in the best possible way the staff of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and in that respect, Sir, I shall not be trying to place any political yardfowls in the management of the BMC.

We destroy institutions when we think that beyond a certain level you can place political friends and political associates. That is all right at the level of a clerk; it is all right at the level of a messenger. When I was at the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation, I personally was in charge of staff recruitment in so far as I was the Chairman of the Establishments Committee, and I set myself rigidly against any political appointment in appointments at a certain level influenced other than by considerations of strict efficiency. I would have done a grave disservice to that institution if I decided that I could make the Deputy Manager and all the posts of senior personnel out of political friends and political associates. That is what destroyed many institutions in this country, and as long as I have anything to do with it, people will be helped at the level of clerk, at the level of messenger and so on, but unless you qualify on the grounds of efficiency, you will not be a General Manager of mine or any deputy or in any senior management position. So honourable Members need have no fear whatsoever about that. I am in no doubt whatsoever as to the wisdom of that policy in relation to the functioning of these institutions.

I would just like to add to the speech that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has made. He has strong views about the matters on which he spoke and I would just like to add that he consistently omits the importance of food security as a rationale for agriculture. No one is denying that it may be easy or much cheaper for Barbadians to rely exclusively on North American food, but what happens in the event of international hostilities? What happens in the event of emergencies? We must still be able to feed ourselves for at least limited periods, and that is one of the important considerations for having a vigorous and healthy agricultural sector.

It is a fact that in the year ahead we will not be able out of Government finances to take many new initiatives in agriculture, but fortunately we have a few special projects in agriculture which are being financed by external agencies and to that extent we are still going to be able to continue considerable momentum in the field of agriculture; so that much as the situation is a tight one financially, it is not without hope as far as the agricultural sector is concerned.

With respect to the closing of the outlets or the closing of the collections under the Barbados Labour Party

some time in 1977 or 1978 is concerned, I am advised that the produce that used to be collected at these out-centres never reached the BMC, and it was best felt that we should close these centres. So the new food collection centre which we are going to build at Oistin with the assistance of the Food and Agriculture Organisation is not a new idea, but hopefully the management will be much more efficient and the organisation of it much better than we have had in the past.

With those remarks, I beg to move once more that this Head stand part of the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 3.15 p.m. today.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
2.30 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 went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

HEAD 74 -Subhead 17

The question that this Subhead stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Subhead 19: Integrated Rural Development Project.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, request for a supplementary under Head 74, Subhead 19, arises from an error in the presentation of the Estimates for Printing in 1981. Originally, Sir, the amount of \$150,000 was included for professional services under this Head but at the time of submission of the final drafts, only \$10,000 appeared under this Head whereas other items such as vehicles, plant and equipment were increased by over \$100,000. This Resolution, Sir, seeks to correct that error and place the estimated funds at the disposal of the project executing agency, which is the Agricultural Development Corporation.

Here again, Sir, you are not actually asking for the provision of any money. All that we are asking, Sir, is that the financing be through freezing of other items within the Subheads. In short, Sir, there is unused money under other Heads that we are asking that we be given permission, as it were, to use money which is here needed under Other Heads and this really arises, Sir, because we do not practice virement. I feel very strongly and I am virtually embarrassed in having to do this because I feel that what is involved here is no more than a management exercise.

If the House gives me \$5 million in my Ministry, \$5 million to spend and under a particular Head I had half a million dollars and for one reason or another I have only spent \$200,000 there but I need \$300,000 to spend elsewhere, once at the end of the day I can account for how I have spent the money I see no good reason why Parliament in 1982 should be involved in an exercise of this nature. Nevertheless this is a system that we are operating and emphasising on me to have a new look at the style of management to which I have addressed my thoughts in a broad way at an earlier stage in my life in Parliament but I will not say more on that now, Sir, except to emphasise the point, Sir, that all that we are asking in these Resolutions is that unused portions of other items within other Subheads, Sir, be transferred as it were.

With those remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Head stand part of the Resolution.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would take this opportunity to give us an update on the progress of the Integrated Rural Development Project.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I did not actually anticipate, Sir, I am sorry. I should, Sir, actually have in the course of my presentation given this information. I think it is relevant to the point and I took the opportunity, Sir, to avail myself of the latest position, which I am happy to report to the House.

The project consultants are continuing work, Sir, and the public relations programme is about to commence in the selected tenancies and small holding areas. In addition, Sir, the seven Extension Officers have already been appointed and the Credit Officers to be attached to the Barbados National Bank are in place and are undergoing training. Only yesterday, Sir, I approved the appointment of a Marketing Specialist and a Draughtsman. The Project has acquired vehicles to be used by the Extension and Engineering staff and discussions are currently taking place, Sir, on the possible inclusion of the Gibbons/Boggs Co-operative in Christ Church into the programme.

The first disbursement of U.S.\$163,000 has been made to the Government by the Inter-American Development Bank, Sir, I believe the area where we hope to launch off, as it were, Sir, is going to be Hannahs. All the elements are there, good agricultural land, labourers nearby, agriculturalists nearby and water and it is felt that that and its project is likely to be one of the — (ASIDES — in Christ Church East?). No, no, not Christ Church East. It is really outside of my constituency. I can assure you all the objective elements seemed to favour that one and I am really looking forward to its commencement.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did interpret the Minister's answer to the query of the honourable Member for St. Philip North as a reply in this debate. I want, however, to talk about the Integrated Rural Development Project and the significance which it holds for agricultural development. I believe that both in conception and, I trust, in execution this would be one of the most important projects being carried out by the Government and that its impact on agriculture can be substantial.

The project, in particular, relates to uplifting both the agricultural potential of real small holders — genuine small holders — and improving, as well, the physical conditions under which they live and carry on their business and I know that when I hear people saying that the Government should do more for small holders in Barbados, that they omit to recognise the importance of this project.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to stress its importance because when I was Minister of External Affairs, I had something to do with the negotiations of the loan which has come from the Inter-American Bank relating to the financing of this project and the project was recognised not only by the Government but by the lending agencies as one of great social development importance.

The persons who are benefiting are people who own a quarter acre of land, a half acre of land and four acres of land. People in the Windsor Tenantry, for instance, Windsor Village, Hanson's Village, Sunbury, if I can talk

about the St. Philip area, Sir, and in other parts of the island as well where agricultural tenants exists.

I know that when I went around the country with the team from the Inter-American Bank, we make a point of looking at the living conditions which existed in some of these plantation tenancies and found that many of them were lacking in water and roads, which were some of the physical development necessities, and there is built into the project as well, an element of improving the physical conditions of the tenants.

I am sure that this Minister, in particular, as indeed his predecessors will put the maximum effort behind ensuring that the Agricultural Development Corporation does not get bogged down in bureaucratic delay but would press on with this project as at fast a rate as can be possibly accomplished. For instance, Mr. Chairman, in the Hanson area rather near to Hanson's Plantation in the Windsor Village there is enough seep water available for irrigation purposes. There are about 40 acres of land which has been sub-divided and rented for a considerable number of years to small tenants. They make a contribution both to sugar and non-sugar agriculture and it seems to me — and I think this is one of the pilot areas as well — that in an area such as this we can be making a contribution in increasing not only their earnings but by uplifting their amenities.

I think the Government ought to be commended for this type of input which it is contributing to agricultural development in this country. Too often people fail to recognise the actual performance of the Ministry and of the Government in these respects and look clearly at the record which will reveal to say that nothing is happening for agriculture. There are many ways in which agriculture needs certain help and assistance and I hope to get the opportunity when the Hon. Minister is ready with his project to offer a few words, although of course, I will speak to him before he even gets into the Honourable House on his project.

3.30 p.m.

I have listened to all of the pundits in this Honourable House in some of the areas and I want to stress one of the areas which we are achieving in this exercise and that is providing not only marketing skills for the small agriculturalist, but most important providing on a co-operative basis, equipment to enable them to plough their lands in a proper way. This is one of the elements of this project and it is built in because, Mr. Chairman, perhaps one of the greatest needs in agriculture today is to provide enough money to enable the people in agriculture to pay for the equipment which they have to buy from overseas with a rate of inflation over which we have no control.

Now, we are faced with the prospect where with falling sugar prices, we are not able to match the increase in the cost of the tractors even if they are small ploughs or tractors that we have to purchase to use on the land in this island. It seems to me that one of the approaches to agriculture — the one which we adopted here in the Integrated Rural Development Project and, it can be extended, as well, to larger farms that is Government encouraging the Government sector to set up its own purchasing company to purchase and pool machinery to use on a cooperative basis, but on a proper basis in making profit as well, so that, it will be self financing in the future so that there will be enough heavy equipment to benefit agriculture, as a whole. I think it is a field in which the Government will get concessionary grants — maybe not at the time that one gets from the International Development Association, an arm of the World Bank, but sufficiently concessionary that it would be beneficial to agriculture, as a whole. This component has been built in to this scheme, and I congratulate the Government on that aspect of it. I am sure that when the Hon. Minister, in this year, in this Session, makes a report on the performance of the scheme and on his Ministry, he will be able to say that he is answering not only the problems of his constituency in the rural areas of Christ Church, Sir, particularly in the Gibbons area but, that he has helped the honourable Member for St. Philip North too I think in the Sunbury area and in the Hanson area; the honourable Member for St. George South in Windsor. Fortunately, Sir, I did some of the negotiations for the money but, none comes to my constituency, but, it comes to Barbados and that is important, Sir.

But, I really hope that this important project will not pass the Honourable House other than for the well pointed query from the honourable Member for St. Philip North that we would not recognise its significance and, there is something that I think the Ministry in its bulletin should write about. I know that when the honourable Member for St. Andrew was in charge of agriculture his Ministry would publish, on a regular basis, a bulletin called "The Farmer" which was worth reading. I do not know how many members of the public read that bulletin, but, if you read it, as well as reading the bulletin put out by the Sugar Producers Association of Barbados, you would have greater insight as to what is happening in agriculture in Barbados, than listening to some of the criticisms that I hear, from time to time. I hope that the Hon. Minister can also assure us that he is continuing that public relations exercise. The Hon. Minister is very conscious of his public relations, Sir. I know that. I cannot fault him on that, Sir. He is very conscious of his public relations and I hope that therefore, he would push, as far as the public relations of his Ministry is concerned, this aspect of the Integrated Rural Development Scheme.

The question that Head 74, Subhead 19 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Subhead 23.

SUBHEAD 23 — RESEARCH LABORATORY

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: At the time, Sir, of the preparation of the Draft Estimates, 1981–82, in October 1980; the Ministry of Agriculture calculations Sir, with respect to the professional fees in relation to the Central Agronomic Research Laboratory, these Estimates were derived in January 1980 and gave a cost of \$3.6 million, Sir, to the entire project. In March, 1981, after the approval of the 1981–82 Estimates, the consultants advised that the cost of the work, as estimated from the Bill of Quantities for tender would be \$4.95 million. When the two tenders received were opened in April 1981, the lowest fixed price was \$5.2 million and the next was \$7.1 million.

Based on the RIBA scale of fees, Sir, and the lowest tender, the consultants have now submitted claims as follows for the work done up to the time of the award of the contract: Quantity Surveyors \$88,600, Civil and Structural Engineers \$77,900, Architects \$220,200, Electrical and Air-conditioning Consultants \$36,200 making for a grand total Sir of \$423,065.00.

Approximately \$190,000 of these fees were paid during the previous Financial Year and, so, the balance of \$233,000 is due at this time. The provision for professional services in the Estimates 1981–82 is only \$150,000, Sir, and so the supplementary of \$82,000 is being sought to meet the deficit. But since no construction activity is proposed on this project because of the financial situation in the country, we have taken a decision to defer the commencement of the construction of the Central Agronomic Research Lab at Graeme Hall, so, since no construction activity is proposed, Sir, until perhaps 1983, the supplementary is being financed, by the reduction of the amount approved for structures, under this Subhead, by a similar amount.

In short, Sir, there is money in the Estimates, under a different Head — Structures, Sir — and, we are seeking permission, Sir, to as it were transfer the money from Structures to Professional Services. So once again Sir, were we practising virement, there would have been no need for this Resolution.

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

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

The question that Head 74, Subhead 23 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.40 p.m.

HEAD 78 – MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to draw the House's attention to two typographical errors, one of which is of some significance. I think it is line 5 of the relevant portion of the Addendum which should read "1980-81" instead of "1981-82", and about two or three words beyond that for the linguistic purist we correct the grammatical error and substitute "was" for "were". The otherwise stylistically clumsy paragraph is understandable.

This supplementary becomes necessary, Mr. Chairman, because of the unanticipated late delivery of chassis which were ordered in 1980. They did not arrive in Barbados until after the commencement of the financial year April 1981. Consequently, the bodies of these chassis had to be paid for from the Item now under consideration, Head 20 – Item 1. Meanwhile, the Government in its relentless pursuit to ensure that the fleet of the Transport Board is brought up to adequate size ordered 22 Mercedes Benz chassis which arrived in this country in December. The bodies for these chassis are now being built and it therefore becomes necessary for the Ministry to obtain the sum of \$1,074,000 in order to defray the expenses which will be incurred.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the House the breakdown in expenditure is as follows. Under the terms of the contract between the Ministry of Transport and the builder of the chassis, the Ministry is required to make an advance payment of 20 per cent. That works out to \$264,000. It is anticipated that by March 31, the end of the financial year, only 15 of these buses will be delivered to the Transport Board. Therefore, the sum asked for contains the component of \$720,000 which goes toward payment of the bodies of 15 chassis. The third element within the sum requested is \$90,000 which goes towards presumably the Ministry of Finance for the payment of Consumption Tax, \$6,000 Consumption Tax per vehicle. That accounts for the \$1,074,000 that I am requesting this Honourable House to vote for.

Those of us who are concerned with ensuring that our transportation fleet is brought up to standard where we can supply a reliable service will no doubt be happy to support this Resolution which we hope will expedite the day when Barbados will have a much improved transportation service.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Subhead 20, Item 1 stand part of the Resolution.

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

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I was not quite sure whether the Minister was saying that the fabrication

of the bodies for these buses was anticipated to be done in 1980-81, because it appears that the provision of \$3 million appeared in the Estimates for 1981-82, so that what you are in essence asking for is a supplementary to complete the fabrication aspect of it. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the Member would give way, I would like to elucidate the point. It was envisaged that chassis which arrived after April 1981 would have been in Barbados during the financial year 1980-81, and the bodies for these chassis would have been constructed during that financial year. They arrived later during the current financial year and as a consequence it was necessary to take money which was allocated for the construction of bodies which have subsequently arrived, or which have just arrived in December, for those bodies which arrived later, and that is why there has been a shortfall under Capital Expenditure.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the explanation. I would appreciate if the Minister could at some later stage perhaps tell this Honourable House what is the position in relation to his mission to the United States with a view to getting buses. As I understand it, – he had said in the House on a previous occasion that he was proposing to make a trip to the United States of America for the express purpose of securing buses from that market for use in Barbados. At the time he seemed to be brimming with optimism that he could usefully and economically get buses from that source, and perhaps this could be an appropriate time to inform the Honourable House what progress has been made in that direction. I believe he has visited the United States.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this is not the time when I should sort of articulate much more fully at this point in time, the concerns about the public transportation system, but the Minister, the honourable Member for St. Michael East, is always wont to accuse those who criticise his Ministry for lack of originality in their comments in addressing the problems of transport. I think the Minister will find himself that in a small community like ours there is not going to be an awful lot of room for originality in addressing the problems of transport which the society faces, because the problems essentially for all those who want to see – and you do not have to look too far to find them, and you will find in the Minister's own comments there is not much originality emerging, because what he has to be concerned about and what all of us have to be concerned about is the provision of buses.
3.50 p.m.

That is the final responsibility, the provision of a sufficient number of buses to transport the people in this

island who need buses and the setting up of a proper administration to administer the operation of these buses. I mean you do not have to talk too much about originality when you are dealing with basic problems of that sort which have to be addressed. So what in essence is required is the political will to grapple with these problems and to deal with them. Let me assure the Minister that it is going to do him or his Government no good continually harping back as to who was responsible for this, and for that and the other. Time will run out in due course for you because at the end of five years — it is all right in the first five years to talk about the colossal failures of previous administrations — your people will perhaps say, well all right they have had some time, let us see what they are doing.

At the end of ten years you are not going to be in a position to look back and say you have been responsible for this. In your stewardship for five or ten years you are going to have to tell the people why you have not provided us with a proper transport system at this stage. I am urging the honourable Member and all of his colleagues for that matter, not to be continually looking back, perhaps in anger, at what has happened before. Look forward a bit and tell the people of this island what you are doing in relation to the provision of the services which are required for the use of the people of this country.

The honourable Member is wont from time to time to accuse others of confusion in thought, and when sometimes you look at some of the positions taken by honourable Members on the other side, sometimes you wonder who is confused in thought. The honourable Member made comments on the last occasion that he addressed the problems of transport, about a number of institutions which were in one way or another going to be responsible for the administration of the problems of transport in this country. From the speech he made — and he accused me of not understanding what was happening, when one looks back at the record, it is good perhaps that the records are available in time that one can look at them — we see that no less than four institutions according to the Minister are going to be responsible for the problems of transport.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the debates of this Honourable Chamber for Tuesday, December 1, 1981 at page 484, you will find that what the Minister spoke about was a Transportation Authority which was going to be responsible for the problems of all transportation in Barbados. The agency will deal with the totality of transportation in Barbados. One institution. Then at the bottom of the page he talks about the fact that the Board about which the Prime Minister spoke is a different agency and this Board would be set up for the purpose of administering the funds collected by the Transportation Levy.

Thus in a short space of time we have two institutions dealing with transport, an overall agency dealing with the problems of transportation, mark you, which we have heard of, I suggest, for the first time when the Minister spoke on that occasion, then secondly a Board which is going to administer funds collected by virtue of the Transportation Levy. In addition to that, and as I understood the Minister, these two institutions were in no way to replace the existing Transport Board.

At one level or another you had a Transportation Authority dealing with the problem of the overall transport of the island, a Board which was being set up to administer the Transportation Levy, a Transport Board which was presumably going to deal with the day to day problems of buses, and then in addition to that an overall supervisory jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transport and Works. In essence what you have are four institutions for that matter coming to grips with the problems of transport.

Now if you tell me that I am confused about that, I ask you to look at your Debate and explain to this Honourable Chamber what is the position as far as the transportation in this country is concerned, because from reading that Debate and certainly on hearing the honourable Member on the last occasion, I got the impression that we were talking about these three institutions which were going to be in one way or another responsible for the problems of transportation in this country.

Now if that is so, Mr. Chairman, it is to me a massive waste of public funds because you do not need a million and one institutions to deal with what is essentially a single problem, a problem which in essence does not need much imagination to come to grips with. You have to provide buses; that is the first thing. You have to provide proper administration. Without them it is nonsense and foolishness talking about any high-flown and hifalutin and other theories in relation to the transportation system.

Whilst I am on this, perhaps the Minister.....

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way, he is repeatedly committing what logicians call the fallacy of equivocation. He is equivocating on the word "transportation" using it to mean bus transportation as a species of transportation, and then transportation as a genus. He must not do this because in doing this he unwittingly misleads the House. He must use transportation and specify in what context he is using the term "transportation".

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member accuses me unwittingly of misleading the House. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I do not comprehend the written word. I would invite the honourable Member

to look at this Debate, look at his statement on it and tell this Honourable House what this means: "Soon this Chamber will have the benefit of discussing the proposals for the establishment of a Transportation Authority, and I might give him a brief and succinct review of the kind of agency that is envisaged. The Transportation Authority as it is conceived in this early and embryonic stage within my Ministry — it has not yet been submitted to the Cabinet for ratification — is an agency that will deal with the totality of transportation in Barbados."

Within there he accuses me of confusing the issue, but yet he goes on: "The Board that was averted to in the speech by the Prime Minister is a different agency and this Board will be set up for the purpose of administering the funds collected by the Transportation Levy....."

Now is the Minister not saying there are two separate agencies? Can I be accused of being guilty of equivocation if I read the simple English language where he said that there are two different agencies? Can I be guilty of equivocation when I read the language as it stands?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: If the honourable Member would permit me to elucidate with as much patience as I can command, the fact of the matter is that the projected Transportation Authority will deal with all transport in Barbados, not only the bus service, not only public service vehicles, but private transportation as well. The projected Board to administer the Transport Levy funds will be established for the exclusive purpose of administering these funds in so far as they go to equip the Transport Board which deals only with one aspect of transportation, namely, transportation provided by bus service. This is precisely what I mean. When you assimilate the two concepts of transportation, you commit the fallacy of equivocation. You must however, if you want to argue with any degree of liquidity say what kind of transportation you are referring to.

4.00 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this exchange but it is clear that a Transportation Authority is dealing with, among other things, buses. The Board which is to administer the funds is dealing with a collection of funds with buses. The Transport Board is dealing with buses. However you finish, whatever the Minister says, whatever equivocation he is talking about, whenever he is finished at the end of the day you have three separate agencies dealing in somewhere or another with the problems of bus transport and you have above that the overall supervisory jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Now, if I am guilty of equivocation, I accept the charge but that is how I understand it and I think that

is how any rational person reading and hearing what is being proposed in relation to the transportation service will comprehend it.

Now, I said I did not want to dwell on this too long but perhaps the Minister in his statement could also tell us what is the position in relation to the Transportation Levy and the collection of funds under that Levy because, as I understand it, those funds are being collected specifically, among other things, for the purpose of assisting in the purchase of capital investment in the nature of buses, so in essence, as I said before, I do not want to repeat this. Buses are necessary. You have to deal with the problem of roads too and you have to look at the problems of preventive maintenance of your transport equipment because there is no point talking about buying a whole lot of new buses and having your roads in a dilapidated and ridiculous condition because what is going to happen is that the very new buses which you are going to introduce will deteriorate in a big hurry. The old ones are going to be shaken apart if the roads are not in a good state, so these are elementary and fundamental problems which you have to look at and you do not have to try and look for all sorts of original theories to deal with the problems which are essentially basic and down to earth problems which affect the transport industry and the travelling public of this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to speak on this Head?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am indeed interested in the dialectical argument which has ensued between the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and the Minister but let me say right away that the problems of transport in Barbados are nothing new and I think one has to keep repeating this statement because all of a sudden it seems that everybody believes that the present Government and for that matter its Ministers of Transport should, within a short period of time, solve all of the problems which are confronting the Transport Board or indeed solve the problems of our road systems.

I think it is good on occasions such as these to recap a few things, Sir. Those of us who studied the history of Barbados, like my friend, the Hon. Minister and my friend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will recognise that these problems have occurred over and over and over again in Barbados.

We have come full circle today in transport where we are reverting to a position where there are several persons plying their trade in public transport, a situation that pre-existed the semi-nationalisation of the Transport System in the 1950s by the Barbados Labour Party Government and there are many who claim today that the private enterprise participating in transport is more effective than the public transportation authority.

If you read the history between the 1930s and the 1950s, you would see that there were others who claimed that the proliferation of so many small people without adequate resources to re-finance their businesses was harming the proper delivery of a transportation system. I do not know how many people take time to reflect on these matters when they speak or write about them and some of the problems or most of the problems which we are seeing today occur because we have never looked at some of the innate fundamental difficulties of running and updating a proper transportation system in Barbados.

Let me make the obvious point, Sir. It has to be paid for. It is either going to be paid for by those who use the system on a direct fee-paying basis based on the mileage that they travel or it is going to be paid for by the public at large either by way of levy or by way of subsidy. I think it is less than candid of any politician in this House to try to pretend to the public that you get transportation without somebody having to pay the bill.

No matter who is the Government of the day, the Government just cannot print dollars without having it backed by assets in order to provide the basics of a proper transportation system and therefore I do not see that the Government should make any apologies for taking a look at trying to accumulate sufficient capital funds for transportation by way of a levy. It is fair that the levy should be distributed in such a way that those of us who have more should pay more than those of us who have less and that certain marginal economical sectors of our economy like those who are old aged pensioners and those who are in need will get relief from the levy.

As I understand it, that is the way this Minister has conceived and approached the problem of transporting or paying for the transport system. There is nothing basically wrong with the levies. I would wish that the Government could eventually move on to the position where, with the exception of a few visitors to our island, we may be able to provide the cost of transport out of direct levies from a fee-paying system. It may be possible. It is a matter the Minister has to study.

The Minister has reiterated on a number of occasions, one of the other basic problems that has been confronting transport as run by the Transport Board and it is that we look at transport only in terms of how fast a bus is going to be there and that it is going to be on time. We fail to recognise that to ensure that objective, we must have a proper training system within the Transport Authority and we must have a system to prevent accidents and injuries occurring and damage occurring to the transport fleet.

In short, Sir, you need, as the Minister has said before — he and I had completely agreed on this and I

think he has given this a lot of thought — a proper maintenance and preventive section at the Transport Board. This has never been put into the Board. Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, it would be unthinkable for any properly run airport, any properly run air transportation system, to wait until after there is a breakdown to have a way of regularly looking at the engines and dealing with the problems which occur.

4.10 p.m.

Now, the Hon. Minister inherited such a system. Let us get to analysing them, Sir. I do not believe that there is one honourable Member in this Honourable House who has had any responsibility for running a transport system other than myself, and I did it as a school boy. I shared it with my adopted father. So, I am talking from a position that I have seen these things confront the private sector, as well.

And the other point — and a very crucial point too — is that one has to standardise in the transport system. You have to standardise the number of buses. You cannot have five, six, seven and eight different types of buses. You have to have a properly run and accounted for Parts Department. You do not have this. You have to provide enough capital, so that, if a bus breaks down because of engine failure and it is substantial failure, you can lift that engine out, put in a new engine because you have stand-by engines, and get the bus back on the road within less than three hours. None of that has been provided for. And, it has cost factors.

Politicians will be doing the public a world of good and we will get a higher creditability — because I understand journalists are now saying that politicians are at the lowest creditability with the public — if you tell the public that that standard of service means that we have to pay for it. The 27 of us and the 21 in the Senate do not bring money, as though they are *deus ex machina* "dropping from the skies". It has to come out from the public some where and it is less than fair that we continue to discuss these matters, as though you are throwing fault at the feet of a Minister who, in my view is coming to grips with the problem. It is going to take him some time to deal with those problems. I have listed about five areas, and I am sure you will agree with me on those areas that he has to attend to. But, he is deeply conscious of them and it is going to take time.

Now Sir, my friend made a telling point about the state of the roads. I do not know again how many people in Barbados recall the road system. I hear occasionally a lot of foolishness being spoken about the roads in Barbados, that they are worst off than when some of us were children. I was a child over 45, 46 years ago, Sir. I recall walking on marl roads all over Barbados. There were tenantry roads that were never fixed. I do not know how many people think about this and I deny most

strongly that there has not been progress in the last — let us add the last two periods — your stewardship and ours together — 30 years than before we were governed by either of the Democratic socialist parties that have governed this country in the last 30 years. Why would people not be honest and recognise that under the former colonial administration, that when you live in a tenantry, you lived down a mud gap and you could not get in any other way and, that the problems of the mud gap have been attended to since you have had the people's true representatives, the Barbados Labour Party and Democratic Labour Party people attending to them. A lot of people believe that you can do everything in a day. It cannot be done in a day. Obviously we are competing claims.

Once again, the heavy Capital Expenditure of the road must call for money. At one go, I hear them say, the Labour Party increased the taxes. Whenever the Shadow Minister of Finance, who unfortunately is absent from his seat, is speaking, he is talking about an overburdened taxation system. On the other hand, when they are talking about the things that are needed, that you need better roads, you need more transport, you need more schools, you need more books, will politicians be true and tell the people that this must cost more money? I do not know. Either, we are going to ask for higher productivity so that we can deal with these problems..... but, once again, as I understand it, in the last five years more tenantry roads were constructed in this country than at any period in the history of the country.

I have a constituency, Sir, that has some very bad tenantry roads. Nobody will believe that in Christ Church West — they conceive of that constituency as running from Hastings to Worthing and Marine Gardens — nobody remembers the poor people in Bonnetts, nobody thinks of the poor people in Balsam Land, nobody thinks of the poor people in Ventnor Tenantry, nobody thinks of the poor people in Worthing Tenantry but, the honourable Member for St. Andrew — my friend — when he came in recognised that they had as much right to an improved road system as those of us who use the main highways. And, if we have spent some of the money in putting right the tenancies where the persons in the lower socio-economic group in this country have lived, we may be criticised for that, speaking in terms of judgment, but, we cannot be criticised for failing to take steps to deal with the road system.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I know in the Hon. Minister's — I am finishing off Sir — own constituency, it is only recently that some of the people in the Ivy, in Rogers Road, in Gittens Road, in Tichbourne, are seeing the acts of getting proper roads to walk on, since he was in it, Sir. And, he has only been in here a short time. We had 15 years before. But, an effort is being made

and, I think if people are candid, they would see that the Governments are taking steps to try to improve the condition and Barbadians must learn to be patient, in some regard. We must understand that when you go to some of the so called developed countries that some times they are worst off than the standards that we have here. I am not saying, Sir, that we do not need a period of maintenance for our roads. And, I am sure that the Hon. Minister is the first to acknowledge this.

But, I would appeal to my colleagues, in this Honourable House to try and say to the people that we can only achieve all of these things if we have the economic resources to achieve them and, even then, it is going to take time because we have not got the full human resources to do it overnight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister may wind up, please.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister would take the opportunity to update me on something that has been bothering me for a little while.

During the Mini Budget, I drew to the Hon. Minister's attention that it was my opinion that, as a result of an increase of bus fares to children, we would have a lot more absenteeism than you were having before. I have reasons that this has now shown itself in attendance at school. As a matter of fact, I am having a look at a newspaper dated Thursday, January 7 in which some very telling remarks have been made on it. The Hon. Minister, on that occasion, assured the Honourable House that he would see to it that a scheme operating from the Welfare Department was set up, so that any parents having any difficulty would have been able to get the necessary assistance from the department. He also, at that time, was thinking of some way it would have been worked out through the school, in order to remove that type of guilty complex that parents seem to have, when they have to appeal to the Welfare Department for assistance.

I would like the Hon. Minister to update me on two things — whether or not from his Ministry and the Ministry of Education statistics, there has been any evidence to support that the increase in bus fares is causing hardships, in the school attendance, and secondly, how is the scheme working and what use are parents making of it?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, briefly, I will respond to one or two questions which were raised.
4.20 p.m.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central wanted to know what fruit my visit to the United States bore in connection with looking for buses. It is necessary for me to give some explanation as to why the United States of America was identified as one of the sources from which buses could be purchased.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West made the very valid point that any cost efficient transportation fleet best operates on the basis of standardisation, that is, there is an avoidance of a multiplicity of types of vehicles. Ideally, the best kind of standardisation is the purchase of one type of vehicle, and given the preponderance of Leylands in the Transport Board's fleet, it would suggest that we should standardise with Leylands, but everybody knows that the Leyland Company is teetering on the verge of bankruptcy year in and year out, and nobody knows when they will go out of business. It would therefore be to put the public transportation service of Barbados in hazard if one were to standardise with only one type, that is, using Leyland.

When I came into the Ministry, already on order were Mercedes buses from Germany and it became obvious that once we were purchasing Mercedes buses that Mercedes would have to be an element in the standardisation programme. Since there was, and there is still, some considerable doubt as to how long Leyland will remain in business, if we opted for only Leyland and Mercedes we might eventually find ourselves standardising the Mercedes alone, and to put all our eggs in one basket would be too great a risk for the travelling public of Barbados. Consequently, the Transport Board decided that it was in our best interest to standardise at three basic types in order to ensure a more or less reliable supply of spare parts.

There is also another reason for investigating the American market for the purchase of buses. My researches in this matter revealed that Leyland buses were for all practical purposes, assembled vehicles. The Leyland diesel engine is produced by Cummins Manufacturing Company, which is a United States company, the transmission by Rockwell Manufacturing Company, and to the extent that Leyland supplies any of these parts at all, or that any of these parts are produced in England, is based upon the issuance of a licence by these companies in the United States for British counterparts to produce these parts. Therefore, the economies of the situation required us to go at the source. If in fact the Leyland which we have been buying is an assembled vehicle, assembled from American made parts, then it would seem if we went to the United States of America to buy vehicles that

we would be able to get them more cheaply, and this is precisely what our investigations revealed.

Now the Transport Board fleet will in time have fuel efficient small units with a capacity of around 29 to 30 passengers, and the best technical advice suggests that the best of these small buses are produced in the United States of America.

Now the business of buying buses is not as simple as the business of buying sugar cakes, and therefore we must enter into it with proper circumspection. We feel that any prospective vendor of buses must come to Barbados, look at the roads, examine the topography of the country in order to anticipate faults and therefore prevent the disaster visited upon us by the purchase of Seddon vehicles. I hate to mention it, but I believe it is at the core of much of the financial problems that exist in the Transport Board today. Therefore, the business of shopping for buses must be entered into thoughtfully, circumspectly, and we must proceed with deliberate caution. That is what is being done.

If I were not a responsible Minister, addicted to squandermania, I could flood Barbados with American buses which you might see breaking down on the side of the road day in and day out, but we must make certain that whenever we spend the precious tax dollar of the workers of this country that we do so with an abundance of caution.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central made an extremely valid point when he talked about the possibility of overlaying the administration of transport in this country by too many bureaucratic agencies. Most Ministers must be very conscious and sensitive to bureaucratic obstacles, and the intention behind the point is well taken, but because there are several agencies of Government dealing with a particular subject, it does not mean that there are any encumbrances of bureaucracy. It would be impossible for any agency in Government not to deal with a multiplicity of agencies.

The Transport Board has to deal with the Licensing Authority; it is unavoidable. It has to deal with the Customs; it is unavoidable. It has to deal with the Ministry of Finance; it is unavoidable. It is in the nature of things that any operation in Barbados, private or Government, must deal with a multiplicity of Government agencies, but its relationships must be so ordered that bureaucratic obstacles will be kept at a very minimum.

I understand the intention of the Member, but if he is saying that the projected creation of the body to administer the Transport Levy and the Transportation Authority will constitute encumbrances to the proper

functioning of transportation in Barbados, I believe that he will find that he will be pleasantly mistaken. If his comments are a warning, the point is taken. If he is asserting that these agencies are unnecessary, that is a different matter altogether, and he has not demonstrated that they are unnecessary in the administration of transport in its totality, or bus transport in Barbados.
4.30 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North referred to a number of children who are absenting themselves from school and asked about statistics in this matter. I believe that this is a question more appropriately put to the Minister of Education. I myself do not know of any causal relationship between the increase of bus fares and an increased absenteeism within the Ministry of Education. However, only last week when the officers in my own Ministry and the officers in the Ministry of Education....(Asides) That is not the Bible, that is a viewpoint of individuals, and I believe in data being produced in a scientific manner. I do not rely on commonsense; I rely on scientific analysis.

Mr. Chairman, when these officials dragged their heels over working out a system whereby parents could get relief within the transfer system, I gave an order within my Ministry that the Ministry of Education as long as it is administering this programme automatically give free transfers to any parent for every third or more child. In short, if a person has two children at school, that person will have to pay for the transfers. If that person has three children at school, he will get one transfer free; four children at school, two transfers free; and I hope that there will be no delay in implementing this.

Mr. Chairman, one final point made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, a very good point, is that there is an inter-relationship between a cost effective bus service and proper roads, and it is precisely because of this that the projected Transportation Levy has two components, one relating to the purchasing of vehicles and other equipment for the Transport Board, and allocations for the development and maintenance of a proper road system. It is because this Government recognised that the two things were inextricably linked that the projected Transportation Levy contains a dual purpose funding component, one for transportation and the other for roads. That is why my Ministry in the coming year will proceed to move with the same decisiveness on roads as we have moved within the transportation sector, and I hope that next year at this time when we come back here we will have in place all of the systems that are necessary to ensure cost effectiveness within the Transport Board and a reliable service.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central said there is no scope for originality in thinking

in relation to the problems of the Transport Board. I categorically deny this fatalistic outlook, Mr. Chairman because if what he is saying is that all of the options.....

Mr. M. A. KING: On a point of elucidation. I have not said that there is no room for originality in addressing the problems of transport. I think the honourable Member for St. Michael East is going a bit far when he accuses me of saying that there is no room for originality. What I have been saying is that you do not have to try to work up all sorts of elaborate concepts about a transport system when you have to deal with certain fundamental problems first; deal with the problem of acquisition of buses, financing, repairs and proper administration of the Board. That is the point I am making.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, those are mere words, but behind those words stand very complex problems, and I know there is a great craving on the part of the honourable Member for simplicity, but the persistent view that the problems are simple problems which can be wished away by uttering words has led to the deplorable state in which public transport is today. These are complex problems and admit only of complex solutions. The old nostrums of the past, the simplistic nostrums of the past have palpably failed and will be disregarded, and there must now be new and fresh thinking on the complex problems and this new and fresh thinking will be and has been already brought to bear on these problems by this Minister, and we hope that in the foreseeable future this House and the country will see the results of this.

The question that Head 78 – Ministry of Transport – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

LEAVE FOR EXTENSION OF DEBATE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I held a little discussion with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I am seeking the leave of the House, since there is an agreement on the Other Side, to extend for one hour the time allotted for this debate. This debate obviously should go for three hours and I think there are about fifteen minutes to go; so I am seeking leave of the House to have the time extended. I have discussed this with the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition to extend the time for one hour over the allotted time for this debate.
4.40 p.m.

Sir, if you want me to put it in a very formal manner, I beg to move, Sir, that this Sitting be extended for one hour over the allotted time, Sir, of which we were discussing in Committee consideration of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very reluctant to entertain such a motion at this stage of the debate. It would have been much tidier for the proceeding of this House if before we entered upon this debate that a decision had been reached and we had made the necessary motion at that stage, but it certainly does not appear to be very happy. I have been advised that both sides of the House seem willing to entertain the motion but personally I do not see that we are doing what is right. It seems to be making a mockery of the Standing Orders of this House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, dealing with the Order. I think that Your Honour may be slightly misinformed because when we entered upon Government Business we had no idea that there would have been a filibuster of two hours and forty-five minutes or that the debate on less than \$2 million in a Resolution that encompasses some considerable amount of money in excess of \$2 million, \$7,320,855; that two small items would have ensued two hours and forty-five minutes of the allotted time of three hours.

When it emerged in the course of the debate that time was running out, some consultation took place between the Leader of the House and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the House, as I understand it, indicated that he would be willing to ask for leave for the allotted time to be extended. Less than 15 minutes now remain of the allotted time by Standing Order No. 72, less than 15 minutes and if the proper motion is put and if Your Honour allows a motion to be put at this stage, in my opinion, the motion should be that Standing Order No. 72 be suspended for the rest of the day's Sitting. That is subject, of course, to Your Honour's interpretation as to what should be done and certainly not the motion that has been put by the Leader of the House that we extend the time because we cannot extend the time unless we suspend the Standing Orders.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I agree that.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If I may conclude, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two honourable Members on their feet.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I appreciate all the honourable Member is saying, Sir. The time for the debate of this Resolution is three hours and that is the end of the debate when we reach that. I withdraw my motion, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to conclude, Sir, but with any extension, Sir, when the proper motion is put certainly we could not adequately deal with a motion of this kind in one hour when the introducer of the Resolution himself may take 59 minutes, if he felt so disposed, in introducing the Resolution.

A lot of small people out there have been waiting for a considerable period of time for their money. We could not do justice to a Resolution like this extending it for an hour or so. There has never been any agreement on This Side, Sir, that is why I said that you may have been misinformed that we should extend to an hour if the proper motion is put. That is all I want to say, Sir. I hope that I have been as short as the circumstances would allow me to be.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to be heard on this motion. There are ways of doing things. The honourable Member introduced into this House, when he was Prime Minister, a time limit on supplementaries. As far as I can recall, this is the first time that an extension has been sought and agreed to by a Government. As far as I can recall. Maybe it has happened, but I cannot recall.

We agreed to extend, the Leader of the House agrees to extend so that the Carifesta \$7 million or \$5 million, whatever it is, can be discussed and now we must get up and have the Leader of the Opposition tell us that we are filibustering. You have to learn some manners; that is the answer. We are filibustering — trying to accommodate the Opposition and are accused of filibustering. Know your place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. I cannot have.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Not you, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The motion we have before the House is now withdrawn, Mr. Speaker. (ASIDES) Trying to accommodate you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. We must have some order. We must have some order. I do not propose hearing any other honourable Member on the proposal from the Hon. Leader of the House. What I mean to say is this. It must be appreciated if the Government made an offer to accommodate the Opposition by having this particular item debated, in view of the fact that the time limit only affords another 15 minutes.

I have heard from the Leader of the Opposition and it is upon hearing the Leader of the Opposition that confirms in me that the Chair is right not to entertain such a motion for the simple reason the Order Paper was circulated to all honourable Members, both sides of the House. Both sides had ample opportunity during which to plan and arrange business as it should have been conducted in this Honourable House today. In view of this, I have already expressed the reluctance to entertain the motion. I am now more than convinced that I am right in refusing to entertain the motion at this stage. 4.50 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you have to hear me on this Sir. Sir you said while making your comment that I made an offer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. First, let me get the record straight. That is not true. The Leader of the Opposition asked me, during the course of this debate — the Deputy Sir, the Deputy Leader Sir. Not you, I do not talk to you. I do not talk to you. The Deputy Leader. Not you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: He is shouting at me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do not shout at you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You idiot. Do not shout at who? Errol Barrow?

Mr. SPEAKER: Both honourable Members will take their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do not shout at you?

Mr. SPEAKER: Both honourable Members will take their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You had better know your place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked both honourable Members.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I apologise Sir. Sir, I want to make the position clear. I have to make the position clear, Sir, for Hansard.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, during the course of this debate, inquired of me, if it would be all right, if we do not get through with two Subheads, Sir, when we come to the Head CARIFESTA, if I would extend the Sitting, so as to accommodate debate. I told him that I had to discuss this with my colleagues but as far as I was concerned, Sir, I had no objection.

Out of my courtesy and out of trying to accommodate Members on the Other Side, Sir, this is what we get, Sir. Then, you hear that we try to stifle debate. I want to make this very clear that I went out of my way to try to accommodate the honourable Members on the Other Side and, this is what we have got out of this. (ASIDE) Know your place Errol Barrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, the Hon. Leader of the House is offending the Rules of the Honourable House. And, just saying, "I am sorry" is not enough.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I apologise Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman, has reported progress and has asked for leave to sit again.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

HEAD 79 — MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Subhead 31: Other Venues and Festival Villages

Subhead 32 — Carifesta

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the funds being sought in this Resolution are to meet long outstanding Bills for CARIFESTA which was hosted in Barbados in July and August last year. It was necessary for the Ministry of Information and Culture and the Ministry of Finance and Planning to go through the large number of Bills and Statements of expenditure that was incurred during the festival and bring before Parliament a completed set of accounts.

We are now seeking, in this supplementary Mr. Speaker the sum of \$5,984,855. There are some things, Mr. Chairman, that I think should be put on record. I want, first of all to deal with the Capital Expenditure for CARIFESTA. We built at West Terrace, in St. James, Sir, permanent and impermanent buildings to the tune of \$5.8 million. Now, there are two permanent structures at West Terrace and long before the festival started we had discussions with the Ministry of Housing, the National Housing Corporation and Richard Gill Associates and we sought to integrate any capital construction for CARIFESTA into the long range planning of these departments in their building programme. And, we were told that in the site at West Terrace, the National Housing Corporation intended to build a super-

market and this was in the development plan way back in the 1960s and early 1970s, a supermarket to service the thousands of houses in that area and we were also told that they needed another building which the National Housing Corporation would have constructed — for the provision of a number of shops, space for banking facilities, druggists facilities and so on. We took a look at the plan for the area and constructed, exactly on the site in accordance with the instruction and the direction of the National Housing Corporation, the two buildings that they wanted.

That was some \$5.8 million, Sir, for the two buildings down there which would cost far more now if you were building at this time. But, more important, Sir, there are an investment that was always intended to be made both by the Democratic Labour Party when they were the Government and by this Government, to provide much needed facilities in West Terrace for the houses in that area.

We also had two temporary buildings down there, Sir, and in our effort not to waste any of the expenditure, we sought to find out, before we started construction of any building, what use the buildings could be put to after CARIFESTA. One of the temporary buildings was earmarked before I myself left the Ministry of Education, to replace the St. Saviour's Primary School in St. Andrew. Now, I remember when I was in that Ministry, Sir, that the cost of a new primary school to house the numbers that are in the St. Saviour's School would be in the vicinity of \$1 million. One of the buildings at West Terrace, is to be used for housing the children of St. Saviour's in St. Andrew.

There is one other building, Sir, and there are some plans also for this building, Sir. The police have intimated to me Sir, that at District 'A' in Station Hill, the police up there do not have the facilities for eating, cooking and so on, indeed, there is not enough room for the public which comes to pay licences and so on. And, the other building, I expect would very shortly be transferred to the District 'A' compound for the use of the police, Sir. Now Sir, this is \$5.8 million in Capital Expenditure that has remained for use in this generation and indeed, in the case of the permanent building for posterity. Now, I mention this to point out Mr. Chairman, that it is all part of the development of West Terrace, that it is not at all incompatible with the National Housing Corporation's plan for that area.

Now, we have \$3.5 million in theatre stock. The Barbados Labour Party Manifesto of 1976 says as follows:-

"The BLP considers cultural development to be an integral and vital part of the process of national

development and the emergence of an enlightened citizenry. That is why we are committed to providing wider opportunities, better facilities, and the encouragement of mass participation in the entire range of cultural and artistic pursuits."

5 p.m.

Now in consonance with this clearly articulated policy of the Barbados Labour Party, we have all during the course of the last years been from time to time telling the public of Barbados, quite often on the floor of this very House, Sir, what were our plans for cultural development and the provision of facilities for cultural development in this country. It is a shame, Sir, that for so many years up to the point in which Barbados has reached the stage of development which it has reached that it has not been able to boast of any serious theatre, any theatre equipped with the basics that would suit the needs of a society such as ours. We have spent some money on the Queen's Park Theatre, the Queen's Park Steel Shed and the Combermere School, and brought them up to a highly acceptable level for performances such as are spreading out through Barbados at this time, Sir; \$3.5 million.

Now, we have upgraded two secondary schools. I have had a number of complaints repeatedly, including a complaint from one of the honourable Members on the Other Side, about the state and condition of the Ellerslie School. We have had the opportunity during CARIFESTA to take some money and upgrade that school, as indeed we have done in spending some money on the St. James Secondary School, and I believe that bill comes to less than half a million dollars.

There are other expenditures, Sir. We have now half a million dollars in equipment for theatre stock; lights, sound equipment and the whole set of it, Sir, and indeed part of the expenditure of CARIFESTA has been to provide sleeping facilities for a number of our guests. We have bought a number of beds, and the beds have now been distributed — not handed out, Sir — to the Government Industrial Schools, the Christ Church District Hospital, the Psychiatric Hospital, the Geriatric Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Golden Rock Child Care Centre and the Defence Force. These are not extras, Sir, these Departments I have just called usually have their annual Estimates provision for beds, etc., and all that has happened is that no provision will be made in the Estimates of 1982-83 for beds for those Departments. These beds that we purchased for use during CARIFESTA will be used in those Departments. What I have just stated is over \$10 million.

I have been hearing a lot of wild reports about excess expenditure and all that. I do not know about any excess expenditure, Sir. At no point, to my know-

ledge, was there any expenditure over and above what was supposed to be spent, but this \$10 million, slightly more than \$10 million, represents a permanent addition to capital stock in this country.

Now, two interesting things were said, Mr. Chairman, during the course of a debate today. One was said by the honourable Member for St. Michael West who said that profit and loss is not the only consideration in development of a country, and the honourable Member for St. Michael South, also on the Opposition benches, said that we cannot think of agriculture in terms of profit and loss, dollars and cents. The honourable Member for St. Michael South cannot think of agriculture in terms of profit and loss, and I on This Side cannot think of culture in terms of profit and loss and dollars and cents.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that this Government try to address itself to many of the problems that confront this society. We believe, and we believe fairly fervently, that there must be a cultural dimension to development, that there must be a conjunction of the spiritual and the temporal. We believe, Sir, that there must be a reconciliation of the material and aesthetic. It is therefore necessary for us to think in terms of discovering, devising and transforming the material means of existence in our society, and we should deepen the moral, spiritual and cultural bonds in our society. It is important that we do this if the people of this country are to see the distinction and live the distinction between having and being, Sir.

A lot of discussion at the political level deals with what man has in terms of money; income, GDP and all these things, and very little deals with what is man quintessentially, and we are concerned about that. The primordial instinct of man, Sir, is to seek to attain a better quality of living, and in seeking to acquire a better quality of living I would throw out to the Honourable House, Sir, the statement of St. Thomas of Aquinas, who was commenting in a treatise on Aristotle, and he said: "*genus humanum arte et gratione vivit*", and for those people who did not go to school too long, Sir, it means that the human race lives and will survive through the application of art and reason. What St. Thomas was saying is an age old saying, and it is also in the Bible, that man cannot live by bread alone, that there has to be another dimension.

I remember, Sir, about three years ago — I think it was in 1979 — that His Holiness Pope Paul II said in Paris: "I am a son of a nation which has been through great vicissitudes of fortune. Its neighbours have condemned it on a number of occasions to death, but yet it has managed to survive." And he said it survived, Sir, not through force of arms or physical force, but solely by relying on its culture. That is His Holiness

Pope Paul II, and I am proud to adopt the words of His Holiness as my own, Sir. I think what he was also saying was that there is a primacy of people over things, and that there is a superiority of spirit over matter.

In my final minute, let me say this, Sir. I hope that we will be able to get into this debate. I am sorry that the Opposition ran from it, because there are a lot of things to say, but I will close by saying that the expenditure on CARIFESTA, as far as I understand it, is in the vicinity of \$10.2 million and is applied to capital structures that will remain as part of the heritage of Barbados.

The question that Head 79 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I am seeking your guidance in a matter concerning this debate, as I understand that under the Standing Orders debate on the amount of money has reached the point of time.
5.10 p.m.

The Rules as I understand them require that a certain amount of time must be allocated to the debate. I wish the Chair's guidance however in the matter of an amendment which has been submitted duly and correctly under the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just take your seat a minute. This matter that you seek to raise now has been dealt with by the House. I am sorry the honourable Member did not come in a little bit earlier.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Your Honour report to His Honour the Speaker, the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, with amendment.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative. A division was called for.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain your point of order. At this stage it is completely out of order. I just wish to consult with the Clerk at this stage.

(Mr. Chairman consulted with the Clerk).

I want to say now that I cannot entertain a division on this. The Head has been passed, there was no call for a division at that time, and on a motion to report the passing of the Resolutions I cannot entertain it, and I

now understand that it has been withdrawn; so I will report accordingly to His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

**THE BARBADOS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY
(EXTENSION OF FRANCHISE) ACT, 1982**

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, to move the second reading of a Bill to make provisions respecting the extension of a franchise granted to the Barbados Light and Power Company.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, under and by virtue of the provisions of an Act passed in the early part of this century, the Electric Company was given a franchise for a period of 42 years ending in August 1986. The company does not have a monopoly on the supply of electricity in Barbados. Indeed the Act is a regulatory Act rather than a concessionary Act, but the Electric Light and Power Act does require that any company that wishes to sell electricity to another person has to have a franchise. Section 5 (1) of the Act does say that the Minister may from time to time, by provisional order, grant to any local authority, company or person the right, which may include an exclusive right, to supply electricity for any public or private purposes within any area and for such period as the Minister may think proper, but subject to the following provisions of this Section and so on.

It is a complicated and somewhat obscure provision of law that not only has the Minister got to make an order, but the order is not confirmed by Resolution of Parliament. It has to be confirmed by an Act, and this is why we have a Bill before us and not merely a Resolution confirming the order. We are not giving the Electric Company any right it does not now have. All we are doing is allowing it to carry on its business after 1986 when the present 42 year period expires.

The reason why it is necessary to come a few years in advance is that the current expansion going on at Spring Garden which is a very substantial one indeed, involving the spending of \$US1 million, I believe — and part of which is guaranteed by the Government — is necessarily being financed in arrangements that will extend far past 1986. One of the conditions laid down by the World Bank when the Government was negotiating for the Electric Company to be loaned this money was that the Government guarantee and that we give the

Electric Company a franchise to ensure that it would be in business during the period of repayment of the loan. The loan has been examined in depth on the occasion of the debate on the guarantee, and I do not think that there is any quarrel about the terms of the loan. The company's policies have been discussed and the rate fixing arrangement analysed, but I do not think that the terms of the loan from the World Bank came under any criticism, and this matter of extension of the franchise basically is part of the terms of the loan.
5.20 p.m.

The Government therefore has brought this Act at this time so that we can complete the free conditions and allow disbursements of the World Bank's fund to the contractors and so on who are building new works for power generating at the Spring Garden site.

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

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

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

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SPEAKER, left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN, reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 2.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ABANDONMENT OF
ACQUISITION OF A PARCEL OF LAND, THE
PROPERTY OF TEXACO WEST INDIES
LTD. SITUATE AT SPRING GARDEN,
BRIGHTON, BLACK ROCK,
ST. MICHAEL

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1979 the Caribbean Petro-Chemical Limited, a company that was registered in Barbados with a major shareholding in Italy sought an area of land to set up a business operation. Approaches were made to the IDC with a view to supplying this land for the siting of this chemical factory. The Ministry of Lands proceeded with the acquisition of a portion of land which was owned by Texaco Limited. The purpose, Mr. Speaker, was to hand over the land to the IDC which would in turn make it available to the petro-chemical industry.

Between the years 1979 and 1981 it became evident that this industry or plant would not get off the ground and it was therefore felt that it was best to return to this Honourable Chamber which had previously approved the acquisition of that land and seek approval to abandon that acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I need not remind this Honourable Chamber that that is the course which the abandonment of land which was previously acquired and had Parliamentary approval should take and hence this Resolution — I am sure the Addendum itself is self-explanatory — is before this Honourable Chamber.

I must say that the Government in pursuing the acquisition or making this land available to the setting up of this petro-chemical plant considered the fact that it would have had beneficial effects for Barbados. It would have provided employment for the people of this country and at the same time it would have brought to Barbados a chemical industry from which the technical advice and knowledge would have been of a benefit to this country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore in introducing this Resolution and with those few remarks beg to move that this Resolution to abandon an area of land as set out in the Addendum do now pass.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just a very brief contribution to this matter. In the course of researching this matter, Sir, I draw to the attention of the Government that it would appear that there is an error as to the acquisition.
5.30 p.m.

The debate — the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Brighton Black Rock was done in May. I thought I heard the honourable Member say something about 1979 — it was done in May 1980. In any case, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I cannot indicate that I am sorry to hear that we will not be having a petro-chemical plant, in that particular area. I cannot say that I am sorry to hear that because I recall that when this matter was debated, in this Honourable House, I made what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister described as an impassioned speech concerning the protection of that area of the coastline in Barbados and the need for very careful and meticulous examination of a decision to put a petro-chemical plant on that particular spot, to examine the product which would be produced there more, particularly in regard to the effluents which would have been flowing from this plant into the sea and into the surrounding area. So, I cannot say, at all, that I personally am sorry to hear that there will not be a petro-chemical plant, in that area. I have no doubt that there are good and sufficient reasons why the abandonment of the project has been agreed to or has been decided and I would like to feel that the speech which I made might have impelled the authorities to examine the thing, in some cases. But, that is not the point I rise to make, Sir.

The point I want to draw to the Government's attention is that precisely, for the reasons which we discussed about why they ought not to be a petro-chemical plant in that area, I would have thought, in the context of the policy outlined by the former Hon. Minister responsible for the Environment on the preservation of the coastal areas — and it is his desire to have the environment as closely preserved as possible — and in the context of speeches made in this Honourable House on both sides, that the Government might have taken this opportunity of acquiring the land to maintain control of it, to maintain the guarantee, as it were, that that land would only be used, in a particular way, over the coming years — I do not recall what was the amount of money envisaged for payment of the land and it may very well be that the original owners of the land might have sought to have the land returned to them, if the Government had determined that it was not going to use it for the purpose for which it was acquired, the specific purpose. But, so long as the Government was going to be using it for a public purpose, it is well established that that principle would stand.

I wonder, if the Government gave any consideration to retaining ownership of that particular piece of land and, thereby, guaranteeing that it would be preserved as part of the environmental management and development of that coastline. That area, Sir, may be described as a honey pot area, and already, there is enough debate in this Honourable House on the need to be extremely careful with our coastline.

Texaco, I believe have no immediate plans from what one sees and hears for using the land for industrial purposes. But, it may very well be that since the Government itself had determined that it could put a petro-chemical plant on that spot, that Texaco or the owners might consider it desirable to examine their sale of the land at perhaps, a higher remuneration than they would have got had the Government acquired it; for purposes not similar, but at the same time equally destructive. It would seem to me that the Government might give some consideration, if they have not done so or at least indicate to us, on This Side, if they have done anything to retain this land for environmental purposes.

That area, Sir, has suddenly become very very populated with a number of houses. I do not know if honourable Members have been going down into what is literally in the seacoast. There is a flat area that extends far in excess of half of a mile from the edge of the sea and a large number of houses, in spite of the fact of the development and the movement of certain houses, over on the side near to Texaco, a substantial amount of development has suddenly been springing up and while it is true that the houses that are being built are largely of the board variety, these houses are intended for the tourist industry. And, it seems to me therefore Mr. Speaker that between Texaco and the Light and Power Co. on the one side and the Paradise Beach Hotel and the other developments going up the hill on the other, Government may very well consider it desirable to re-examine their decision to abandon this acquisition, Sir.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take the points raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, but Cabinet has really looked into this matter to see whether it was wise to either release the land and give it back to the owners or whether they should proceed and compensate the owners and have it landscaped or retained for environmental purposes. In Cabinet's considered opinion, it was felt that the land should go back to the owners because it belongs to Texaco Limited and they are willing and prepared to make good use of it. It would have been a very expensive exercise for the Government and, Government has therefore decided to abandon the acquisition of that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item No. 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 5 is the Instant Order of the day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF SEVERAL PARCELS OF LAND AT BONNETTS, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution calls for the acquisition of some parcels of land, in order to expand a development already undertaken by Government in the Bonnetts area. Cabinet had earlier decided that a number of parcels of land should be acquired to make way for a development, and, in order to facilitate the building of phase (1) this Honourable Chamber was asked or invited to approve the acquisition of an area of land which is now used for the purpose of building terrace units at Bonnetts.
5.40 p.m.

All this Resolution seeks to do Mr. Speaker, is to acquire other areas of land adjacent to the present development so that a more orderly development can take place and that the necessary roads can be provided for this expanded housing development. I am sure that all honourable Members will appreciate the fact that there is a need for more and more housing, more orderly development of housing and better planning in the development of housing, and to this end, this acquisition seeks to realise what Government feels is a better policy in respect of housing.

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

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Christ Church East has seconded the Resolution, but I would like to third it, if that is possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very intense and deep interest in this Resolution since it relates to one of the most important parts of Christ Church — the area of Christ Church stretching between Reservoir Road and Club Morgan Road and it involves a section of the constituency of Christ Church West which has been in need of development for several years.

I believe, Sir, that it was in 1978 that I approached the then Minister of Housing and Lands, the Hon. Leader of the House, and drew to his attention that there was a large area of Christ Church West in the Bonnetts area completely lacking in any proper system of roads, no provision was made for any playing fields or recreational facilities, that in some 46 percent of the cases there was no pipe-borne water or proper toilet facilities. It was not long before he responded promptly to my call and had a survey done of the area confirming the statements that I

had drawn to his attention, and together with the officers of his Department and of the National Housing Corporation he visited the area and within a very short period of time he brought the relevant Cabinet Paper before the Cabinet of Barbados, and got the approval of the Planning and Priorities Committee for this project.

I would like to say that the project has some features that I would like to see repeated in developments such as in our housing developments in the area, and I want to give the credit for the conception to the Hon. Leader of the House.

In this development it is proposed to have 68 terraced houses. In addition, we have made sure that none of the persons who were living on house spots there are removed, but they are being resited and their toilet and water facilities are being upgraded at the same time. Proper roads are being constructed; light facilities, utilities are being put in. There is a provision in the second phase of this project for a day care centre, there is provision as well for small shops for craftsmen who could ply their business in the area, and there is provision as well not only for a playing field, but for multi-purpose courts.

Sir, I believe that that is the correct approach and conception to proper house planning, and I am sure the honourable Member for St. Philip North, who I know shadows the present Minister of Housing, will approve of this type of total development for the area. But there is more, Sir. I am aware that both Ministers have also been talking to the Natural Gas Corporation about bringing in natural gas for the area, to the Post Office authorities for putting in post box facility, to the Telephone Company for a public telephone system, so that we will have a total community in Bonnetts, and I am deeply indebted to the Ministers, the former Minister and the present Minister, for this whole conception for Bonnetts.

The people of Bonnetts, Sir, have had to wait a long time for this. My predecessor in here, Mr. Patsy Springer, very soon after he became a Member of Parliament introduced a Resolution calling on his then Government to acquire this same pasture, referred to as Bourda or Crane pasture, for providing playing fields for the area and upgrading the facilities. That Resolution never saw the light of day. He told me when I came into the House that I could try but he was sure they would turn it down, Sir. Back in 1974 or 1975 the then Minister of Housing and Lands, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West, started an enquiry again about the acquisition pursuant to a question, I believe, that I had asked on the matter, and again nothing came of it. So I am very happy that it has fallen to the lot of this Government and to the two Ministers whom I have mentioned to have been able to bring about this project.

The project is proceeding at the moment. I had hoped that by now we would have finished the first phase of the construction of the houses, but I am assured by the Hon. Minister that some time soon after April some of the houses in the first phase will be completed and tenants will be allowed to move in.

I want to make a point, Sir, that I hope the National Housing Corporation and its Tenants Committee will bear in mind, and I am sure the Minister himself will ensure that it is borne in mind. There are several persons in the surrounding areas of Bonnetts who are now living in overcrowded facilities.

In one particular house, for instance, I know that there is a mother, a father, and 13 other people, including relatives, living in a chattel house with one bedroom, a normal sitting room, a shedroof and no proper toilet facilities, and they have been waiting for several years to get a proper house at least to relieve some of this overcrowding.

I have spoken to the Minister on this point and I have written a letter to the National Housing Corporation that wherever possible priorities should be given to the persons resident in that and surrounding areas who have demonstrated a clear need for housing of this nature, and I know of at least over 120 people in the area — ranging from about the Bay Land, going up to Worthing View and involving Flagstaff and parts of Brittons Hill as well — who have come and spoken to me who have a justification for rehousing in an area such as this.

I am making the point very clear, Sir, because in many instances they are already established there, their children are going either to the schools at Bayville, or St. Paul's or the surrounding area, some of them are working in near areas and therefore they should have as little disruption as possible.
5.50 p.m.

I believe that priorities should be given to those with families in preference to individuals, and that those in the surrounding areas should be satisfied first. I am saying this, Sir, because I will really be deeply disappointed if after the struggle that I have had to bring this matter to the attention of the Government and with the assistance of my colleagues both the former and the present Minister of Housing to have got so far, I then find that the people at Bonnetts and Club Morgan, Flagstaff and Forde Road feel themselves frustrated by the whole exercise and see people from other areas with less deserving circumstances benefiting from the development in the area.

The other point I should like to draw to the Minister's attention is that in part of Bonnetts — the tenantry

just to the north-west of these lands that are being acquired — there is a very bad drainage problem, and indeed with a little downpour of rain at times, people in these areas can find themselves cut off from the main Brittons New Road and Bonnetts Road as we know it. I have written on several occasions to the Ministry of Transport and Works asking for proper wells to be put in, and particularly I am referring to the area near to Mr. Neville Osbourne's wall. I see that we are acquiring right up to his wall as well as an area near to what was formerly Mrs. Greenidge's residence as one perceived Mr. Jones' land, and we are now acquiring some of Jones' land to bring the road right back down to this area. *(Asides)*

My friend the honourable Member for St. Michael West said that I have made the point, but I know how fond he is of his constituents, and I can assure him that in intensity I am no less fond of mine, and particularly an area that has consistently supported me — I think I got 85 per cent of the votes last time in that area, and I must put their case very strongly, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will allow me to do so within the time allotted to me. I am asking the Minister if in the planning he could plan — because he is going to have to re-align some of these houses — to provide proper drainage facilities for this area.

Sir, in the area that he has acquired right next to the lands belonging to the Caves and to Mr. Neville Osbourne as well, he will have to re-align the houses there and give some security of tenure to some of the old people. We have some pensioners in that area and I am asking him if in conjunction with his colleague responsible for Housing Welfare that the opportunity be taken to repair the houses of the old age pensioners in that area and to give them some proper toilet facilities as well. Some of them need it.

The final point I want to make on this Resolution is that there has been some delay in settling the entitlement of persons in the area of compensation for the lands being acquired. That is a fact. Now Sir, the other thing that has happened is that the Valuation Committee has offered for similar land and adjoining land different prices. In one case they offered 80 cents a square foot, another one they offered 89 cents, another bit they offered 91.5 cents and the people cannot understand this because it is adjoining areas and it seems to me that it is good land, a lot of it is very good building land and there is no reason why the Valuation Committee should vary in such a short area in its estimate of what should be paid for the areas of land being acquired. I know this would not be a ministerial decision, but I am making it so that the Minister can become aware of it, because I have been making representation in the cases of some of the persons about the sort of price being paid for the areas of land being acquired.

I want to assure the Minister that I am grateful for the personal interest which he has been taking in the project and the efforts which he is now making to ensure that the project should go ahead at full speed. I recognise that they will have to go over to the next financial year for additional funds to be provided for it, but I hope that we will not just stop at phase one, and indeed I take his assurance having regard to this Resolution that this Resolution would help him to begin on the planning of phase two and to complete the whole project. I believe that it will become a model area and one of which both his predecessor and himself should be properly proud, and I am sure that this is one part of his performance in which the Shadow Minister will find nothing to criticise but everything to praise, except the Shadow Minister may ask for something similar in St. Philip North.

I have much pleasure therefore in seconding this Resolution and asking that the House pass it unanimously, and I look forward to celebrating with the good people of Bonnetts when we have completed this project. I can assure the Minister that he will have the complete support of the residents in this area, and no word of praise on this matter would be too great for the former Minister. I know he has taken some stick from people. He can hold his own. He does not really need anything, but I must confess, and I must let it be known, that the speed with which he responded is the sort of speed which I expect of outstanding Ministers who perform well in their Ministries, and he has certainly responded extremely well and extremely quickly and with dynamism in answering this problem. I think that history should record this on his behalf as an outstanding piece of work.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I think that I should respond to a few points raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church West. It is part of Government's policy — and shortly I will be pursuing this policy more vigorously — to have a total development of the area. My predecessor did commit himself to this policy and I wish to give him an assurance that I fully endorse the concept of total development.

On the question of the destruction of families, I am fully aware that this has and can lead to social problems — that is, putting families in an area that is totally foreign to them — and I have decided in my policy and I have also discussed this with the National Housing Corporation and the Committee there, that they should wherever possible try to resite people within their community area or as near to this community as much as possible. I would like to assure this Honourable Chamber that I feel that there should be no disruption and if there is disruption there should be a minimal amount of disruption whenever people or families have got to be resited in other areas.

On the question of drainage, this is part of proper planning and I for one, will not allow any housing development to take place — surely if it means Government's direct involvement — without being satisfied that there is adequate and proper drainage in that development. It has caused lots of concern and certainly it has brought about a lot of criticism of this Government and other Governments, and wherever possible I am going to see personally that the suck wells and drainage are adequate so that this question of flooding will no longer be a problem, surely not in the newer developments.

6.00 p.m.

The policy of providing terrace units in other parishes will be pursued because I feel and it is felt that the parish of St. Lucy, the parish of St. Peter should also benefit from terrace units or housing developments. As you plan and as industrial development spreads to the north, one has to bear in mind that housing developments must also go hand in hand in order to complement the industrial development that will take place in the north and it is in this light that it is a matter of policy in the future that the parishes of St. Lucy and St. Peter, in the North will be looked at favourably in terms of building houses in that area.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not intend to touch very much on the parish of St. Peter because in another Resolution I will have an opportunity to disclose what plans one has for the parish of St. Peter, but all in all, I think that there are a few problems in housing but I am sure that I have had the full co-operation of all concerned. I must say that even the private developers have been coming to me and they have agreed with the course that housing is taking.

I must say that it is a continuation of the planning that has taken place under this Ministry and certainly under my predecessor of this Government and wherever there are wrongs, I am prepared to correct them and what is right I intend to continue to build on them and I think it is the only way in which housing or any proper policy can bear fruit in this country.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. R. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF PROPERTY AT GOVERNMENT HILL, ST. MICHAEL TO MR. WILBERT CALLENDER

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not anticipate much debate on this particular Resolution. It is simple. I think that all of us in this Honourable Chamber are fully aware that the Private Secondary Schools in Barbados have played an invaluable role in the educational system.

The Co-operative High School which is owned by Mr. Wilbert Callender is one of those schools. The Co-operative High School has had outstanding success not only in the academic field but also in the athletic arena. Many a boy and girl, a number of students who attended that school have gone on to represent Barbados as far as the Olympics and this certainly is an outstanding achievement of a private school which suffers from certain problems, that is financing, because it is very difficult for private schools to operate and they have always found problems to operate.

I am sure that we must give full credit to Mr. Callender and the Co-operative High School staff in keeping its head above water when other schools have floundered on such economic grounds but the Co-operative High School was located at the corner of Hall's Road/Belmont Road and when the development for that area was in train, the school which was then rented by the Co-operative High School was compulsorily acquired by Government for property development and as a result the Co-operative High School was in search of new premises and Government felt that in as much as the school had made its contribution to this country and to this Government that it should be given a home of its own and it was temporarily housed at Government Hill and Government felt that it should show its full appreciation by allowing Mr. Callender and the Co-operative High School to remain permanently at the new premises.

The Resolution therefore is to grant a lease for five years in the first instance to the Co-operative High School. They have an option to renew it and there is a rent charged in the new Agreement. Mr. Callender has already indicated his willingness to pay the rent and this Ministry and this Government has accepted the fact that Mr. Callender should be given the opportunity to continue in the premises which is owned by Government at Government Hill.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have very great pleasure in recommending that this Honourable Chamber should endorse this Resolution whereby allowing the Co-operative High School to continue the good work which

it has done in the past and I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in seconding that I would particularly rise to thank the proprietors of the school who were of great assistance when the Government needed the old premises for development purposes and who very readily co-operated with the Government in the transfer.

I would like to endorse fully what the Minister has said about the good work done by the Co-operative High School and, as I recall, Sir, we were asked to put this lease at a higher figure but at Cabinet the then Minister of Housing and the Minister of Finance agreed that the educational value of the school should be recognised in taking the rent into account and although the Resolution before the House itself speaks of annual reviews of the rent, the Government certainly has no intention of increasing the rent on this useful educational institution at this time or indeed the foreseeable future.

We think that the school deserves a home. The Government is glad to be able to support the work of this dedicated proprietor.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that both the substantive Minister and the Prime Minister in their contribution to this Resolution have made it quite clear that these are concessionary rents that are being given to this property because, Mr. Speaker, if this was not made very clear, it would have been a very dangerous precedent being set in the management of home properties in Barbados.

Time and time again we have been coming to this House and approving acquisitions for which the Government has been paying large sums of money and if you have a look at this, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the rent being paid — and as I said, I am glad that it has been admitted that it is concessionary rent — does not even return one third of one percent on the property value of that property.

6.10 p.m.

One must be very careful Mr. Speaker that you are not appearing to offer some specific advantage to one proprietor over other proprietors. There are other proprietors in Barbados who are conducting schools as well as Mr. Callender and they, unfortunately are not in the..... do not have the good fortune of being housed, in Government premises in most cases and are paying economic rents for the properties that they are occupying and they are not enjoying any other or any more contributions from the Government than this other school is enjoying.

As I said, I cannot fault them — they said quite frankly that they admit that the rental being charged is a concessionary one as a token of appreciation for the work being done by this particular school. But, I only raise a little warning that one has to be very careful that you are not giving the impression that you are creating and treating one particular institution which is performing similar functions with some type of favour. This, Mr. Speaker, has caused me not to proceed any further in this particular debate because I was wondering what type of advise the Hon. Minister would have got from his property management section in the fixing of a rent like this on property, which is, in my opinion valued at well over \$400,000.

On the broader point, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when the Ministry must make a concerted effort to bring scientific management to the property that is owned by the Barbados Government. The Barbados Government is the biggest owner of real estate in this country and real estate, like any other asset, has to be properly managed and, I am saying that the same management that should be brought to the financial affairs of this country — efficient, competent management — must be borne on the management of the properties of the Government.

Time and time, one wonders when you continue to acquire property, if it would not have been better to do a careful survey of properties now owned by Government, and, in lots of cases some not in use, some being under-used and, in these hard times begin to make better use of the Government properties. I will not proceed any further with this particular thing. I will just say that the Hon. Minister has to be careful that he has not created a situation where other institutions performing similar functions might not make some special appeal to Government for contribution towards the rental being paid for the accommodation that they are now in — and Government would have to seriously consider it, if they are not to appear to be showing any particular favouritism to one particular organisation.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I must.....

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker I do not know if I have gathered correctly, the intention of the honourable Member who has just sat down. There is nothing for anybody to quarrel about if we are going to accept that there might be a case for Government to make a careful review of its properties and to look to see if they are being utilised as best as could be and, as effective as could be done, at this point in time.

But, if the honourable Member is beginning to say that the Government should set a particular rate based on rate pattern in relation to its lands when it is leasing those lands to private persons, then, I believe at this point

in time that it may be a very dangerous thing so to do, as we would say, in Law. I could understand that interest rates are very high. Already, rents are beginning to rise to astronomical heights and if Government is in the forefront of setting what could be deemed economical rates, on the basis of money today, when interest rates come back down.....and, I do not believe that the present interest rates will last for ever and ever, amen, as from here onwards. As I understand it, current trends in the United States seem to indicate that interest rates are beginning to fall, and if Government goes ahead now and sets rates based on the current value of money, we will soon find ourselves in a situation that the Trinidadians find themselves in.

The Hon. Minister of Housing and the last Minister of Housing have on numerous occasions spoken about the pressure at National Housing for living accommodation. That has only come about because of the escalation in rental value of properties today. I am happy to see that the Government has taken into consideration the use to which this property would be put I believe it is a good step. I believe it is an example which could go forth from Government to other land owners who are in possession of lands that are being used for purposes such as this, but I believe that Government would be going in the wrong direction, if they set up a rent pattern in this country.

There is a little famous saying, in Barbados, "if the newspapers say so, it is so; if Rediffusion says so, it is so" whether it is so or not. And, if the reporters published tomorrow that an honourable Member of this Honourable House is encouraging Government to set rental rates at a certain level; that is the end of what I consider, reasonable rents in Barbados, today.

I hope the honourable Member was not saying that Government should be the leader in pushing up rents in this country. The NHC cannot now carry the burden. They cannot now carry the burden of building to accommodate numerous persons who would like to rent from Government. And, if we find rents going up over and above what they are today — and, there is no doubt about it, within the last six months, rents have taken a serious height in this country and, if Government is the leader in pushing rents further, it is a sad day for the Government of the day and for the country.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Philip North raised the question of the value of "Grand View" the property that we are dealing with today. The honourable Member sought to tell this Honourable House that the value of the property is \$144,000 and he also sought.....

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say \$144,000.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am sorry. I withdraw that Mr. Speaker Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought he said \$400,000.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Four hundred thousand dollars. Well, Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me — I want to make it quite clear that the value given by the Valuation Department is \$144,000. But, it was after the building was repaired that that valuation was given. At the time when the Co-operative High School occupied the building, it was in disrepair, it was not in livable condition and the school went into it, it was only after that Government did some repairs to the building and that is how you arrived at the value. In other words, it was a building lying down there doing absolutely nothing. This Government's policy is to make sure that full use is made of Government's property. From time to time, Government has to find accommodation for people who have been dislocated as a result of compulsory acquisition or development purposes. This is one of them.

But, the honourable Member and this Honourable Chamber must also know that this is the first time that a school was dislocated as a result of acquisition for road development of this country. It is on record that wherever people are dislocated as a result of such acquisitions, alternative accommodation is provided. That is Government's policy and that was the former Government's policy. So, there is nothing new. There is no parting from precedent, Sir.

The question of arriving at what is an economical rent was looked at in the context that the Land Valuation Department had already valued the land, had valued the property and they submitted to the Ministry of Housing what they considered to be an economic rent. But, in the final analysis, Cabinet has a right to look at the circumstances and see whether it can introduce what is known as the concessionary rent. We feel, we stand by this that the school has made an invaluable contribution and, therefore, it had earned concessionary terms or concessionary consideration.

6.20 p.m.

I make no apology, and I do not think that this Government needs to make any apology for that. We feel that we have done what the country expects of us where a school that has made its input and its contribution to the total advancement of this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to go on record once again as saying that we hope that the premises will continue to be used by the school to provide the education which we know it is capable of providing for the young generation of this country.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BATTLEYS,
ST. PETER**

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Resolution speaks for itself, but there are a few things which I must say on this Resolution.

Government's policy is to resite people causing minimum hardship and at the same time improve their living conditions; providing better facilities and amenities for the people whenever they have to be resited. Therefore, the Battaleys acquisition should be seen against the background of Government's policy which is to see that people are not moved far from their communities that there is minimum dislocation.

The area to be acquired is adjacent to where the residents now live, and the land is owned by Mr. Michael Belle. Government has approached him and asked him to release this area of land for the resiting of these persons. There is also a tenantry known as Battaleys Tenantry, and it would be a continuation of the tenantry and that development. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the residents that will be affected will not have any cause for concern. I would wish to assure you that there should not be any disgruntlement as a result of the resiting programme, because in keeping with Government's policy, they will be given waterborne facilities and the very best accommodation will be provided, similar to what the residents of Emmerton Lane had when they were resited at Clapham Park, and those persons who are now being resited at Mt. Friendship, St. Barnabas, St. Michael.

I have visited the area, I spoke with the vendor.... (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: With the M.P.?) It was not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to travel with the M.P. because there is an understanding between the M.P. and myself, and he has confidence in this administration and his colleagues, knowing that they will provide nothing but the best for his constituency. I have seen where the residents will benefit from improved water mains, and I am sure that it is planned in the development to have well constructed roads, and as I said before, proper waterborne facilities.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the area will find favour with you as the distinguished representative of that constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg you, please do not involve the Chair in debate in this Hon. House.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure that the representative for that constituency will have

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is totally unnecessary — and the honourable Member I think because he has not been in here long enough to absorb the totality of the requirement of May's — but we understand that no debate should take place. I am asking the honourable Member not to involve His Honour, or the Chair rather, in the debate. We know the intentions already, you do not have to state them.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am sure that the representative will be happy to know that everything is done to help and improve the lot of the persons who will be resited as a result of this acquisition at Battaleys.

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

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to stand and support this Resolution. I would have to say that better days are coming for the people in the north. It is approximately 20 years that we have had no sort of acquisition in the parish of St. Peter, and we all know and hear what the people of St. Peter suffered, and how they suffered under the hands of the Democratic Labour Party because they were already loyal to the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one point here. The only thing I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister and the Government for is not to allow a few dollars for the acquisition down there stop progress of the project in St. Peter, because I am sure that I have called in the past and they responded ably, and I do not think that St. Peter will be left out any more. I am sure that those people in St. Peter with the houses will be dealt with in a way that everyone will be happy.

I would also like to make another point. I do not think that I should say directly now that we should postpone this Resolution, but there is one point I see in this Resolution that is inadequate for the amount of houses that we have in the parish of St. Lucy to be resited at this time.

6.30 p.m.

When you look around and see in Speightstown you realise that we have Battaleys, Farm Road, Road View and all these places, but we do not have one playing field in the area. I believe there is a plantation of approximately 20 acres of land which you can acquire. I look here and see 1.865 hectares which is approximately four acres of land which I think is a bit small. As a former member of the National Housing Corporation Board, people call me daily — and I can assure you that we have over 100 people in the parish of St. Lucy — who are desperately waiting for spots and to acquire four acres of land today, I am sure that as soon as we put houses there, there will be a .

demand for the same thing again. So I am wondering if it is possible that the Minister could look into this particular acquisition and try to do something so that the people of St. Peter can be happy. The Government should pay quickly for the property which it acquires, because as you know, there are lots of people down there who do not want to move unless they know what is happening to their property, and I hope that Government will turn around very soon and make sure that the people in the parish of St. Lucy are happy.

I am very happy to hear the Hon. Minister say something about St. Lucy because I believe that once he starts in the north he will continue in the north. You all know how we in the north have suffered for the last 15 to 20 years; so I thank you, Mr. Minister and I hope that you will continue the good work you are doing and with the speed with which you are doing it so that the people in the north will be satisfied and happy with your movement.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I think I should reply to the honourable Member for St. Lucy. On the question of housepots, I am fully aware that there are a number of persons who are in desperate need of housepots, but for the honourable Member's information I wish to let him know that current negotiations are underway with a view to acquiring the remainder of the Checker Hall estate, some 11 acres. It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, to have lots available for persons wishing to have housepots, and at the same time the residents in that area will benefit from a playing field. I hope that the honourable Member will realise that it is not only in other areas that we are looking with a view to providing these facilities for housing areas or resiting areas, but also in St. Lucy. I wish to give him the assurance that these same facilities that are going to be provided for the people in Battaleys will be provided for the people in Checker Hall.

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

RESOLUTION TO COMPULSORILY ACQUIRE LAND AT PROBYN STREET

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Probyn Street, St. Michael.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the acquisition of a parcel of land of some 52.02 square metres. It is adjacent to the Fire Station and it was thought that the area should be acquired and passed over to the Fire Station in order to expand their facilities there. The Addendum is quite self-

explanatory, and with that I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this being the end of Government Business, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Question No. 3 stands in the name of the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To ask the Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs: Would the Minister list all of 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?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not now observe the Minister in his place and the reply to the question should be deferred.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister is not in his place, but as Leader of the House I still conduct business on behalf of my colleagues in their absence.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: When you really come to the point, the person to answer this question is very probably the Prime Minister, because diplomatic representatives are accredited to the Governor General for whom I answer in the House, and a number are accredited to me. The diplomatic representatives of Commonwealth countries which are monarchies are accredited to me as Prime Minister, and indeed I have to give permission for any diplomatic representation to be accredited here. So I do not think you can say that I am not the appropriate Minister, whether it is addressed to the Attorney General or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: What we are now hearing from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is that the question has been misdirected.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not mind giving the answer because it is an answer to be laid anyhow.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I have already ruled that the reply be deferred.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: With great respect, it is a question to be laid. I have a list which I am willing to lay.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have got to follow the Standing Orders.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like the Chair's guidance in the matter. The Prime Minister indicated in his speech that he is responsible for accreditation when he was speaking a moment ago, but the instrument which indicates the responsibility of Ministers under the Constitution indicates that the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs has certain responsibilities. I am raising the question for guidance.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is still Question Time, not speech making time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear the honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am asking a question of the Chair in the event that honourable Members of this House are seeking to have a question answered, would they need to be guided by the published information as to responsibility, or would they be guided by the information as has been given by the Prime Minister on an ad hoc basis.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already replied and I think I gave the information that is now being sought.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that Private Members' Business be now taken.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I had given you that assurance during the course of the day.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has indicated that we will now be doing Private Members' Business but we are asking that this matter be deferred until the next Sitting of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Am I to understand that the Opposition with all of these Resolutions, Sir, are not ready to discuss them? I hope that I do not hear them say at anytime on this Floor of the House that we are stifling the debate and would not give them the opportunity to do Private Members' Business or that we are filibustering. I just want to give them assurance as I did earlier in the day that we would have dealt with Private Members' Business and they should have been prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Acting Leader of the Opposition is seeking leave of the House to have all of the matters under Private Members' Business deferred until the next Sitting of this Honourable House. That is Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can at least do No. 4 seeing that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central is in his place. I am sure he can start this one. I am confident, Sir, I mean, the Government is here, Sir, sitting down ready and willing to debate anything you have to debate and the honourable Member is in his place and I am quite sure that he is quite ready and willing, equally as big as he is, Sir, to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In dealing with Private Members' Business, Order No. 1 standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition, it was agreed last week to have its time limit extended. No limit has in fact been put on it. I notice that the Order Paper, at least my copy of the Order Paper bears no reference to this. On the face of it, my copy of the Order Paper merely contains — it is not Order No. 1, Sir, I am sorry; it is Order No. 2 — what is ostensibly an out of order Order because bearing that date, it should not appear on the Order Paper. We all know that the House agreed to retain it although we did not put a time limit and I would draw this to the attention of the officers of the House, Sir, so that they can make the appropriate notations at the end.

In fact there are a number of little mistakes on the Order Paper and there have been for a little time. The honourable Member for St. Michael South East is described as the Minister in charge of Education Regulations. I think that supply is not — well, I suppose it is, Sir. Last week, supply was not carefully separated from Non-Supply. Supply was printed above the 1. This week at least it is printed next to it but I think that some more precise definition could be made of supply.

I also wonder whether there should not be a return to the practice by which Supply is printed as Supply

Bills, Supplies, Resolutions or whatever. In the days when they used to be an order of priority of Government Business — Supply first, Bills second and Other Matters third, it was necessary to print classifications. While we do not follow that, we nearly always call Supply first and therefore it is in its proper place but we do not classify the Other Orders and I respectfully suggest, Sir, that they could be classified on the Order Paper once more.

Mr. SPEAKER: The observation should be noted.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that is the end of Government Business as had been indicated and since the Opposition seems not to be in readiness in spite of persons who give notice of Resolutions to the Debate, it would appear, as if this seems to be the end of this Day's Sitting.

We are still fresh on This Side, ready, willing and waiting to debate the Transport Board Resolution and why they have not been licensed and to hear the speeches from the Other Side, Sir, and all of these things. It is unfortunate that the one dollar amendment to the Carifesta Vote was not dealt with today due to the intervention of the Leader of the Opposition and his conduct, Sir, and I can only move, Sir, that this House stand adjourned in the light that there seem to be no business from That Side and we have completed ours.

I beg to move, Sir, that this House do now stand adjourned until the 26th of January, 1982 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.50 p.m.