
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd March, 1982.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met on Tuesday, 2nd March, 1982 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. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry); His Honour C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker); 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. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Dr. R. C. HAYNES, M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.P. (Edin.); Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Transport and Works); Mr. L. A. WEEKES; Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.A.S., J.P.; and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon F. A. Cayless.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER and Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, February, 23, 1982.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, February, 23 1982 be taken as read.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance to the Central Bank of Barbados of the repayment of the principal sum not exceeding \$2.5 million and of interest thereon advanced to the Barbados Development Bank.

A Bill to amend the Police Act.

A Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to public parks, beaches and caves and related matters.

I may inform the Honourable House at this point that there are a few separate amendments to these Bills.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Police Act be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW and Hon. L. R. TULL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, a Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to public parks, beaches and caves and related matters, was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT and Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that on the Order Paper we have Resolution No. 1 which is under (a) and (b).
12.30 p.m.

I indicated by letter to the Clerk of Parliament for despatch to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I wanted to withdraw what is printed on the Order Paper, Sir, because we think it is better to have the two Resolutions which we have also circulated to be dealt with in the manner in which they have since been sent down.

I indicated this to the Clerk of the House to speak to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the absence of the Leader and he has indicated that there is no objection. Mr. Speaker, I have made those comments for the purpose of the record, Sir. Therefore the two Resolutions which we now see on the Order Paper will be dealt with in the manner which I have indicated by letter if there is no objection, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I am not very sure, Sir, if I should seek the leave of the House to have them withdrawn and substituted, Sir. I will take Your Honour's ruling on that, Sir.

I beg therefore, Mr. Speaker to seek the leave of the House to have these two Resolution substituted, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Withdrawn first.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking leave of this Honourable House to withdraw Resolutions (a) as they stand on the Order Paper. They should properly be numbered Resolution (a) and (b), if there is no objection.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, at this point, Sir, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 — 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 to deal with the three money Resolutions which we have before us.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. N. K. SIMMONS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of the House to withdraw Item No. 1(a) and to substitute therefor what is now 1(a) as 1(a) and the second part of 1(a) would be numbered 1(b) and to deal with the two as two separate and distinct Resolutions, if there is no objection. There is no further amendment whatsoever. Is it clearly understood? Is it the pleasure of the House that the Honourable Member may proceed? Could I get a clear indication?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, you are asking for a very clear indication. We simply want to be absolutely clear on our side that what is happening is that according to the Order Paper under Government Business the Resolutions numbered (a) will not be dealt with as two Resolutions, (a) and (b). That is what we are doing? No objection. We have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member may proceed. I should now leave the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was quite sure that there was no real problem but we just like to have things formalised. I want to thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues for supporting this gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the House and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with three Resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do now leave the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Do now the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. *(Laughter)*. Sir, I have no objection. You know I would not like to see you leave the House. I would make sure that you remain in the House as long as I can, Sir. Sorry about that, Sir.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: On that motion, Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot speak on that motion. The Standing Orders forbid that you speak on such a motion.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply 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.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed, I am wondering, if for the comfort and convenience of the honourable Members, you could take all the necessary steps to ensure that there is a more comfortable temperature in this Committee. It is very uncomfortable and we wish it a little warmer because it is going to get a little warmer later on and we would like the right temperature for that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I really could not support the honourable Member. Since it is cold now, it is going to get warm later on, why make it extra warm for them, Sir? It can remain as it is and it can gradually get warmer, Sir. That is my suggestion, Sir. I have no doubt it is going to be very, very warm because I am going to deal with all that he had to say last Tuesday. I am going to tear you apart. I was waiting on you. It is going to be very warm.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter will be looked into.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is a low resistance they have, Sir. That is all, Sir. We are fit, we do not complain.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE EXPLANATORY NOTE TO SUBHEAD 7 – REVENUE SERVICES UNDER CAPITAL HEAD 73 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Order No. 1(a) was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to amend the explanatory Note to Subhead 7 – Revenue Services under Capital Head 73 – Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, now that the Resolutions have been separated, the amount of \$10 000 and the Explanatory Addendum around it is quite clear.

The Rates and Taxes formerly rented a house at Four Roads in St. Philip. The house was always intended, from the time of the abolition of Local Government, to be only a temporary office. It was always the intention of Government to build up governmental sub-office facilities at Six Cross Roads in St. Philip. Honourable Members will be aware that a decision was taken – partly under the time of the Democratic Labour Party Administration and partly under our time – for a complete review of the facilities at Six Cross Roads.

Well the major part of this has been undertaken and an industrial estate and other facilities are now being built at that area. In the compound of the Government land, there was a house which formerly used to be used –

I believe – by a District Agricultural Officer. I am not sure whether the post was a Senior Agricultural Officer or what but with the consolidation of the activities and extensional services at the Home in St. Philip, this house became available. Bearing in mind the dilapidated condition of the rented premises at Four Roads and the inconvenience *vis a vis* a house situated within the semi-urban area which is developed at Six Cross Roads, it was decided, by the Ministry of Housing to allocate this house to Rates and Taxes.

Nowadays, it is very necessary to have security in mind at all Revenue Collecting Departments of Government. In order therefore, to outfit this building for the purposes of a collection centre for Rates and Taxes, it is necessary to install certain security bars and to do work in relation to security. It is therefore required to spend \$10,000 on this amount of money. The amount of money will not be an additional charge, but in accordance with the accounting formulae that Government has to go through it should be shown – we are informed – as a separate and distinct Note in the Estimates. Accordingly, we are coming to Parliament for an amendment of the Note to reflect the factual situation that \$10,000 of the appropriated amount would be used for this purpose.

I beg to move, Sir, that Head 73, Subhead 7 – as amended – stand part.

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

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

Item No. 1(b) was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,560,000 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. 23 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, in rising to move that this Resolution stands part – as amended – I just want to highlight a few points with respect to the National Drug Service and the Special Benefit Service.

I suppose you are aware like most people that the Barbados Labour Party promised in its 1976 Manifesto that on assumption of its office, it would introduce a National Health Service and in that Health Service, there would be a vital component dealing with the question of drugs. Kaiser Foundation was commissioned to carry out a study with respect to this vital, necessary and essential implementation of the Service, and it was considered that the National Drug Service should be the first area of implementation of the National Health Service.

It was discovered, as a result of the study done by the Kaiser Foundation, that in 1976, \$3 077 400 was spent by the Government sector on drugs, and in 1977, the amount was \$3 754 300. Together, these would amount to \$6 832 000 approximately. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it can be clearly seen that any statement that is premised on the idea that the Service could be implemented for \$200 000 is a huge and colossal joke. Certainly such a statement can only be calculated to mislead this House and the public of Barbados at large.
12.50 p.m.

The supplementary provision which is now sought, seeks to meet commitments due to Central Purchasing, to pay for drugs which were credited to the Service over a period of time, and also to take into account the expansion of the Service.

The Service has been doing extremely well — out of 33 private dispensaries in the island, 12 are actively participating. I have had discussions with the President of the pharmaceutical body some time ago, and in those discussions I sought to discover the problems with respect to a broad participation within the National Drug Plan. All I could hear being trotted out at the time was the question of markups. I said that the Government is not unwilling to listen to, and if needs be, improve markups if this will militate against participation by the private companies.

I however pointed out, and will again point out, that the Government — and certainly this Ministry — is not prepared to subsidise a drugstore based upon the dispensing of medicine. I therefore asked them to come up to me not only with their throughput in sales of drugs, but all aspects within the drugstore, so that I can know if you are losing money in drugs, if you are making money, and where you are losing money, because when you have a drugstore where people sell a host of things and you have a limited area — the back store selling drugs — obviously I would want to know exactly what part drugs are playing in the total service offered at the drugstore.

This interview with the pharmaceutical body took place about five months ago and up to now I have not heard from the people who interviewed me, nor am I aware that there are difficulties in producing to me the information which I sought to get. All I do hear is that it is very cheap selling the drugs, the markups are too low, and there are problems in that direction.

Now, if you have a problem it is not our fault that the markups are flat by the system which we have implemented. We have been looking at this. The markups are not so flat; it is the question that the pricing system has been so changed that the prices are not as high as they used to be in the past.

The drugs which used to come into Barbados in the past used to be extremely expensive. On certain brand name drugs, after the Drug Service came into operation, we were able to cut the percentage on those drugs by something like 17 per cent, also 32 to 34 per cent on other drugs. So what you are hearing is not so much the question of problems within the National Drug Service or the Benefit Service which people are unwilling to participate in, and the question of seeking to denigrate the sources of supply will be put in its true perspective here today, because I have made a careful study and analysis of the companies which supply drugs to Barbados — and they are highly reputable firms.

But there is another thing I want to say, and of course it might be a question of mashing corns which will have to be mashed at some time or another. The time has come when I feel that there should be a separation of medicine as practised, from the ownership of drugstores. In that arrangement you can have serious problems where if the doctors find themselves unable to channel their patients to the drugstore of their interest, they will seek to create problems for any service which, in their view, will not allow additional profits to come their way. Those are some of the problems which we face.

Mr. Chairman, one would think in dealing with the importation of drugs, and dealing with your formulary for your drug plan, that there are a group of nebulous people without any clear understanding of drugs who are administering the scheme, but I want to give the House a clear picture of the persons who are involved:— Dr. Jane Yeo, representing BAMP; Dr. Fraser, representing the University of the West Indies; Dr. Mahy of the Psychiatric Hospital, who is the Chairman of the Formulary Committee; Dr. Graham or Dr. Edwards representing the Medical Staff Committee; Dr. Rao, a specialist in leprosy and tuberculosis. That is the medical side of it.

You have now the pharmacist who sit on that Committee:— Mrs. Edna Franklin, a pharmacist of outstanding repute and one who is very well known. You have Miss Gloria Selby, who is at the moment responsible for the pharmacy at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; Mr. Turnbull, who is the Director of the Drug Service, and other resource persons, and these resource persons are the two Assistant Directors of the National Drug Service, Mr. Yearwood and Mr. Prescod, and a Miss Morris, who also serves on that body.

1.00 p.m.

The Government took care to ensure that the best knowledge was available to it, and when this Committee was appointed, there was no question of any interference. We said that it would consist of certain bodies within the society and the recommendations would come from them and not from the Government as such.

The Tenders Committee is also a very important area to deal with these drugs, and I will tell you that when a notice is put out for the supply of drugs, all the importers of drugs in Barbados have an opportunity to tender, and this is no tight arrangement in here where friends alone or friends can tender. All people can tender. It is advertised in the Press in this country and any person, no matter how great or small, has the right to tender for the supply of these drugs.

The Tenders Committee under the Financial Drug Service Rules of 1980, Section 25, makes provision for the people who serve on that Tenders Committee, and the people who constitute the Committee are the Director of the Barbados Drug Service, the Assistant Director responsible for supplies, Mr. Yearwood, a nominee of BAMP; Dr. Yeo again; a nominee of the Pharmaceutical Society, Mr. George Warner of Six Roads Dispensary in St. Philip — a man of outstanding qualifications and great experience; the Chief Pharmacist at the Hospital, and Miss Selby is functioning in that role at the moment; the Chairman of the Formulary Committee or his nominee; the Chief Supply Officer or his nominee and the Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Chairman of the Staff Committee.

Now with such persons as I have just read to this Committee, I have no doubt whatever in my mind, that the public largely — even though there are people who for narrow political reasons would seek to denigrate the system and bring it into disrepute — would agree that certainly the country can trust a body consisting of such persons.

Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Government purchases drugs from 15 countries abroad plus one drug manufacturing company in Barbados. The accepted products are manufactured by 70 companies of which 56 are among the huge multinational companies, six are international companies of lesser financial stature, and eight are so-called generic companies of international standards. All of them qualify to tender under the Barbados Drug Service system by being companies which are registered to market, and are marketing in Barbados. Therefore you can clearly see, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing that is mysterious about the system or how the service is being administered. Even at today's prices, the drugs which are being brought into this country are comparatively cheap.

An honourable Member said in the last debate on this matter that the Government took off the 15 per cent import duty on this item to make it cheap. It is not only that. It is by the system of tendering, and the manner in which the whole question is approached, that we are in a position to continue to sell drugs as cheaply today as we are selling them.

There is another thing, Mr. Chairman. At a recent meeting at which I addressed the nurses in this island, I made a public request to the pharmacists in Barbados to meet with me individually or collectively to discuss any problems which they might be encountering with respect to the National Drug Service. I cannot say that the Government has all the answers to all the problems. We are always amenable to constructive suggestions and wherever necessary to implement those suggestions no matter from which source they come so long as the suggestions are calculated to further the better cause of the people in this country; and I still stand ready to meet with people who are involved in drugs in Barbados to discuss with them their problems and to see how we as a people interested in the health development of the community, can hammer out the problems and arrive at a sensible solution. It is certainly not in the best interest of people's health that whenever a matter comes before Parliament, the people should seek to create all types of problems and confusion and to create doubts in the minds of people.

I have listened with some interest to the views as put forward by the other side, and I am not impervious to any reasonable arguments which they have put up, but I want to suggest to them that the time has come when there should be a halt to the attacks on the institutions of health and the undermining of the stability of these institutions. You may seek to tear down or destroy, but the time will come when you yourselves may have to carry on.

1.10 p.m.

I want to say this further. In Health, there are a lot of problems. (*Aside*) In terms of politics and other things, 100 years can be a short time so if that is shortly, it might be 100 years away. I assure you that you still have a long time to wait and a long time to cry in the wilderness. The public understands it. As a matter of fact, on the first take-over by this Administration, we were told that the Government would come down even without the ballot box before that time. We went right through to the time and were given a further endorsement. Therefore I do not think that we need to get into that at this time. We still have a long time to go. We will hear a lot of bleating. We will hear a lot of complaining. We will hear a lot of sabbling-wrangling. We will hear a lot of that. It does not matter. What I have to do is to put the case as it is — appeal for clear thinking on the question of drugs and the question of administration of medicine in this country. It is vital that that be done, and I want the people who are involved to address their minds to that.

I myself do not want to say too much at this time because there are other things which will be

said — and shortly said as well — and probably coming in another Resolution, when the opportunity will afford me to say much more.

Mr. Chairman, with those brief remarks, I move that this Resolution stand part as amended and I am quite willing to supply any further information which might be required.

At first thought, I was of the view that I should adopt the attitude of making a few minor remarks and just moving the Head. But I took as a very serious consideration, the views put forward on a previous occasion by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, who said that it is the duty of a Minister in putting forward a matter to Parliament to give Parliament all the information that Parliament is entitled to when he moves a Resolution or a Bill in this Honourable House. I have always respected the judgment and I thought that I should be as wide as possible, even though I did not want to do that initially. But it probably would be a good thing since in my statement I might certainly nip in the bud what might be coming from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second the Resolution Mr. Chairman, and reserve my right to speak on the very Resolution, Sir.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Resolution and from the Addendum, I can see that a Special Benefit Service has reflected in an increase which simply means that the people of Barbados are taking advantage of the cheap drugs in terms of price, and not quality; Sir, I wish to emphasise that — in terms of the cheap drugs — that are now available because this Government has gone into generic groups. Inexpensive perhaps, Sir, is a better word than cheap, but the quality nevertheless is there as I established last Tuesday when talking on the same subject.

The Special Benefit Service, Sir, cost the Government of Barbados over \$1.2 million per annum and the Special Benefit Service means that three basic categories of the people who are ill will benefit more substantially than the rest of the population. Firstly, Sir, all persons over 65 would be entitled to drugs free of charge. Secondly all persons who are suffering from special diseases would be entitled to free drugs and in some cases if they cannot be free, they will be largely subsidised.

These special diseases, Sir, are diabetes for which insulin is the only cure, hypertension — and last week

I gave a comparison between the brand name drug Aldomet and the generic drug methyldopa and indeed Carlmel.....I mean there are several types of generic drugs, Sir, for the cure of hypertension — and the third of course, is cancer.

Now when we say Special Benefit Service we are talking about the categories of persons who fall into these three areas, diabetes, hypertension and cancer.

The third category, Sir, under the Special Benefit Service, is children under six years of age. All children under six years of age get their drugs free of charge — absolutely free — at all the Government dispensaries which are basically located at the polyclinics. This is where the drugs are dispensed and naturally of course, as is the policy of this Government, wherever possible and whenever possible, generic drugs are used. To reassure the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the honourable Doctor, there are several instances where generic drugs are not used because of the peculiar circumstances of the history of an individual person that is accustomed to using a particular brand name drug because this brand name drug does not give off any sort of reaction or does not have any after effects.

That is an important point, Sir. Not only are the drugs free and not only do we try to ensure that we give generic drugs, but we also give brand name drugs to the three categories which I have mentioned if the doctor can prove that they may suffer after effects by way of substituting the drug which they are accustomed using for another drug.

What I would like to stress, Sir, is that I have become aware that doctors are not aware that substitution is possible under the present and existing Act. If a doctor — after he or she has written a particular prescription for one of his patients — does not want the drug substituted by the pharmacist for a generic drug, all that doctor has to do is to write "No substitution." 1.20 p.m.

Now, the point which was made last week by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central clearly indicated that he missed that point. I would not say he did not understand it, Sir, because I am confident that he understands all there is to understand about the National Drug Plan. But he missed the point and I would like to re-emphasise that doctors can virtually state that no substitution must be made.

You know, Mr. Chairman, this Government has done a lot for the people of this country by the introduction of the National Drug Service because in the old days — and this is not meant as a reflection on the Medical practitioners — there was a joke, when I was a

young boy, of what a prescription really was. The answer to that was that a prescription..... you could never read it. I mean, the doctor gives you a prescription, Mr. Chairman and it is virtually impossible to read what the doctor has written. So it was interpreted to mean that the doctor was writing in a very different form to the pharmacist to say, "I got my \$20.00, now you can get yours." I do not see that as a reflection, Sir, on medical practitioners but purely to indicate that the cost of drugs in this country escalated a great deal over the last 10 years and this Government made a serious attempt to address the imbalance. But more importantly, Sir, when one thinks and talks of health, one must consider the national health, one must consider what schools are doing to ensure that the children of today would be healthy in spirit as well as in body.

And, only last night, we were discussing, Sir, if you would recall — I believe, perhaps, you were at the meeting — that alcoholism perhaps is one of the major ills that face Barbados today. When I heard from the former Minister of Health — the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown — that the *per capita* consumption of alcohol per annum is 100 gallons — which includes, of course, table wines and beer — I was flabbergasted and so were the many members who were around the table because none of us had ever thought that the *per capita* consumption, per annum, of alcohol in Barbados is 100 gallons. When you think about it, that is indeed a very serious problem.

I do not wish to stray, Sir, but, in dealing with Health, these are matters which concern the Government of Barbados and I would like to see the Government do a study on alcoholism in Barbados. Conduct a serious study, in order to determine the real truth, and in order to determine exactly what the situation is in relation to the consumption of alcohol in Barbados. I am quite sure that the churches would support us in this particular venture, because it is indeed, the sort of venture which would stand us in good stead if it determines where we intend to go from here.

In closing, Sir, I again reiterate my support for this supplementary and wish the present Minister of Health very best wishes, because I believe that he is doing an extremely good job in the very difficult circumstances.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Hon. Minister and one of his colleagues. But, I want to deal primarily first with the Resolution before us.

The Resolution itself states that up to the end of October last year, 1981, the cost of drugs and supplies amounted to approximately \$3 397 733 and this forms part of the original vote which is \$4 338 447. The Reso-

lution itself also calls for a supplementary provision of \$1.56 million. This in itself is a 30 per cent increase over the original vote. It therefore means then Sir, that the total vote for the entire year would be \$5 898 444 or approximately \$6 million. This clearly indicates, Sir, that if the progression continues, one would clearly see what the cost of the Drug Plan will amount to. This \$6 million, Sir, is brought to bear on a service which is partially functioning. It is nowhere near the capacity to which it can function and already we see the cost escalating.

To give you some idea as to how I would reason the increasing cost, the Roemer Report which is probably the guiding light towards the implementation of this service made reference at that time to 28 pharmacies in operation made the cost of drugs in those pharmacies to some 7,775,000 X dollars. Very clearly you would see, Sir, that an efficiently run private pharmacy for the 365 days of the year, that their total expenditure in drugs was approximately \$7 million and we are relating this to a half service which has not yet got off the ground, already incurring costs of about \$6 million.

Furthermore, Sir, these private pharmacies were particularly using brand name drugs, and as compared to the Drug Plan itself, they are using generic drugs, and there you have a situation in which much emphasis has been placed that if you use the generic type of drugs, then the cost of the service should be less. I daresay that if the private pharmacies were using generic drugs as well that that cost would never have been that amount. Therefore, Sir, we must disabuse our minds that the real cost of the service lies in the type of drugs we use, but it has a lot to do with the kind of structure, the kind of management and the kind of people who utilise the service.

Prior to the Drug Plan, all the drugs in Barbados for the very same people were totally free and the cost remained well within the Government expenditure from time to time. Now you have, as I say, a service which is not fully functioning. It is not utilising all the people who used the services in the past under the old service. Therefore, Sir, this will bound to lead us in our thinking that when we said that the Plan will cost far in excess of what was anticipated and that the burden will evidently fall on the shoulders of the people by way either of levies or increased taxations and we rarely await, not too far from now, to see what that increased taxation will be.

1.30 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, when we look at the operation in terms of cost, one starts to wonder, and I thought the Minister would justify this increase by relevant facts and figures and make sure that the plan keeps within the

relevant cost. Who supplies or dispenses the drugs are important. We have never challenged the integrity of the people on the Boards, we have never done that. What we are saying is that these people do not manufacture drugs, they do not sell them, they have to accept their drugs from the people who operate within the Plan itself. Therefore, the question of drug supplies could only relate to the people or the agents who supply them, and since no division is set up here to test the efficiency of the drugs, no more than a private practitioner who from time to time will be able to make some report in respect of the efficiency or the therapeutic value of those drugs.

But, Sir, I believe that the cost of this Service may very well be looked at from the structure of it. The dispensaries themselves have the sole burden of supplying the drugs to the community, and if you want a proper service, then those dispensaries must be properly structured. You cannot have a dispenser to be a stock clerk and a dispenser at the same time. We knew from the beginning that the Plan would have a lot of difficulties because the personnel that would be required — especially the professional personnel — would be limited. You started your Plan asking a pharmacist to dispense drugs, then he must also act as a clerk. According to the Plan which suggests that you have to pay at some of these polyclinics, you have to provide the kind of stationery, etc. where he would be able to keep proper control of his drugs.

I would venture to say this. Whenever you put a dispenser under that strain, there are a few things that will affect the cost of drugs generally. You are likely to have spillage, because in doing three or four things at the same time there is a possibility of spilling the medicine. Then you have the possibility of spoilage if he is not in a position to monitor the drugs, because we know that some drugs will not stand up properly in these climatic conditions, and many of the pharmacists themselves probably lose a bit of money every year because of that kind of cost. Certainly the pharmacist in that position must be in a position to dispense them under the most ideal conditions.

Then there may be a question of overstocking. If you cannot monitor your stock properly, the chances are that you are likely to overstock, and a reasonable conclusion has provided the information that approximately ten per cent of the cost of drugs could be lost in this way. Then I feel that your management who deal with the supply of getting the drugs at the other level must have firm financial control in the sense that the machinery must be of such that they would not allow large quantities of drugs to be bought without being required. All this, in my view, tends to send the cost of the drugs up, and the Service as well.

Then we must look at the people. People who use these drugs must be in a position to get the maximum out of them in the minimum amount of monies to be spent on them. In other words, they must not be in a position where they can have spoilage of drugs at home, or too much at one time. They must be in a position to be able to use them within that period and get the best results for them.

Therefore, we look at the Benefit Service as it applies to the drugs. I heard the last honourable Member who sat down talk about the Benefit Service, and each time I have to mention that the Government had offered the people a free service, I have never been able to get anyone on that side to agree. They have always said free, but at some point — the point of delivery. How are you going to get the point of delivery in dispensing drugs? This is how I understand it from their service, for the 65 year old — and mark you, Sir, this service will hardly operate at the private dispensaries where there is probably an 8 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. service. We do not have a 24 hour service. Sir, how is the same 65 year old who might take sick at 5 o'clock in the evening getting it free? The difficulty is that he may not even get it either, because the law specifically states that you must give. If you enter into the service, those people are entitled to free, and as you say now, half free cost. This means that that 65 year old would not be able to buy the medicine, he will probably have to wait until the next morning. It is not free for the 65 year old as such.

Furthermore, most of these 65 year olds are pensioners, and you are saying that the pensioners must pay — this is what you are saying when you say subsidise the medicine — you are saying that the pensioners, or those people who go to a private doctor must pay. This is the whole crux of the matter. The polyclinics do not have doctors there every day or all day, so the majority of people would have to go to a private doctor, and the charge to the patient for going to the private doctor is that he must pay. If the doctor orders six items on that prescription, he cannot pay less than five dollars. Now, let us assume that a prescription is written for the 65 year old — because this is the one that I know used to get his medicine totally free under the Democratic Labour Party — he therefore will now have to pay for their own medicine.

Worse still, Sir, people do not retire at 65. The age for retirement — which this Government forcibly, to some extent, ensure that people retire at — is 60. They too, as pensioners, will have to pay like the rest of us who are not pensioners. I feel that provision should be made that as soon as you reach retirement age you should probably qualify for some of those benefits.

We also must look in another area. If the doctors are not functioning, your Plan would not be anything to

boast about, because the dispensers operate next to the doctor, and the doctor must write the prescription. That is the law. If they are not functioning, then clearly your plan is not functioning either.

1.40 p.m.

I would ask the Minister to try his utmost if he wants the Plan to succeed, not to ask — and I will repeat it again — not to ask one or two pharmacists to see him because all along the Pharmaceutical Society represented the pharmacists in this matter.

The pharmacists have put up from time to time varying formulae in order to come to some arrangement with the Government. My recollection is that the pharmacists have been asking for a dispensing fee, not to rip off anybody, but because in private enterprise you must make sure that your business is viable, and even if you had to drop on your base cost you ought to be able to maintain a proper return, because you will have people working with you who expect also to be paid adequately when the time comes. Therefore, Sir, the private pharmacies will only find it reasonable to take part in this Plan when the Minister or the Government decides to accept a proper arrangement,

I will go further and say this as well. Before this Plan was implemented last year, I think most of the pharmacists received some notification after they could not agree on the original formula for pricing the drugs. It was suggested that the Government needed time to carry out some kind of survey, and that they would use some Systems or something like that to come to a reasonable conclusion.

I want to know if the Minister can tell us if the Government has carried out that exercise.

In reply to the question of substitution, I wonder why the honourable Member for St. Michael Central talked about substitution. He ranks substitution in terms that a doctor can use brand name drugs, but if the doctor orders brand name drugs and he carried it to a polyclinic or to one of the Government dispensaries and it is not on the formulary, he is not getting any medicine. So what is the point of arguing about substitution when the clear case is that you believe that generic drugs will be the answer. No dispenser is going to hold himself responsible for breaking the law at that point, neither would he be encouraging patients not to go to the other polyclinics to get cheaper medicine.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side feel very strongly that in view of the absence of any statistics to substantiate how the plan is going and just saying that you want \$1.5 million to supplement the cost; and in the light of what I have drawn to your attention that the X cost of drugs can be reflected in many ways, we would

like to hear not that we are against the Plan or that we do not want any Plan to succeed because all of us are interested in health.

We as a Government tried to provide some of the best when we were in the Government. We tried to provide some of the best services, and I dare say that we might not be hearing about linens not present in the hospital in our time, but we tried our best to provide the kind of service that would benefit not only the 65 year olds and not only the six year olds. They are another set of people. Why only six years? Are you only a child at six? They are older than that. You need to broaden the Plan so that it reflects very carefully and very closely what the people in Barbados have been accustomed to.

At the clinics under the Democratic Labour Party there was no age anything for children. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You did not have clinics.) You do not know. I worked in clinics on Saturday mornings, and I would suggest this as well because I know that much of my service was given to the Government and perhaps other sacrifices, and I can boldly say that if the Pharmaceutical Society did not press for some means of providing an opportunity to educate or provide an opportunity for youngsters to train in pharmacies, perhaps I would still be working in St. James, St. John and St. Lucy. I used to work at Warrens during the day and every evening, and on Saturdays I would attend these clinics. I think the Minister needs to know what the Democratic Labour Party had been doing free, not anything to do with 50 per cent or any brand name. We provided an opportunity as if they were real people. That is how we treated them, and I want to say that no amount of side-stepping the issue and talking about the integrity of people will solve the problem. I have no time for that. The important thing is to make sure that there is less cost for these drugs, that the Government is serving the people as cheaply as possible and that the structure is so made that everybody will feel happy when they go home at night. If you are not careful with the Hospital, because the Hospital is involved in this Plan as well and they are already ceasing the Outpatients' Clinic, and that was the only institution that provided a 24 hour service for our people. When this is taken out of service, where would people who need treatment not in terms of medical treatment but who may want supplies of drugs, turn?

As I pointed out before, you have to look at this Service very carefully and not use it purely because of some political obligation in 1976 which you have not fulfilled anyhow that you can tell the people that you are providing them with a Service far and beyond what they expected and got before. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister will give me some more of the facts as to this \$1.5 million increase, because a 30 per cent increase on, I almost said, a non-functioning service is very hard, and if it is functioning and you increase it

by that amount, you are bound to know when it gets fully into operation what your costs will be over the years.

I go back to what we in the Democratic Labour Party have always expressed, that the cost of this service will probably be in excess of what you anticipated it to be.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the Shadow Minister for Health on this side has made an excellent contribution on this question of the Drug Service in Barbados. I should like Sir, however, to respond very briefly to one or two remarks made by the Minister in his introduction.

I have sought not to attack the Minister because I believe that the problems that he is facing are problems which he has inherited. The Minister clearly is not *au fait* with the history of this Scheme or the history of the delivery of drug services in Barbados.

When I made the statement — and I want to be quite clear about this — that the scheme could have been introduced for less than \$200 000, what I was referring to was the accumulated administrative and other costs between September 1976 and the introduction of the drug scheme last year. It could have been introduced for less than \$200 000. I was not talking about the cost of drugs, so to come in here and talk about the cost of drugs being \$3 million in 1976 and \$3.7 million in 1974 does not help us. That is the cost of the drugs themselves. But there was a tremendous overhead expenditure over the previous four years before any kind of Scheme was introduced into this country, and that is what I was referring to. That is the first point.

1.50 p.m.

The second point is what the honourable Member has recited is a list of persons of professional standing involved in various aspects of the Drug Service. I am a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. I am forbidden by virtue of membership of that College from deriving one cent in professional activity from the sale of any drug or the giving of any injection to any person. Any person who comes to any Fellow of a College, even when I was a Member you are forbidden. You have to write a prescription and the person can go to whatever dispensary they like.

Let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman, I was the first person in Barbados to recommend the establishment of a National Formulary to Government. Indeed, Sir, I was the Chairman of the Hospital Group which involved the vast variety of drugs involved for the formulation of a formulary in this country, a Barbados National Formulary. I was Chairman. Mr. Chairman many of those persons whose names were read out here today sat on that same Committee.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: which had prepared a National Formulary for Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: At that time, Sir, the overall Chairman was the Chief Medical Officer and I was Chairman responsible for formulation of a National Formulary. At that time, Sir, a decision was taken that the names that went into the formulary — listen carefully — the names that went into the Formulary should be only generic names or where the generic names were cumbersome, approved names; or where it was impossible to do otherwise, to put in a proprietary name, so when you recite the names of people who are responsible for the composition of a formulary, all the formulary contains is the generic name of the drug or the approved name of the drug or in some cases, the proprietary name. Now what happens beyond that point is another matter.

When an order is placed under a proprietary name, you know exactly what you are getting. When an order is placed under a generic name, there is no way that anybody in Barbados can guarantee the quality of that drug. It is true, Sir, that some generics are made by reputable companies; some generics are made by fly-by-night companies; some generics are made by subsidiaries of reputable companies and there is no way that we can undertake the cost of monitoring every batch of drugs that come into this country. So when you are talking about the establishment of a formulary using generic names and so on, you are talking to someone who has reached the height in his profession; to someone who has spent 19 years in health care delivery; to someone who has worked in a National Health Service; to someone who has been a University teacher and to someone who can tell you the background to generics in this country going right back to the 1960's.

And I am telling you now that the first attempt to bring generic drugs in this country occurred in 1967 without the knowledge of the Government. The Jamaican firm that was involved got the generic drug mixed-up with the dummy sample that was shipped into Jamaica for the purpose of carrying out a trial on hypertension and it is only because a druggist at a major firm in Bridgetown recognised that there was a difference in the two tablets, that we were able to trace back and find out who was responsible, in fact, for stealing those drugs from the University of the West Indies and mixing them up with the generic drug that came from Jamaica and imported into Barbados as far back as 1967.

The point I am trying to make is that you cannot control — there is no way in Barbados that you can control the quality of generic drugs. Minister, I am inviting you to listen to what I am saying and to use your commonsense in this matter and not to allow yourself to be confused with the lot of thinking — and wrong — thinking that has gone into this area.

There are some good generic drugs, Sir, there are bad generic drugs. But the central point is that we here cannot determine and will never because it might cost about \$1 billion a year in order to carry out a continuous sampling of those drugs. And when you take a sample and you send it to Miami or to the United States, you are back in the same position because the very bandits in the generic field in North America have been known to infiltrate even reputable laboratories that would test the drugs for you. You cannot control it. That is a risk you are taking and you have to face that.

The next point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is this. There is a clear indication here that there is going to be a massive increase in the cost of drugs, no matter what kind of drugs you use. It is a question of elasticity of demand and one of the biggest problems you have in delivery of a health service is that you cannot control the demand. As a matter of fact, in Ontario — and the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister will understand what I am talking about — no matter what scheme they have introduced to prevent the escalation of the Health Service in that State, everyone has failed.

What they are doing now is in fact reducing the number of medical professionals entering the profession and putting a reduced quota on the number of doctors coming into the profession in Ontario because they feel that if they can control the number of doctors who write prescriptions and who are at the head of the health services that in this way they will be able to control the demand on cost and this Resolution is a clear indication.....(ASIDES — Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Doctors are wasteful then) It is not that doctors are wasteful. They are not wasteful. That is not the point. It is a question that you have gone into an area where you can never control the demand.

I would also like to reiterate that what has been said by the chief spokesman on Health on this side that what people are paying for now, they once got completely free under the Democratic Labour Party and before the Democratic Labour Party, to some extent, they got it free under the previous Barbados Labour Party. That is a fact. What they are paying for now they got it free under the previous Barbados Labour Party to a lesser extent and to a greater extent under the previous Democratic Labour Party Administration.

But, Sir, there is another aspect of this whole problem that I wish to draw to the attention of this Honourable House. Proprietary companies in Barbados because of the small market you have to be careful what you are doing. Health is a dynamic organism and if you interfere with it you pinch it at another point, it will react at another point. It is not static.

A proprietary company, Sir, may have 50 preparations in Barbados. Of those 50 preparations only one might be making a profit because it is sold to the Government in sufficient quantities since the Government is the largest purchaser of drugs in Barbados.
2.00 p.m.

If, Sir, that proprietary company no longer has access to that market, you might find that the other 50 drugs that are used in significant quantities in a population of a quarter of a million, that you have shortages of those drugs all of a sudden and those drugs might be life saving drugs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 2 o'clock.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will want to speak again.

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

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2 o'clock. This sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.
2.04 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that there are no replies to question ready. We automatically go into Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, Sir, that Resolution has been postponed, under circumstances in which this Honourable House agreed to the postponement still prevailing.

I would move therefore that there would be a further postponement of that Resolution.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution calling on Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the laws governing the licensing and registration of motor omnibuses and the Road Traffic Laws of Barbados are observed by the Transport Board.

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Maurice withdraw the Resolution. You do not have anything to say.)
(Asides).

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, in the operative part of the Resolution now before this Honourable House, I move that the Honourable House of Assembly condemn the Minister responsible for Transport for his failure to ensure that the laws governing the licensing and registration of motor omnibuses are observed by the Transport Board. And, I further move that this Honourable House calls on the Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the Road Traffic Laws of Barbados are observed. (Asides)

Mr. Speaker, the Road Traffic Act of Barbados passed in 1981 is very specific in its requirements that vehicles be licensed and registered. Motor omnibuses which are public service vehicles in this country are among those which the law requires should be appropriately registered and licensed under the Road Traffic Act. Now the reason for this requirement is obvious, because in the first place, it ensures that the vehicles which are being used in the public transport system are of the quality which is appropriate for such use, and it ensures that the safety factor of these vehicles is of the highest level. The other consideration is that the safety of the public is a vital consideration in the whole problem of licensing and registration under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act.

The Act is very specific in its terms that no vehicles which are not duly registered and licensed should be used on the roads of Barbados. And yet, we find Mr.

Speaker, that by September 1981, long after vehicles should have been registered and licensed, it appears that only 60 buses of the Transport Board had been appropriately licensed and registered in accordance with the Laws of Barbados, but yet were still operating as public service vehicles on the roads of Barbados. By December 1981, when this Resolution was first introduced into this Honourable House, there were – according to reports from the Chairman of the Transport Board – some 60 vehicles or so which were still not licensed and registered but which were still operating as public service vehicles on the roads of Barbados.

So that it was clear that the Transport Board in the latter part of the year of 1981 did not ensure that all of its vehicles had passed the fitness test which had been required for them to ply as public service vehicles or alternatively, that the Ministry of Transport and Works, had not done what was required of it, in facilitating the inspection of the passing of public service vehicles as fit for use on the roads of Barbados. So that, by the end of 1981, we found that we were in a situation where legislation had been enacted by this Parliament – it had been proclaimed, it was enforced in the country – and yet a statutory corporation owned by the Government of Barbados was operating public service vehicles in the country improperly licensed or not licensed or registered at all. So that, we had a Statutory Corporation which was entirely in breach of the laws of the country.

And, what did we find? When issue was taken about the illegality, when the Police took steps to enforce the laws, we found the Chairman of the Transport Board unrepentent in the fact that buses of his department was operating illegally. Not only in that respect, but the Chairman went further and authorised conductors of the Transport Board to use, to quote his words, "to use their discretion in overloading the buses." and thereby also breached the Road Traffic Laws of Barbados. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Shame.)
3 p.m.

So that what the Chairman was in fact doing was operating totally without reference to the laws of the country. It would seem that he cared nothing about what the laws of the country demanded. What was a little more unfortunate was that the Minister of Transport and Works – for whom I have the highest regard – himself was very critical of the Police Force for doing their duty, and when it would appear that the Minister of Transport and Works was doing what he conceived to be his duty, he was supporting his Chairman. He was very ascerbic in his criticisms of the Police for doing what was no more than their duty, to ensure that the Road Traffic laws of the country were being observed, and when he was challenged about it in this Honourable Chamber he made the statement that he was unrepentent in his criticisms of the Police.

Naturally, the honourable Member based his argument on the background that the public interest demanded that the public service vehicle be available for transportation, but that was not the issue, because it behoved the Ministry of Transport and Works and the Transport Board to see that the laws of the country were being complied with. The end result of it all was a sloppiness either in the Transport Board or in the Ministry of Transport and Works, and whichever way you look at it Mr. Speaker, it is sloppiness on the part of the Government of Barbados, a sloppiness about which the Prime Minister last Tuesday so eloquently spoke in relation to another aspect of Government policy, a sloppiness which he readily admitted in the absence of the Press from this Honourable House.

But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the position is that there can be no doubt that the Transport Board was breaking the law, and the Ministry of Transport and Works was doing nothing to ensure that a department which fell within its purview was itself complying with the laws of the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age where we find that the business of Government is being run and organised by Statutory Corporations — to some extent, Statutory Corporations are now becoming the order of the day so far as being instruments of Government's policy are concerned — we cannot have a situation where Statutory Corporations would take the law into their own hands, so to speak. We say that where a Statutory Corporation blatantly and without any sort of cause to consider, breaks the law; that runs counter to what we consider to be one of the cardinal principles of the Rule of Law which demands that all citizens are equal before the law, and when we talk about citizens, all persons being equal before the law, we talk not only of individuals, but Corporations come within that description as well. So for the Transport Board to act as it did was tantamount to the Transport Board being of the view that it was outside the law and could do as it pleased, and that no agency of the law had any right or authority to tell them they should not break the law.

We say, Mr. Speaker, that an act by a Statutory Corporation of that kind can undermine, if allowed to its logical extreme, the very fabric of law and order in the community, and if we look to the juris-prudence which we practise and which should govern our whole legal system, the Rule of Law demands that irrespective of how high you are, how mighty you are, irrespective of how powerful you are, irrespective of what your social position may be, irrespective of what privileges you may enjoy in the community, everyone has to be subject to the ordinary law of the land.

In 1950, Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of the exercise of power and privilege was brought to its focus in a

case where Lord Lieutenant Earl Peel, Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire, I think, was prosecuted although he was a Lord and fined for a breach of the building regulations and ordered to pay a fine of some £20 000. In the following year, 1951, a case was brought against the Yorkshire Electricity Board for breaching the building regulations. That was a Statutory Corporation very much like the Transport Board, and it had breached the building regulations in a very gross way. The Yorkshire Electricity Board was prosecuted, it was fined £25 000, and its Chairman was fined £1 000 and sentenced to a term of imprisonment for six months. When the case was brought, the Attorney General of England said that he was bringing that case to underscore the point that Statutory Corporations were not outside the law and that they, like ordinary citizens, were subject to the ordinary law of the land. That is a lesson which the Chairman of the Transport Board should take to heed.

As Chairman.....(Aside)....ex-Chairman, I am told — as Chairman of the Transport Board he rendered himself liable to prosecution. The Board itself was liable to prosecution for operating buses illegally, and as Chairman and as authorising buses illegally, he exposed himself to prosecution. Maybe we in this country ought to take time off and ensure that irrespective of what position one holds in the country, irrespective of social class, whatever privileged position you may hold, that we are all subject to the ordinary law of the land.

Now, I can imagine what the response of the Government will be to this Resolution which I moved. They will say, for instance, that when the Democratic Labour Party controlled the Government of this country buses ran on the streets without being registered or licensed, so I know exactly what is to come, and I would be the most surprised man if I did not hear that sort of submission in this Honourable House today. Rightly or wrongly they have said that. (Asides) But the essential difference is — whether that was so or not I do not know — what is sure is that never in our time would you have heard any Minister of Government publicly or privately supporting an illegal action on behalf of a Statutory Corporation.
3.10 p.m.

If that were so, which we are not admitting, that essential difference would be brought to bear. Now there can be no doubt that a lot has obviously gone wrong in the transport system. I have no doubt that the Minister must have been reacting to the pressures which he found himself in when he made the sort of statement with which we take issue. But this Honourable House can take small comfort in the fact that the Minister has now done what we on this side have been calling on him to do and fire the Transport Board. We can take little comfort in that because that Board should have been fired long ago. I think the Minister knows that.

We on this side are urging that Government take all necessary steps wherever possible to ensure that the laws of this country so far as the licensing of motor vehicles are concerned are observed. It is important that from time to time, we stop and take heed of small things and big things in the community which need to be done.

I can hear an honourable Member on the other side saying that at a time like this when the country is faced with such great financial problems that we are talking about issues like this, but we have to pause on occasions especially when the pressures are biting on Government and when they are likely to do all sorts of things – and we have had examples of how Government has sought to pass legislation and set up levies where other bits of legislation have not been in place to deal with the problems. We have to pause for a moment on occasions like these amidst all the hurly-burly of the financial problems which Government is now currently facing and tell the Government that you like ordinary individuals must obey the laws of the land when those laws are in place. And we think that belated though it is, that the Minister of Transport still has something to answer for, because of his failure to do what he ought to have done when the time was ripe.

That is why we on this side, Mr. Speaker, move that this Resolution before us do now pass, and I am inviting honourable Members on all sides to support the Resolution which I now formally move in these following terms:—

Whereas motor omnibuses in the public transport system have been and are still being operated by the Transport Board without being appropriately licensed or registered as required by the Road Traffic Act, 1981;

And Whereas disregard for the law by a statutory corporation wholly owned by Government undermines one of the cardinal principles of the Rule of Law;

Be It Resolved that the House of Assembly condemn the Minister responsible for Transport for his failure to ensure that the laws governing the licensing and registration of motor omnibuses are observed by the Transport Board;

And Be It Further Resolved that this Honourable House calls on the Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the Road Traffic laws of Barbados are observed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second and to speak on the Resolution moved by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central which has been moved with considerable elegance, considerable precision, and came directly to the heart of the matter, which dealt

with the operations of the Transport Board in the context of the law and in the context of the licensing of motor vehicles under their responsibility.

I, Sir, wish to lend my weight and give full support to his submissions that statutory corporations in this country must obey the law. I should also, Sir, like to lend my weight to his submissions in respect of the status of Statutory Boards within the legal framework of this country. Barbados is a parliamentary democracy. The Constitution of Barbados has established a system of ministerial government and ministerial responsibility. Persons appointed to Statutory Boards whether as Chairman, vice-Chairman or in any other capacity must understand that by their actions they cannot threaten the fundamentals of the constitutionality of Government in this country, nor can they threaten the authority of any Minister.

Ministers are subject to scrutiny and subject to examination on the floor of this House, and I will say this: although I agree with the honourable Member who has just spoken in respect of the position taken by the Minister responsible for Transport on the question of licensing, I feel free to say that I support the Minister of Transport in his decision to dismiss the Chairman of the Transport Board and whomsoever refused to follow his advice or his directions. I do this because I have respect for Parliament, I have respect for democracy and I have respect for the Constitution of this country.

Only a few weeks ago on the floor of this Honourable House in a matter relating to licences and other matters of the Transport Board, I stated that the Chairman of the Transport Board should have been dismissed at that time, and since then, Sir, other information has come to hand which has made it perfectly clear that under his chairmanship, the Transport Board would have continued to operate in an area of illegality in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, this I will make a document of the House:—

“Dear Sir, I am sure that you do not know what took place with the sale of the transport buses. I will tell you the various factors.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is all right to say you will make it a document of the House, but it might be the biggest piece of mischief and totally unrelated to this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the area of illegality of the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: The area of what?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The area of illegal activity on the part of the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would recommend that you pass that information over to the Attorney General or to the Commissioner of Police or the Director of Public Prosecutions, or both. I am not going to allow this House to be dragged any further down whilst I am in this Chair. That is a warning.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I support the position taken by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. I would urge on the Government that the situation should never arise in this country again where buses are allowed to run on the roads without being properly licensed. I would also urge, Sir, that the Minister responsible should investigate the matter which is of grave concern to me in respect of the Transport Board in Barbados where Mr. Darcy Scott had to complain of the disappearance of several buses from the Transport Board which he had been asked to sell on behalf of the Government of Barbados, and the disappearance of those buses seems to me to be a matter that needs to be investigated whether by the Police or whoever should investigate it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I can appreciate what the hon. member is saying, but is he referring to buses which are in use, driven along the road, or is he talking about old condemned buses? I think you should know this if he says that Mr. Scott complained of them being taken away or stolen. The House should be told quite clearly what he is referring to — if they are bus bodies, old buses, condemned buses or new buses. We are no wiser
3.20 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Part of the assets of the Transport Board in the form of buses and a legitimate complaint has been made by a reputable person who was acting as Government Auctioneer on behalf of both Governments for many years which seem again to me to impinge on the legality of the action of the Transport Board. I have nothing further to say because I do not wish that last bit of information to be confused with anything else — the disappearance of the buses that Mr. Darcy Scott was asked to sell. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are one or two things that perhaps should be mentioned in relation to the contribution made by the honourable Member who moved the Resolution. I think a lot of his contribution has been based on misconception of what is the Rule of Law. He makes the point, Sir, that Statutory Boards, — he uses terms of people of a certain standing in the community — should be subjected to the same laws as anybody else, Sir, and that is the situation in Barbados today, Sir.

What is wrong with the jurisprudential concept called in support of the argument of the honourable Member, Sir, is that he did not at any time refer to the sanctions that are applied when there is a breach of law. The fact that the Transport Board and the Ministry of Transport and Works did or did not licence buses in one question.

The other question and that falls squarely within my area of competence, Sir, is whether the Police were at any time prevented from carrying out the law. If the Transport Board did not licence buses, Sir, and put them on the road the Police has the same powers under the same Road Traffic Act of 1981 that they have in respect of a private individual who does the same thing. No part of the argument of the honourable Member who just sat down has stated that the Police were prevented from carrying out their duty under the law. I think the honourable Member would have been very much in order to put both sides. To say that there was an illegality — whatever that means in this context — without saying on the other hand that the Police took certain action to remedy that illegality, is giving the House half of the story.

The Resolution says, Sir, that the “disregard for the law by a Statutory Corporation wholly owned by Government undermines one of the cardinal principles of the Rule of Law.” I do not believe that the honourable Member really means that. How can you undermine the Rule of Law just because a Statutory Corporation did not licence a bus and put it on the road. I am sure that the honourable Member — if he thinks of what this means — would get up and agree with me that that has nothing at all to do with the Rule of Law. These are fine jurisprudential concepts that are passed around, maybe by the honourable Member for St. Michael West who had a little exposure to Law recently and he uses these concepts in that way, Sir. But I am surprised to hear the honourable Member who moved the Resolution used these things as loosely as that, Sir.

The Resolution goes on to say “And be it further Resolved that this Honourable House calls on the Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that the Road Traffic laws of Barbados are observed.” This Resolution is superfluous, Sir. The Government does not have to ensure that any steps are taken to make sure that the Road Traffic Laws of Barbados are observed. We passed the Laws. It is for the Police to go and carry them out. We cannot go out on the street — meaning the Government cannot go out on the street — and stop cars and buses and report them, Sir. It is the duty of the Police. I see nothing in this Resolution to suggest to me that the Police did not carry out their jobs in relation to the incident spoken of by the honourable Member.

I understand, Sir, that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who just sat down got up and said that he is commending the honourable Member for his precision. What precision you are talking about? Everything is wrong with this Resolution. But you would expect him to say that, Sir. You would expect him to get up and make the strong protestations that he abides by the Constitution and he has respect for the House of Assembly, and all that — useless jargon — and then get and sought to slip in — he got stopped though, Sir — and sought to slip in under the table what could have been a piece of mischief. I am not saying it is, Sir, what could have been, Sir.

The fact that a public auctioneer has said that he wrote a letter; I do not know what it is he said; he said so; I am going to deal with what he said, Sir. The fact that a public auctioneer says that he went and carried out an auction and did not find — he did not say buses; he backed off, Sir, when the honourable Member for St. James challenged him on it, Sir; he did not say there were buses; he said part of the assets of the Transport Board or some such jargon — the fact is that there are not there is not enough for any honourable Member to come in here to throw that out as if to throw some blame on the integrity of the people who run the Transport Board. There were all sorts of reasons that it could not have been there, Sir, and we would prefer to hear honourable Members come in here and lay bare before this House, the true facts rather than make the type of scurrilous attacks on people of integrity in this community.

I must assure the honourable Member whose Resolution it is, that really I do not know what to vote for. The Preamble of the Resolution is full of misconcepts, if you can use that term. The Preamble is faulty and at least half of the Resolution — I had better look at the other half — but at least half of the Resolution is meaningless because he is calling on the Government to do something that the Government has no duty or responsibility to do. It has no responsibility to do it. You passed the laws and the Police carry out the laws. I certainly have no intention of going out on Buckley Road and stopping any bus and checking to see if it is licensed because the Opposition brings a Resolution saying that I must assure that. That is the job of the Police at Boarded Hall.

The other part of the Resolution, Sir — because it comes in two parts — is condemning the Minister. Now, he really has the nerve to get up and condemn the Ministers in here over these things, Sir. He says that the Minister was actuated by the — they say that the end of politics is the public good. I think Aristotle said that, Sir, the end of politics is the public good. (Asides) You would not know anything about these things. He said it

in "The Republic." You would not know. You would not even know that he wrote *The Republic*.

But the honourable Member in moving the Resolution said that the Minister was actuated by public good, Sir. He freely conceded that, Sir, and then asked this Honourable House to condemn the Hon. Minister for operating in the interest of the public good, Sir. I cannot support this Resolution Sir. It is faulty both in preamble and in terms of the Resolution. (Applause). 3.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question.....

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, all, or the most that could be said about the Resolution is that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central wanted to draw the attention of the general public to the fact that Transport Board buses were operated in Barbados without being licensed.

Now this is nothing new in Barbados. That is the first thing we have to begin with — that this is nothing new in Barbados. The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central is a practising Attorney-at-Law and has been practising for a very long time and he is well aware that every day in the Courts of Barbados, there is at least one case against somebody for operating a vehicle which is not covered by insurance and there is a case against somebody for driving without the appropriate license. So it is nothing new that people break the law in regard to insuring vehicles or carrying the appropriate license. It has been possible for the Police and everybody else to see that the Transport Board buses were not properly licensed, at a given time.

But we have to go further back, Mr. Speaker. This Government took the initiative and a positive step to bring a new Road Traffic Act to Barbados, an Act that had been promised by the Democratic Labour Party since 1962 and they could not produce one. Honourable Members on that side dared us in here to produce a new Road Traffic Act. We produced a Road Traffic Act that will now allow the Police and everybody else to be able to recognise the category of vehicles that are operating on the streets of Barbados.

Why do you not hear about the taxis that are still operating up to today that have not yet been licensed and we have gone past June last year. Why do you not ask about the Mini Mokes that are still operating that should be licensed under a new license form? Why do you not ask about the tour coaches that should be licensed and are still operating under the old license system that has not yet past the required test to acquire the new licence?

When I left the Ministry of Communications and Works, Mr. Speaker, there were some 2 700 hired cars on the roads. You cannot see H 2700 up to today. Ask Rates and Taxes how many have been renewed? Ask Rates and Taxes how many taxis have been renewed? You will find that a lot of them have still not yet been renewed. Ask the Supervisor of Insurance why he has had to send out a notice to all the insurance companies telling them how many people have not yet paid their insurance on the vehicles or have got a credit scheme and are not up to date with their insurances?

If you talk about the Rule of Law it starts from high heaven and stinks down to earth. It comes right down. Do not believe that anybody is clean of it. It stinks from heaven to earth. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and down.) (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.) What the Opposition should be saying is they should be urging this Government or any Government in power either to bring into operation a no fault insurance law or adequate provision for persons who are injured on the roads out there by vehicles operating in this country.

In Britain, you have a special form that caters for people injured in law. They have what is called, the Motor Insurance Bureau that looks after that.

Why does the Opposition not talk to the insurance companies that raise their premium rates every year, and ask them to insure the vehicles and so save the number of persons who are injured and left as cripples day after day because somebody's vehicle has been on the road when it has not been insured. Why does the Opposition not look at the Ministry of Transport and Works, how it has been constituted for years, where there were never enough officers to examine vehicles, and at the same time go outside and look at road accidents. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We changed that.)

We have had to go in, Mr. Speaker, and change the whole system of transportation in this country. We have had to increase the number of inspectors at MTW. But then, when you talk about buses — let the same gentleman who has moved the Resolution go home and ask his brother to show him a copy of the King Report that was prepared on the same Transport Board and if he cares to read it carefully, he will find that his own brother had said back in 1974 that 70 per cent of the fleet of the Transport Board had passed their useful life as public service vehicles and needed to be renewed. You should be complimenting the Government and the Hon. Minister for having checked them on the road to carry the people to and from work. You have to look at the Government Mr. Speaker, and see how employment has increased from 1976 to date.

When we went into Government, there were 90 000 people at work. Up to last year, there were 110 000 people. Ask how many new vehicles the Government has put into the Transport Board during the relevant year and ask how many they put into the Transport Board. Ask them. So if the Government was caught in a dilemma it is either you put down all the buses and have a Resolution from the Opposition talking about how people cannot get home or you use the buses and have a Resolution from the Opposition talking about using buses that did not pass the test. We tried to rationalise the system. We look at the minibuses that were operating.

In 1976 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, they had mini buses operating that were illegal according to the law as passed by the Democratic Labour Party. As a matter of fact, I do recall there was one mini bus which used to operate through Hastings, run by a man call Carlton Brathwaite and that mini bus has been the subject of several discussions in this Honourable Chamber. But nobody touches it, police or otherwise. We increased the number of mini buses up to about 310 in order to relieve the transportation problem in this country.

You then have to ask yourself a question, did the Government do something that was wrong? If you go into Bridgetown today, I guarantee that you would find many commercial vehicles that are not yet inspected for last year or this year. I have been Minister responsible for Communications and Works. I have knocked my head to bits and pieces trying to devise a system whereby we could inspect all the vehicles that are operating on the streets of Barbados within a given time. The last thing I did was to ask the High Commissioner in London to send me copies of the MOT Inspection Certificate and forms from Britain to see if we could legalise garages outside and put them under a standard to help with the inspection of vehicles in order to get through all the inspections that are necessary in this country within a given period.

The Motor Vehicles Road Traffic Act took into consideration that no matter how you work, you could never have inspected all the vehicles in Barbados if licensing started at a particular time of the year and ended at a particular time. That is why the Act provided for vehicles to come up for inspection and renewal of licences at the anniversary date and not in April, May or June, as it was under the old Act. We figured that by doing it this way, you would stretch the inspection over a complete year and therefore relieve the pressure existing at the Ministry of Communications and Works.

The Hon. Minister is not responsible if a bus went out there unlicensed. There is something that this

Honourable House has always failed to understand that Hon. Ministers of Transport and Works have sat at the Pine and, we have been criticised in here, they say, for interfering with the day to day business of the operation of the Transport Board.

3.40 p.m.

You hear that on one side. The next time you condemn the Minister for the Transport Board for not operating as somebody else would like.

As far as this Minister was concerned, this Minister set out a broad policy. There was a time when I never even visited the Transport Board. If there is anybody to be condemned, you have to condemn the Board and those who operate the Transport Board from day to day, so you do not bring Resolutions against the Minister, you cannot approbate and reprobate at one and the same time, you just cannot. You either have to agree with the Minister and find out what his policy decisions are and criticise him on that, or you have to attack the Board. You say the Minister is responsible, but when the Minister seeks to deal with the problems which exist you then come and attack him (*Aside*). You above everybody else, you are now beginning to learn what was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have to give time for the new Road Traffic Act to fully come into play. I believe that in the process of time we will be able to identify all vehicles in Barbados in their categories. I believe that in time we will know when a vehicle is licensed or when it is not licensed. I can say now, part of the plan which I left at the Ministry even looked into special tags or methods of identification of the Rates and Taxes certificate which goes on the windscreen so that the police or anybody else would be capable of identifying vehicles that had been licensed in the relevant year.

As I am at it now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with another point. I have often heard it said that Ministers do not do anything. You must understand that the Minister can only set policy. If the police have failed to do their job, they are the people to be criticised. If a person has failed to do his job, that is the person who must be criticised, but in all I cannot support this Resolution as it is drawn, I certainly cannot.

The members of the Opposition have always defended the Chairman and the members of the Board. I heard last week they were complimenting the new Chairman of the BMC and the Minister, and therefore if you throw compliments on one side, you throw criticisms the same way. So if you compliment the Board members when they do something, you must not launch your attack then on the Minister when something goes wrong. I think you need to investigate whether or not the Minister or Ministers have had a policy which is in keeping with the development of the country, and whether

or not that policy has been carried out or is being carried out in accordance with the directive of the Minister. If that is not so, then you know where you are. I do not take these little backhand swipes about complimenting the Minister for having discharged the Board. That is a power he has by virtue of appointing them. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Which you could not get done). Mr. Speaker, I will not worry to answer my friend over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Always seek to address the Chair.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I see red herrings being thrown out hoping to draw in a whale. This whale is not hungry today.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that those of us who sit in this Honourable Chamber, and you have been here for some time, sometimes feel sorry for those who have been here for a long time as they hear the novel arguments being advanced from time to time, and sometimes completely opposite arguments over a period of time coming out of the same mouth.

I would like to say, so we may dispose of him early, that the major disappointment of this debate so far has been the utterances of the Attorney General. The people of this country have been led to believe that an Attorney General is the leader at the Bar, they believe that he is the chief adviser to the Government on the laws, and in this Honourable House he is looked upon as the officer, the chief adviser on the laws to this Honourable House. We believe too, Sir, that in the context of his portfolio falls the concept of law and order as envisaged by most of us who live in this community. When, therefore, the Attorney General makes one of his rare interventions into a debate in this Honourable House, we look forward to having from him if nothing more, at least some guidance as to the thinking in his department concerning the method which ought to be used for the maintenance of law and order, and also some guidance as to when honourable Members on either side might stray from the basic principles enmeshed in the concept of the Rule of Law.

But, Sir, how can we expect an Attorney General who lays claim to being a classic scholar, who cannot distinguish the difference between Aristotle who was a student of Plato, and Plato the master. What can we expect when he puts *The Republic* something that is known to every first standard boy who comes face to face with the classics under the authorship of Aristotle. (*Aside*). I shall not overstate it, as the honourable Member has asked me not to overstate it.

I shall not go any further, Sir, except this: constant and passing reference is made to those who had a passing acquaintance with the law. It is not everyone who has been exposed to a nutshell course who can be described

as having a knowledge of the law, even though he may be described as a lawyer. I hope that we do not have to have debates which open and close week after week with this scurrilous and utterly foundationless concept that only persons who appear in standpipe cases before a Magistrate are blessed with knowledge of the law. I shall not bother with that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: All of this is relevant to this Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, it is to do with the Rule of Law, Sir, as expounded by the Hon. Attorney General. The Attorney General sought to suggest that because it is not the duty — and here it is the only thing in which he was right — of any Minister to direct the Commissioner of Police, but the converse is also true, and that is the guts of this Resolution.

The guts of this Resolution is not an attack on the Minister personally, because I believe in his more sober moments the Minister who made certain utterances in the interest of his portfolio would be the first to admit that he could not possibly mean the words as they came out; but we have no way of knowing what is in his head, Sir, we can only deal with what he said and what we see. The guts of this Resolution is that in the same way it is not the duty of the Minister to direct the Police, it is also not the duty of the Minister to hinder the police in the exercise of their duty.

The point is, Sir, that we are hearing a lot about how you cannot direct the Police. What we are dealing with is how you are not to hinder the Police as well. We have heard a line of argument which suggested that because there have been murders in the past, that it is all right to murder now. That is the logic of the arguments we have heard from the other side.
3.50 p.m.

Because other people may have killed and got away with it, because persons may have committed murder and have gone undetected, is it all right to commit murder? That is not what the law is about. It has to do with when a crime is committed or when a wrong is perpetrated that it is the duty of the society through its law enforcement agencies to correct that wrong, and if possible, to prevent any furtherance of that wrong.

Now for someone to suggest that in 1974 the King Report indicated that there were old buses on the road and import that into an important discussion in 1982 is begging the question, to put it mildly, Mr. Speaker. But more it is an indication of the bankruptcy of the Government in terms of its capacity to argue on the issues of the day. We are seeing constantly the bludgeoning of the community by the Government because it has the power, and what we are suggesting to them is a return to an in-

tellectual approach to dealing with the people where it is not sheer power which is applied.

Mr. Speaker, we have on other occasions alluded to the illegal activity; in fact let me put it another way, Sir, to the actions of the Government which may be deemed to be extra the Constitution, which may be deemed to be extra legal. Mr. Speaker, when a Government establishes a law which says that you have to apply to Town and Country Planning for permission to put up a building and that Government proceeds to erect a bank, alter the building, change the face of the environment without even looking in the direction of the Town and Country Planning.

It could be said — as has been said here today — that it was done before, and let us move on. But if we allow that sort of thing to happen as has happened with the new Barbados National Bank that has opened at Cave Hill, if we allow some other indiscretion on the part of the Government merely because it is Government, if we allow the Minister — angered perhaps in some state of stress — to state categorically that it is not the duty of the police to interfere with a particular process seen from his point of view and that process turns out to be a breaking of the law, if all of these little things are left alone, Sir, the time would not be far when a Minister can look out through his window, espy a particular person whom he despises and argue that that person should be in prison and so direct.

It is a short step from not paying attention to these small matters which we seek through this Resolution to draw to the attention of this Honourable House and the larger matters which are usually condemned and called a dictatorial activity.

Dictatorial activity does not start with a dictator. It starts with freedom-loving people who ignore little indiscretions. It starts with people who claim to be in charge of — and have great love for democracy, who will look the other way when that democracy requires the prosecution of someone who belongs to a certain status in the community. What we on this side are saying — have been saying and will continue to say, Mr. Speaker — is that we have sufficient regard for the system we have, we have sufficient regard for our country that we will take the time in opposition to point out these small or apparently small indiscretions committed by the Government either in their individual capacity as Ministers or as a Government in their policies so that they will not be allowed in the words of the proverb to go from an inch to a mile.

Mr. Speaker, one need not dwell on the question of the Transport Board *per se*. The fact is that even after the Minister had spoken, after the police themselves categorically stated that they were prevented from doing their duty, after all of that had happened, we had the temerity,

the utter gall of the then Chairman of the Transport Board going on television in this country and committing the unpardonable sin when he announced to the people of this country in the face of evidence, that a Transport Board bus had been involved in an accident; in the face of evidence by way of a picture in the newspaper he had the gall to go on television and make a statement, Mr. Speaker, which decency prevents me repeating, but which I believe it well known to most of the people in this Honourable House.

It shows that the Chairman of the Transport Board in his capacity as Chairman of the Transport Board had a contempt perhaps for the Minister, for the Government or indeed most of the Government because I am told — I am not going to play games, Sir — that part of the problem at the Transport Board is that the then Chairman believed that he had a direct link with the Prime Minister which to him was equated with a direct link to God, and that no Minister over there or nobody in Barbados could tell him what to do as long as he had cleared it with his Prime Minister.

We sought perhaps in not too good a way to import into other discussions the fact that a former Minister whom I do not now see in his place had attempted to have that particular Chairman transferred or moved from that Board. I sought in this Honourable Chamber to make a statement concerning the fact that it was being said outside that that Minister had extreme difficulty dealing with that particular Chairman.

I am not able to state categorically now that it has been revealed that the Chairman of the Transport Board had made it extremely difficult for anybody in the Ministry responsible for Transport and Works to direct the Board in any matter. We wait for his statement. I as a citizen and a representative of a substantial number of people — and as a colleague on this side of this Honourable Chamber — wait to hear his statement, and I hope that his statement will be full, and I hope that the Minister will do us the people of Barbados the courtesy of revealing the entire story concerning the Transport Board.

If there have been illegalities, we wish to know about them. If persons have misused their office, we wish to know about them. If we find that the Minister has acted unfairly, we will condemn the Minister. (A VOICE: You are stoking the fire.) Mr. Speaker, stoking the fire? That is our duty in here. It is our duty to stoke the fire. That is why we were put in this Honourable Chamber, and the Minister has a responsibility that supersedes our responsibility. He does not have to stoke the fire, he has to open the window and let the smoke out.

Mr. Speaker, we have reason to believe on this side that the Minister will not be cowed in the interest of any so-called politics to keep the lid on the facts, because if

and when the Chairman... despite the persuasion of other members of his party... let me put it this way: if and when the Chairman opens his mouth, we know that the Minister will tell the population of all that has gone on in the Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker, when the facts about the Transport Board are revealed, it will make Bath, ISL and Golden Mile — those things that were examined by Sir Herbert Duffus and in which the Democratic Labour Party were found to be above suspicion — seem to be like nothing. It would be seen that the Transport Board is a veritable — I cannot say, den of iniquity, Sir, because I am not sure if I would be in order — but it will be seen that the Transport Board leaves a lot to be desired, and the people of Barbados have been called through their Prime Minister to pay more for transportation.

4.00 p.m.

The people have had money collected from them. They have not seen any improvement that is worth talking about in the Transport Board but they have agreed to give the new dispensation an opportunity to prove itself. They have agreed not to prosecute them and we, in this Honourable Chamber, have called on the Minister to show that he is worthy of that trust which the people of Barbados have been giving him.

He has taken the first sensitive step, we are told. We are told further that those sensitive steps were taken with much difficulty. Remember in "Mr. Valiant for truth" that John Bunyan character, "Though with much difficulty I have come hither..." it is with much difficulty that the Hon. Minister has come to the point where he can see the back of the Chairman of the Transport Board. I am not able, Sir, on the Floor of this House to condemn any one personally. I speak only of them in their public capacity when they behave in a maladministrative way and I claim, Sir, that so far as the Transport Board is concerned, there has been enough that it can be described as maladministration of that Board. This brings me to the point as to whether it is the Minister who should be challenged and who should be excoriated, who should be called into account in this Honourable Chamber.

The honourable Member for St. Joseph, a former Minister in that — in the words of his Prime Minister — unfortunate Ministry, sought to introduce a novel argument, although one could understand the basis of his motive. He sought to suggest that it is merely unfair to attack the Minister when in fact it is the Board that wants attacking. Well, having to some extent attacked the Board, let me look at that argument. The Ministerial system requires that the Minister responsible for the area encompassing the Statutory Corporation be accountable in this Honourable Chamber. That is the ministerial system and parliamentary system that we know.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable Member is misquoting me at this point. I said I based my argument on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member is misquoting you, you can only rise to elucidate.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: But you cannot rise on a point of order and elucidate too, please. Your point of elucidation must now be considered fraudulent because you rose on a point of order so please take your seat. The honourable Member may continue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, since I saw him shaking his mouth to speak, I knew he was caught in the trap again. Mr. Speaker I am coming to the argument. I am sorry the honourable Member seems to think that I am misquoting him. I understood him to be saying — I do not wish to misquote him — that the Minister ought to be praised when praise is due.

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation now, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Member must take my statement as a whole and not pick out one part. What I said was that Members on that side have criticised Ministers by accusing them of interfering with a day-to-day operation of Boards and therefore if it is found that the Boards have gone wrong, you cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. If you criticise the Minister for interfering with the day-to-day operations of the Board and say he must not, then when the Minister leave the Board to themselves you cannot accuse the Minister if the Board is not operating as the Minister wants it to be. You must either follow the true system and accuse the Minister of right but you cannot at one stage pick up the cudgels of the Board when it suits you and then attack the Minister also when it suits you. That has been the purpose of my argument.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, the refined appreciation or the appreciation of the refined restatement of his position, Sir, is accepted and understood and I go on to say this: he has made it even clearer that he and the Government must distinguish between abandonment by a Minister which is incompetence and interference by a Minister which is also incompetence. Ministerial responsibility is clearly set out in the kind of system we run and Ministers must be able to calibrate. They must be able to feel what is happening in their Departments. They must be able to give broad guidelines to their Statutory Boards but when the Statutory Boards are going off course, they must have the antennae to receive, and the honourable Member for St. Michael South East is constantly saying

that he does, there must be able to see that they are going off course and take the necessary corrective steps, but what I am talking about is not that.

I am dealing with the responsibility that a Minister has in Parliament, that a Minister has to Parliament. It is not proper for honourable Members on this side to come in here and move a motion to condemn a Chairman of a Board. That is contrary to the contention of the system we claim to have.

The Minister is the one — rightly or wrongly — who must take the responsibility in the Parliamentary system and so, when we come here with a Resolution it does not fall well from the mouths of honourable Members over there to be saying — as I thought I heard the Hon. Attorney General saying — that this Resolution is directed to the wrong place. I withdraw Attorney General — as I heard an honourable Member on that side say. This Resolution is directed to the right person unless we have the wrong Minister. Unless, Sir, that when we say we condemn the Minister it is believed that we mean the Prime Minister but we have said the Minister responsible for Transport.

We are not condemning him because he is fat. We are not condemning him because he is short. We are not condemning him for any of those reasons. We are not condemning his person. We are condemning him as Minister responsible for Transport and we are saying this that he has imported the condemnation because he uttered actual words in the incident. The Minister himself was concerned in the incident.

Now whether the Minister was right or wrong was a matter to be canvassed and a matter for a jury either of this Honourable House or public opinion to comment on and to pass judgment but we cannot be told that we are approbating and reprobating when there is maladministration, when there is an error in the body politics when it comes to the Minister who is clearly responsible for that portfolio and we are saying that we wish to condemn him. We are saying it in Parliamentary language. This is the highest position of Parliament, Sir, so I do not understand how honourable Members over there could be trying to suggest that my distinguished colleague from Christ Church West Central has done the wrong thing. He has done an immaculately correct thing. He has drawn to the attention of this Honourable House that the Government, whereas disregard for the law by a Statutory Corporation wholly owned by Government undermines one of the cardinal principles of the Rule of Law.....which brings us to the Attorney General again, Sir.

The Attorney says that this concept — I cannot recall the exact words because they did not make a lot

of sense — is nonsense, words to that effect. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Attorney General does not understand that. I believe that the Attorney General has to make the debate in a particular direction and therefore that is what he is doing because surely, Sir, the honourable gentleman has been steeped in the law and not only steeped in the law — let us forget the law for a moment — steeped in the business of living in a society, he must know that in a small society like Barbados that the Government does set the pace for what other people do. For someone to get up and say that every day in the Court, there are cases about people who did not pay their insurance or every day in the Courts, there are people who did not pay their licenses, it seems to me they are saying by inference that the Government, therefore, does not have to pay its licence.

4.10 p.m.

We are charging that because the Government will not pay its licence, because the Government will not do its duty before the law, other citizens would come to the conclusion that if they do not do it they, the citizens, do not see why they have to do it. In all those circumstances, Sir, we say that that is the beginning of the breakdown of law and order as we have come to expect it. We believe, Sir, that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must wind up his debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Sir. We believe that such breakdown of law and order as outlined or perpetrated by the Government sets the wrong passage for the citizenry as a whole, and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we say they challenged the very foundations on which this country stands or on which we wish it to stand. We say, that that foundation is the Rule of Law and it is in that concept that we offer this Resolution, as a reminder if nothing else to the population of this country, that the Rule of Law is still the basis of existence in this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution that is before us raises a fundamental question and it is a Resolution that is very simple in its terms. It points out, Mr. Speaker, that certain motor omnibuses were being operated by the Transport Board without the appropriate licence. It further points out that this was a disregard for the law. It goes on to condemn the Hon. Minister for Transport for his failure to ensure that the Transport Board operated its unit within the law and it calls upon the Government in the operative part of the Resolution to take all necessary steps to ensure that the laws are observed.

I commend the Shadow Minister of Transport for bringing that Resolution before this Honourable Chamber and for speaking in clear and unmistakeable terms on a matter which is of fundamental concern, not only to this Parliament, but to the people of this country because it raises at least three fundamental issues. One of these relates to the Rule of Law. The second one relates to the question of ministerial responsibility. And the third one relates to the role of the Royal Barbados Police Force in the administration of law and order in this country.

All of them are fundamental to the continued existence of Barbados, as a democratic society. And, it is a clear duty, incumbent on the Opposition, to point out wherever and on whatever occasion the Government fails to live up to that high responsibility which it has to the people of this country, to ensure that the law is observed under all possible circumstances. For doing that and for carrying out his responsibility as a Shadow Minister there have been some bad attacks on my colleague, the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central. We, on this side support him entirely.

Now, what are the facts in this case? The Police obtained certain information. The Police took certain steps and, as I understand it, soon after that, the Transport Board and the Hon. Minister and the Ministry took certain measures in order to get the situation regularised. So that one part of the Resolution was actually acted upon, because as soon as it was recognised that there was some inelegance, if not illegality, on the part of the Transport Board, some measures were taken. (Hon. L. R. TULL: Ah, that is what I wanted to hear.) But instead of merely taking those measures gracefully and getting up and admitting that there was an illegality, that certain things which ought to have been done had not been done by those responsible; instead of that, we have a massive attack on the Royal Barbados Police Force..... (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Minister of Defence.).....and we had — I will come to that — and we had, on the part of the Chairman of the Board, some attempt to say that conductors had some discretion in how they operate, as far as the law was concerned. This is in relation now to over loading or carrying more passengers than were required.

Now the Rule of Law pre-supposes, indeed it requires that when a law is passed by this Parliament, that those who have to administer the law and those who have to operate under the law, must observe that law. The Transport Board fell from that high responsibility because it sought to give the impression that the Royal Barbados Police Force was acting irresponsibly and the Transport Board as a Statutory Corporation must carry the blame and the Chairman of that Board must carry the blame.

I have heard a number of speeches on that side. But I have not heard any of them up there get up and say that the Hon. Minister was right in having members of

that Transport Board dismissed, not for inefficiency, you do not dismiss people for efficiency but, obviously, for inefficiency. In spite of all of the talk over there let them get up and answer the fundamental question, was the Hon. Minister right in the exercise of his ministerial function in calling upon members or certain members of the Transport Board to resign?

Let me make my position clear. As far as, the Governor of the Central Bank is concerned, if he is one of the members to go, I am satisfied and pleased about that. Not because I believe that he is an inefficient member of the Board. I do not believe so. I believe he is a very competent person. But, as I have said on a number of occasions before, the Governor of the Central Bank should not be involved in the administration of any statutory operation in this country, apart from the Central Bank. (Hon. L. R. TULL: Why, what is the principle?) *(Laughter)* That is a matter of principle with me. So I am satisfied with that particular decision. Now that is as far as the Rule of Law is concerned.

As far as the ministerial responsibility is concerned I, perhaps can understand the thoughts that were beating through the breast of the distinguished Hon. Minister of Transport. I see he is feeling his breast. Do you have any? (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Are you interested in that?) I — sometimes I wonder. He went on and he.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder too. *(Laughter)* Of course, when we will hear more of the Resolution.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The Hon. Minister went on to attack the Police Force and he was highly critical of the Royal Barbados Police Force for carrying out their duty. I believe on reflection, because he is a very sensible man even though he speaks in very long terms, elongated, gargantuan, polysyllabic, in his particular terms, he attacks the Royal Barbados Police Force.
4.20 p.m.

He is a sensible man, he knows what he is about and he knows where he is going, but I am satisfied that he is satisfied that on that occasion he perhaps overstepped the limits of propriety. I am certain that he will get up and admit that. Unrepentant.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: is only a matter of opinion, but as far as ministerial responsibility is concerned, you can of course carry out that ministerial responsibility. When your officers fail in some particular way and you feel that you have to come and defend them, all well and good; but when it involves an agency such as the Royal Barbados Police Force, charged with the high responsibility for the administration impartially

of law and order, the Minister must tread very carefully. I believe that on reflection in his heart of hearts, in his breast, he will admit that there was some error — an over zealous defence of a position that was in fact indefensible.

All he needed have done on that occasion was to say "we admit that the buses have not been licensed according to law, we are taking all necessary steps to get the matter corrected." That is all, but then he went on to defend the indefensible. Why, I am not too certain. I believe he was a bit petrified at the thought or prospect of a transport system immobilised by some 40 or so of his units not being able to run because of their unlicensed state, and I believe he saw a public outcry — a bad situation made worse through that particular action — and he jumped on to the theme of the public interest. He is defending the public interest which requires that the buses should run, and I believe that is the dilemma in which he was caught.

It was a genuine dilemma, an obvious dilemma, but if he found himself with a Board that did not take the necessary steps, a Board that did not show the requisite degree of foresight and forward planning that was necessary in such a situation, then I could well understand the plight and the dilemma in which he found himself.

So where are we? I would be most astonished if anyone on that side could vote against the terms of this Resolution. It is a plain, straightforward Resolution which recites the facts of the case, and without any embellishment, without any exaggeration, and without any distortion calls upon all right thinking persons to take a stand against a position that was illegal. That is all the Resolution does, and I am wondering what kind of country we would be in when we have members of Government who might stand up and vote against such a simple Resolution. It is logical, it is straightforward, it sets out the case, it points out an illegality and it calls for the taking of steps for the correction of that particular measure, or it points out that certain things should be done. That is all the Resolution does, plain and straightforward.

We want to know if on the grounds of pure politics, on the grounds of the failure of the Transport Board to carry out its responsibility, on the grounds of the Minister through the dilemma in which he found himself having to be highly critical of the Royal Barbados Police Force, if in those circumstances anyone over there could get up and speak against this Resolution or vote against it.

We are talking now about integrity, we are talking about straightforward logic, we are talking now about

the genuine public interest, because if we are the freest country in the world we must observe the Rule of Law. If we are to live up to those highest democratic standards, the public interest in Barbados demands that the Government of Barbados must be a model employer, must set the very highest standards in the operation of its services, and in this particular regard the Government through the Ministry of Transport and Works and its agency, the Transport Board, failed miserably on this particular matter.

There are no political points to be scored on this Resolution. I do not think that you are going to lose any votes on this matter. Your stocks are low enough at the moment, you cannot go any lower. The Minister has taken all necessary steps to ensure you cannot harm him. When I drive through the Ivy, any of those buses can get through there. The Back Ivy and the ten avenues off the Ivy look lovely, Barber Greene work, but not St. Peter.

So there are no political points to be scored on this. We are talking about the public administration of this country and we are talking about the standards that should be observed as far as that public administration is concerned, and the policy measures that may be taken. Now, what more can I say? (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You have not said anything yet). I know when the Deputy Prime Minister is worried. He is worried about the strength of the arguments that have been advanced from over here, and he sees the potency in them. We recall that last week they tried to put up an argument that there was no sloppiness on the part of the Government as far as the levy for the National Insurance and so on was concerned, and the Deputy Prime Minister was the prime spokesman for the Government on that.

4.30 p.m.

When he was not in here.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the House had taken a decision on that very matter.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes. I am not questioning the decision. I am questioning the judgment of the Deputy Prime Minister on that matter. The Prime Minister came in and said yes we admit.....

Mr. SPEAKER: For the Chair, you have lost the opportunity to do so.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Very well, I will let that pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must now question that by a substantive motion.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of doing that. But I would say this as I come to the conclusion. Let us look at the members over there. I invite you to look at the terms of this Resolution, recognise that it is set out clearly and logically and I invite you to vote according to your conscience. Admit that a wrong was done. Admit that the Transport Board failed in its high responsibility to the people of this country in terms of observing the laws of this country. Admit that the Minister overstepped his bounds in some way although I recognise the dilemma in which he found himself, and then let us all agree that having put that behind us, we will try to ensure as far as possible that we get the improved bus transportation system which has been promised in the manifesto of your party, but which is a very long time in coming.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just briefly since I have been urged by honourable Members on the other side to support this Resolution. I may have supported it if it were amended, but surely in its form I cannot because the Resolution reads as follows:

"WHEREAS motor omnibuses in the public transport system have been and are still being operated by the Transport Board without being appropriately licensed or registered as required by the Road Traffic Act, 1981."

It is not true that the omnibuses are being operated now at this point.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the Hon. Minister speaking to?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This is a Resolution, Sir. You ask what I am speaking to. I am speaking to a Resolution under Private Members' Business. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that you are well aware of what I am speaking to, and I address my remarks to the Mover of the Resolution hoping that I would have been able to support it had it been amended. I have been reliably informed and I have no doubt that when the Minister gets up to address the House, he will make it very clear that the buses are now licensed and operated by the Transport Board.

On December 15, 1981, notice was given of this Resolution. We have had the spectacle in here, Mr. Speaker, where for nearly every single Tuesday, you have been calling on the honourable Member Mover of this Resolution to deal with the Resolution and he repeatedly said he was unable to deal with it from December, 15, 1981.

Now this evening when the buses are legally operated, we hear a lot of dog-eared speeches made about the Transport Board, about the Chairman, about supporting the Minister and condemning the Chairman, and about the Minister dismissing the Chairman and think this is something new in dismissing somebody.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central dismissed the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the year 1976 after we had won the Government, and the Leader of the Opposition dismissed Joy Edwards on two occasions, and reshuffled and almost dismissed his Deputy Leader.

Only a few Tuesdays ago in here, an agreement was reached between the Deputy Leader and myself in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition came in and almost dismissed his Deputy Leader and would have liked to dismiss me, but he could not.

Sir, I do not think that there is any transport system any part of the world that has never been criticised. When we were in Opposition we were critical of the transport system in Barbados. We were critical of it because Miss Rock, now deceased — God rest her in her grave — under your jurisdiction was allowed to run buses in Barbados unlicensed and unworthy for years, and uninsured I am told, taking people from Bridgetown down through the hills with bad tyres, bad brakes and bad drivers too under a bad regime at that time. Now this evening we are hearing criticism of the Transport Board. I would say this. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Do you support the Minister or not?) You are a political clown. You cannot even make a political joke.

I am satisfied that the transport system in Barbados is better than it has ever been in this country. There are better buses and more buses on the road and more road worthy buses. We have licensed the mini buses which you allowed to run up and down here at will with no taxes coming in from them to repair the roads that you claim have pot holes, just as you did with the one armed bandits where you allowed people to bring them in here and not pay a cent to the Government, and now you are crying out about selling them out.

Mr. SPEAKER: What are the one armed bandits to do with the Transport Board. Speak to the Resolution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. I will tell you what in Parliament may be a little related. Some of the members of the Transport Board may play the one armed bandits. They were unlicensed and the honourable Member could find himself down in Baxters Road marching behind Mr. Douglas and closing down the places. He is always a clown in everything he goes to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the present Minister is trying his best to bring about a very efficient service to the public and to reduce the Transport Board deficit. This is my firm belief. I believe he is doing everything in his power to make sure that there is a proper preventive and maintenance system carried out in the

interest of the public of this country, and for any man or woman who is operating as a member of the Transport Board makes it difficult for the Minister to have his policies implemented, his only alternative is to call on that Board to resign and if they do not resign to dismiss them, because the Minister must answer to the public. That is what the Minister must do because he has to face the public.

There is no Chairman of any Board at all that has to take the blows for the Transport Board, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Tourism or the Ministry of Education or Labour. And very few Chairmen I see face the polls. I never see Bernstein face the polls. He used to get in the background and push the money up front.....or Sam Ashby. I have never seen them face the polls.

4.40 p.m.

Maybe they were afraid to fire those Board Chairmen, whether at the Transport Board or at any Board at all, Sir, when they failed to carry out a policy because they were too close, wrapped up in the Bath deal. But this Minister and this Government has the conviction to dismiss a Board or its members so do not worry to use that as a public hurrah that somebody from the Transport Board was dismissed. I remember you all had a man who at that time, Sir, Senator Brathwaite. He was Chairman of the National Housing Corporation. They could not dismiss him at the time. Don't hold back there. You know what I am talking about. That is only board work. We will hear about that later.

Mr. SPEAKER: He built a house to house the buses. *(Laughter)*.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you are so right, Sir, that I believe he used to build some houses but I do not know if they were for buses and Leacock was the cement man at the time so houses and cement would apply. This is the building of houses for the buses to go in and cement. All of that would have worked in. The honourable Member for St. Michael West would know that.

Sir, I am satisfied within my mind that the Resolution is completely out of order in its present form. It is empty. It is lacking in content. There is absolutely nothing that one could add to this here apart from getting the headline of the newspaper that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central — I think he is, if I am not mistaken, Sir — has brought a Resolution in here to condemn the Government. But what I would also hope is this here: as mentioned by one of the honourable

Members on the other side, there are a number of unlicensed vehicles going around this country. I am not quite sure what is the reason for them being unpaid, whether it is indifference on their side or whether some of them cannot be inspected but surely you have not got to inspect a private vehicle to the best of my knowledge.

Many of them go around the country without third party insurance, unlicensed. Motorbuses — the same thing, Sir and this, I believe, is creating a very, very grave problem, both to the Government and the people who live in this society because it is only when some person is injured, seriously injured, or there is some fatality that one would discover that that poor person would receive absolutely nothing from the insurance company and I would hope those in authority — not the Ministers — those people who are to carry out the law, have it implemented, even if they have to go back to the old time system of putting up stop checks on the roads on mornings checking to see if your driver's licence is renewed, and also your car registration.

I believe that may help because I remember, Sir, some of us.....(Asides) You hear that Sir? They used to go through the back because they heard the police down the road, when they were not paying in time. You hear about it yourself, Sir. The honourable Member use to be around me in those days, getting a lift with me on mornings to Cable & Wireless.

I would think, Sir, it would be a very good idea if the Police or the authorities — I know the Police have been pressed into service with a number of very important matters in the light of rising crime in the juvenile section of this country, in particular, Sir. These are the reports coming out. We have heard the Minister joked about this here. There is nothing funny about this. This is something worldwide, Sir. There is a new approach to everything and I know that they are very, very hard-pressed but I would hope that there would be some approach whereby people would set out to pay their driver's licence and registration fees for the vehicles which they use.

A country can only be managed financially by people paying taxes and, Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent wish that we would join in supporting the view of asking the people to pay their licences and their registrations for their motor vehicles.

I cannot support the Resolution, Sir, because it is very empty in content and lacking in depth.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business for the day. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sit down Don).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure, Sir, that with the leave of the House, if there is no objection — I know they will object. I have no doubt, Sir, that with the leave of the House, Sir, that Private Members' Business be extended, Sir, for another 20 minutes. This has been done in the case on several occasions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will have to extend for more than 20 minutes. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Miss Miller come back.... I might want you to vote).

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Half an hour, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You would have to extend for more than half an hour now.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, would you direct me as to the time?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister would have to be given at least half of an hour and the mover of the Resolution is entitled to wind up unless we are advised that any other honourable Member would want to make a contribution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir. What you are actually saying, Mr. Speaker, if we seek the leave of the House and it is the pleasure of the House to extend for half an hour you are saying the Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is entitled to another half of an hour.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, and then Sir, the mover of the Resolution would wish to wind up. Maybe the honourable Member could wind up next Tuesday, Sir?

Sir, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be extended — hold on a moment — Sir, I beg to move, Sir.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I am on a point of order. We have had these frequent *ad hoc* submissions from the Leader of the House. If it was the intention of the Leader of the House to have an extension of Private Members' Business, the proper procedure would be to have that the appropriate Standing Order be suspended at the beginning of the session. I think that Your Honour would give some indulgence if such a proposal was made even before the time had elapsed, but we are not now — as I am advised by Your Honour's ruling just now that the time has expired — to take Private Members' Business.

Let me give you an analogy from the Courts. If you want leave to appeal and you want to apply for an

extension of time, you do not apply for an extension of time after the time for appealing has expired because you should know before that time has expired that you need a bit more time. You understand what I am saying, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: And I also appreciate your technique by causing that time to expire further.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, it cannot expire. It can only expire once. If you die, you only die once; you cannot die twice, Sir. If you expire, your last expiration when you depart yourself you expire once. You do not prolong the expiration. If you expire at a quarter to five you have expired.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I remember when you made Mr. Lloyd Smith....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not...to that. I beg your pardon, Sir. I am just saying this, Sir. No one can predict at this juncture how many more Members want to speak. I do not know what the urgency is that the Hon. Minister expects to expire before next Tuesday so that he must speak today. I do not understand. There is no consultation on this side at all. I do not understand these *ad hoc* submissions.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, what I just would like to say, Sir, is the Government Business is important to be done and that is the problem which we have. We have to get through with that. Let us worry about that. What I am seeking — and there is precedence for it because we have seen it before. In your time, Sir, during Mr. Lloyd Smith's, the proprietor I remember very well, gave him almost two hours — I simply hope, Sir, that with the pleasure of the House that Private Members' Business be extended for another half of an hour, Sir.

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

The question that Private Members' Time be extended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
4.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the only interesting points made in relation to an issue that has merely historical curiosity are those relating to a most peculiar conception of the law. What we have heard here this evening — and what we hear whenever people in this Honourable Chamber try to trip over themselves in demonstrating to the public their allegiance to law and order — is a pervasive conservatism with respect to the interpretation and the application of the law and an even more heinous colonialist view of the Police Force. And I shall exprecate what I mean, Mr. Speaker.

Some time ago in the 18th Century, there was a philosopher called Kant, and in his architectonic philosophical works, he wrote at length on the law and he was the first man within the western world who gave birth to the proposition that the highest form of rationality is the law. He was later followed — in the 19th Century — by another German philosopher called Hegel. Taking the legal reasoning further, he maintained that the rational is the real and the real is the rational and since the highest form of rationality was the law, then the highest form of reality is the law. And, right down through to the 20th Century we had another naive, western jurist called Kelson arguing that the law is the ultimate reality. *R. S. Grandin*

The arguments that we have heard here today are predicted upon an uncritical assumption that the law is the ultimate reality and this is something with which I would want to take short issue.

Laws are rules that are made by men, created by men and when one hears such propositions which take it for granted that the law is the ultimate reality; one is moved to remember that German philosopher called Feuerbach who said that men have created God in their minds and then become governed by God. It is precisely the same kind of reasoning which applies to the law.

Men create law. Law is not nature. Nature is the only ultimate reality in the world. Men create laws and men create laws for specific purposes. Men create laws to organise society, men create laws to exploit, men create laws to oppress. There are all kinds of tendentious purposes for which laws are created and in a typical Feuerbachian development, we find that the same laws that men create come back to govern them, as if the laws themselves were the omnipotent.

This is the beginning of bourgeois thought, this is the beginning of conservatism, it is the beginning of foolishness and that is why there has been so much unclear thinking with respect to this matter relating to the Police.

I take the view that laws are rules of convenience for the society. I do not take the view that a law is something that governs my conduct and that if a group of big head men in this Chamber take it upon themselves to pass a law that this is not a light, then it ceases to be a light. The laws cannot be an ultimate reality. There are things which transcend laws, which transcend bit and pieces of ink on paper that constitute ultimate reality and laws exist to order society. And we find in cases where there are similar disobedience and where there is a breakdown of law and order, such phenomena existing where the law ceases to accord with reality.

I take the view that the law is a body of rules. You can hold your colonialist, conservative bourgeois view as you like. I hold mine. You are governed by stale Kantianism. I am not. I take a materialistic view to the interpretation of law. I take the view that laws have to reflect what is going on around us, the flesh and blood within us.

That is the view I take of laws, and if laws fail to organise this properly, then they have to be abolished. And, I say that if the laws of this country point to a situation where sick women fall down in the streets groaning in labour and cannot get medical attention, then that law is operating in a manner that is contrary to humanism, one must look at the historical context in which rules are evolved in order to determine their utility.

One cannot subscribe to a blind following of rules simply because there are rules. That is why I categorically reject the specious jejune and silly arguments, Mr. Speaker, of the law and order people. Those are the kind of arguments that disreputable politicians like Nixon and Agnew used to keep people of colour down. (*Aside*) It is well known that worse type of reactionaries and conservatives preach this law and order foolishness in order to mystify people and confuse what is reality. I do not want to give any more lessons in philosophy, Mr. Speaker, and so I will move.....(*Aside*).....I am going to get to that my friend and colleague, I am going to get to that.

I am saying that those people who stand up in this Honourable Chamber and pretend to defend the Police against me who is criticising them, are precisely those people who hold a backward and negative conception of the Police.

They still assume that a Policeman is a Barrabas. And when I talk about Barrabas, I refer to a concept, not a historical person, for convenience of exposition. They perceive the average policeman as a muscle-bound Barrabas type of individual who hears that something is the law and then follows it blindly, who sees a man riding a bicycle without a light and arrests him without considering the circumstances surrounding the particular action.

I am asking for a different kind of policing in Barbados. I am asking for a thinking policeman, not a Barrabas, muscle-bound, block head. Those people who intend to defend the Police against me are implicitly asking for that kind of policeman and I totally reject this colonialist model of a policeman. I, Mr. Speaker, am asking for a thinking man. I am asking for a constabulary made up of men who look at circumstances, analyse the circumstances and then act in the public interest.
5 p.m.

It is the public of Barbados that pays the salaries of the police, it is the public of Barbados to whom the Police have prior obligations, and it is the public of Barbados who they must serve, not harm. They are to be like Plato's guardians, harsh to the enemies of the public but sympathetic and gentle to the members of the public themselves. I could never condone a situation of any person paid from the taxpayers' money, be that person Prime Minister, policeman or otherwise, if the consequence is harm to the public of Barbados. The police, like the politician, is a public servant paid from the public purse, and therefore his first concern must be to enforce laws in the interest of the public.

And I want to go one step further, and you can interpret this as being anti-police if you like, I care not one wit. The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker. If police are recipients of the taxpayers' money, then police must be open to criticism like any other people who use money from the public purse. It is sheer hypocrisy for Members to get in here and make public statements when they whisper things beneath their breath about the police that are negative. If the police warrant criticism, they must be criticised, and criticised in this forum or any other forum, and the Minister or any other politician elected by the public has the responsibility to call it as he sees it regardless of the consequences. Do not tell me that you cannot criticise the police, you criticise the police especially if their actions impinge upon a Ministry for which I have responsibility.

It is sheer cowardice, Mr. Speaker, dastardly cowardice, to get in here and make pious, platitudinous, nonsensical speeches singing paeans of praise to the police while at the same time whispering criticisms of them in your living room. I am not that kind of hypocrite, I am glad that I am constitutionally incapable of that kind of hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, to turn now to the specifics of the Resolution. It is something that I have gone over already in this House and I do not want to waste your time very much with it. It is a well known fact that the logistics of having buses licensed were such that it was impossible for the Transport Board to do it in the time allocated to it, because contrary to what has been put out in the Press, there are certain steps, some of them time consuming, which must be taken for a bus to be properly licensed.

That bus must be serviced. In the Transport Board at Weymouth where buses are serviced we have eight service pits, woefully inadequate. It is envisaged in properly administered fleets that the optimum number of pits that should be available for servicing buses would be 10 percent of the total number of units that form part of the rolling stock. There are eight, and we have about 260 buses on the book. Moreover, about 140 of these vehicles are barely road worthy, 105 of them are Seddons, and you know the inglorious history of the importation of Seddons into

this country. I do not want to repeat it, Mr. Speaker, but when these buses are being serviced it takes the mechanic a very long time to do so, the reason being that he has to service the buses manually in the absence of any grease machines. It takes a long time removing the grease before the buses can be properly serviced, and after they have been serviced they are then taken to the Ministry of Transport in the Pine where they have to satisfy the same rigorous standards that we impose upon other vehicles.

If I wanted to take the easy way out, I could have given the Inspection Department of the Ministry of Works an order to write licences for the buses immediately. I could have done that, but it would have been highly irresponsible and it would have exposed the travelling public of this country to unnecessary hazards, and therefore, faced with the difficulties and the problems involved in adequately preparing buses for licences, Mr. Speaker, we decided to let them run their full course. Now that all the buses are licensed and operating, I fail to see the usefulness or relevance of such a Resolution.

A member of the other side described me as unrepentant, but I refuse to accept the notion that the sole issue is the issue of breaking a rule of law which clearly was conceived by the mortals within this Chamber who did not envisage the development of a situation such as occurred when the police took the highly unusual action of removing vehicles that were not properly licensed. It is highly unusual and an extreme action undertaken by the police, when one considers that in the normal course of things a man driving an unlicensed vehicle is reported and then sent on his way. One wonders why the police took the action of unilaterally bringing a substantial portion of our transportation system to a halt. I find that unacceptable then and I find it unacceptable now.

If the police had taken the action that is normal in these circumstances, merely stopping the vehicles and reporting them, you would not have heard a whisper from me. Let them report the drivers of the buses, let them report the Transport Board. They have done that in the past and they have secured convictions against the Transport Board in the past when unlicensed vehicles were on the street. Let them do that, I would not complain, but they had no right to deprive the travelling public of this country of a transport service, and I will repeat it over and over again, and I will repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it is a shortsighted and stupid action. That is my view.

If it costs my life, I hold that view, because I believe the primary responsibility of any public servant, including the police, is the welfare of the public, and the welfare of the public was not served — it was subordinated to cause embarrassment to the travelling public of this country, of whom they should be protectors and guardians. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: And to you). And me too. Let us face it, I am responsible for it and I do not

like any area for which I have responsibility to be criticised unfairly, or treated unfairly, and any man at all who impinges upon any area for which I have public responsibility and prevents me from serving the public as they should be served, is a man who has to reckon with me, whether he comes in uniform or any kind of regalia.

That is my position on this, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.
5.10 p.m.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was addressing the Chair. He may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are one or two further points that I wanted to make. At the time when I finished speaking last, I was bringing to the Minister's attention the relevance of the smallness of the domestic market when any change in the drug supply system in Barbados is considered.

I had made the point that proprietary companies whose drugs may be a little more expensive, who spend a considerable proportion of their money in research and development of drugs which we cannot do in Barbados, who also invest heavily in literature for the continuing education of all aspects of the profession, and who also might have only one particular drug which they market in Barbados at a profit, but at the same time keep here in Barbados drugs which often expire because of non-use — maybe 20 or 30 other drugs which are not manufactured by the generic companies — that you must understand very clearly that we will be denying ourselves of those drugs when they are needed, because very frequently generic companies only manufacture a very limited range of drugs and they do not offer their continuing services either to the medical profession, the nursing profession, the para-medical profession, to research or to maintaining continued and diversity of supplies of drugs in Barbados.

I also wanted to make the point that no matter what kind of formulary you establish in Barbados, no matter who are the people who sit on Committees here in Barbados, when you place an order for proprietary preparations, there is no guarantee that you will be getting a preparation that is of the quality which you envisaged when you placed that order.

There are about 50 different ways in which drug companies get around that problem and in due course I will bring a list of all the ways and the techniques that they use from false labels to importation of material that is basically substandard, to bypassing certain biological test in the manufacturing process, to using different constituents in the mixing of the tablets. There are about 50 different ways in which the same tablet which contains the same amount of drugs can be assembled, one more cheaply and one more expensively.

So the Government must recognise — and must admit — that they are in the area of very significant risk when they get into the area of generic drugs, and they also might be short-selling the public in terms of the availability of other preparations.

There is one final point I wanted to make in relation to this. The cost will be the same. The demand for drugs will go up in relation to the availability of drugs, and you are going to find that so long as you have a system of the kind that you are trying to implement in Barbados, that this year it will be \$3 million, next year \$6 million, the following year \$12 million, and it is going to go up in geometric proportion. It is not going to go up by \$3 million a year. You are going to reach a point because you cannot control the demand in this kind of area of social welfare as you can in many other areas.

Now, Sir, this kind of thinking has clearly escaped those responsible for developing the health service and the drug plan in Barbados. They have not looked at the market in Barbados; they have not looked at their relationship to the international market, they have not looked at the impact of moving into generics in terms of the availability of drugs in Barbados as a whole, and the only people who will suffer in the long run would be the people of Barbados.

The trouble, Sir, is that when particularly as a physician you criticise any area of health no matter how constructively, it is as though you are criticising motherhood, because people who are ignorant and ill-informed will get up with the most ridiculous slogans instead of responding to the substance of what you are saying. I have tried today, Sir, not to speak on particulars as I have done before. I have tried to bring certain conceptualisation to the impact of alterations and impress that

you may make of a biological welfare system where you cannot control the ultimate end result, and it is my considered opinion that unless the Minister takes the initiative of reviewing what has been going on in that Ministry in relation to drugs and properly seeks alternative opinions, he will probably find that he will be leading this country in the wrong direction.

I have deliberately restrained from criticising him because I know that this has been a policy development over a number of years and he had no control or was not connected with that. I know it will take him a year or two to become familiar with all the intricacies and ramifications of the international drug industry, but at the same time I urge on him to recognise that when we stand on this side — and there are two of us in all major aspects of the profession on this side of the House — we relate not only from personal experience but from the experience of being long involved in health care delivery not only in Barbados, but throughout the Caribbean.

Let me tell you something about Africa. They messed up the generic drugs and messed up the health services of Nigeria. I have been an examiner in Nigeria. I have been consulted on many occasions in relation to health service delivery in many Third World countries, and I am telling you that whereas the proprietary companies spend their money in promotion, spend their money in research, spend their money in continuing education of the profession, what the generic companies do is spend their money in bribing people in order to get their products to dislocate the markets, and that is why you see that they concentrate on Third World countries.
5.20 p.m.

I did not wish to speak on dumping today in relation to generic companies. I do not wish to speak on false labelling that with all there is outside the jurisdiction that we might bring in this country. I can tell you this. There are many drugs actually brought into this country and many Third World countries, particularly generic drugs, long after the expiry date. There are drugs which the company itself would not market because the expiry date has expired under its proprietary name and they would market those same drugs after the date of expiry through a subsidiary company without the brand name on it and then dump it on Third World countries.

These are the kind of things that we are letting ourselves in for and many of those tablets, not all of them, some of them — as a chemist Sir you would know — some of them maybe you can go over six months or nine months without any major effect or lost of effect or bad effect on an individual because of the tablets but some of them can be quite dangerous. I want to repeat just what I have said: as a major form of activity that responsible companies in the United States who you might apply for

or send an order to them for a generic drug, that same responsible company might send you a drug, through a subsidiary after it has expired where normally in the United States you would have to dump it. That is a fact. That is a fact of life and you cannot get away from it.

If you are going into generic drugs, if you are going into it, then you have to face up to these problems and I am telling you this that you have no way, you cannot control it. It will cost more than the Budget of Barbados. It would cost billions of dollars to set up a laboratory here to seriously monitor and assess 300 or 400 drugs. You are talking of employing probably 20 000 or 30 000 people; you think of having probably 20 000 mice; you think of having monkeys from all over the world; you think of having all sorts of bio-chemical laboratories and so on. As a matter of fact if you did that here in Barbados you would probably not have any unemployment if you can get one of the major countries in the world to transfer their drug testing laboratories into Barbados because you would probably employ about 20 000 to 30 000 people with a budget of over U.S. \$1 billion a year.

You cannot control it. You cannot control it so be careful how you go into it but do not get up here and try to suggest that anyone on this side might have a vested interest in trying to sabotage Government's policy because we try to bring to your attention the dangers, because we know of the dangers.

This situation existed, Sir, in Guyana but Guyana changed its policy after a very senior person one night needed a drug very urgently and I had to rush up to the airport and hand it on to the pilot of the plane to take it to Guyana and the policy was changed a couple of years later.

Nigeria has changed its policy now. An Arab country — I heard reference to it sometime ago — was faced with the option: you could have generics but the proprietary companies would pull out. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to continue. I feel very strongly about this because I feel that the same thing can be achieved by bulk purchasing and not handing over the market in Barbados to any one group of drugs.

I feel that you can enter into long term contracts...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: with small escalating clauses that there can be a whole heap of inputs into the drug purchasing system for the protection of the people of this country and I speak, Sir, to advise the Minister because I do not think that at this stage he can be held responsible for what is going on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I think it was on last Tuesday, Sir, I heard the Member for St. Michael South Central, the Shadow Minister of Finance, surely a man who is well recognised in the field of medicine in Barbados and probably beyond these shores. I heard him on length on that day. I heard him again today, Sir, speaking with all his vigour and passion and setting out to put the Government on the right course.

Whenever there is a new system introduced into a country by a Government, there are always criticisms by members of the Opposition based sometimes on personal aggrandisement — which I am not in anyway attributing to any honourable Member on the other side or on this side — based sometimes for political power and probably to score political points and I can cite one example.

When that Party, the Democratic Labour Party had introduced into Barbados free School Meals, I recall very well, Sir, it even caused the Minister of Education's father, if I am not mistaken, in that year — I am subject to correction — to lose his seat in St. George because this new found innovation had presented itself on the platforms of the then Government. We were critical of it then. I know this is a fact. It is alleged — I do not know, Sir — it is alleged that the Minister of Education's father had felt so strongly on it that he said he would punch holes in the pots and pans. I do not know if it is true — it is alleged. But knowing the Opposition, they were capable of saying that he said that and would throw the pots and pans down Gun Hill. Today it is no longer a dream. It is a reality.

On that occasion you had pointed out to the country that it was going to be free all you had to do at every school was to walk up, sit down and eat and drink free. But it took something like almost 18 years for it to be really free because this Party recognised the usefulness of it and made it free at last but we hammered it. The same thing is happening now.

You brought that into the country on that occasion for the purpose of providing, as you put it, a balanced meal to the young children in the country, free. We are introducing a system now by way of a Drug Plan and a National Health Service to reduce the cost of drugs in this country. It is your duty to point out the ills as you see them. It is our duty to accept the advice of those persons who can speak as authoritatively as you can on such matters but is not in a position to do that because they are not elected into this forum. That is why the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central sounds so good.

You have me bamboozled with the medical terms. The language was thawed, passion, sincerity showing on your face but I am with the people that you appointed. You think I could doubt the ability and the sincerity of Dr. Graham? You can sit down. You have a chance to talk, of Dr. Yeo or Dr. Fraser, a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians like yourself?
5.30 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member by making that statement, is, I think, Sir, reflecting on the integrity of another honourable Member because I have taken great pains to point out that it is not the decisions taken by that Committee that can affect the actual drug that comes into Barbados. It is a question of importation. I will explain that in detail. You can have the best people in the world doing that. They do not place the orders, they do not manufacture the drugs. This is the point I am trying to make all day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. That was an opportunity to speak. That was not a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member's speech from last Tuesday until today — I will put it this way. If I were not a Member of Parliament and had to sit down in the gallery or go outside and listen to the honourable Member on a public platform — as you did say last Tuesday that you are going to speak on another occasion on the subject, in another place — and you told 10 000 to 20 000 persons what you said in this Honourable Chamber, I would not buy a single drug because I would be afraid to go to the doctors in this country. That is how you have put it across in here. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Listen carefully.) Do not tell me listen carefully. That is your case that the drugs come from Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary — all sorts of these people; and people offered you money; all of these things.

What I am saying is that members here — I am told — are going to monitor. That is what I am told. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Cannot work.) But let us try it. We said the School Meals system could not work. But today a dream is a reality. I am not prepared to err with you on this occasion, or your colleagues either for many reasons which I would not say; maybe quietly, I would not say it here for the records. I know what I am saying. Though you and I are not seeing eye to eye on certain things, I would not be unkind to you to say something. I would not do it at all.

I am told, Mr. Chairman, that this is a well thought out plan with people of the highest calibre in the medical profession. But what galls me is this: that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central can say these

things on the floor of the Honourable House. When the Barbados Medical Association comes out and say the same things that you say, I would then be satisfied to turn my back on the Government's policy in this particular respect. Let me hear the Barbados Medical Association as a unified body condemn the scheme and say that they cannot monitor it. Otherwise, I cannot go on with you.

I can only, therefore, conclude that for political reasons — and I know power is a serious thing. I know that is your ambition and I do not blame you. On this occasion I may be accusing you wrongfully. I may be, but I do not think I am. I know it is a fact that you are a doctor. I know it is a fact that you are a Barbados Scholar. I know it is a fact that you and I were very, very close. But I also know it is a fact that you are very irresponsible when you are looking for power. That is also a fact.

Now, how can you tell me — for example, Dr. Edwards, I do not know who this is; Mrs. Franklin, Gloria Selby, a Mr. Turnbull — I am told that this Mr. Turnbull was brought down here as a specialist in this field — are you going to tell me that I am to go on with your arguments all the time? I want to hear about the Medical Association — if you are a member of it. Call on them to make a public statement saying what you said in here: that the Government would be unable to monitor the generics that come into Barbados and therefore, some of them make people blind and all sorts of things.

You have said the worse things about this scheme, the worse things, the very worse things. It is a speech that you should be ashamed of as a Barbadian. You should be ashamed of your speech, when you read it. You have done this country no good; you have done it no good in making the speech which you have made here and plan to go outside and say something in another forum.

I would like the Minister of Information to put you on a panel with these very people and let me hear how you would come out. That is what I want him to do. Do not come in here where I am in no position to follow your medical jargon. That is all you do, call a lot of medical terms. The Hon. Minister of Labour hair is dropping out because of the very generics. You said all of that in your speech, but you cannot find the formula to put back the hair on his head. That is the trouble. You destroy, you pull down. That is what you do. You can destroy but you have no policy to rebuild.

You told us, on the floor of the Honourable House that you know — your blue paper — how it could have been done for \$200 000. Why do you not call on

this Minister to submit your blue print to the specialist — your Turnbull, Frazer, Mahy? Why did they turn down your blue print? Do you mean that everybody is wrong and you are right? You said the paper was there. But I am going to tell you what would have been a service to this country.

I heard the Member for St. Michael — anyhow, I am not going to play I do not know where you are from — North West, I heard the Member for St. Michael North West say how he gave his service — am I right in saying that? — to this country free. But do you know when? Do you know when he gave it, Mr. Chairman? He gave it like how the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gave his when that Government was in power. That is when he gave it. Because, in 1976, as soon as your party lost power, you resigned from the hospital. I wanted to see you then.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. I never said that I gave my service free. I said that I sacrifice a lot, but I did not say I gave it free. *(Laughter)*.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I do not know if you sacrifice time or money. I do not know which. But there was some sacrifice in it, whether it was time or money. Why are you not sacrificing it now? That is why you put party politics above your country. That is why you have a case.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. The Civil Establishments Orders of this country require that anyone who is an established Civil Servant or a member of the establishment would have to resign, as a Civil Servant, in order to participate in a general election.

I resigned from the Public Service of Barbados, in 1976, well in advance in any general election, in order to become a candidate in St. George North which I could win easily now, but I did not win at that time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I accept the honourable Member's statement that the General Orders did not allow him — you mean that the General Orders did not allow you to draw the money. I was talking about sacrifice. Do it for free. Put your expertise, at the disposal of your country, as you promised in St.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir. Any advice that any honourable Member on that side wishes as a result of my expertise, they can have it free, at any time. *(Aside: Oh, my God!)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Let us get ahead now.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You know what they say, Sir, "Beware of the Greeks when they bring you gifts." That is what I will be afraid of — "Beware of the Greeks".

A case, Sir, was therefore only made out by both honourable Members as a case to convey to the public — that is how it has got across — to the public. When you can stand up in an Honourable Chamber and say that because of the generics you — I have it here. Thank God for the proceedings coming early. Right here. (Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: True.) The honourable Member said that somebody went blind somewhere in here, Sir. The honourable Member did say that someone went blind, Sir. You will recall this that someone went blind, or nearly blind.....(Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Blind, Blind, not nearly.).....because of the drugs.

Now, if you said that on a public platform, I would be afraid, Mr. Chairman, to go to any doctor because I cannot read the prescription and I would be unable, Sir, to determine if this drug is some generic that is going to make me blind or make me see better. So all the taxpayers' money would have gone down the drain because of the position taken by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the honourable Member for St. Michael North West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am timing myself, Sir. The Clerk was not looking at the clock. I know how many more minutes I have, plus the interruptions. I know how many minutes I have, Sir. I am not going to over do it. The Clerk at the Table was not looking at the clock when I started. He is guessing. I looked at my watch and at that. I have four more minutes to speak, Sir, including the interruptions.
5.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: With the interruptions the honourable Member has three minutes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The position, therefore, Mr. Chairman is this. I am asking the honourable Member and the other side not to go around saying these things about something which I cannot accept, in the light of not having a statement from the Barbados Medical Association. I want to be guided by them. Failing that, I have to be guided by the people whom we have put on the Committee, and unless I can get a statement coming from all the druggists — or their Association if there is one — and from the Medical Association, both of you stand condemned in my sight.

It is only political mileage you are trying to get, and you are insincere in your arguments in this House. That is my contention. It is all right for your language to sound sweet. I heard one talking about Aristotle and another about Plato. I did not go to school for very long, and both of them were Ministers of Education, one in your administration and one out here. Now, where am I

who did not go to school? Therefore I have to go on with him, he would be like me, because the experts seem to differ.

You differ with the Government experts and you are expecting me to support yours. I want an independent view and that independent view has to be that of the Barbados Medical Association.

Mr. Chairman, I have made enquiries about whether they have ever written the Ministry saying that the generics are of no use, that they are difficult to monitor and that the Drug Plan is a bad plan, a plan that is going to cost the country millions of dollars. I believe that if you add up the money that the very old people you talked about who used to come and pay you \$35 for the first visit, \$20 on the second, then they were told to come back in six weeks' time to get their blood pressure checked and that was \$10, then they were to come back in another two months' time to get another blood test for another \$10, and they would get a handshake and a "Good morning, Gran, how are you? You are looking well," that was another \$10 — when you add up all that you all do over a period of years, you would see that it cost more than the drug plan. It was a bare rip off, a lot of you in this country rip off people, and this Government set out to curb some of those dangers to the society and to provide for the country a plan that would reduce the cost of drugs in this country for the old and the young.

Mr. Chairman, it has my blessing, Sir, and I am prepared to err with the experts. I cannot and will no longer accept the opinions of the member for St. Michael North West and the member for St. Michael South Central. They have made speeches with passion and vigour, and because one has medical knowledge and another who is a chemist or dispenser a knowledge of drugs they think they could baffle me into something, but I prefer to err with the experts than with both of them.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, today I have heard a lot of hysteria from the Opposition benches. The honourable doctor is in a position to attempt to blind us with science and scientific jargon, and he does not lose or waste an opportunity to do that, but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that Barbadians are far more intelligent, far more educated and a far more thinking people than the honourable Member for South Central gives them credit for.

We have heard a great deal today about the word "generic". When I first introduced the Drug Bill into this Hon. Chamber, I tried to explain not only for the benefit of honourable Members, but for the public benefit, the difference between generic and brand name drugs. Happily, Mr. Chairman, since that time we now have a situation in Barbados where the generic is commonplace. May I draw an illustration?

At the supermarket where I shop I now see on the shelves a certain range of products called No Name products — large boxes of corn flakes, large containers of tea, large jars of coffee, large packets of biscuits, and there is no special label, no special patented marking on them. There is just a plain label and the only thing you see on the label is actually an indication of what is contained in the jar or the box or the packet. These No Name products are coming at a far less expensive cost than the brand name products, and in my supermarket, I see that Barbadians are buying the No Name products.

So there is no difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in Barbadians understanding now a little more clearly that when we say generic, we are talking about the same product. The corn flakes that are in the Special K box or in the Kellogg's box, or in the boxes of all those other people who make corn flakes, are no different in quality or in taste than those you will find in the No Name box. Barbadians now know this on a daily living basis and so they do not have as much difficulty nowadays, as they used to have, in understanding that when we say generic we are talking about the same decent, good quality as the brand name drugs, but that the only difference is to be found in the price.

Mr. Chairman, again picking out pieces from the hysterical tirade I heard coming from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, it is sometimes difficult for me to keep remembering that he practises medicine in our community. We live in a community — not now, but for many years — where drugs do not come into this country willy nilly. We have heard accusations about dumping, we have heard about escalating costs, cheap drugs and poor quality. The honourable doctor is not going to tell this Honourable House that before the Drug Service came into being, that there were quantities and quantities of tablets which were not in tablet form when they arrived at the Queen Elizabeth hospital — that they has fallen apart, so to speak, and would arrive in powdered form.

The Deputy Director of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is sitting there. If this was a Court of Law he could come and give that evidence, because he had given it to me at the time when I was his Minister. The Director of the Drug Service is there and he knows about these things. The honourable doctor knows of these things too, Mr. Chairman, but it is very easy and cheap to come in here and make a big show because you are the only doctor in here, and it does not lie well in the mouths of doctors to stand up to the public and decry generic drugs and at the same time seek to defend brand name drugs.

It is well known that everywhere in the world doctors have a heavy financial investment in brand name drugs, and therefore have an interest to protect, and the honourable doctor knows that. I am not accusing him of

having any financial interest in the manufacture of certain brand name drugs, but it is a too common practice; and everywhere in the world people are crying out against the cost of brand name drugs.

In the United States of America there is a whole chain of drug stores now called the People's Drug Stores — Mr. Chairman, you must know about them — and you can take your prescription there and they will substitute whatever is on it for the best quality generic drug that is available.

5.50 p.m.

They go on and on and talk about escalating costs. The cost of everything is escalating in this world. As I have said before in this Chamber, if we did not cut at the very root of the cost of drugs, it means that the cost would have escalated in Barbados perhaps at a faster rate, but like the cost of everything else the cost of drugs will continue to rise. We know that we are living in what we now call the post OPEC days. The honourable doctor and the honourable pharmacist on the other side will tell you if they want to be straightforward with you, that certain petroleum products form the base of many many drugs which are in common use today, and that factor alone frightens us when we want to look at the possibilities for escalation in cost in the drug industry. So this is not anything peculiar to Barbados, Mr. Chairman. It is not anything that Barbadians must be afraid of.

Generic drugs were not new to Barbados when the Drug Service started. It is just that we are wanting to bring economies wherever we can, and wherever it is possible in the National Formulary you will be encouraged to go generic rather than brand. It is as simple as that, and I do not want people to keep on referring to the National Formulary as though it is something written in marble. The National Formulary is a flexible document; it has a series of drugs in it, and there is more than ample room for substitution to be found within the National Formulary. So it is not fair to get up in here and say that if you are prescribed one drug and you do not want to go generic that the National Formulary will not make accommodation for you. The National Formulary contains not only generic drugs, Mr. Chairman, but also brand name drugs.

We hear about this wave of cheap generic drugs. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the same sources from which we purchased drugs before the National Health Service and the Drug Service began are the same sources from which today we are purchasing both generic and brand name drugs. The fact is, as you must know being a chemist yourself, that there is only a handful of reputable drug companies in this world. There are several subsidiaries, but our sources are no different.

There is also another practice which must be known to the honourable doctor and the honourable pharmacist on the other side, and this is why I have such great difficulty understanding why they would seek to mislead this House and deliberately so, because we have a policy — and we have had it for years in this country — where every drug that is imported must have a quality certificate coming with it, and not only a quality certificate; it must have a certificate from the country of manufacture saying that that drug is used in the country of manufacture. In other words, it must be good enough for your people before it can be good enough for my people. The honourable Member for St. Michael South as a former Minister of Health knows that that is so. The honourable doctor should know that that is so; the honourable pharmacist knows that that is so, and it is irresponsible to stand up in here and try to give the impression that under the Drug Service we are importing inferior, cheap and no-good drugs.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about how the generic companies bribe people and how they dump drugs in this country. (*Asides.*) I did not say that the honourable pharmacist said that. I said he should know. The honourable doctor said these things and gave those impressions. He is the master of impressionism. The honourable pharmacist will know these things, but he must not be complying by his silence.

Now, we have heard about dumping and we have heard all the decrying about how the generic companies bribe people. Mr. Chairman, there are some cases before the Courts of the world today where drug companies bribe not only people but entire Governments. So there is no point making that kind of point about generic drugs as though it is not true of brand name drugs. It is true of a whole line of products. It is true about aeroplanes, it is true about motor cars, it is true about drugs. The fact is that after advertising, the drug industry is the greatest profit-bearing industry in the entire world today. There is money in it, and that brings me to the point I really want to make.

There is no druggist or pharmacist, there is no doctor in Barbados today who does not deep in his heart and in his conscience want to support the National Drug Service. Do not mind all that lip service given the fewer service systems in Ontario and other metropolitan countries. The fewer service systems generate demand. The more people come to you, the more complaints you can find wrong with them, the more fees you will get. The *per capita* system that we are wanting to implement here does not give any doctor an interest in generating any great demand because for the same amount of money he would be interested in treating fewer and fewer patients, and all the over-subscribing and all the good morning gland would come to an end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the real point that has to be made is this: as I was saying there is no doctor, there is no pharmacist or druggist in this country who deep in his heart and conscience does not wish to support the Barbados National Drug Service. It is not an issue that we want to be politically partisan on. That has been said in this Chamber time and time again. It almost goes without saying.

The point of departure, Mr. Chairman, comes at the dollar sign. The National Drug Service has problems with the pharmacists over a profit margin. That is the only hurdle left to be jumped. They are business people and they are entitled to make a profit, and I will defend their right to make a profit. All that has happened is that the Government and the industry or the association cannot arrive like any other employer and employee situation at an amicably agreeable percentage of margin of profit, and the honourable pharmacist knows that. They are going to arrive at that.

They will sit down and they will talk and talk and will arrive at it because these pharmacists who are in fact in the National Drug Service and dispensing it under the National Health Service are reporting that they are doing very well, that their patients are happy, that their patients are paying less than they used to for drugs even in the face of escalating costs and that they are making a profit, and I have absolutely no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that in due course the rest of the pharmacists are going to fall in. Let them agree on the margin of profit.

That same hurdle lies now to be crossed in respect of the doctors. The Government is at the point where it is seeking to arrive at an agreement between itself and the doctors in this country in respect of what they will be paid for certain procedures and for certain practices in the clinical or the medical part of the National Health Service.

So don't mind all this flannel and fizz that is being talked in here; it comes down to dollar bills and like any other dispute over money, it will be settled in due course and Barbadians will become fully entitled to the National Health Service for which they have voted not once, not twice, but thrice.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I might make one final point before I sit in respect of the Special Benefit Service. The honourable Member for St. Michael Central earlier today—I think very well again in this Honourable Chamber—articulated in the way which the Special Benefit Service is meant to work. But I want to say that the Special Benefit Service is exactly what it says. It is meant to specially benefit certain sectors in our community who even—

according to the other side in their days of the free-for-all—were not enjoying the benefits that they should.

We had a free-for-all system I do not deny it. We had a free-for-all system at the clinics, Health Centres and the Casualty where people who could afford would go in. I used to have a basket—I had to throw them away—I used to have a basket, \$200 worth of drugs when doctors were over prescribing them because they were free and the taxpayers were paying for them. Any and everybody—whosoever will—went and got; and the people for whom that service should properly have been operating were the people who were edged out of it. That is what the Special Benefit Service is meant to do.

I have no problem with people who can afford to pay going to the doctors and paying some cost, not if the price for it is that all the old age pensioners, all the people over 65 in this country are going to get free drugs and all the children under six. The honourable Member—the honourable Pharmacist—wanted to know what is the magic number of six. The magic number of six is very simple. It is that when the child is six years old it goes into the School Health Service and so we are seeking to look after it up until the time it is six years old.

Formerly we handled the situation where the child remained in our care in the Health Centres until the age of four and you had a gap between four and six where those children were no longer seen on a regular basis in the Health Centres and by the time they caught up with them in the primary schools, at six years old, some of them has suffered dramatic reversals. So this is just an attempt as an on-going, continuous plan and a sane approach to the individual health of our aged.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Special Benefit Service is I think, a fine price to pay. All of those over 65 those with special diseases, a category which is not told, hypertension, diabetes and cancer patients—the three big killers—those are the drugs which cost a great deal of money and that is where the big numbers are when we are talking about morbidity in our community.

That is in a very small nutshell what the National Drug Service is all about. I want people to stop calling it the Drug Plan. It is a service. It is on the ground, it is working and Barbadians want to be given a chance to have access to it. I want to appeal to the pharmacists and to the doctors to try and come at the very soonest opportunity to some amicable agreement with the Government with respect to fees and charges and costs of their services so that we can open up the whole of this Service to the people of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister may wind up.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we have had another wide ranging debate on drugs and health in this country and bearing in mind that this is the month of the Estimates, I am wondering if the other side is not giving itself a chance to debate Health when the time comes but rather they think that if they do it now, they would not have to do it then; because certainly the recitation every week of the same type or argument will not go down well with the public in this country.

I want to start off by saying that the National Drug Service is here to stay. The National Health Service will be implemented to stay. In Great Britain it took a very long time to fully implement its National Health Service and up to now I am not even too sure that it is properly implemented. The pitfalls which the Government and Council in Great Britain faced with the implementation of its service, the Government of Barbados is trying to avoid and therefore by trial and error — and we hope, not with much error — we hope to implement the National Health Service and we are going full steam with the National Drug Plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard quite a lot being said here today. The honourable Member for St. Michael North West who seemed to be much at variance with his colleague from St. Michael South Central said that there was no argument at all about the integrity of the personnel of the Formulary Committee. At least the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central eventually came back and said that he was the author of such a Formulary Committee and that the people who are now on that Committee were people whom he brought into that body. That is really a strange revelation in the face of the things which he said previously and also which he said earlier in the day.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West said at the time of the implementation of the Drug Plan that there were 28 pharmacies. My reckoning is and from the information at my disposal, — probably you may be better off than I am; you may have a better network of collecting information than me — the Statistical Department says that there are 33.

You also said that the private companies in Barbados — and you can correct me if I did not hear you correctly — are importing drugs to the tune of \$7 700 000. This seems a very strange figure to me because the figures which I also have are that the figures are something like Bds \$10 million per annum which works out to something like \$40 per capita of the population so I do not know exactly where the information is coming from but probably it can be neither here or there in the question of figures. It is not my duty to mislead but I will have to give as best information as is available to me.

The Member for St. Michael North West asked a number of pertinent questions despite the fact that he was trying to score political points. He said that he gave a lot of the services free and he corrected this today by saying later on, that he made a number of sacrifices by going to various areas in order to give assistance.
6.10 p.m.

I would like to know where he made these sacrifices. If he was speaking in terms of the overall population of the country from the point of view of administering drugs to them, if he was speaking in terms of the political gains which were there to be made. As a matter of fact, I would hope to think that that is probably what he had in mind. He also mentioned the point of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the question which I do not want to go into at this time. I believe a debate may soon come here, in which you might be able to have a full discussion on that. But if I consider it necessary, I may, later on make a statement on that.

Do not seek to condemn the Government for everything that is happening in the institutions under the Government. The Government is responsible in here as was much canvassed today and no Hon. Minister is going to shirk easily from his responsibility, certainly, not this one.

But I am not to know if the patients at the Geriatric Hospital did not have coke this morning. I would hope that it is brought to my attention that there was no money to buy meat, or that the meat did not come and let me make a noise about it and bring people to look on these matters. But I am not going around there like a detective to know what is going on at the Psychiatric, Geriatric, the Queen Elizabeth or the Polyclinics or anywhere, for that matter. I am not going to fight to know all of those things. I am too busy a person to look on all those things. But when matters are brought to my attention, I immediately take action in order to cure the problems.

So if there are problems at the QEH with respect to linens they will be dealt with in the fullness of time. And I hope that you would not be too unhappy over the things which will be said.

But you ask why the escalation of cost. And I think that the question is a very legitimate question and certainly deserves an answer. Now the amount of \$4 338 447 was voted under this Head and there is an amount which has come over of something like \$1.34 million. In addition to that, we owe the Central Purchasing Department — again this is a hangover from the past and when you have to go over with the physics, you have these types of problems when the Bill sometimes does not come in time, you have problems at the last moment, these are

problems which you encounter — there is something like \$68 000 which owed to the Central Purchasing Department.

Purchases delivered to the dispensaries up to September 30 last year amounted to \$3 394 510 and the amount of money paid to the private pharmacies re the Special Benefits to October 31 1981 was to the order of \$40 233. The amount which we are now seeking to have, in the supplementary provision, will meet the expenditure up to the end of this financial year. Medicine, because of the system which is now applied, is to some extent, easily available to people and the people are making much use of this Service. The Service is not restricted. You say that it is not free. You say that we promised a free Health Service, we promised a free Drug Service and yet we are not giving it.

I have made the point before and I am going to make it again, with some emphasis. Nothing is really free, it has to come from somewhere. It comes, in the final analysis, from the taxpayers and if you have industries, if you have oil, if you have resources where you can get royalties from them, you might not have to tax the public to get those things. Probably, if you live in Libya or if you live in Saudi Arabia or in Iran or one of those countries, you might be able to get what you want without having to pay income tax in order to carry the burden. But the money must come from somewhere.

And I would tell you, it is not a bad thing to have people in the community who are able to make a contribution towards the drug because you will find, as in England, there were people who had good false teeth and still decided that they were going to change them ever so often without any reason. And the Hon. Minister of Education — my predecessor in office — mentioned people who had baskets of drugs because they were able to get them free. They did not appreciate the fact that those drugs had to be paid for. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: How come? They were cheaper.) And therefore, this is a natural propensity on the part of people who feel — and I will tell you, we are a danger to the society when many people believe that everything must be given freely to them. It is the worst situation that you can lead any society into. You have to let them understand that they have to pay. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is true.)

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Member is misleading me. I do not know if he is misleading this Honourable House. I feel so. You see, Sir, he just stated that leading a community into believing that they can get something free is the worst form of something. Now saying that on a background of his Manifesto having told the population that they would get the drugs free, I am totally confused, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Please. I have heard. The Chairman has heard.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member seems to be all intoxicated by his own verbosity. I just do not know why he must always rise. He is like a mullet. If he sees a bait he must take the hook line and the sink at the same time. *(Laughter)*

Mr. Chairman, the point that I am putting forward is that the worst thing you can have is a society in which people expect to get everything free. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You cannot afford it.) You cannot afford it in the society, and people must learn to make a contribution to anything which they are using. The first phase of the National Health Service will make provision for the people over 65, the indigent and the children up to age six — special provision will be made for them. We will go on and we will monitor the situation and then — the other group will be phased in. Those are people who are in the vulnerable areas as far as health is concerned, and therefore you consider that they are the people you would bring in. No matter what happens, you have got to look after them.

The reason why you have brought in them is because, no matter what happens, they have to be taken care of and the people who are over 65 and the children who are under 6 and the indigent are not the people who are as prone, as the others. And, if a person becomes chronically ill within that age group, they are looked after as well. So, therefore, the Government has its eyes opened. We are hearing a lot here, Mr. Chairman — incidental to this, somewhat — about the Government not meeting certain commitments of its promises to people and what have you. These are things which have got to be looked at very carefully and have always got to be properly analysed. The Government is monitoring all the situations and will make sure that everything correct is done in the interest of the people of Barbados.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West said that there is no provision for the testing of drugs in Barbados. I suppose it might be useful, if you can take this matter up with your colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I suppose it is well known that we send our drugs to Jamaica to be tested. It would cost the country a fortune to set up a testing laboratory for all drugs in Barbados. You have to do a measure of sampling with respect to drugs and you have to look at it in this light.
6.20 p.m.

I hope that in the fullness of time some laboratory might well come into the Caribbean which might be able to serve the entire region and to which Barbados will have quick and ready access. We are a small community, we

use very limited drugs and therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to have a laboratory for the testing of drugs in Barbados.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West touched on a lot of problems. He dealt with the question of markups, he talked about the spillage and the spoilage within the druggists' department, what problems the pharmacists will have and what costs they will have to bear. I do not believe there are many rich druggists in this island, if there are at all, but I know that some of them can be unreasonable as well.

He asked the question too of a survey which he said that the Ministry of Health has undertaken to conduct to be carried out by Systems. Systems is not doing a job for us, Systems is doing a job for the Pharmaceutical Society — for your body. You should know this. You are not aware of what is going on, you are only coming in here and trotting out things without knowing what is going on in your Society. You are a delinquent member of your Society. You should know what is going on. You should come here to properly advise me today of what Systems has recommended. I have told them to come back to me and up to now they have said nothing. They have to come to me, we have made an arrangement that they would come back to me on this matter.

Certain remarks made by Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Hon L. B. BRATHWAITE were ordered to be expunged from the record by the CHAIRMAN at this stage.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot today about the brand names, we have heard a lot today about generic drugs, and what have you. I am going to say a few things here now and I want to direct this particular point before I go on to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. You are no longer the most powerful man in the land as far as medicine and the hospital are concerned. I want to address that remark to you. *(Aside)*. You were, because you were able to stop an enquiry into its functioning and you were powerful enough to do that and to have the Minister then transferred to another portfolio. You were a powerful man, and I am not going to deny that you were.

Mr. Chairman, in all types of drugs, in brand name drugs you get weak drugs and you get mistakes made in those drugs as well. In the generic drugs you get the drugs and you get mistakes in drugs, but more than that, Mr. Chairman, men like you and me and all of us in here — as well as women — make those drugs and they are subject to mistake. It is recorded somewhere in the Good Book that God said he repented he had made man, and therefore we are subject to mistakes. *(Aside)*. I am sure, seeing the behaviour of the honourable Member for St. Michael West, God certainly would repent that He made him.

Mr. Chairman, the whole position is this: that we are not stopping any brand of drugs from coming into this country if they meet the criteria. All they have to do is to meet the criteria. In addition to the drugs being tested for use in the country from which they come, the drugs are also tested when they come to Barbados. They have to come here with a certificate, and if they do not come with that certificate the drug is rejected. Drugs are not allowed to come in here willy nilly, and all the honourable Members who are in medicine and drugs would know that.

I have said — and I am going to repeat it again — that all we have heard here today from the Opposition benches is calculated to destroy the National Drug Plan and the National Health Service. I am very satisfied about that, but I want to assure them that there is nothing they say that will stop the Plan from going into operation.

I believe that we have overcome, up to this moment, the major obstacles and difficulties which we initially encountered, and I want to appeal to the honourable Member for St. Michael North West to give and to lend his weight in ensuring that this plan for drugs succeeds. It will redound to your credit. Get into the organisation and try to put your point of view over. Whatever there is can only be found out and dealt with adequately when we have dialogue on the subject. It is the only way you can succeed.
6.30. p.m.

Coming here in the hope that you can score cheap political points will not do anybody any good at this time, and I would hope that the honourable Member would use his influence as well as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who I have no doubt in my mind, is influential in his profession and among his peers in order to bring about a Drug and Health Service that will be of great credit to this country and do honour to himself.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1981 — 82 No. 22

Head 19 — Ministry of Finance and Planning — was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 19, Ministry of Finance and Planning, stand part.

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

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

Head 20 – Revenue Collection – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 20 – Revenue Collection, stand part.

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

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

Head 25 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs, stand part.

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

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

Head 36 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36 – Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – stand part.

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

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, this Head states that the inadequacy of the vote under Head 36 (1) Item 2, – Other Personal Emoluments – is due to the payment of acting allowances and the payment of substitutes following the grant of training leave to two Research Officers for a period of five months and six months respectively and the secondment of one Administrative Officer to the CARIFESTA Secretariat for four months.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side are happy to see that some provision is being made for the payment of these two officers who were seconded to CARIFESTA or to the Department of Culture, as a matter of fact, but at the same time I believe that it gives us an opportunity to look at some aspects of CARIFESTA.

I believe too that most Barbadians and indeed Members of this Honourable House would have some doubt about the actual event, and indeed some people are asking whether or not we were wise in hosting this event. Of course that might be – to use the usual phrase – being wise after the event, but if one were to look at CARIFESTA and judge it as whether it was a failure or a success, I believe that we would be prone to believe that it was more a failure than a success, and as such we

would want to ask why. Why was it not as successful as was anticipated in the first place?

We attended the previous CARIFESTA in Cuba and I believe it was there that the then Minister, the honourable Member for St. George South said that we would host CARIFESTA, and at the time I believe that most Barbadians were happy with the decision. But it was not as successful as we had anticipated and some reasons should be given or some questions should be asked. It seems to us on this side of the House that first of all there was some bad planning.

Those of us who attended the NIFCA performances over the years would realise that the one thing which was missing in the planning of CARIFESTA was that some of those persons who were most instrumental in ensuring that NIFCA reach the required standard, were somewhat absent from the Planning Committee of CARIFESTA. I am not here to say why – I do not know – and I believe that the Hon. Minister or the person who was responsible at that time might be in a position to explain or to give some reason as to what did go wrong.

It seems to me that at that time, it would have been in the interest of all Barbadians – and I believe the good name of Barbados throughout the Caribbean – that we should have the most knowledgeable people available to assist in the planning of CARIFESTA. Added to that, it seems to me also that our planning was rather late in coming on stream. I am not sure if that was because of the financial constraints at the time, but you will recall that early in the planning or the pronouncement as to whether or not we should host CARIFESTA, the Minister said that we would have a village, and I believe it was supposed to be West Terrace.

The fact of the matter is that West Terrace was not ready for CARIFESTA and we had to accommodate the various participants who I believe were some 2 000 to 3 000 in various places such as schools and hotels, and this in itself created enormous problems in the sense that first of all it did away with the village atmosphere which is so essential to the life of the festivities which are going on. For example, at Olympics you have an Olympic Village, although sometimes there are many villages and it adds to the understanding between the people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Carifesta was not only held for the performances but indeed to understand peoples of various cultures and so that people of like minds could come together, and the splitting up of the various contingents did a lot to dampen the interest and enthusiasm which CARIFESTA could have had. This meant that in some respects really, the participants were annoyed because – I do not know by what yardstick it was judged

- some went to some of the hotels and some went to schools, and the schools in many instances were not equipped as well as the hotels would have been, and this created a severe problem. In addition to that was the fact that the transport system seemed to have broken down. Indeed very often we noticed that buses were running with three or four members from various contingents, and this in itself created a problem for the local population because very often people would be waiting at the bus stop for buses and they would see a CARIFESTA bus going through with four people.

Mr. Chairman, our local contingent also suffered tremendously from transportation problems. I am dealing with the planning of the Festival, and I can recall one occasion where our national choir had to perform at Codrington and then was asked to leave there at 8 o'clock in the evening to go as far as Farley Hill. Well that was impossible, which meant that the people in that area were deprived of seeing our own national choir. This in itself also meant that people found difficulty in getting from one venue to another. Very often because the contingents were split up in either dancing, drama, or singing, it meant that buses were pulling off to go from one area to another which meant that there did not seem to be that degree of coordination which was essential for the proper functioning of CARIFESTA.

6.40 p.m.

Again in the planning decisions to me, and to us on this side of the House, it seemed that the importation of tents was a last minute effort and as far as the tent at Trents was concerned, it was only used once throughout the whole CARIFESTA.

My own investigation was that the tents were not suitable or are not suitable to Barbados and when at St. James Secondary School persons were advised to put it in one area they said that "No", the playing field was better only to find that when it rains in that area it floods tremendously and the participants could not get to the tent.

In the case of the tent at the St. James Secondary School, what has happened is that the tent has taken up more than half of the playing field and in placing it there, it has destroyed the playing field. In June of 1981 the playing field was ready but because of CARIFESTA there is no more playing field not only from the point of view of place but the destruction which the trucks did to that playing field. I understand that now in order to move these tents it will cost some \$1.5 million. To move the tent at Trents alone it would cost \$100 000 which means that the tent is there to stay and as far as that tent is concerned, we understand that it is not under the.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is a point of order. First of all I want to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that it is highly disrespectful for the honourable Member to be addressing the Chair with his hands in his pockets. That is the first thing, Sir. I think we are well aware of some of the actual ethics in here and I would at least just draw that to Your Honour's attention, Sir. I mean, it is highly disrespectful of him, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member, please, please.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with the tents and I will continue to deal with the tents at St. James.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I rise on a point of relevance, Sir. This debate of which the Head is Civil Aviation cannot accommodate any debate of CARIFESTA. I will point out, Sir, that the object of the supplementary is to pay personal emoluments which are due by the Civil Aviation out of the Civil Aviation Fund to people who acted in Civil Aviation and there are three people which the Resolution deal with.

Firstly there were two officers who were on leave so therefore substitutes had to be paid. That has to come out of the Civil Aviation Vote because there were doing work in Civil Aviation and if you give people leave you have to pay them from the Civil Aviation Vote. The third officer was seconded away from Civil Aviation to do CARIFESTA business but what we are paying for is for the person who did the work in Civil Aviation when he was doing other work.

In no circumstance can this form a debate on Carifesta.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I allowed the honourable Member some latitude. Do not mind if you disagree? You are never relevant. Mr. Chairman, I thought the honourable Member would have dealt with it lightly but the honourable Member is now going into matters which when the Opposition had the opportunity to debate in this House they did not debate it. I object strongly to this Head being used as the basis for a debate when this has nothing to do with CARIFESTA and I draw your attention to the rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. I accept the point made by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister. I believe however, that it would have been much better — and he would have save a whole lot of trouble and time — if the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister had mentioned

these things when he introduced the Head. The honourable Member for St. James South is really going into a debate on Carifesta which is not and cannot be permitted at this time. I will let you continue and wind up your speech dealing with the specific problem relating to the Civil Aviation aspects of it.

Now before the honourable Member rises I must have an indication — (*Mr. TAITT stands*). On what do you rise?

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That cannot be at this stage. They can be no point of order at this stage. I cannot entertain it at this stage.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege because the point I am raising has to do with a question of privilege, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has lost his chance. Let me hear from the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. The honourable Member is out of order. Order, please.

Mr. Chairman stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. James South.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will be brief by just saying that although the money which we are asking now is to pay the members who were attached to the desk of CARIFESTA I believe.....

Hon H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order. They were not attached to the desk. We are asking for people who worked in Civil Aviation. The honourable Member was a Magistrate and he was seconded to work in Youth Affairs. When he was in Youth Affairs, somebody had to do the work as a Magistrate and I am trying to explain that the Magisterial Vote would have to carry the cost of that person. When the vote comes up for the other....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the honourable Member understands.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on the point just raised by the honourable Member, I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention that because of the expenditure which we are now dealing with, the cost of that

expenditure is CARIFESTA, Sir. Mr. Chairman, please hear me. Mr. Chairman, he is saying that the money is coming from the Civil Aviation Head. We are contending — please hear me, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I have already dealt with that matter.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am dealing with the point he raised, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already dealt with the point raised by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But then what the Deputy Prime Minister said should be struck from the records, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But what puzzles me most — and I must ask for order. Order, please. What we must understand is that we have Reporters working in here and we must facilitate them in their work.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of your ruling I prefer not to comment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, and the Estimates are coming up now. The question is that Head.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to ask the Minister on this question of \$36 171.29, we are now moving to supplement this amount into the Ministry of Civil Aviation and I wish the Minister to indicate to this Honourable House what is the thinking which allowed the Ministry of Civil Aviation to permit this extra expenditure by allowing one of the officers whose substantive responsibility was for Civil Aviation to be moved off to some other area. Is it that that particular officer had some special expertise in the area of Carifesta, Sir? It is said here "one Administrative Officer to the Carifesta Secretariat."
6.50 p.m.

Is it that this particular officer had some special expertise.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is the second time you asked that question.)..... dealing with the expenditure of money and the planning of CARIFESTA? It cannot be so, Sir. It cannot mean that this officer had any special expertise because if one looks at the planning which took place for the event which he left to go to, Sir, one can see immediately that there was no special expertise brought to bear in the area where this officer is said to have gone. It cannot be, Sir. Let us look at some of the snafus, let us look at some of the foul-ups which occurred in the area where the officer from the Civil Aviation Department.....

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I must object, Sir, because the honourable Member is trying through the back door to do exactly the same thing and you have ruled on that, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really do not understand the submission by the honourable Member. I am asking him a question about the Department of Civil Aviation. Is he saying now that he is not entitled to be asked that question? I do not understand how he can accuse me of coming through the back door.

I am saying that the reason why we are spending this money, Mr. Chairman, is because he, as Hon. Minister — or whoever is the administrator in his Civil Aviation Department — allowed his Administrative Officer to be moved, and now he comes back to Parliament to ask for additional money. I am trying to seek the justification for this supplementary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have asked your question.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have more to say, Sir. I am dealing with the general practice of taking persons from one department, after Parliament had decided on the amount of money to be spent in that department, after Parliament has been given to understand that the expenditure for a particular department would be a certain amount of money, then Parliament discovers subsequently that a subterfuge is possible because, Sir, if what they are saying, if what the honourable Member is contending is that this is money from Civil Aviation then when the honourable Member came down here for Head 36, in the first place, this Honourable House was not given the full information. To have told us that he had an Administrative Officer who needed a certain amount of money and now to come back and tell us that he needs more money for the Administrative Officer although we are told in the Addendum to this Head where the officer went, he is saying that where the officer went is not the concern of this Honourable House. That is what he is saying.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am getting into the debate because of the real absolute, I do not know what to call it. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Is it a point of order?) (Hon. Del. O. BRADSHAW: You are shaping good for the Court.) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do you like it?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is nearly 7 o'clock. Go ahead, let us hear you. Are you making a speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You intend to do what Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I asked if you are making a speech. *(Laughter)*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If you permit me. Why not? I rose on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear your point of order. The Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, what the honourable Member for St. Michael West is setting out to do, Sir, is to try to debate this whole matter, Sir, in the light of his colleagues hearing and in your light you would listen. There is no way, Mr. Chairman, there is no way, Sir.

What the honourable Member for St. James South was pointing out was specifics — the planning of CARIFESTA and you quite rightly ruled, Sir, that he cannot deal with it. Now, you have the honourable Member for St. Michael West doing the same thing, Sir. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Not true.) Well what are you talking about then? You were not talking about anything then.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please, please. I take note of your point. Please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You will have to go home.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member may continue his dissertation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, carry on. It is nearly 7 o'clock.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am really concerned that an Hon. Minister who comes to us for a supplementary — and it is not as if that Hon. Minister comes regularly but the Government comes regularly I am concerned that when they come down for these bits of money — this is over \$2 million Sir — in a situation where this country is in such bad shape, Sir, that 2 million cents is worthwhile examining in some detail. I am concerned.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Head does not require \$2 million.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Head we are discussing now.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, I cannot discuss the \$36 000 outside of the \$2 million in the Resolution. I am sure you will

grant me that, Sir. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Seven thousand.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: \$7 093.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I made the point that this forms part of a Resolution for \$2 million; that is all I said. That is a fact, Sir. Do you mean that the Hon. Minister is denying that, Sir? That the small amount..... (Asides).....you see Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. There are too many interruptions. Remember the Reporters in Parliament.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am very serious. It states here a sum of \$36 171.29 has been expended out of a provision of \$36 324.00. Now, Sir \$36 171 has been spent out of \$36 324.00 and an amount of \$7,000 is now required to supplement the available balance of \$152, *et cetera*.

We were told in this Honourable Chamber during the Estimates, on a matter that is predictable because we were talking about other personal emoluments — we were not talking about something like drugs where the price could go up suddenly by 30 per cent in a week — we were talking about a fixed amount. So this Parliament voted for a specific sum of money on the basis of information which the Hon. Minister gave to this Honourable House. Now, he comes down here, Sir, and he is saying that he needs \$7 000. And, the honourable Members over there say — and your immaculate ruling, Sir, is — that we cannot discuss the planning of CARIFESTA, with which I agree. But Sir, we can discuss what has caused this department to have to get an additional \$7 000. I think that is proper.

Sir, I am raising a question concerning this whole business of moving one officer from one department and sending an officer into another department when the officer who is being moved does not seem to have any special expertise. Any reference which I make to CARIFESTA, Sir, would only be in the context of whether that officer had special expertise pertaining to the inept planning of CARIFESTA. That would be to my own reference and I would like the Hon. Minister to be able to indicate to this Honourable House if he wishes because, Sir, these days there seems to be a question of whim and fancy. If it suits the Hon. Minister, he would tell us. If it does not suit the Hon. Minister he does not seem to have to. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Nine o'clock tomorrow morning you have to come back here and talk.) I get paid for that. That is what I get paid for, coming back at 9 o'clock. And we are young enough to do it. I do not know if the old gentleman over there will be able to come back at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this supplementary here has been brought obviously because it is clear that there will be an inefficiency in the amount of money to take you through to the end of the Financial Year, and it is in respect of the secondment to the CARIFESTA Secretariat.

I think it would be good if the Hon. Minister could give us some idea as to whether there are other officers either in the Ministry of Tourism or Civil Aviation, or indeed, other Ministries or in departments of Government or indeed in this Parliament itself who were seconded to that CARIFESTA Secretariat for whom so far no provision has been made, by way of supplementary provision or otherwise. I think we have to get the whole picture because what we are getting is the kind of *ad hoc* arrangement — piecemeal — bit by bit — and we could never get the full picture of this CARIFESTA business. I believe it is time.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I agree with that. It is now time that I report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 7 o'clock. This Sitting now stands suspended until 8 p.m. this evening. 7 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.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. The honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was raising a question here because we cannot get the overall picture as far as CARIFESTA is concerned. We have here a supplementary in respect of an officer from the Ministry of Tourism who was seconded, and we would really like to know what is the overall picture. Are there other officers in other Government departments or agencies who were also seconded but who have not yet been paid — or for whom no supplementary has

been brought in? (Mr. CHAIRMAN: A good parliamentary question). It may be a good parliamentary question, but a good point to be made in Parliament too.

I think we would like to know this, because this would be an indication of the kind of inelegance that has occurred in the total planning of CARIFESTA, and I would be glad if that particular question could be addressed, if the Minister could give us some information on that. It may be that some of the officers in certain Government agencies are still waiting. I am not talking about private individuals because I know we passed a supplementary on that. I do not know if all of them have been paid or not, but the planning of CARIFESTA is nothing of which the Government can be proud, and the fact that we are coming for these piecemeal measures is an indication of a sloppiness to which the Prime Minister referred only last week.

I hope that the Minister would address his mind to this particular point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, this particular Head deals with Civil Aviation and Tourism, Subhead 1 — General Administration, Item 2 — Other Personal Emoluments.

Sir, I am wondering whether the secondment of an officer from the Ministry of Aviation to the CARIFESTA Secretariat resulted in the confusion which existed at the airport, which was under the Ministry of Aviation during the period of CARIFESTA. There was considerable confusion there not only in respect of the many persons from the Caribbean, those attending CARIFESTA and those not attending CARIFESTA. Many people appeared to me to be hanging around the airport. I do not know whether they were sleeping in the airport or not. It appeared to me that there was a decline in the amount of ground transportation available from the airport in respect of other visitors, and this has had a serious problem as a consequence of the diversion of many taxi owners and drivers from airport work. Many of them have not been able to continue in their usual service to visitors to this country, because they have not been paid as a consequence of the step taken by the Ministry of Aviation during this particular period in respect of the management of the airport. So several millions of dollars would still be owed away to those who normally provide those ground services from the airport to the hotels.

Many of those people run mini buses and they cannot get any money from the banks. They have been forced to go to private individuals to borrow money because the Government has not paid them their money, and many of these people provide transport from the airport. So the few tourists coming to this island during

this particular season have had some problems with ground transportation from the airport — which falls under the Ministry of Aviation — consequential on the financial difficulties imposed upon the transportation services which they normally provide.

I am confining my remarks strictly to the Ministry of Aviation, and I am not going to deviate from that in any way. This is a proper and legitimate way of debating under this particular Head.

I believe, Sir, that if the Ministry of Aviation did not second this officer, thereby incurring this additional expenditure, and had made proper use of the existing ground services in a highly service oriented population like Barbados — which has a very well organised infrastructure in tourism — I believe that the Ministry of Tourism would not today have been coming for this money. And all the confusion in respect of the movement of visitors to this country that occurred during the month of June 1981, all the confusion consequential on this aviation policy decision to move this officer from his job and send him elsewhere would not have happened, and the people of Barbados would not have been landed with a bill of over \$20 million as a consequence of this act of gross mismanagement on the part of the Ministry of Aviation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would the Hon. Minister please move the Head?

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: I will not reply to the last speaker, Sir, because he was obviously under great strain, so great a strain that he has attributed all kinds of things to what he regards as an act of secondment.

The only other area strictly under this Head that I would speak of, Sir, is the question of the research. The Government believes that this area is an area which requires trained people and that is why we permitted two officers to go and train abroad. Of course, when the officers go on training abroad, the work has to be continued here in Barbados, so you have to pay for two sets of people — the people abroad and the people here.

That was not anticipated at the time of the Estimates, because we do not know when the scholarship opportunities are going to come up. A number of international organisations offer us scholarships, but sometimes they take a long time to go through the bureaucracy, and then when they get into our Ministry of Foreign Affairs they have to be sent to the Ministry of Education which then has to distribute them, so it is very difficult.

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 37 – Ministry of Transport and Works – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Head 37 stand part.

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

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

Head 41 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Head 41 stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Head 41, Sub-head 8 – Queen Elizabeth Hospital – Supplies and Materials.
8.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Health one or two problems which I feel are of great importance to this country. This Head refers to supplies and materials. Now amongst supplies to a hospital would be operating tables. I want to draw his attention to the fact that since January 5 of this year three modern operating tables – electronically operated – and one steriliser have been lying in the Harbour here in Barbados. That creates a serious problem, Mr. Chairman, because unless that equipment is moved from the Harbour as soon as possible, it will be severely damaged and considerable losses will be incurred.

A similar situation occurred in respect of a similar type of steriliser costing some \$US70 000 – I am informed – which since arrival in the hospital – because it was left in the Court for a prolonged period of time the engineers so far have not been able to get it. Now we are talking here of several hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I understand the problem is that payment for these materials were by means of a site draft, and there is some complication between Central Purchasing and elsewhere – I do not know where – in order to get the goods out of the Harbour. I must point out that if this continues, it is going to create problems with suppliers in respect of parts, because if the people are not paid, then they will demand other lines of credit – letters of credit and so on – to be established, and create serious problems for the maintenance staff of the Hospital.

I should also like to point out that under linens, it is not only in the operating theatre but also the wards there are short of linen. Patients for example cannot get pillows because pillow cases are not there. I have had one of those complaints – not from my patient – but only this morning I was told that by a patient who was in the hospital two months ago. The mattresses in the hospital are in a serious state of disrepair. Some of them are soiled and need replacements. The beds or at least the springs in the beds in the hospital need to be replaced or repaired because they have become now after almost 20 years almost like hammocks in the institution. These are facts that we have to face, and I bring these things to the attention of the Minister, and I have tried to assist him by trying to outline the kind of problems that you have in that area.

I should like the Minister during his period of office to pay a little more attention to make sure that there is a continued supply of the limited range of drugs in the hospital. I would also like to draw his attention to the fact that there are many tests that you cannot get done in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital because of frequent lack of re-agents. At the present moment – certainly up to three weeks ago – specimens had to be sent from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to a private laboratory in order to have thyroid tests done.

I would like to draw one particular example to the Minister of Health that it is critical in a pregnant patient that is suffering from thyroid disorders to be able to monitor the level of thyroid activity particularly in the later months of pregnancy. If you over-treat the patient you might turn that patient into a cretin, and if you under-treat the patient you may create a situation of toxicity in the child. You may produce a goiter in the child if you overtreat the patient and might create serious hazards and problems at delivery for the mother.

A problem – and this is a chronic problem – is that the hospital has to accumulate specimens for months and months, and then by the time they get the re-agents they are just dealing with a backlog of specimens, and in critical diagnostic areas when you really need the help of tests, it is a very serious thing to get a report back and instead of the result of the test, you get written on the report “No re-agents”. This has never happened in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital before, and this is what has taken place today.

I will give you one example so that you can investigate it. Just put down T3, T4, T7 and investigate it and see whether I am telling the truth. They are thyroid tests and it is a serious problem. (*Asides.*)

It is not a question of reporting anything to the CMO; it is a question of money. It is a question that

the hospital either has not got the money or if they have the money there is something wrong with the method of ordering the re-agents. The point I am making is that it is to the disadvantage of the population of this country, and here is the place to deal with money matters, because eventually when you trace it back, it has either got to be mal-administration or a shortage of money or both. I am appealing to the Minister that when I bring his attention to these areas in the Health Service, I am speaking to him in order to bring to this attention areas that should be looked into.

On the question of X-rays, this is a problem in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, although I must say it appears to me to be less so now than it was say two or three years ago, because after some 20 or 30 years, we have managed to recruit two Barbadian radiologists.

With respect to Casualty prescriptions, many patients when they go to the Casualty cannot get their prescriptions filled because of the lack of drugs, and it is not an uncommon thing for patients to be butting around the following day after they have gone to Casualty with the Government prescriptions going into Bridgetown to private dispensers to get prescriptions filled on the Hospital Casualty prescription form. Now these are facts that we just cannot ignore.

Another area that needs looking into is the question of availability of intra-venous fluids. These are very critical, particularly in the patient following operation and the patient on long-term treatment, and there have been recurrent shortages of vital intra-venous fluids. I think this is a matter that needs to be looked into. Here again I do not want to get back into the kind of debate we had earlier on, but there is something called pyrogen that gives fever in those intra-venous fluids where you have to be absolutely sure that those intra-venous fluids are bought from reputable firms, because unlike drugs where you can vomit up or you might have diarrhea or at least you have something for getting it back out of the body, once that goes directly into the circulation and is contaminated you really have very little recourse thereafter.

Now there are many other areas, but I realise that it is late in the evening and I do not want to detain this House much longer, but what I am trying to get across is that the policies pursued by this Government have led to a run-down of what you found and what you have.

8.25 p.m.

If I may suggest a very basic concept in policy development in Health in particular — although it has general applications — is to look and see what you have and see in what way you can maintain what you have, improve what you have and over the next five years

see what you can build on to the Health Service from year to year rather than shifting all and neglecting one area and moving into other areas without a proper policy to maintain what exist there.

Now, Sir, on the question of X-rays, there are people in this country who can hardly afford it because for the first time there is a private X-ray facility — apart from the St. Joseph Hospital — now here on the south coast that offers highly competent services. In fact, the same doctors who run the Queen Elizabeth Hospital X-ray Department exercise their rights as consultants to do private practice there.

Now quite clearly the fees which that have to charge will be much higher than the fees charged in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the simple reason — (*Asides*). Not Delaware, Delaware does not have an X-ray facility — the fees have to be higher because they have to pay the cost of equipment which would probably cost some half million or almost a million dollars in a personal investment plus they have to buy films and so on.

You will be surprised to see the number of persons who would opt to go to that facility rather than go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital because they can go down there at 8 o'clock in the morning and wait for hours on end in order to get X-rays. And simple little things that could be done, Sir, like providing adequate toilets within the X-ray Department for persons who have to have examinations of the large bowels by radiological means, many patients have complained of the humiliation to which they were subjected when they were asked to go and empty their bowels as part of the examination procedure or when they are given a gown that has been soiled by previous patients who have had to defecate as part of that procedure.

These things should not be happening in a modern hospital in this day and age when all is necessary — it is a terrible humiliating experience — I have been absolutely shocked. Now, Sir, there was a time when the facilities down there were adequate — when there was one Radiologist in the hospital — but now you have several Radiologists in the Hospital so that if you go down there and you see what is happening you would be shocked. You would not believe that you are in Barbados.

I would invite the Hon. Minister to go down to the X-ray Department one morning when they are doing their enema studies and see whether or not people should be subjected to that sort of humiliation. Sometimes males and females undress, moving pass each other in the same area. It is a serious problem down there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would not want to complain on the honourable Member's speech in terms of an after dinner address. (*Laughter*).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do appreciate the point, Sir, but, Sir, these things are very, very important and I believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Government to look at the infra-structural facilities and make sure that there are adequate supplies because unless you have supplies there is no point in appointing staff, buying heavy expensive equipment and then you do not have supplies. For example, the hospital.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wind up please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The hospital frequently runs out of materials to process X-rays films. That is a serious problem. It is also a serious problem, Sir, when materials for critical diagnostic use — injections used for diagnostic purposes which would only be available within a secondary institution — are not available. I am not finished yet, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time has gone.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to Head 41 Item 8, Sub-Head 2 — Grants and Subventions, Item 2 — Subscriptions and Contributions and the note reads: "The Government recently signed an Agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute in St. Lucia; a supplementary vote is required to meet the Government's contribution of U.S. \$11,875 for the first year of the project."

The first question I would like to ask is: when was this Agreement actually signed and where is the Agreement? This House is being called upon to vote a sum of money for some international or regional commitment and this House does not have available to it a copy of the Agreement and we therefore do not know exactly what it is that the House is being asked to vote money for. I am submitting that something has to be wrong with what is going on with the management of Government and its projects and the Agreements into which it is entering. We have got to do much better in this Parliament.

I was a member of Government. I am now in the Opposition. As a member of the Opposition I am concerned about the position of Parliament and for the short period that I will be in Opposition — we will be taking over at the next Election — for the remainder of this period I will be dedicated — and the Opposition will be dedicating all its energies — to ensuring that Parliament is established as a premier place where public affairs are properly debated and discussed.

I am saying that in this particular matter, I believe the Minister of Foreign Affairs can have a hand in this because he should ensure that these international and regional Agreements should be brought here. I do not know if he sees them in Foreign Affairs. You see the

Agreement though? I do not know. I am making the point. We as a Parliament are being called upon to vote a sum of money for the establishment of something called the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute consequent upon some Agreement that was signed sometime, but here it is we have absolutely no information which has been vouchsafed to this House.

I think this is a crying shame. (*Asides*). Exceedingly sloppy, not only sloppy. Let us put it into the superlative. We expect better from this Government. Government said it was going to bring all kinds of higher and better levels of administration and that Parliament was the place for these matters.
8.35 p.m.

I will find it very difficult — and the Opposition will find it very difficult — to support this particular supplementary unless we can get some information on the matter. (*Asides*) It is not going to take any skin off my nose. We can vote against it. I am saying that unless we get proper information on this, it will be difficult for us to support it. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, no cross talking, please. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Canada. Canada is coming up.) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: It should be in US. dollars.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I am just making a point, and instead of challenging the Opposition to vote against this measure, the Hon. Minister himself should say, all right I will give you full information.

When the matter is being introduced, it is the responsibility of Government to get up and give the relevant information. But what happened is that Government is ducking under.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: True, true true.).....(Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: Look.)..... winding-up speeches when the points made cannot be debated — and hoping to get away with that. Now I believe this measure might be in the interest of the health of the Caribbean. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not so sure about that either.)

Anyhow, I think I have made the point. I know the honourable Member for St. Michael South East has learnt very well. He now introduces his measures in the proper manner after he has had a little instruction. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I have always done.)

I believe we have to take the Hon. Minister of Health in hand — the new Hon. Minister of Health. He was all right at Communications and Works but he is in a new Ministry now and he will take a little time to find his feet. Last week he said that he did not know that there was a shortage of linen or anything like that at the

Queen Elizabeth Hospital. (Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I will deal with that.) He did not know that anything was wrong and he has constant consultations. And I read in the *Nation* now all of this.....(Asides)

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, on listening to the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, it dawned upon me — in a manner that it has never dawned upon me before — that it is a good thing that a doctor is not the Minister of Health. I hope it will never be so again. It has been so in the past and you can attest to the fact that it did not work too well. Except for the..... (Aside: Dr. Cummins.).....Dr. Caddle. Except for the Hon. Attorney-General, I do not think really that an Hon. Minister should be in a portfolio that is of his discipline.

The Hon. Attorney General must of necessity be a legally trained man and therefore.....(Aside)..... I am going to be very kind to you at this stage. I am not going to say anything. You are not going to bait me into saying anything. We are dealing now with Health. We are not dealing with the Caddlary at this moment. I will deal with the two honourable Members who have addressed the subject. These waters seem a bit deep for you. I know you enter into them very often, but for some reason, you have skilfully kept out of these waters at this point in time. I suggest that you continue to keep out.

However, we have listened here and I think according to the rules, people should try to speak in a language in here that all people can understand. If the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central wants to lecture us in Medicine, I take it he can always invite us to meet somewhere and address us on these various subjects. We ourselves have some knowledge — not knowledge which he has — but obviously, we have to catch on and try to understand what is really taking place. However, he has raised a number of good points. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you.) Unfortunately for him, he tries to over kill unnecessarily on matters, and I do not think it makes good sense.

For example, he talked about the question of having operating tables lying in the Harbour since sometime last year. Now, if operating tables concerning the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are lying in the Harbour, it is not for us really to get them out although we need them in the hospital. It is for Central Purchasing. According to the financial rules and the manner in which the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has to operate at the moment, we have got to purchase through Central Purchasing and it has been creating a lot of difficulties for us within the hospital. The hospital is a very sensitive area and as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said, it is a living area and medicine is. Therefore, the Ministry should have some freedom of operating with respect to

the purchasing, and in my view, there should be a special arrangement made which will govern and control the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the purchasing of goods that are to do with the hospital and not to send them into Central Purchasing which is extremely delaying. We cannot do it on our own.

As far as the sterilizer is concerned which costs U. S. \$70 000, I do not know what the position is. There is one thing I am going to say but, before I deal with that I better take up the point which the honourable Member for St. Michael South raised. With respect to the Agreement which you referred to about the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute in St. Lucia, that Agreement was signed by myself, I think in July last year in Belize. At the moment Governments have been urged to introduce these matters. If they cannot be done by arrangements outside of the parliamentary system, such Governments can probably go ahead according to how they are structured and sign the Agreement. Of course, they come through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as it is now, and therefore they can handle certain matters.

This matter came up before us in Belize — it was signed in Belize — and I assure the honourable Member that when the time comes if we are advised that it has to come before Parliament, it would of necessity come before Parliament. (Hon. L. R. TULL: It does not have to come before Parliament.) I do not think it has to my advise was that it did not have to come before Parliament. But I think the honourable Member wanted to know exactly, if there is an Agreement and when it was signed. I think I might have answered your point or at least brought you somewhere in the understanding of what has happened.

A lot has been said about the hospital, within the recent past.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way. It is customary in Committee....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I do not know if it is. You had a wonderful.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Either you are giving way or you are not giving way. Do not give me a lecture.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am not giving way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: A lot, Mr. Chairman, has been written and orchestrated about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and we know a lot of things. I have my good friends in there as well. The country unfor-

unately, is divided actually right down the centre. It is unfortunate that it is so. But that is how it is. Do not believe that in a hospital of doctors there are going to be all wild ones that will hate the Labour Party or nurses for that matter. All parties will have their friends.

There is one thing I want to say and I want to be on record as making this abundantly clear, the doctors and consultants — I merely wanted to say even put that in inverted commas because there are a lot of people who come into Barbados from the various territories in the Caribbean and quickly come in and believe that they are consultants — they only serve for a few short years without much experience — I would give to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he is an experienced man and I believe that he is well recognised in his discipline — there are a lot of Johnny-come-latelies who have been able to get jobs in the University and they come here and believe that they can ride rough shod over the people at the QEH and the Ministry of Health.

I want to serve notice here and now. I am satisfied on the research that I have made, that there is a proper agreement between the Government of Barbados and the University setting out the conditions for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to be a hospital of learning attached to the University of the West Indies. (Aside). 8.45 p.m.

There is none, but they come here operating as a law unto themselves, believing that they can kick down and knock down and they can do whatever they like. I tell them tonight from the floor of this Honourable House, fall in line or else. The hospital is not theirs, the hospital is owned by the people of Barbados and will be run to suit them.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gave us a lecture tonight on shoddiness. He spoke about the X-ray Department, Linens and all types of things. He also told us — and I am glad he told me too — that the doctors exercised their right to open clinics or offices where they care. That is a right that they have as it now stands, but I am going to want to have a look at that to see if the country is not being taken for a ride by the people who operate in the hospital at certain hours and move to their clinics at other hours, and to satisfy my own mind that there is not a conflict of interest.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that according to his oaths or his discipline from the University at which he was trained, there are certain things he cannot do. I want to believe that that is so, and I want to believe that that applies to all doctors as well. I want to believe that the shortages created within the hospital are not shortages created by use

other than a manner consistent with proper practices within a hospital.

Imagine surgeons can be working in a theatre and can know that they do not have tables to operate on and would wait until the last one collapses to make a noise and go out there and say that tables are not supplied. Imagine doctors would know that there is a shortage of linen — linen is what is known in a hospital as "greens" — what is put on people who are to be operated on — and I have information — and I am persuaded that the information I have is correct — that a substantial amount of the linens were destroyed either deliberately or accidentally by burning in the incinerator.

There is a committee which examines this linen and decides whether or not this linen should be disposed of, and when it was regarded that things were looking down because of the wanton destruction of the country's property, the hospital sought to get supplies from local people, but the supplies were not of the quality which would have satisfied the criterion for use in a hospital. Therefore, much as they utilised a reasonable amount of this, it could not have lasted for a long time.

The orders were placed for the linen at the appropriate time with the Crown Agents, and between the placing of the order from here and the contacts with the Crown Agents abroad the cost went up by something like \$14,000, and therefore there was a gap between the actual placing of the order and the supplying of the additional money in this respect. So the idea that you do not have drugs in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital — the idea that you do not have tables — the idea that you do not have films — the honourable Member can tell you the amount of X-rays that are being carried out at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital compared with 1976. Everybody has to be X-rayed, everybody is sent to be X-rayed at Government's expense. The volume has gone up by about 300 per cent or more in terms of films, and films are not cheap again, they are terribly expensive. Therefore, when you hear about all these shortages, ask them where the shortages are.

The same way that you can have people going to search the School Meals Workers who are coming out on evenings, it might be a good thing sometimes to pass and give a knock at some people of substance and see exactly what they are carrying as well. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Let us hear more about that). You can go and get more, you have the sources of information.

I too have my sources of information, but I will say this: I am shortly going to Cabinet to ask for an in-depth enquiry into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It will not be an enquiry like Hanschell's or Duffus' or any of that kind. The hospital to me is too sensitive an

area to be subject to the type of glare that other institutions probably can subject themselves to, and therefore I am going to have a look, and I have already asked an international body to submit names to me of doctors, nurses and administrators from whom I can select impartial persons who will be able to come in and look.

In addition to that, a Dr. Minnock, who has worked for many years at a hospital in Jamaica, in the Casualty Department, has made certain recommendations to me with respect to the upgrading of the Casualty of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. He has made verbal recommendations to me. His report is now submitted to PAHO, who recruited him on behalf of the Ministry, and will be made available to me in the fullness of time. If that report is satisfying, the contents will be implemented.

There are a number of things I would like to say. I deplore the attitude of doctors who believe that they are laws unto themselves and that they are all-powerful and do not believe that the political directorate has a right to act. I will issue this warning now, I know the culprit behind this letter sent to the Nation. If there was anything good about him he would have done it the other way, but I have all my information. That was not the way for him to do it, but I have my contacts as well and I know all that is going on.

I will repeat again with emphasis, that those on the other side who have a great rapport with university doctors operating at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, should let them know that I have some respect for them, but I do not see them as any sacred cows who can defy the will of the people in the institution of the elected representatives and Government of the land. That has to be clearly understood.
8.55 p.m.

I have been very nice to them and very pleasant with them. I have treated them with all courtesy, but they have denied themselves the total admiration which should be due to them. I would implore them to stop being wicked, stop being divisive, stop being bent on bringing this Government down as they hope to do, because Government is always in the final analysis able to make decisions which might not always be satisfying to people who seek to destroy it.

The question that Head 41 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 43 – Ministry of Information – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 43 – Ministry of Information – stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this Head is seeking to get money for the payment of acting and other allowances. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether it is the intention of the Minister – I know that the honourable gentleman who heads this portfolio is not in here but I am sure that somebody is carrying the papers for him – if anybody can – I do not know if there is anyone over there capable of carrying the papers for that honourable gentleman, but we are bound to hear – Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if it is the intention of that department to stop the acting allowances, because, Sir, it seems to me as they used to say, that that whole department is a Hollywood set. They have their actors. The Minister may himself be an actor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will now act. It is 9 o'clock, the hour of interruption and I must report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday March 3, 1982.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
9.02 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.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, if I recall, I was just about to raise a few questions concerning Head 43, Ministry of Information. Mr. Chairman, this Head is providing the sum of \$146 099 to finance expenditure in respect of acting and other allowances.

Sir, I would like to ask the Minister what is the position with the department which, as I understand, has been in this situation for some considerable time. If I recall, long before CARIFESTA the then Chief Information Officer was transferred to a new post — a post which seemed to have been created with a certain amount of haste — called, I think the Chief Cultural Officer.

Recent reports indicate that that officer has now been transferred to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The only thing that seems to be constant in these very recent and strange transfers appears to be the officer himself and the Minister concerned. All other things seem to suggest a lack of consideration for the expenditure involved and arising out of that, the efficiency, to say nothing of the efficacy of having departments of Government which can do the work which Parliament expects the department to do.

I should like to know what is the philosophy of the Government or what is the particular philosophy of the Minister. I do not know if the philosophy of the Government and the philosophy of the Minister necessarily coincides but I should like to know exactly what is happening because it is costing us some money.

Is it that there is no officer currently in the Ministry of Information capable of being appointed to this post? If there is no officer currently capable of being appointed to the post of Chief Information Officer, for example, has the job been advertised. If the job has not been advertised, is it the intention of the Minister himself to carry out the role of Chief Information Officer or is it his intention to disband the post of Chief Information Officer or is it that a Civil Service position of Chief Information Officer runs counter to the Minister's concept of the propaganda requirements of a Ministry over which he has the honour to preside?

One needs to know from the Minister responsible for Information and whereby one wishes to know from the Government — what is the situation. One hears stories of the Minister inflicting himself on the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for example. Now, Sir, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is germane to the Ministry of Information if for no other reason than that the Government Information Service has a prerogative to use the air waves through the studios of the CBC.

Mr. Chairman, it is passing strange that certain persons working in that institution seem not to fall within

the ambit of the structures to which we have become accustomed in such places as the CBC — that is to say, statutory Boards. That Statutory Board which is responsible for disseminating information to the public at large and which was created, as I understand it, to raise the standards of and to assist in the proper informing and educating of the population, has to a large extent, been equated with the Government Information Service. Indeed sometimes it is difficult to tell which is the Government Information Service and which is the Caribbean Broadcasting Service.

I do not intend to use this debate to deal with the CBC but, Mr. Chairman, when persons in the CBC who because — and this only from appearances — they have been able to carry out the responsibilities or the duties or the wishes or the whims of the particular Minister find that they are being rewarded in a singular way. For example, I am told that a particular gentleman working on the staff of the CBC earns as much money as some Parliamentary Secretaries, if not more.

Is he a Specialist Officer? Is he doing part Government Information Service and part CBC or is he unusually relating to the Minister's wishes in carrying out of his duties. I am talking about Vic Fernandes for example. That is the kind of complaint which I am hearing coming out — that he gets some special salary (*Asides*). Why not? I am not saying anything about his character, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with the officer, with the person concerned because that would not be proper. I am asking about the principles and I am asking further if the Minister has given any directions to the CBC as to the manner in which information concerning, for example, Parliament is to be disseminated to the population of this country.

Mr. Chairman, very often in these Chambers, honourable Members make significant contributions, significant speeches. I am not taking a position for one side or the other. I am saying it is the duty of the CBC to report accurately what occurs in this Honourable Chamber. If, in fact, an honourable Member on that side makes a fantastic contribution and it is reported faithfully, that is a plus for this Chamber. It ought not to matter from which side the contributions come but we are noticing more and more that reports allegedly of the proceedings in this Honourable Chamber, reports emanating from this Chamber are reflecting in a very small way what actually occurs in this Honourable Chamber.

If the honourable Members are suggesting that any Member of this Honourable Chamber has extra-ordinary influence over any of the persons in the CBC, that is even a further indictment and I am wondering if that is not at the direction of the Minister concerned. It is not

unknown that that Minister like God "moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the Government Information Service needs some assistance in this regard. They need some help but what I am concerned with primarily is this business of having everybody in acting posts. I do not understand why everybody at the Government Information Service is in an acting post. Is it that they are re-organising the Ministry of Information?

10.15 a.m.

I am told that the Ministry has as part of its responsibility, the reporting on the activities of the Hon. Ministers, but that somebody had misunderstood the direction in which that reporting should go. That reporting ought to be coming to the public to indicate what the Hon. Ministers have been doing, but I am told that from time to time, the reporting goes in the other direction to let the chief know how the Hon. Ministers are behaving outside of office. I am not certain if that is part of the functions of the Government Information Service, Sir.

We do not understand why we should have to have a supplementary to deal with paying acting allowances, after that Government indicated that the acting of the old time days was now over that they would, to the best of their ability make sure that people would be promptly appointed to post. I would like to know, before I go any further what is the delay? What is the difficulty? What is the problem concerning the filling of these posts in the Government Information Service? Depending on the responses one can get from the other side, we will see if it is necessary to go any further, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable member.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Does any other honourable member, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. Please make your contribution.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is exactly why I got up, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I was in this Honourable Chamber from 1966 and I want it to go into the records of Hansard — I know my way around here, Sir, and very well. I will say no more at this point. The strong barrier in this society still exists and I say no more at that point again, Sir.

Let me deal with the Resolution now, Sir. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was critical of

the Government. I know it is normally the policy of the Chair for the Chair to catch the eye of honourable members of the other side, Sir and therefore I rise in my place to defend the Government on what I consider a rather mild and scratching type of speech; a time wasting type of speech. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You cannot say that.) The speech has asked for absolutely nothing. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Let us have it friendly today.) The honourable Member asked about strange transfers in the Government Service. Let me first answer that.

To the best of my knowledge, when a person joins the Government Service, he is subject to transfer to any department at any given time. I think that is the answer. You as a former Minister of Government attempted to transfer Walker's wife, did not get through with that(Asides) I am only dealing with transfers. The lady worked in your department and you attempted on several occasions to get Mrs. Walker transferred. So you cannot come and argue about transfers now.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what the honourable Member is saying is misleading this Honourable House because I state categorically that it is not true. I am saying that in my capacity as a Minister, I had absolutely no interest in an/or any step taken to have anyone from my Ministry transferred — least of all Mrs. Walker. Rather Mr. Chairman, I sought to have her permanently appointed and she was.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You also sent home Mr. Murrell from Cox Hill and his wife had to write the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of the country. If you talk about transfers, as a Minister unprecedented..... You see, when the honourable Member is complaining this morning, Sir, about CBC is what you call "when the cat is out", Sir, "the rat takes possession", Sir. You know what is wrong with you and CBC — the honourable Member for St. Michael West? His colleague — the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — has been able to get in to CBC and the *Advocate* — either buy his way in or talk his way in — and before you can even get the news on, if the honourable member for St. Michael South Central says that this is a pair of glasses when it is a glass of drinking water, it is in the news an very long. Sometimes I have to wonder how important Government statements are made and they do not come out on CBC. But you are not to be worried about CBC; it is your colleague; you are worried about getting the publicity at CBC. That is your problem. He is not in his place this morning, so you start now to push in one about CBC. What is wrong with CBC?

Your other comment is that somebody up there is getting more money than a Minister. This is what I say about the Press in this country. If you want good Press reporters, you must pay people well. You used to write in a paper, sometime ago, up at Cable and Wireless. Do you

remember? The Muslim; the paper you used to write in one time. They would not know that, the Muslim. Then you went to Antigua and you used to write in Antigua also, so you are a piece of journalist. That is what you are, a piece of journalist and you would know. As a matter of fact, your colleague on your right — the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition — is also a writer. *(Asides)* I remember he wrote a poem in China.

If you need proper reporters at CBC or the *Advocate* or the *Nation*, you must pay them well. The amount of money I hear that is paid at CBC and the *Advocate* and so on — what else do you expect to get? You must find people getting mixed up on the side. I looked into the *Advocate* and see debates here on Tuesdays reported on Sunday for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central at the time when most newspapers are sold in the country. That is a real coincidence.

The Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition can say anything at all on Tuesday. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister can talk on Tuesday, it is in the papers on Wednesday or Thursday. But on Sunday, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gets prominence in the *Advocate*, in particular. You would not call that stale news. *(Laughter)* That cannot be stale news. It is news to reach the largest area of the reading public on Sunday. So what are you going to get up and criticise CBC for and the Minister?

You first started it, you set it up on a political background. You carried away people from Rediffusion. You had to join the party to get a job at CBC — as the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism said he had to join the Democratic Labour Party to get a job at CBC. That is on record in here. Now if he goes on as an announcer — short as he may be and intelligent, as I believe he is — whether he can read or write — he had to join the party to get a job. So what is the criticism? *(Laughter)*

We are trying our best; the Hon. Minister is trying his best to straighten out CBC. As far as you talked about interference — about somebody get transferred — you are talking about Mr. Ince. I do not get into those little nay nay things. That suits you. That is your mentality. Somebody got transferred. You want to know who is whose body's girlfriend. That is not me. I am not concerned with that as a Minister of Government. I am concerned with the policy. If the CPO decides to transfer Mr. Ince, he is transferred to what department he is transferred to. It is none of my concern.

All that this Resolution is seeking to do is to pay for the additional vote.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if the honourable Member would give way for a minute. Mr. Chairman, the gravamen of my speech was not whether Mr. whoever it is was transferred. I wish to know when they are going to fill the vacancy occasioned by the transfer. The Hon. Minister must not misunderstand what I am saying. I was merely questioning because this is to do with the money for paying the acting allowance.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You started out by saying that there are some very strange — I wrote it here — strange transfers. You cited the Ministry of Information and you spoke about who was in CARIFESTA and you wanted to know now why he is transferred to be acting in this place and the next place. I am told there are no strange transfers. All that the money seeks to do is to pay for additional persons who are either now acting or who have been acting because the Government set out to create as much employment as possible. I want to know a man comes into the Civil Service to the best of my knowledge and you enter the Civil Service today and you are appointed tomorrow. You had Pedro Welch, your party had a man by the name of Pedro Welch, Acting Labour Commissioner for almost 15 years because you heard he married to Barker's daughter who is a Labourite.

10.25 a.m.

When I look around and see Pedro Welch drawing up under you all, I feel like vomiting. For 15 years you had Pedro Welch acting as Labour Commissioner in Barbados. He is a spineless man. We had to come in here and fight and argue how such an important post could not be filled for almost 15 years, and when you heard the answer, it was that he was married to the daughter of Mr. Barker from Whitehall. Mr. Barker was an old time Labourite, so Mr. Welch could not be appointed. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Barrow said he would abolish the office first). He would abolish the office first before he would appoint him. The poor man had to go to Cable and Wireless and was made Personnel Officer. Now you come in here to talk about people acting?

Then you had Keith Hall at the Port. Because you knew that he — his family, not him, because he is a civil servant — was a supporter of a particular party, Mr. Hall was acting down there as if he were in Hollywood. He made Ronald Reagan look like a joker as an actor, so you come in here this morning asking about when we are going to fill a vacancy, and about these strange acting transfers and acting appointments.

Sir, the Resolution is not as controversial as the honourable Member set out to make it, but he cannot help trying to play to the Gallery when the occasion arises, especially when he sees a few young ladies or some schoolgirls, or if he sees the *Advocate* newspaper. He has to catch the eye of the judges, so he must find

some nonsense to say. He said absolutely nothing by trying to condemn a Minister on the premise that a man has been transferred from one department to another, and he brought in CBC to say that a man there is getting more money than a Minister. You should be ashamed. You had better go to Antigua and the Bahamas and see how they get paid. (*Aside*). Why do you not apply for the job and give up the ministerial job?

Sir, the Resolution is supported by this side, and I beg to move that Head 43 stand part.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have another contribution to make on Head 43.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Does any other Member wish to make a contribution?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are in Committee, Sir, so I think that one or two other Members would....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, in this case, you have spoken already so I will entertain another honourable Member who so desires to speak.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Just for my guidance, Sir, I am not questioning your ruling. I just wish to know, since the rule is that a person may speak more than once, whether the contributions have to be in rotation. My understanding would be.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will decide that. Just follow the directions from the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As Your Honour wishes, Sir.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I could not really sit here and listen to the honourable Member who just sat down on the other side making such statements and conveying the impression that the Minister of Information had been doing something, committing a mal-practice, and questioning his integrity.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, Mr. Chairman, you heard every word I said and at no time did I question the integrity of the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken. Please continue.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member talked about principle. Any time you use the word "principle" or question the principle on which something is done, then you are questioning the integrity of the person who has allegedly committed the act. I am saying that I sat here and heard the honourable Member carrying on — ranting — and asking questions about the appointments — some officer being paid more

than a Parliamentary Secretary. That is what I heard the honourable Member say, and I was of the impression that he was saying that the Minister had something to do with the appointment. I could not really understand that he would have had the gall to get over there and question the integrity of a Minister on this side, when everybody knows the record of all of them on that side when they were in power. They are even seeking now they are in the Opposition to do all sorts of mal-practices and commit all sorts of offences against the Government. He should be ashamed.

I am saying that the Hon. Minister of Information has been acting according to the highest principles in the execution of his duties, and I could not sit down in here and hear either honourable Member on that side or on this side criticising the Minister when I know he is justified in the execution of his duties. I want to let him know that because the honourable Member is not a Member of this Honourable Chamber, some of them on that side are under the misconception that no one will defend him. I want to make it abundantly clear that I support the Minister and I will not sit down in here and hear that sort of accusation levelled against him in any debate.

On the question of advertising a position, it is well known that from time to time some positions are not advertised, but that is not the responsibility of the Minister. There is a Permanent Secretary and a Board, there is a Chairman of the Board and the management of the Board who have to see about that. For anyone to suggest that because a position was not advertised the Minister should be held responsible only shows the irresponsible behaviour, or attitude, or approach of the honourable Member who made the accusation.

I want to make it abundantly clear. The honourable Member knows too well that a Statutory Board operates under an Act of Parliament, and there are certain powers and duties — a certain prerogative — that that Corporation or Board has, and it is not for the Minister to intervene except the Act so provides to have any such thing done as advertising a position. The honourable Member wanted to convey the impression that the Minister has been intervening or assuming certain prerogatives which he does not have under the Act and that he is guilty of some misdemeanour. I want the honourable Member, like all other honourable Members on that side, to understand that they should not seek in the absence of an honourable Member or a Minister to come in here and hurl such scurrilous attacks on him, because he is not without support on this side.

I understand my role — collective responsibility — and when a Minister is wrong I will tell him that privately, I am not going to state it publicly, and I do not

want the other side to come in here and feel that they are scoring any cheap point because they may feel that an honourable Member or supporters from our side are supporting them. It must not be felt in any way at all, so I want the honourable Member to understand that his remarks are unjustified and are not worthy of any honourable Member on the other side — he in particular.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister certainly has brought a new dimension to the Ministry of Information and Culture. I can say that. I have seen the Minister going about his task in a very able manner, and those who feel that the Minister is not one to be out there all the time in public like some of us and that he is not doing anything, I want to give the lie to that situation. It is not true. Certainly Culture has come a long way under the Minister, certainly information has taken a new lease of life — and I would say that though the reports sometimes startle me, because the Opposition gets more air time — they get more coverage of what they say in here sometimes on CBC and television — that is no fault of the Minister.

What are you asking? You are asking the Minister to intervene in that? I would feel that the Minister would be out of place to intervene in a situation like that. I think the reporters must use their judgment, they must bring balance to their reporting. That is exactly what should have been done, and the honourable Member should have advanced that point — it is salient — and not try to introduce some sort of red herring or give the impression that the Minister should be held responsible.

If the honourable Member, like any other honourable Member, has any complaint about unfair reporting, then I feel there is a proper channel through which one can go. Write a letter of complaint to the Permanent Secretary or the Chairman of CBC, not the Minister. If the complaint merits attention, then the Minister will intervene. I am sure we will see to that. This Government does not believe in unfair reporting, but we cannot control newscasters. There is a code of ethics which should be followed by journalists, and one would hope that the journalists would operate within that particular code and not leave it for a Minister or any other person to intervene.

10.35 a.m.

Now what is the honourable Member asking the Minister to do? What is he saying? All I can gather is that he wants to get up in here today and hurl all sorts of attacks at the Minister. I want him to understand that that sort of thing will not be done or supported by any honourable Member on this side, certainly not by this honourable Member.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Resolution and I will say that I give the Minister my strong and sincere support

because I am satisfied that he is doing a wonderful job and is trying to uplift the Ministry of Information which that administration left in a very deplorable state in 1976.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I came into this Honourable Chamber this morning not at all intending to get involved with any controversy concerning the Ministry of Information or CBC. I asked a few questions. The Hon. Leader of the House as is his wont — and perhaps his responsibility — got up and flew a few kites and waved his hands around and uttered the words which we know that Minister will utter from time to time. Lo and behold, Sir, the Hon. Minister responsible for Housing gets up in here and seeks to defend the Minister from an attack that never occurred. There must be a reason why he feels bound to defend that Minister. He said that I questioned the Minister's integrity. I am saying that he and the Minister are birds of a feather; they are alike, so he would know about that Minister's integrity. The Minister's integrity is no higher than his integrity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already said that there was no reflection on the integrity of any Minister, so I fail to see why this argument is coming up again. I think you can proceed to some other point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, the honourable Member has introduced the concept of integrity and he seeks and has put in the record an indication that I was questioning the Minister's integrity. Having not done so, I am not exploring the reason why that Hon. Minister wishes to bring the Minister's integrity into debate.

I am saying that on the question of interference with CBC the present Minister responsible for CBC has demonstrated categorically his interference in the daily running of CBC. I am stating on the floor of this House that on many occasions that Minister has caused questions to be set down to be asked by reporters of the Prime Minister. I am stating that categorically on the floor of this House. I am saying further that that Minister brought a woman here called Mrs. Lewis from America, took her out of the Jamaica Government's office.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please! We are not in this Sub-head and in this Resolution debating the Ministry of the Minister of Information. We are not so doing.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He has a responsibility to this Parliament not to interfere, as the honourable member has said, in the affairs of Statutory Corporations. He is not a recruiter. I am using his words. I am bringing information to this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are straying too far from the matter which is before the House. I cannot allow it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, let me put it in the form of a question. In the context of the responsibility of the Ministry of Information, is it proper for that Ministry to participate in the recruitment of staff for CBC? Is it proper in the recruitment of such staff for any senior official whether it is a Minister, a Permanent Secretary or some other senior official to recruit such staff and then give such staff specific personal directions as to the form which the news should take?

I am stating that during the last elections when I went to CBC — I am now talking about myself — and delivered a speech for the Democratic Labour Party that that speech was taken to the home of the Minister where the Minister reviewed the speech and decided which parts should be taken out. I am saying I know this now because whereas the two people used to be as one, they are now like Cain and Abel, and so the truth will come out.

I am stating categorically without fear of contradiction from anybody of high or low integrity that when we come to interference, there has never been anyone like the present Minister of Information and how he interferes with CBC. He used to be the Chairman of CBC and then he became responsible for CBC and there are those who would tell you, Mr. Chairman, they cannot distinguish the difference when he was Chairman and now he is Minister.

That honourable Member does not have the right to question me coming here on the floor of the House to ask questions about a Ministry and saying that I should write a letter to a Permanent Secretary. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that I hear an honourable Member saying that there is a decent way to get information or a decent way to make a complaint, implying that to come on the floor of Parliament as a representative and raise questions is indecent. Mr. Chairman, that honourable Member must be speaking from motives that go beyond what I am able to discern. I wonder — and begin to question whether these motives are beyond my capacity to discern. I shall go no further on that. I realise that I am causing you some consternation, Mr. Chairman.

I want to make a point, and I want the honourable Member to understand and beware that not everything honourable Members on this side might know honourable Members feel disposed to come here and lay bare. I wish the honourable Member to understand that I am one of the Members of this House who will not use privilege in here to speak things which I know of my own knowledge may not be in the interest of the body politic in this community, and because one may behave in an apparent docile manner, one is not to be misunderstood. One has the capacity to be a vagabond because it is inbred. When we are born in villages, we know how to be saints, we

know how to be sinners. So don't let anyone come in here and suggest that I am raising questions about the integrity of the Hon. Minister of Information. The Hon. Minister of Information and I say hello to each other when we meet.

As for the Hon. Leader of the House suggesting that it is improper to raise questions about a transfer, he introduced the name of an officer. I did not. I am saying that it is an occasion for some disquiet when within a very short time an officer who is deemed to have special qualities — qualities that concern specifically the dissemination of information — is summarily transferred to another department and there he is said to have an even greater capacity for the dissemination and the culmination of culture, then that officer is transferred.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member would give way, I could perhaps assist him. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I think you as a former Consul General in New York would recognise the fact that there is a Department where information must be sent out to the various Embassies and Missions overseas, and I think that is the Department where the special skill of the officer which the honourable Member is complaining about is now being used. He serves a better use to the best of my knowledge in that Department since that Department requires a person with a skill in information.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think you can see from the demeanour on the face of the honourable Member that he is playing forward when he should be playing back, because the truth is that according to the information published, the man is not even working within the area of information. That is not important. What is important, Mr. Chairman, is that the Government through the honourable Member sitting on the front bench have a responsibility to explain these matters to us and thereby to the public, not me.

10.45 a.m.

I am not concerned with where the honourable gentleman works. I am concerned for the public. I wish to know because the public is asking what is happening that a man can be transferred in such a short time to three different posts and I am only asking — and I was asking further — when are you going to fill the other post? What are you waiting for? I am just going to make this last point.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South East asked whether the Minister has to do advertising. He said it is not the responsibility of the Minister as to whether posts are filled, as to whether they have been advertised or whether people have been transferred. I do not believe that a Minister actually said that. I believe that the position of a Minister has been better adumbrated in this

debate by the honourable Member for St. Michael East. The honourable Member for St. Michael East has expounded the framework within which the ministerial system will function as seen by that side.

It is true that the honourable Member for St. Michael South East has come recently to ministerial responsibility and may not yet have fully determined his own methodology but I know that his methodology is significantly different from that of his predecessor. I know that he has on many occasions here indicated himself that he is doing a superior job to the person he has replaced and there are many who believe that the former Minister of Housing in terms of dissemination of information about that Ministry did a superior job but that is a matter of opinion.

But for him to suggest that it is not the responsibility of a Minister to find out from his Permanent Secretary what is happening about filling the most important post in the Government Information Service — the Chief Information Officer is the pivot around which the Government Information Service should function and he is saying that the Minister should have no interest. It is not his responsibility to find out why that post is not filled. Mr. Chairman, I am really finding it difficult to understand that logic. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I raised the question as to the motives of the honourable Member.

My colleague is asking me to stop at this point. I believe that he fears that I am going to say something which he would rather I did not say but I will end by saying this, Mr. Chairman: all that I know about the Hon. Minister I have gathered from the conversations I overhear when the honourable Members on that side discussed him. All I know about him, Sir, has to do with the pain and suffering which the honourable Member seems to project every time his name clashes in certain areas and I over hear. I am not going to go any further.

I warn the honourable Member not to make it seem to me as if he is blowing hot and cold. I wish the honourable Member — (*Asides*). He is your friend? I warn the honourable Member to let sleeping dogs lie but he must not assume that because the honourable Member is in the Upper Chamber that a brief is not being held for him down here. I am addressing myself to whoever is the Minister on that side who is responsible for the Ministry of Information. I am not dealing with the personality of the person who holds the portfolio. Only in his official capacity would I attack him because to attack him in his personal capacity I am sure Your Honour would have whatever I had to say expunged from the record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Item No. 9, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 9.

TRANSPORT LEVY ACT, 1982

Order No. 9 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the improvement and collection of a levy on incomes to be used for improvement of Transport and Roads.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to concur upon the Government the power to impose a levy which would raise funds which would be used for a dual purpose — firstly to improve the bus transportation system in Barbados and secondly to improve roads within this country. It is expected that approximately \$7 million will be raised via the Levy and I shall indicate the purposes for which this Levy will be used firstly as it relates to public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the bus transportation system in this country is in a mess. It is no secret either that over the past few years the Transport Board has been losing money in increasing sums.

10.55 a.m.

Since I became Minister of Transport, it therefore became incumbent upon me to conduct a comprehensive analysis as to the causes of this particular situation — this very unsatisfactory situation — within the Transport Board. We found that there was no proper management structure. The Government, sometime in 1980, recognising this problem as a major cause of inefficiency within the Transport Board, approved the establishment of certain posts and, at the same time upgraded substantially the emoluments paid to the General Manager, with a view to appointing a person of the highest calibre. Simultaneously a post of Financial Comptroller was created a post of Traffic Manager and a post of Manager of Labour and Personnel Relations was upgraded.

This decision was made, sometime in 1980, Mr. Speaker, and yet, when I became Minister for Transport, over one year later, the Transport Board had not filled a single management position. It was recognised in 1980 that management was a crucial element in the operation

of the Transport Board and for over one year, a Board that is now saying that efficiency is irrelevant and when taxpayers of this country are losing \$15 million a year — one get some idea of the callousness and insensibility of people who would say that efficiency is irrelevant — did not make a single appointment.

When old age pensioners cannot get their light and water bills pay because there are too many of them making claims for funds that are not big enough, one can well understand the social commitment of individuals who would claim that an organisation that is losing \$15 million in a year has no problem in relation to efficiency, and that is not right. This is a point that must be emphasised: since 1980, the Government of Barbados approved a new management structure and the Board has been unable — up to the time I came into the Ministry — to fill a single management position. And the first management position filled was entirely due to my own initiative when I was able to persuade the same Board and the Cabinet to approve the appointment of the General Manager.

A journalistic nincompoop called E. L. C. who writes under "E.L.C." implied today that there was something suspicious about the fact that Mr. Codrington served as Chief Labour Officer when I was Minister of Labour and is now serving as General Manager now that I am Minister of Transport. The fact of the matter is that your very competent Board could not encourage a person like Mr. Codrington to apply for the job of General Manager. I did not appoint Mr. Codrington. The Board approved Mr. Codrington's appointment and the Cabinet approved Mr. Codrington's appointment. I conferred with Mr. Codrington; the Cabinet of Barbados approved his appointment and the Board also approved his appointment.

It is only after we attracted a person of the calibre of Mr. Codrington that we were able to get a proper Manager of Labour Relations who assumed duties about two weeks ago — a man who has had extensive experience in personnel relations working within the London Transport Board. We recognise very clearly that men of a particular calibre could not be induced to work at a certain management level within the Transport Board, unless the General Manager was a man of sufficient calibre that they could respect. That was central. I had to find the General Manager. The Board, for over one year, could not find a General Manager of any calibre. So when nincompoops like E.L.C. — orchestrated by unseen cowards within the political organisation of which I am a member — writes nonsense, it must be exploded and there is a lot more that I have to say too about these unseen cowards within the Barbados Labour Party — people who operate in the dark and behind your back. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Right overhere. You have them in all parties.)

So the question of a proper management structure is particularly vital and the Government recognised that this is the first condition that had to be satisfied, Mr. Speaker. The second thing we recognised is that the Transport Board had suffered from years of neglect. Ever since its inception, the Transport Board was regarded as an organisation that was not terribly important in Barbados, except in so far as it served the political ends of individuals. The Transport Board became a political football to be kicked about, whenever it was in the interest of any particular politician to do so. As a consequence, we saw evidence of neglect in the proper management of the Transport Board.

Yesterday, I had occasion to refer to the fact that there is no proper garage. You cannot have a fleet of 260 buses without a proper garage. We had a situation in the Transport Board where when it rains workers cannot work. They have to quit. Production comes to an end. None of the depots are properly serviced. Yesterday, I referred to the fact that in any properly run transportation system, you have a number of pits equivalent to 10 per cent of the total number of units. You have 260 buses and eight pits at Weymouth — the major repair centre.

11.05 a.m.

Mechanics have to operate the removal of greases manually — there are no grease machines — and this takes a very long time to have a bus properly prepared for servicing. The hoisting equipment is obsolete, and that is one of the reasons why when Transport Board buses were presented to the Ministry of Works for inspection many of them were not passed — because, Mr. Speaker, the mechanics in the Transport Board — because of obsolete equipment — could not identify certain faults in the buses which were readily evident when hoisting equipment was used.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, when I went to the Transport Board the morale of the workers was extremely low. A reign of terror existed. The Chairman was known for brandishing guns, and many workers felt it necessary to carry guns in order to protect themselves from a situation which resembled the Wild West in the United States in the 19th century. Much of my time was consumed with dealing with complaints from workers who felt that they had been victimised; yes, victimisation was rampant, people were capriciously fired and abused in a manner unbecoming an organisation run by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, more of this will be said, because I understand statements are to be made and I am waiting for those statements to be made to wash the nasty, stinking linen in public. I am prepared to do it and let those people — the puppeteers behind the scenes — come

into the open and deal with the questions that I will raise.

Mr. Speaker, it became necessary to deal with the problem of low morale. I asked the Chairman of the Board, through whom I transmitted instructions to the Board, to establish a proper grievance procedure, because too much of my time was wasted in dealing with the complaints of workers. To date no proper grievance procedure has been established and we find a chaotic situation where about 30 per cent of the General Manager's time is taken up in dealing with petty complaints of employees. Primitive conditions in respect of labour relations within the Transport Board existed. It was not surprising therefore that with conditions of low morale among the workers, that many drivers took no pride at all in doing the job of drivers. An explanation of the high rate of accidents among Transport Board buses can be found in the fact that the morale of drivers is extremely low. In addition to that, many of the Transport Board drivers are not equipped with basic technical knowledge about the vehicles that they drive and consequently cannot handle the equipment that is entrusted to their care in a proper manner.

A comprehensive driver training programme was asked for by me. No effort at all was made to implement the comprehensive driver training programme that I called for which would ensure a marked reduction in the number of accidents involving Transport Board buses and an attendant reduction in the cost of repairing and maintaining such buses.

Not only that, I asked for the recruitment of a nurse and a small para-medical team to be on hand, because there are a lot of men driving those buses over the age of 40 who suffer from hypertension, and when a man has the swinging in the head, giddyness in the head, he represents a menace to the public if he is driving a bus as big as a Transport Board vehicle. To date none of this has been done.

We looked at the high cost of maintaining vehicles, and what did we see, Mr. Speaker? We saw a backward and outmoded philosophy with respect to the maintenance of vehicles, we saw a philosophy in which buses were run until something went wrong with them. I myself have read about 50 books on maintenance programmes, and whenever I have travelled abroad I have taken time out to visit bus companies in order to solicit advice, since there was nobody within the Transport Board or on the Board itself, or the staff, equipped to give certain kinds of technical advice which made sense to me. It became crystal clear that we would have to change the philosophy with respect to maintenance, and instead of waiting until something went wrong with a vehicle to bring it before the mechanic, that we would

have to work out a schedule and a programme for every vehicle, and after that vehicle has done a number of miles of work, then that vehicle would be brought in whether it was functional or whether a part was defective or not.

We asked for steps to be taken to introduce a preventive maintenance programme. Nothing was done, Mr. Speaker, and when there was an attempt to do something more, there was obstruction of which I will have a lot to say further and I will have a lot to talk about the reasons: none of them relating to the objectives of providing the people of this country with a proper transport system. I will have a lot in public and elsewhere to talk about the reasons for obstructing attempts to have a proper preventive maintenance system in place and a proper comprehensive driver training programme.

I am straining at the leash, but I am waiting for this threatened Press Conference when the people of Barbados will see in all of their dirtiness, certain individuals within the Transport Board. I am waiting for it, and I am waiting for the puppeteers as well to come forward and defend them when I meet them with them. I will establish clear links of a conspiracy to prevent the Transport Board from working, and part of the conspiracy was revealed to me last night. If only I knew about it before I intervened in the debate on the Private Member's Bill yesterday afternoon, my speech would have been of a different kind.

11.15 a.m.

There are high-placed saboteurs in this country on the Transport Board whom I am going to name at the proper time and place. If they want a fight, they are going to get it. There are high-placed saboteurs in this country with public responsibility who by their acts held up and obstructed the work of the Transport Board. These were the conditions that existed, and therefore the Government recognising these conditions, Mr. Speaker, felt that it was necessary to take effective action to deal with these fundamental problems that militated against the efficient running of the Transport Board. That is why it became necessary to have to ask this Honourable House to approve the Transportation Levy.

Now you might well ask me, Mr. Speaker, if the Transportation Levy is going to raise just under \$7 million, what is the point. Is it any different from the kind of capital allocations that were made to the Government last year in respect of providing equipment for the Transport Board? I think we had about \$6 million allocated last year to the Ministry of Transport for capital equipment, mainly buses for the Transport Board. If you are going to raise only just under \$7 million in one year with a transport levy fund and part of this is to be allocated for your building, what is this big deal about the Trans-

port Levy? Is it just another tax imposition on the Barbadian taxpayer?

One of the main purposes of the Transport Levy, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the Transport Board is in a position to get suppliers' credit. At the present time out of a rolling stock of 260 there are only about 130 buses — just half of them that can be relied upon to give normal service without breaking down during the course of any day. We have not yet been able to acquire the expertise to determine the optimum number of buses that should be part of the Transport Board fleet, but those persons who deal in transportation systems that cater to an area and a population that approximates the size of Barbados, tell us that we will need between 300 and 350 buses for our fleet to be of adequate strength. So we are faced immediately with a prospect of adding at least 40 buses to the existing 260 to bring the fleet up to a minimally optimal size, and then simultaneously deal with the problem of getting rid of the 130 buses that have proved to be unserviceable.

This year, Mr. Speaker, we have spent nearly \$5 million on spare parts. Some \$3 million of that \$5 million, Mr. Speaker, was spent on the Seddon and we all know when the Seddons were imported into Barbados. I had occasion to point out that the Democratic Labour Party burdened this country with these vehicles and caused the taxpayers to spend millions of dollars that have not yet been properly quantified. This year it will take \$3 million in spare parts to service 103 Seddons, the equivalent of about 35 new buses.

We are also going to have to ask the Ministry of Finance for relief because another \$4.5 million went to the payment of Consumption Tax. It seems to me that if we are in a deficit and the Ministry of Finance has to supply money to wipe off the deficit that it is a useless paper transaction to have to pay that \$4.5 million only to get it back through some other means. So we are going to the Ministry of Finance to try to obtain some relief in relation to the payment of the Consumption Tax.

Mr. Speaker, in order to operate a bus fleet within the context of Barbados' dependency externally for vehicles and spare parts, it is necessary to have well ordered standardisation. When I came into the Ministry there were about five different types of buses. You had Albions, Vikings, Bedfords, all kinds, and a multiplicity of tools that could not be interchanged, and we recognised that in keeping with the principles of properly organised transportation fleets that it was necessary to have standardisation so that we can have a more economical use of parts, there can be transference of parts from one vehicle to another and so forth. It saves a considerable amount of money expended on spare parts to have standardisation.

The ideal kind of standardisation, Mr. Speaker, is at one type of vehicle, but given the preponderance of Leylands among the fleet, if we went for perfect standardisation it would mean that we would have to purchase all Leylands. Within the Barbadian situation that would be irresponsible because we are always hearing rumours about Leyland teetering on the verge of bankruptcy, and we do not know when that company will fold up, and if that company went out of existence, there could be no guarantee that we would be able to get spare parts. Already it is an ordeal to get Leylands to fulfil their obligations with respect to supplying spare parts for these vehicles, and therefore it would be too great a risk to go for ideal standardisation which is standardisation at one type.

11.25 a.m.

When I came into the Ministry and in view of the innuendoes that are being put out by the running dogs of certain unseen men, Mr. Speaker, it must be recognised that when I went into the Ministry, the Government of Barbados had already ordered 22 Mercedes buses. The Government had committed itself to using Mercedes buses when I went into the Ministry.

If you were going to carry out a proper standardisation programme at the second best kind of standardisation — which does not involve putting all of your eggs in the same basket — you would have to standardise the two types and if you standardise the two types obviously one would have to be Mercedes because when the Government became committed to the policy of standardisation — which was a word unknown in the vocabulary or the minds of the members of the Transport Board prior to my ascension to the position of Minister of Transport — it would follow that you would have to have Mercedes, Mr. Speaker, if you were standardising at two types.

I believe that given the uncertainty concerning the lifetime of Leyland, that it was best to standardise at three types and my information — my own personal research — because I did not have anybody to advise me — that Leyland was for all practical purposes a vehicle assembled by the United States of America; that the Leyland diesel engine was produced by Cummings Manufacturing Company in the United States of America; that the axle and transmission were produced by Rothwell and that the other parts of the chassis were produced by Fuller Manufacturing Company and that if any of these parts from the chassis were at all manufactured in the United Kingdom, it was on the basis of a licence given to them by the American Company.

If Leyland was therefore essentially an American assembled vehicle, the logic of the proximity of the American market to Barbados would dictate that if we

are interested in reducing cost, that we explore the possibility of purchasing American buses and so it was agreed as a principle that we will standardise at three types: one, the Leyland; secondly the Mercedes which I found and thirdly an American vehicle which has not yet been agreed upon because I am collecting as much information as I can and talking to as many bus manufacturers as I can in order to determine which to invite to Barbados to look at the topography of the country to anticipate problems with their vehicles to ensure that the money of the taxpayers of Barbados is spent in the best way possible. So the programme involves massive purchasing of buses.

Information again at the Transport Board has revealed that the replacement rate of vehicles for any transport fleet is considered desirable at ten per cent of the units of the fleet so what has been happening over the past years, Mr. Speaker, is that a number of the new buses purchased by the Government for the Transport Board amounted to a little more than replacement numbers. That is why in almost every circumstance the Transport Board finds it necessary to sell old broken down stock as soon as new stock is taken on.

Questions were raised in here about disposal of such stock yesterday and I am investigating the disappearance of buses within the Transport Board as a result of irregular means being used. It was understood that it was a Ministerial directive given to the Board by my predecessor in office that such buses should be disposed of in order to ensure that there is no corruption and that there is no appearance of corruption and that these buses be disposed of by the Government Auctioneer. The Government Auctioneer has complained to me that on occasions in recent history, the number of items — be their buses or other things that they are required to sell, Mr. Speaker — has always been substantially fewer than he has contracted to sell for the Transport Board.

It has been said on certain public platforms and whispered in certain places recently, that certain of my colleagues went into the Transport Board and took these buses. That is an allegation that I cannot remain idly upon and it is therefore incumbent upon me to investigate it and I have ordered an investigation to be carried out in the Transport Board with respect to these irregularities concerning the disposal of old buses and other items which should be disposed of through the services of a Government Auctioneer as was the clear directive given to the Board by my predecessor — a direction which I have not rescinded. Of that more will be said later, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where there is no meaningful capitalisation from which the Transport Board benefited over the past 20-odd years of its existence, no proper garage, an inadequate number of pits,

no grease machines, insanitary conditions for the mechanics to work in, no proper grievance procedures for workers who feel themselves victimised by insensitive people within the Board.

We also found a situation where the office staff have to work in claustrophobic conditions and cannot perform properly. We find that in an operation as complexed as that of the Transport Board, where over \$30 million is spent every year, that there is no proper controller. The accountants are good bookkeepers — and there is nothing wrong with the kind of book-keeping that they do — but we need to go beyond elementary book-keeping in an operation as complexed as the Transport Board.

These are the important far reaching tasks of considerable magnitude that have to be carried out. There were some members of the Board who believed that by uttering the word "management" that all of the problems would go away as things are supposed to have happened in fables when we utter the words "Open Sesame".
11.35 a.m.

But management is a concept and behind it stands certain complete things that have to be done.

When I assumed responsibility for this Ministry, I recognised early that it was necessary to cleanse the Augean stables — that is the Transport Board. I recognised too that when one has a mess to clean up that there is no where that this mess can be cleaned up gracefully and in a way that is pleasing to everybody. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: True.) The situation must be taken by its metaphorical scruf of the neck and handled. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: I like that phrase.) I am not Mr. Speaker, going to brook any obstruction in my obligations to the people of Barbados, generally and to the people of St. Michael East in particular. Mr. B. M. TAITT: Hear you.)

When I became Minister of Transport, I found that it was fashionable for people to make sick jokes about the Transport Board and the buses. No man with any pride and self respect could sleep well at night knowing that an organisation for which he has responsibility provide sick drawing room jokes for the people of this country, and therefore I decided to take the hard decisions that must be taken. And class loyalties and colour will not stand in the way of my making decisions that have to be made, in respect of cleaning up the mess that has developed in the over two decades of the existence of the Board.

So it is our hope to use that portion of the Transport Levy which I am confident that this Honourable House will vote to give the Ministry of Transport — in a way to get suppliers' credit and thus ensure that capitalisation of the Transport Board which is a necessary

condition to the efficient functioning of that organisation — be as expeditiously acquired as possible. So much for that, for now. Mr. Speaker, we are also seeking this levy to improve the roads of this country. Much has always been said about the roads in this country — the potholes and everything else. All of us know what the problems are.

As Minister responsible for Works, I have looked at this problem and I have had to try to establish certain priorities. I believe that the most urgent case for roads is in those areas where people have to walk in the mud. It seems to me, that where people walk in the mud in places such as Lowthers and in Rock Gap and some other places — that it is necessary to ensure that people do not have to wear two pairs of shoes whenever it rains. We are going to repair the roads in the seats held by Opposition members, because we intend to take those seats after we repair the roads. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You can have mine and repair the roads.) (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: You are seeking them as two separate issues.) *(Laughter)*

Mr. Speaker, the second kind of roads in the order of priority would be those roads that are used by heavy traffic. In these days where we are supposed to exercise frugality in expenditure in areas involving foreign exchange, we know that the presence of uneven surfaces on our roads do untold damage to our cars, with a necessity of importing even more spare parts. And so a matter of the highest priority — second only to those roads that have no surfaces at all — will be roads that are heavily used by the traffic.

Within the financial year, we hope to strike a balance between these two high priority claims in order to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of the resources. People who drive motor cars are also going to be asked to pay the Transportation Levy, and we therefore have an obligation to them to see to it that they drive on surfaces which do not do violence to their automobiles. People who walk in the mud will also have to pay the levy, and we also have an obligation to them to ensure that they get their roads as soon as possible.

This is a commitment that the Ministry of Works gives to this House that the Transport Levy will be used in the area of roads in such a way as to ensure the earliest possible relief for those who have to wallow in mud when it rains as well as the owners of motor cars.

Mr. Speaker, I rest with that synoptical account of the reasons for my request for the Transport Levy. I hope that what I have said will provoke a constructive discussion, out of which will arise ideas which the Ministry of Transport and Works can use profitably in order to ensure that the twin problems of transport and roads will be solved as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the second reading of this Bill, I want to take the opportunity to put the record clear in respect of a few matters. To sit here as a former Minister of Communications and Works for my children to see at some future stage, the records of Parliament today and discover that as Minister for just over two years, I had done nothing, they would certainly deplore the fact that their father was a useless Minister or the people who read the records would certainly think that nothing was done during my period in that Ministry.
11.45 a.m.

On the other hand, I want to say that I am not going to use the safety and the privileged position of this Parliament to say anything which I do not think I should say outside. I think that we have got to be concerned at every stage with what we say, and further, when we read reports coming out in the Press we should to some extent ignore those reports. The Press does not run Ministries, the Press does not run Governments, the Press has a duty and we must uphold them in that duty. The duty is to expose and to bring matters to the eye of the public, and where they can, to educate the public with respect to a number of matters.

In that light I want to address a number of matters in lending my support to this levy. When I went to the Ministry of Communications and Works on September 7, 1976, I found that in addition to the Transport Board running buses, there were two other concessionaires, the Rocklyn and the Elite. The situation with respect to the Transport Board itself was chaotic, and that is putting it mildly. With the Elite and the Rocklyn the situation was hopeless and there was a general outcry within the population for a better bus service and for the Government to take over.

The Rocklyn was running buses for which taxes had not been paid for several years, neither were they insured. The people used to carry umbrellas and parasols in those buses to shield them from the weather, and the Government in its Manifesto of 1976 promised the nationalisation of the island's bus service and I was charged with that responsibility.

When I came in there were something like 210 buses, of which something like 150 were barely useable. After recognising the situation, I immediately came to Cabinet at a very delicate stage of the financial position of this country — which was far worse than it is today — asking Cabinet to approve an amount to purchase 100 buses to put on the roads in Barbados with a view to

taking over the complete responsibilities as charged in the Manifesto – and accepted by the people in the country – of the bus services in the island. My colleagues in Cabinet were sympathetic to the idea as put forward in the Cabinet Paper, but thought at the time that the country could not afford to carry the cost of 100 buses. It was then decided that we would opt for 60 buses, 40 completed units to come in and 20 bus chassis to have the bodies built on them by Butcher here in Barbados.

At the time there was a lot of discussion in this Honourable House with respect to the idea of bringing the completed units here, but it was a crisis situation and deserved crisis measures. Butcher Manufacturing themselves conceded that they were not in a position to handle the 60 chassis if we had brought them in, and therefore there were in complete agreement with me that I had to take serious measures. At the time they could hardly build more than two units a month – and hardly that – and I myself journeyed to London, along with the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry who was Mr. Victor Alleyne, and the Chairman of the Transport Board, Mr. David Shorey, after getting agreement on the purchase of 60 units, 40 completed, to go to get the matter expedited.

While I was in London having discussions with our High Commission there, and they making the necessary arrangements for me to see the people involved, the High Commission personnel were virtually laughing at me and telling me it was hopeless to get the buses out of Leyland under two years. I told them I had hope, I had faith. I believed that after I had met all the people involved that I would be able to accomplish something far better than what they had mentioned to me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my colleague got the information from with respect to where Leyland buses are being built. Probably they are being built out of Britain at this time, but at the time when I was there I was taken to the respective factories where the engines were built in Scotland, and to a number of places within the United Kingdom where the units were made. Different parts were made at different places, but I have seen all the components. I also went to Willowbrook, the company that made the bodies for the buses. At the time Willowbrook had quite a lot of work on hand, and I stressed upon them the necessity for having the buses come to Barbados and the problems that I had faced.

This was done, and Mr. Speaker, the problem with transportation in Barbados is not really a simple one. It is not one that you can brush aside and think it is going to go, or say to it leave and it is going to leave. The thing about it is this – and I do not regard it as a problem, I regard it as an attitude of the people in the

society – a number of people are travelling. I think when I took over the system there were something like 19 million travelling passengers; today I think it is something like 39 to 42 million, or far more than that. There is a tremendous amount of people who are travelling in Barbados today by the buses.

I recall very vividly, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the service from Speightstown to Bathsheba you could hardly get a unit to take you up there – if you wanted to get to Bathsheba to buy fish or something like that – going out from Belleplaine. There were people who were just going sight seeing and there are people who do a tremendous volume of travelling in this country.

There is another thing. When I took over the service there were something like 680 people being employed, today there are something like 1700 people being employed and they have not started to be employed now. When I came out that was the situation, because I had already nationalised the fleet. I did the entire bus service, and to my credit that was so. I am not an "I" man, I am a "we" man, to the Government's credit that was so. That is the position as far as I am concerned.

I want to say further that I have kept myself still on all debates to do with the Ministries I have held previously, and I have done so deliberately. I will only get involved if I consider it necessary to do that, otherwise I am not going to get involved. Unless I know that a Minister himself needed me to speak on a matter, I am not going to speak. There will be non-interference with my colleagues' Ministries. Colleagues and Ministers can be very jealous about their Ministries, and I suppose you have to be very careful. I have suffered because of that in the past and I do not want to suffer for it again.
11.55 a.m.

However, when I came out of the Ministry, I think it was on September 16, 1978, and was transferred to the Ministry of Agriculture, all the news media in Barbados praised me for the manner in which I had brought the Ministry of Transportation from what it was at the time to what it is today, and Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Communications and Works used to be regarded as an area where you put a man that you did not want and you wanted to expose. When I left there, it was where you put a man whom you know can do work. At one stage it was thought that the Ministry of Health was a place where you put a man if you were trying to move him from the glare as was done to the honourable member for St. Michael South.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to put this matter in true perspective. When I left the Ministry of Communications we already had agreement on the post of a Traffic

Manager, a Personnel Manager and an engineer in addition to the General Manager who was always there. There was no question of that, but we never had a Traffic Manager in the post, nor a Financial Comptroller nor a Personnel Manager of the correct calibre for the post. We have always had a sub-standard type of material there which was purely functional, and therefore I sought to have the position upgraded, but as I said, at the time funds were not as free as they became later when we were able to pay a big staff of people and therefore attract the correct calibre people.

Even though today the salaries are far better, it is extremely difficult to find an engineer to work in the Transport Board or to find a Traffic Manager. I remember on one of my journeys to London, I sought to get technical assistance from the British Government in the form of an engineer and an engineer did come to Barbados as well. One was recruited — a Trinidadian — and he came here, but he quickly left. Engineering is a scarce resource. So are traffic managers. You do not easily get them. They are highly skilled and qualified people and it takes time. Government — any Government — must see transportation as a very important area and must make sure that the type of staff is given to it, because when you have \$30 million involved in any industry, you would ensure that people are reasonably satisfied and that you have the correct calibre people in order to run that industry or that corporation.

I think essentially the Corporation was lacking for a very long time in terms of correct personnel at management level.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is too much noise on the Government benches.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I hope Mr. Speaker, I am not being heckled by my side. I thank you for the protection.

Mr. Speaker, unless you have the right personnel to manage areas like the Transport Board, the BMC, the Industrial Development Corporation and bodies such as those, you are going to be in very serious trouble, and therefore you must have the correct calibre management structure, and if you want that expertise, if you want that management knowledge, you have got to pay for it. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, when I left the Ministry, Leyland had already agreed and a plan was drawn for the construction of a workshop for the Transport Board. That was already not only on the drawing board, it was off the drawing board, and it was there ready to be implemented.

There were a number of reports. I will tell you further, Mr. Speaker, that when I come into office there was only the workshop at Weymouth. I am responsible

for three additional workshop depots, and at one time — because there was more space available at Mangrove — I thought that all the heavy work should go to Mangrove and free Weymouth of that burden because of the traffic problems in Bridgetown. We had already looked at other sites in the Warrens area to see if we could find a spot that was closer to Bridgetown so that we could utilise it, but I thought for the time being we should use the depot at Mangrove. There was also a depot created within the constituency of St. Peter at Speightstown, and one at Haggatts in St. Andrew. There was also at one stage thought of putting a depot at Colleton Plantation in St. John, but then it was felt that the two depots between Mangrove and Haggatts would be able to take the respective loads from these areas, and that is why an additional one was not put there. So by and large, Mr. Speaker, a lot of ground-work had been done.

The recent transportation study was as a result of discussions with the Ministry of Communications in my time. When I came in, I had the benefit of the King Report which was just the recitation of things which were known with a few ideas thrown in here and there, and then they had the Richardson Report. These reports are available to any Minister who goes in there to study to see how best he can arrive at a conclusion in order to make transportation better. I want to say this: if you give the Transport Board all the rolling stock, give it even a Board coming from Heaven and the attitude of the workers do not change fundamentally, the results are going to be the same. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker — and I speak with a knowledge of what I am saying — that the attitudes to work in this country must change or all of us will go down. The world is coming to realise that, and that has to be clearly understood.

Mr. Speaker, we have situations where even if you have buses, even though drivers and conductors are well paid — and particularly drivers — they do not come to work. Buses are sometimes lying there waiting for drivers, and they would not come. If they go and the bus is not what they want, they will not drive the bus. They go back. You have situations in the garages — and I know this for a fact because a casualty was from my constituency, and when he came to me crying, I said “man, I don’t support you” — where they have their workshops at home, they work two or three days in the Transport Board and go back home and do their work.

12.05 p.m.

They felt they should be kept forever working in the Transport Board because it is Government and they are sacred cows. Equally so, Mr. Speaker, you have a situation even in the hospital — I wanted to say that — where you have a laundry that is only working for five days even though you have people being ill every day and using linens every day but this is a situation in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. Speaker, the disposal of buses, disused buses, was a matter which I dealt with and I am the person who instituted the system that all buses to be sold must come to me and I was very firm on that. I know that we have had several problems in respect to rolling stock. The best procedure with respect to vehicles coming into your country — we have discovered this in Sanitation — I discovered this at Communications and Works — is to have two types of units and not only that — but unless you have very large fleets — if your fleet is 300 to 400, you will need two types of units. It could be Leyland and something else. It could be the Bedford and something else. It could be the Mercedes-Benz and something else.

The reason for that is this: you may find a situation, whereas the Minister quite rightly said, that with respect to Leyland, Leyland may decide to stop producing buses any moment — not because the company wants to stop producing buses but rather because the workers want more money and decide the best way to get more money is by stopping the manufacturing of buses and therefore you get endless problems with respect to Leyland in that regard.

Now if you have a situation like this, it may not only be staff. It may be a question of shipment out of Barry where the units used to come through. It may be a shipment out of Germany, if you are dealing with the Mercedes-Benz. It might be a shipment out of the United States of America if you are dealing with another type of vehicle — you never can tell.

They might be forces which could interfere with the steady flow of your traffic and there is also the question of the cannibalising of units. You can use part of old vehicles instead of a situation where you will hear that units are being taken out and somebody probably who is much smarter than you are using the old engines or some part of the chassis in order to put their units in shape. Now these are the factors which we have to take into consideration. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the idea is quite an agreeable one.

The question of maintenance is something which I tackled very seriously while I was there but at the same time you did not have any resources. You have to do manpower training and that is what the Minister of Labour at the moment is concerned with — manpower training. If you do not have the skilled personnel in order to do the work that is required within the workshop and what have you, you are going to be forever in very serious problems.

The problem with the Transport Board at the time — and I want to say this with some force — the people must understand that the buses of the Transport Board are their buses; this Parliament is their Parliament, Mr. Speaker; the Transport Board is their Transport Board

and if they mash up the units and destroy them, Mr. Speaker, we are in very serious trouble. People must learn to respect what is theirs. When a bus is damaged or licked up — I saw quite recently and I hope that this will be told to the workers as well — they are not only to be sheltered — they are to be told like anybody else that they are not doing the right things.

One of them passed me coming down on the Boarded Hall Road. I was doing 30 miles an hour and he passed me and he must have been doing 40 miles an hour. Quite suddenly a mini-bus passed me out. I stopped to let a man make a turn and the mini-bus actually licked up the man and the mini-bus that came out was overloaded with people. In my view he had in more people than he should have had. I passed up by him when he stopped again and I asked him if he wanted to take the lives of those people and I want to invite the Minister now to have a serious talk with these mini-bus people and tell them to stop at the bus stops and stop endangering the lives of the people of this country. All the culprits should be firmly dealt with and the permits to run the mini-buses should be withdrawn — not only a fine but withdraw the permits as well. Let them act in a responsible way.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to supplement money funds. Any funds which Government will grant as a subsidy to the Transport Board cannot do it by itself and I would hope that in time that the contributors to this fund will be their own policemen in ensuring that damage is not done to these units on the road.

I would also hope that they will further the policemen in ensuring that these heavy duty machines including these tractors that come out from time to time all over the country — the estate tractors I am thinking of — are not allowed to mash up the road but that they report them and be willing to give evidence before the Magistrate's Court with respect to the damage that is being done.

Nobody should be above the law. All people must respect the law and fall in line with it. I have always talked that way. You should never be too highly placed to feel that you are above the law. The laws we make in here are laws for all people and as the makers of the law, we must respect those laws. That is our duty.

Mr. Speaker, I speak on this matter with a great measure of concern and were it not for the fact that I did, not think I had to put the record square and to let it be known what this Government had done under me — it is for other people to give account of their stewardship and I do not quarrel with that. I give account of my stewardship and the stewardship of this Government. For two years it was my privilege to preside over the Ministry of Communications and Works and I did that and after I left that Ministry, I felt quite clear in my conscience that

I had discharged my duty to the people of Barbados in general and the constituency of St. Andrew in particular.

I commend, Mr. Speaker, this Bill and hope that the outcome of its implementation will redound to the credit of the entire population.
12.15 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the problems of public transport and of the finances thereof are problems which bedevil Governments all over the world, whether the form of transport is internal by bus, by rail, by ferry, whether it is by airline or otherwise, there is a crisis in the world in satisfying the demands for regular and cheap service to the users.

Not so long ago in a City like Boston in the United States of America, the total Urban Transport System went under — the Urban Transport System in Boston in the United States of America. Not so long ago in the United Kingdom, the newly elected Greater London Council faced with the problem of financing a fleet replacement, hit upon the idea of a novel system of rate grants to subsidise capitalisation of the fleet and to standardise fare structure. So intense were non-users of the system that they challenged it to the highest court in the United Kingdom and succeeded.

I mention all of these matters to indicate that any objective discussion on the problem of our particular transportation system must be seen in the context that our problems are not unique, but that the phenomenon of financing an urban transportation system at a level which is regarded by the vast majority of users, as a reasonable level, is a very, very difficult one.

The Hon. Minister of Transport and Works has outlined some of the problems which, in his opinion, the Transport Board faces, after a very careful examination by him of the issues. There is no doubt about it that the problem of finance is a crucial problem. I had the privilege of listening to presentations on this occasion by the Ministry of Communications and Works on the capital needs for an ideal number of fleet, as well as proper maintenance of that fleet. The numbers are horrendous in the context of Barbados.

So it seems to me that if we are to have an ideal transport situation service in Barbados, it is incumbent on Parliament to bend its minds singly and collectively to a reality of the need for disposing tremendous sums of money on capital account at a very early stage — it is in the formulation both at Estimates Committee and in the presentation today. The recurrent cost of operation of the high cost of spare parts was clearly identified. The unsuitability of some of the fleet was also clearly identified. So a solution to these recurrent costs — bringing them down

to a reasonable level, a comparative level — lies in fleet replacement. I think that that is one of the crucial areas for finance at a very very early date.

When the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Finance suggested the principle of the levy to cabinet to give a recurring source of flow of income annually, my understanding of it was that the Transport Board would be placed in a position of knowing that it could go out, make capital commitments over a period of time for a fleet replacement programme and be able to demonstrate to the suppliers that it has an independent source of revenue other than a subvention out of the general taxation pool. Now this is a very important point of principle: all of our experiences with Statutory Corporations in Barbados and students of the anatomy and dynamics of working corporations should find out that the mistakes which have been made in the past by all Governments in Barbados, have been the failure to capitalise corporations which are operating in a commercial area, along different lines from how commercial corporations in the private sector are capitalised.

Who can forget the abysmal failure of the Democratic Labour Party in the 1960s to capitalise the Barbados Marketing Corporation properly? Who can forget that? Report after report by management consultants have indicated very clearly that if you charge the operating revenue of a corporation with the burden of interest which should be a nonoperating expense, that you are leading to the destruction of that corporation.
12.25 p.m.

We also had a similar situation with the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation — under-capitalisation again — so that to grasp this nettle by this formulation is in my opinion a commendable bid by the Government once and for all to deal with this question of adequate flow of income so that long term commitments can be made for capitalisation. Now, this flow of income as explained by the Minister can be the basis for amortisation of a much larger capital sum. What you have to do now if you want to get at that capital sum is to find out what capital sum over a given time span — whether it is five or seven years — \$3 million a year will repay in principal and interest, and that can be worked out.

Today in the world, unfortunately for us here in Barbados, we will not be able to get as much at this present juncture in capital on a repayment schedule of \$3 million as we would like to get, for two reasons. One is that the OECD countries, the large western countries and Japan have recently decided that the interest rate war for suppliers' credit should come to an end, and they have agreed that no longer will this be left to competitive bidding by supplying countries, but that there should be a minimum norm of interest. From what I have been read-

ing, it is somewhere now in the vicinity of ten to 10.5 per cent, suppliers' credit. The United States Import/Export Bank, the OECD in England, the Germans have a comparable one, the French have a comparable one, the Japanese have a comparable one, so that is one point we have to bear in mind there. We would not have got as much had it not been for this.

The length of amortisation period is also very important to us. Developing countries like us in all the international fora have been pushing to have that period of time extended from five to 12 years. That is another important point that we have to bear in mind, because as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would know the longer the repayment period the less the monthly sum has to be, so that the \$3 million will stretch more.

I have been in the Cabinet now for six years. Before I was in the Cabinet I had been in politics for a long time and I have heard on the floor of this House of Assembly repeatedly, both in this Government and in previous Governments, the need for standardisation of the fleet, but when you have an organisation like the Transport Board which is an amalgam of many previous transport undertakings in this country, that takes time. When you have mergers in any transport organisation, compatibility of the respective component parts of the merged organisation takes time. I think that is a matter for commendation of the Government that in the six years that we have been in power greater progress has been made towards fleet standardisation than ever before.

I will go further, because this is what I have heard with my own two ears. The rest of the Caribbean marvel at the quality of the bus fleet in Barbados, the level of service in Barbados, not only that provided by the Government but that provided by the so called minibus fleet. Look at Jamaica. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would know about Jamaica, he has to pay periodic visits there. There is no comparison at all between the fleet in Jamaica and the fleet in Barbados. In cleanliness and in regularity, there is no comparison, none at all. You do not talk about the Windward and Leeward Islands because they do not have an apology for a system. If you go to Guyana, it is worse.

Trinidad with all its money has the units, but my understanding of it from whenever I question anyone when I pass the Port-of-Spain bus terminal and ask what are all those buses doing there, brand new buses, they tell me that they have not got the organisation to get the people. They have a people problem in getting the drivers, conductors, inspectors and things of that kind. It is a different thing. They have the buses and do not have the people to run them.

We are the other way, we have not enough of the buses and we have the people to run them. That is true, but, Mr. Speaker, in all of our evaluation of this situation it is important that we remember that while we are knocking the transport system in Barbados we are operating in the context of a limited financial ability to satisfy all of the needs, and also it is important that we remember that we in our humble way have done better than many of our competitors. That is the good fortune of Barbados. Others abroad recognise this.

Last year there was a visit from the Bahamian Industrial Development Authority to Barbados that was sent by the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation, and they came into my office. They had been on a tour to an industrial estate on a locally built mini-bus, and when I asked them what were their impressions of Barbados, they all unanimously said that they could not understand how it was that we could run buses so late at night in Barbados. They said that. They were amazed that it was a Government-run Corporation.

12.35 p.m.

The Minister of Tourism in Jamaica used to live near me in Christ Church when he was working as a consultant for the OAS to CTRC, and he had a culture shock when he first came to Barbados and lived here for a period of time that tourists and locals in Barbados used to travel on the same bus and that we had such a regular bus service. In Jamaica language he told me that if they tried to do that in Kingston, they would rip them up and throw them outside telling them that they have no concern with them. These are facts.

Of course as Barbadians we believe in improvements. It is our duty, particularly this Government's duty, to do better than the Democratic Labour Party has done, and we have done better already and we will do better in the future. (*Asides.*) You want to deal with him? You will have your full opportunity. You cannot tell me when to stop speaking.

The position is, Sir — as the former Minister said, and as the present Minister has said — that systematic money has been voted for replacements, but not enough. I have always held the view that in addition to standardisation in two or three areas of the larger fleet, there is still a need within that for a medium size bus in Barbados. Somehow we have got to grasp the idea that we have to get a bus bigger than the mini-bus but smaller than the biggest bus because there are some roads in Barbados to which these buses are not suitable. Some of these roads are within the areas that the public expect the Transport Board to service because they are not financially lucrative for the mini-buses to operate. That is a very important area that we have to deal with.

I also feel, and I have always held this view, that we should recognise too that in our attempts to capitalise the Transport Board for fleet replacement we have built on something that the Democratic Labour Party started, but we did it better. We have been using the productive capacity and the technical skills in Barbados to build as many buses as possible and only import the chassis, but as the now Minister of Health said, when the Government took the decision to take over the Elite and Rocklyn, we had to buy some bodies already built. Since then, as I understand it, no ready-built bodies were bought. The question will inevitably arise in future if you are going to buy a large number whether the productive capacity of the plant we have in Barbados can cater to them within the time span that you need.

As Minister of Industry, I have always advocated that everything possible should be done to have your flow of buses regularly so that the employment in the bus building factories will keep flowing, and it is not a question of having a large number at one time, then you have to wait for shipments to come in and things of that kind. Mr. Speaker, this is very important: as a result of the encouragement given by the Government, not only to provide bodies for the Transport Board, but also as a result of the policy decision taken by Government to use the import licensing review mechanism to ensure that mini-buses in Barbados are built locally, a whole new area of export capability and opportunity has been created. I wonder if honourable Members do not observe the large number of mini-buses in Barbados now which are built locally? So we, Mr. Speaker, have achieved a number of objectives in our transport policy in the last six years.

Obviously, Sir, to run a Board of the size of the Transport Board is a massive undertaking. All transport management is difficult. If it was not difficult, if it was an easy thing to do, how is it may I ask this House, that the international airline industry is now losing \$800 million a year? They lost that in 1979 and more in 1980. How is it that the Urban Transport System in Boston collapsed? It is all right to talk about its being easy to manage this and easy to manage that. It certainly is not easy. The Transport Board is the largest single, other than Government, commercial undertaking in numbers of employment. I do not know of any other firm in Barbados.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has two minutes in which to wind up his debate.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not know of any firm in Barbados which has 1 700 employees.

Personnel management in Barbados is a very scarce skill. In all the universities that we have, how many members among the graduates of the University in the last 20 years do you see come out with a B.Sc. in Personnel Management or a Bachelor's Degree in Personnel

Management? It is a little adjunct course tacked on to Public Administration or tacked on to this or tacked on to that. These are big problems that we have to deal with. The Cabinet has done more to try and induce people of management calibre to work at the Transport Board than in any other Statutory Corporation except the National Bank of course, but there is a shortage of financial controllers and a shortage of mechanical engineers. I Sir will.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But the time is inadequate.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the time is inadequate. The honourable Member for St. Michael South caught my eye. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will be consistent on this matter. We have consistently opposed this question of the Transport Levy and we will be opposing this particular Bill that is before this Honourable Chamber today. The reasons for our opposition have already been set out with great clarity in previous debates by various speakers on this side of the House and I do not propose to go into any great depth in outlining those objections again.

What I will say on this occasion is that the provisions for the imposition of the Transport Levy were made in a speech that was stated to be a non-Budget and then it was claimed recently to be subsidiary Budgetary proposals so that the provision of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act could be applied to it. But that particular Act — the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act of 1968, I believe — makes provision for any Budgetary Proposals resulting in the imposition of any taxes, that such taxes should be collectable within a period of four months. That period of four months have elapsed and it is clear to all and sundry that what ever money is being collected from the employers and employees in this country in the guise of a Transport Levy is contrary to any statutory or constitutional provision in this country.

I believe that there is some statement made by the Minister of Finance that such collections are now voluntary so that we have ended up in a position, due to the sloppiness of the Government, in which persons in this country are paying money to the Government, having deductions made from their income without any statutory authority. They have no control over those deductions but yet they are told by Government that the deductions are voluntary. This Opposition will not be part of that sloppy approach.

The legislation which is being introduced now contains an element of retroactivity. In other words, it is seeking to correct some sloppy work by trying to back-date the time from which the legislation will take effect. We are not part of those particular provisions and operations

and therefore we will have to vote against this particular measure.

The position is that in the past, provision was made for public transport in this country out of the general taxes paid by corporations and by individuals and by other imports in this country: the buses were bought out of it; the spare parts were bought out of it and provision for that public transport generally made out of the general taxes. What we have now is an imposition of a special levy to make provision for the Transport Board for the service that it provides and for the improvement of roads, all of which services have in the past been provided out of the general revenues out of this country.

It has been said that the level of general taxation in this country is high, and now upon that general level of taxes, we are having a special levy imposed. Now normally levies are imposed in areas where — let us say in certain states and localities in the United States as my colleague the Member for St. Michael West knows very well — there is no other provision for funding those services but Barbados is now only one better and we are using general revenues and we are also using special levies for this particular purpose.

We listened this morning, Mr. Speaker, to a very forthright and frank speech by the Minister of Works. In all my years in this Honourable Chamber and during the years that I have come in as a stranger, I do not think I have recalled a speech being made from the Government front benches with such depth of feeling, with such deep concern and indeed with such implications for the unity of the Barbados Labour Party and for the relationship of a Minister to a Board or Statutory Corporation for which he may be responsible.

Let me at the outset say I admire the Minister and I congratulate him for the forthrightness and the courage with which he spoke. I am certain that there are honourable Members on that side who may feel likewise but not many. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But they would have been none other there. In your time you would have got the pan cart and a dismissal).
12.55 p.m.

I want to make it clear, I do not share the Hon. Minister's concept of the law and the Rule of Law in this country. I want to make that clear. I believe in this matter, the honourable Member for St. Andrew and myself would think alike on this matter of the Rule of Law in the country, as he enunciated in here today.

I can afford to disagree with the Minister because I am on this side and the Hon. Minister is on that side — but where you have the Hon. Minister of Health on that side — the front bench — the honourable Member for

St. Andrew — and you have the Hon. Minister of Transport and Works, the honourable Member for St. Michael East also sitting on that side, you have a clear cut point of division on the front benches and within the Cabinet. We cannot paper it over. It is a fact, coming now within the fifth year or so of the rule of this Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a second reading speech or a fifth reading? (*Laughter*)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: This is my first speech on the second reading. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the concept of law as outlined by the Hon. Minister of Transport and Works.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Ministerial independence.).....and however much it is clothed in the intellectual jargon and invoking the names of Hegel and Kant, (*Asides*).....I am not in that because I know there is a clear intellectual line of descent from Kant and Hegel down to Hitler and Mussolini and the fascists and by a by-path, fascist on the right.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just what is the honourable Member now debating? (*Laughter*).

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am debating the Transport Levy. This has to do with law.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Member is trying to confuse himself. (*Laughter*)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: About Kant and Hegel?

Mr. SPEAKER: But he is not confusing the Chair. The Honourable House has come to a conclusion on the matter to which the honourable Member is now referring.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, if you could send for the records and tell me what conclusion the Honourable House came to on Kant and Hegel, I will accept your ruling. As far as I know, this Honourable Chamber did not come to any conclusion on that.

Mr. SPEAKER: However, that is not now before this Honourable House.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you. Now I want to make it clear again.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member would give way. I would like to make it clear, Sir, that it is now 1 o'clock and I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended for one hour today, Sir, for lunch.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly at 1.01 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael South was addressing the Chair. He may continue, if he so desires.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was making a point that I believe Rule of Law and for me, that means that laws are passed by this Assembly and that it is the duty of the Royal Barbados Police Force to administer those laws, impartially, as it sees fit. If there is something wrong with the laws — if they become inoperable, or if they create an unjust burden on people or if for some reason, they affect the public's interest adversely — I believe it is the function of the law makers to change the law. I believe it is the function.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Police are going to collect the levy now?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, I am going to collect the levy, Mr. Speaker. I am going to collect — well, not me, I am not collecting any levy. That is for the Minister.

That brings me to the fact that the Transport Authority which is envisaged in this piece of legislation is set out, of course, in the document called, "Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party General Elections 1981" and I know from the Schedule that it is the Minister who will appoint the Chairman and other members of the Transport Authority.

That is as it should be and he has taken a very strong stand and I hope that having spoken and having committed himself to that extent, he does not find himself in a position of having to appoint some of those very members whom he has spoken so feelingly about having to appoint them as members of the Transport Authority. That may very well happen. But I hope he has the courage to stick to his position and not have to veer, in any way, by any pressures coming from any quarter, high or low, in this country whatever may be the class or race or whatever background it may be. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Or the consequences.)

The Hon. Minister in looking at the Transport Board for which he has statutory responsibility was quite logical in his analysis of the problems facing that Board and he mentioned them starting with the requirement for a proper management structure. No one can fault him

for the analysis that he has done on that Board and it did give me some satisfaction — gave us on this side some satisfaction — to see the analysis done. From the emphasis placed on the need for a proper management structure, it makes us realise even further, that the Democratic Labour Party was on the right track in the proposal it put before this nation as far as transport is concerned. One of those proposals in a document entitled, "Getting It Back Together", the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party under Transport stated: I am quoting:

"The Party promises that it will completely restructure the Transport Board and give this vital public corporation a modern management structure in keeping with its important functions."

So, we of course, — this is no Johnnie-come-lately position — will have to support the proposal of the Hon. Minister, not only to say that the corporation needs a proper management structure, but in his effort to ensure that such a management structure and the personnel to fill the positions within that structure actually get into place. It is really amazing from what the Hon. Minister has said that it has taken so long, after he has identified the needs and the requirements and after he has given instructions, that the Board could not find it possible to put the persons in place.

I wonder if it were a failure of will on the part of the Hon. Minister to get the Board to carry out his policy, if it were intransigence on the part of the Board or if he encounters opposition, at other levels, because I find it difficult to believe that an Hon. Minister with the necessary power, having identified that necessary statutory authority, having identified the need and having issued a policy statement, is incapable of getting the necessary appointments made on getting the Board to do what he has said.

2.10 p.m.

It is a clear case where he states that the Board was inefficient in that it did not carry out his wishes. It did nothing in respect of those matters.

I also took note of the charge that there are unseen cowards within the Barbados Labour Party trying to orchestrate matters. Now, that is a very serious charge. He went on to identify absence of proper garage facilities, the depots not properly serviced, and matters of that sort. I was not surprised when the former Minister jumped up not only to second the motion but also to clear himself, because this is not a case now of going back and saying the Democratic Labour Party anything. You have been in power now for over five years. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: And 50 new buses). Fifty new buses, however many new buses there are, the fact is from the Minister's own admission here today when he took over in 1980 there were massive problems with which he was faced, leaving the

impression that previous Ministers of that Government, including those who immediately went before him, would have been derelict in some form or fashion, because the matters that were identified here are clearly matters which would have fallen under their responsibility and which they should have been able to do something about. We cannot forget that position. It was quite clear. A number of things are clear.

The Minister is obviously concerned at the level of policy; he is concerned at the level that his particular wishes are not being effectively implemented by a Board and so he has taken certain steps to deal with that, as he has said here this morning. He has also further said that whenever other disclosures come he will be prepared to speak further on this matter.

Let me make it clear. If there is a problem between the Minister and the Board, that is none of the making of the Democratic Labour Party. We never appointed anybody to the Transport Board — we do not have the power — so it is the Barbados Labour Party Government that appointed this Transport Board. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And we had the strength to fire them too). If there was a failing, if you appointed the wrong persons, that is your responsibility and you must take the blame for that. If you appointed persons who are inefficient, you must take the blame for that. That is something purely of the making of the Barbados Labour Party and we are now out of that situation in which they can get up and blame the Democratic Labour Party for what has gone on. This has nothing to do now with the Democratic Labour Party. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: We are not going to blame you for a while.) For a while, but the people will tell, they will speak and we will abide by their decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: Address the Chair, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, we know that the people will support you, there is no.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point, that is not germane to the present issue.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Is it true or not true, Mr. Speaker? I may ask you to give a ruling on that. Anyhow, the other matters referred to, the requirement for a preventive maintenance programme, the problems over the standardisation of buses, and to say that a Board was innocent of the meaning of the word "standardisation", it was not part of their vocabulary, and these — what was the phrase? — running dogs. We have been having some pretty harsh language — I recall from last night — not very pretty, not very elegant language. The need to set up a proper grievance procedure. These are serious charges and it is a matter of considerable concern to the people of this country that for so long this particular situation

has been allowed to continue and the Minister did not have the nerve to do something about it until now.

I do not know what catapulted or galvanised him into action, but he has now taken the action, and it is firm, positive action, and I say this to the Minister: that the people of Barbados are willing you to do something positive in order to create a better transport system in this country. At all levels they are willing you and they will be behind you if you take the necessary steps within the framework of the Laws of this country in order to create an effective transport system.

The lines are clearly drawn. We have indicated from this side our approach to this piece of legislation. I am concerned about fixing certain matters by Order, like the amount that has to be deducted from employers and employees. I am saying I am concerned in that area where these things are fixed and Parliament itself, unless it takes positive action, may have no action in that regard.

I have a concern for the role of Parliament to scrutinise this kind of subsidiary legislation and these Statutory Instruments, and I believe that where such matters are to be done, that they should be subject to affirmative resolution by this Chamber, not negative, but subject to positive, affirmative resolution. I believe that over the years — and this is not something I am saying that you have initiated, because it was done in that way by some of the legislation passed by the Democratic Labour Party Government — but particularly when we are in the area of imposition on people those Resolutions in my view, the Statutory Instruments under the parent legislation, should be subject to affirmative resolution.
2.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made the general points that I wish to make. I have said that there is a clear difference between myself and the Minister on this question of the Rule of Law and the role of the Police Force. I have said that I admire the courage of the Minister in that he has set out clearly some of the ills of Transport Board, and we support him fully in his efforts to try to get an improved transport system for the people of this country. Any action that he takes within the framework of the laws of this country and which will be for the improvement and better efficiency of that service will get support from this side.

The problem is whether he will get support from within his own party, from within his own Government. That is the question that has to be answered, and whether he can get the type of support demonstrated in this Chamber for policies that will make for a more efficient system.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our transport system is vital not only as infrastructure as it is sometimes called, but as a genuine economic service in this country. It is an economic service in its own right, and the Minister is right to lay stress on the question of training. Any service that is so vital must have an on-going training programme, not an ad hoc programme.

I recall as a Minister of Education speaking at a training course for conductors, and I believe there were some drivers there from the Transport Board — I believe this was in the late Sixties or early Seventies — but I do not think that for a service or a corporation that employs so many people that it can be done on an ad hoc basis.

It has to be something that is ongoing, and realising the vital nature of that service — again on this score we cannot fault the Minister in that particular regard — if we can have more persons in this country who have the courage to get up when they feel strongly on a matter and speak from a position of conviction, then I think that this country will be a better place and that the people generally may have more confidence in its public officials and its law makers such as we are in this Chamber who are charged with the heavy responsibility of delivering services at as efficient a level as possible and for the best returns possible that the people of this country can get.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill to provide for the improvement and collection of a levy for the improvement of our roads and our transportation system.

Although the Minister introducing the Bill did say that the Transport Board in particular had a lot of problems and have had these problems for many years, and subsequent to his speech a former Minister, the present Minister of Health also gave an explanation of the Labour Party's performance since taking power in 1976, I think that though it is true to say that we are presently experiencing a lot of problems at the Transport Board, the problems which we experience today are far less than the problems which we experienced prior to taking over the Government in 1976.

One must not forget that it was a political decision on the eve of the General Election in 1976 of the Democratic Labour Party to reduce bus fares to 25 cents in a mad scramble to please the electorate. This created tremendous financial problems for that Statutory Corporation, and we are still feeling the effect of that move today.

One must also remember that in 1976 the Transport Board operated 130 buses and employed approximately 685 people. Today the Transport Board operates 260 buses and employs over 1 700 people.

In those days, Sir, the two private concessionaires the Rocklyn Bus Company and the Elite Bus Company as a result of the subsidisation granted by the Democratic Labour Party's regime in the closing days of 1976, were granted large subsidies, and all these bus companies had to do to collect the subsidy at the end of each and every month was to produce the ticket stubs which the Transport Board or in fact the Ministry of Finance could not possibly check, and approximately \$350 000 a month was paid out to the private concessionaires in subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, this Government stopped that by taking over the Rocklyn and Elite Bus Companies. There are no more subsidies to be paid, and the fact is that we have brought into sharper focus this whole idea of mini-buses again as regularised transport in Barbados, and this Government does not in any way pay a subsidy to the mini-bus operators. On the contrary, Sir, mini-bus operators have to purchase a licence and they pay taxes, so they are now contributing towards the Treasury rather than as in the old days the Treasury contributing to the people who were involved in transportation.

Sir, I remember in 1976 when this Party came into power some of the problems which we faced with the Transport Board. In those days it was quite common — it did not happen on every occasion — that if a bus travelling in St. Peter — for argument's sake — had a flat tyre, to take another bus, a whole big bus and send another tyre up to the bus that had a flat tyre in St. Peter to have that tyre changed. That is a fact. There were no service vehicles as such that one could use, say, a jeep, a small Suzuki or whatever to send a team of people up to the bus to change the tyre.

On the other hand, if that bus had had the misfortune to break down as a result of something going wrong mechanically or otherwise, the bus had to be towed back to Weymouth in Roebuck Street. There was no place else throughout the island where the bus could be serviced. Weymouth was the only place at which all buses could be serviced. Today we have heard that there is Haggatts, there is Mangrove, there is Speightstown and there is Weymouth.

So although there are still a lot of problems that we are faced with in the transportation system, I still think in my humble opinion, that we have come a long way, and although I see room for improvement, I still think that credit should be given where credit is due, and we must not fail to recognise the good works that has been done by the two former Ministers of Transportation and Works. In those days it was Communications and Works.

Sir, travelling passengers in 1976 totalled approximately 19 million. Today the latest figures indicate that over 40 million are travelling on our transportation system. This has nothing at all to do with the mini-buses,

so there is a tremendous strain on the Transport Board. It is not as though we started the company from scratch.

A point has been made by the Minister introducing the Bill that we were saddled with Seddons over 100 of which were imported by the Democratic Labour Party. Seddon buses are top heavy. I remember in 1976-77 when this Government first came into power, 90 per cent of all accidents with all the buses were Seddons. Whenever the rains fall, the Seddons skid very easily, and because of this top heaviness where all the weight was on the front of the bus, they became very difficult to control.
2.30 p.m.

There are other problems, Sir, apart from the one of major capitalisation and in the Transport fleet which the Minister pointed out. But I think that this Levy — as much as I would like to see the levy go — will be with us for many years, in my view, because based on what the Minister said, if we are to get rid of the Seddons and at the same time increase our fleet it would mean that this is an on-going process and this process would take time.

Ideally of course, instead of spending \$3 million a year in spare parts to repair Seddons that ultimately serves no purpose, one should get rid of all of the Seddons, start cannibalising them. When something goes wrong with one, cannibalise one Seddon until you reduced your stock of Seddons and take the money and invest in new stocks. That is a policy decision.

The country cannot afford to write off all of the Seddons although I agree that that would be the best thing to do and when one looks at the terms that are granted to the Government of Barbados for the purchase of buses — five years as I understand it — five years is just not enough. The life of a good bus — not a Seddon, a Mercedes or a Leyland — as a matter of fact in 1956 when the Barbados Labour Party was in power we bought Mercedes and I still believe, Sir, that there are two Mercedes operating in the Transport Board from 1956.

The life of a good bus is 20 to 25 years so therefore the financing should not be five. If you were to look at the whole picture, I believe you need massive financing at the moment and you need longer terms. You must get 12 or 15 years, Sir, in order to really make an impact so that your amortisation payments are reduced, so that your rolling stock can increase rather than having the money spent in repayment schedules. They are too heavy and too burdensome to carry.

What you also have to look at, Mr. Speaker. When you make recommendations — and I am quite sure it has not missed the eyes of the Minister — is that there is a tremendous need for larger facilities. The physical headquarters at Weymouth are just too small. I have just mentioned earlier that we have increased the staff from 685

to over 1 700. The physical accommodation has barely increased. How can people be expected — I mean in no private enterprise would we expect this to happen. And for many years the Transport Board has had no Financial Controller. How can a business that has a volume of \$19 million per annum operate without having a Financial Controller, operate without having proper middle management and upper middle management staff.

It is quite simple because when you start to deal with a figure of \$19 million, Sir, the Transport Board has to compete with the private sectors and that is basically the problem: no one is going to leave working for a major company downtown to work for the Transport Board at a 25 per cent cut in salary. So these are the things which I believe would have to be looked at. The Minister would have to consider increasing the levels of pay at the highest level in order to attract people from private enterprise to ensure that you have a better transport system and a more efficient transport system.

Sir, I know that it is difficult for a politician to stand on the Floor of this Honourable House and accuse people of theft but one of the major problems at the Transport Board to my knowledge, has always been theft and this is why at one stage that the talk of the turnstiles was mentioned and I would like to know what is happening with that decision. There is a definite need to ensure the viability of the transport system in Barbados. Turnstiles are important.

As to those detractors who will tell me that you will put a conductor out of a job, I say no, Sir. It is a question of re-defining the job description and the conductor becomes a bus security guard and he is working. He ensures that no one jumps over the turnstiles and he ensures that law and order is maintained on the bus. Though initially the capital to initiate such a programme is quite expensive, I still think in the long run, Mr. Speaker, we will come out ahead.

There are many countries in the world who have computer bus systems. I believe in Illinois, they have a very small town that has a system that operates their buses based on a computer system. Everything is based on tokens and turnstiles. When the bus returns in from a route, the bus is connected up by a hose to the main computer. The main computer extracts all the tokens and counts them at the same time. Then you plug in from the main computer. You plug from the engine and the different parts of the bus and it gives you a read out on how much gas consumption and oil consumption. It even gives you the extent to which the tyres were worn based on the miles that were done. Now once you have all of that information you can easily determine whether or not a bus is operating efficiently — preventive maintenance, Sir.

If you see immediately that a bus is using more oil than is standard, then it goes to the garage, more gas and so on and so forth and by the same computer system it can tell you whether or not the bus is having problems with its crank shafts or any other mechanical, electrical or major problems. You have some idea of what is going to happen before it actually happens so you can institute preventative maintenance programmes. I am not saying that we should institute such a system but systems like that are available and if the Minister says — and I am sure he is more knowledgeable on these matters than I am and he has researched them — there are other areas I believe that he would have to investigate.

I know that there are certain financial constraints and I know and can understand the frustrations which he must feel as Minister responsible as I am sure the previous Ministers before him felt because you are dealing in an area of public transportation where you do not have sufficient money to do the things that you want to do and this is always used as a whipping stick in here or outside. Regardless of what you do, people are never satisfied that you are trying in the best interest of the country to achieve something in their own interest.

The control, Sir, of mini-buses has to be taken in a more serious light because there are profitable routes in Barbados to run a bus and there are unprofitable routes. Unfortunately the Transport Board cannot identify the routes that are profitable and run a bus and the routes that are not profitable and do not run a bus.

The Transport Board has to provide a service to the people of Barbados and though they may be losing money on a particular route in a particular area, they still have to provide the service. A mini-bus operator is not cautious. He does not care about the national interest. He is concerned with making a dollar. He is a private entrepreneur. I am not criticising him, Sir. I am just simply saying that his function is quite different to the function of the Transport Board.

What I think has to be done is that you have to identify profitable routes and the ones that are not as profitable and you have to work out a situation in terms of licences so that the licence for a non-profitable route would cost a mini-bus operator \$12 or \$15 a year to operate and a profitable route will cost him about \$3 000, \$4 000 or \$5 000. By so doing you devise a scale and you will find that the mini-bus operator who is paid \$15 to operate say in Grazettes or in the Pine would report it to the police if he sees another mini-bus operator who is supposed to be operating in the Pine doing otherwise.

In other words we alone cannot police the situation. The mini-bus operators themselves will ensure that the

situation is policed and more than that, Sir, I believe that the police must have a law which will give them sufficient teeth to ensure that the mini-bus operators that break the law are brought to justice swiftly. I am recommending, Sir, that consideration be given to such a Bill that would give the police the power to seize and hold a mini-bus if it is operated in the wrong area until such time as the Court hearing comes up.

Now if the police can seize a mini-bus on the Friday and the Court hearing does not come up until the Wednesday it simply means that the mini-bus operator cannot operate the mini-bus for four or five days. That in itself acts as a deterrent apart from the fact that you have the mini-bus operators looking out for their own interest because of the differential in issuing permits.
2.40 p.m.

Those are just one or two problems, Sir, that I thought had to be looked at and if they have been looked at by the Hon. Minister, perhaps in his closing remarks he could elaborate a little more in closing.

Sir, let me just say once again that I support the imposition of such a levy. I believe it would go a long way towards the improvement of our roads and our transportation system. I do think that this levy would have to be maintained for several years, based on the economics of the situation and I am appealing to the Cabinet and the Hon. Minister to see what can be done to ensure that larger repayment Schedules are available to Barbados so that, we could spend more of our money which will be derived from the levy for the purchasing of buses rather than meeting very heavy repayment schedules.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Bill before this Honourable Parliament which sets out as its objects and reasons:

“A Bill to provide for the charge of a Transport Levy on the income of employers and employed persons and for related matters.”

The Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Michael South have clearly stated the position of the Democratic Labour Party in this matter. We will oppose and vote against this Bill because it does not conform, in our view, with the requirement of the Law. We will, however, support the position taken by the Hon. Minister of Transport in his effort to increase the efficiency of the Transport Board.

This Bill, Sir, is unlawful in several regards. Firstly, the statement introduced into this Parliament, I think it was on Tuesday, September 8, 1981, was deemed by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance, in response to an objection which I made, that it was not a budgetary

proposal at all. Yet, the levy is being made in the context of that statement, and the Act under which it is being raised provides for the proceeds of taxes or impositions made in Budgetary or supplementary budgetary proposals.

The second objection, on a legal basis, Sir is that it does not conform with the provisions of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act..... (Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Man, you said so last week and the week before.)..... In that the four months period has already expired.

But, Sir, there is an additional and very important point of law that is involved here. Unlike the Health Levy, where there were the two main legal and constitutional objections which were made by the Democratic Labour Party Opposition, the Health Levy is being paid into the Consolidated Fund in accordance with the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act. This Levy is being paid into a newly created fund and there is no provision, Sir, under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act to collect money in this manner and pay into a special fund. There has been no amendment to that Act nor has there been an amendment to the National Insurance Act to establish this as a special fund under that Act.

Unlike the Health levy which one can object to on grounds of retroactivity — but, at least it conforms with the law in respect of the money being placed into the Fund as set out by the Law — this Bill does not even conform with that other aspect of the Law. So that is an additional area of illegality and as honourable Members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition we have a duty that levies and taxes.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Sir the point of order is this: The honourable Member is saying that an illegality has been committed in so far as funds which should be paid into the Consolidated Fund are being paid into a different fund under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act. This matter has been raised already and it was pointed out that the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act speaks of payment into funds including the Consolidated Fund. It is not an exclusion of it.

As a matter of order, Sir, I submit that the honourable Member should not be allowed to suggest that an illegality has been committed by the Government in respect of the disposition of money raised under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act. I will, if Your Honour gives me time, I will just get the Section, Section 4, I believe of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act. I cannot remember the number of the..... (Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Cap. 85.).....85? I will read the exact Section to Your Honour. I mean, there must be some restraint to debate where the truth is concerned. It is not an offence to tell a lie in Barbados. It is not even an offence to tell a lie in Parliament. But, where this matter

has been canvassed before, it does trespass on the Rules of Order.

Cap. 85 of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act says:

“ “tax” includes all assessments, charges, duties, fees, rates, impositions and other levies (however called) the proceeds of which are payable into the Consolidated Fund as part of the revenues of the island.”

It does not say “tax” means all assessments. If it says, “means”, the honourable Member would be on good ground. If it says “includes” he is simply misrepresenting one of the Laws of Barbados which I submit is contrary to the Rules of Order of the Honourable House. He is contradicting the law — he is stating that the law says something which it does not say.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, legal advice available to me simply interprets that word, “includes” on a wider base. But, that legal advice makes it imperative that the funds be paid into the Consolidated Fund. And, I want to assure the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas that it is not a question of seeking to misinterpret the law deliberately but it is a question of an interpretation of the law, by the legal advice which is available to us on this side. (*Asides*) If it is different from yours, well, — it is not a question of deliberately misinterpreting the law. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It is a question of interpretation anyhow.) It is a question of interpretation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue. Since I became an honourable Member of this Honourable House, I recall — I think as far back as 1978 — that I tried to indicate to this Honourable House, Sir, that when dealing with the question of transport in Barbados, that much of the debate related to the symptoms of basic ills within the transport system, whereas, nothing was being done to look at the basic problems relating to transport — in Barbados. At that time — I think it was during the Estimates Debate of 1979 — I pointed out that the Government had made a grave error in its policy position because, when they had previously increased the bus fares which had been increased, I think, on two subsequent occasions, they had failed to increase the subsidy made available to the Transport Board in those years 1977, 1978 and 1979 which would have been consistent with the expansion of fleet that had taken place that they had made an error of judgment in believing that the increase in bus fares would have offset the capital and current requirements of the Transport Board.
2.50 p.m.

The net effect of that has been a severe decapitalisation of the Transport Board over the past five

years, which has resulted in the transport crisis adverted to by the Minister of Finance in his September 8 mini-Budget — I will call it what he now calls it — or supplemental budget, when at that time he said the only area in which there was a crisis which he would freely admit was the Transport Board. But it was that process of de-capitalisation because of insufficient subsidies to reflect the capital needs of the Transport Board that has landed this country in the position in which it finds itself today in respect of transport.

It is against this background that this Transport Levy is being raised. We have not been told how much money will be raised by this levy on an annual basis, we have not been told what will be the impact of this yet additional burden on the National Insurance staff to collect yet another tax on behalf of the Government, when we know, Sir, that there are serious problems within that department to meet what would be its legitimate duties under the National Insurance Act in respect of benefits to be paid. I refer to the very common delays in payment of common benefits like Maternity and Sickness Benefits and so on. We have not been told to what extent the overload that is being created there will affect the performance of the National Insurance Board, although it should not affect the fund, because this money is not being paid into the National Insurance Fund.

Sir, one positive aspect of this particular Bill is that it entitles the Minister to control withdrawals from the Fund, and in this way it might be possible to ensure that the monies are used exclusively for the purposes for which they are being levied on the people of Barbados. I believe that we need a far more comprehensive approach to the whole question of transport in Barbados. It is my belief that land transport, inland transport, cannot be separated from transport outside of Barbados. I believe that just as the Port comes under the control of that particular Ministry, the question of sea transport should probably come under that Ministry, and a very reasonable case can be argued for air transport, aviation, to come under one transport Ministry at some time in the future.

Sir, we know that it is not only in the area of ground transport that Barbados is facing serious problems. There is a major problem in the area of air transport, a very very serious problem which I cannot deal with, because I think that although this Bill is rather broad in that it refers to a levy and it refers to transport, I do not wish to spend much time on it in my speech except to make the point that the whole question of transport needs to be looked at, and it needs to be looked at in a very constructive way as well as the fundamental problems relating to transport in Barbados.

The question of financing, Sir. With the Transport Board as it stands, if you raise \$25 million a year in

levy on the people in Barbados it would all go down the drain. There is no point making tax impositions on the people of Barbados unless you have a comprehensive plan in order to make sure that some benefits accrue to the people of Barbados.

I must, therefore, Sir, lend my full support to the Minister responsible for transport in seeking to reorganise the Transport Board of Barbados.

Many an hour has been spent on debate in this Honourable House and at no time since I have been a Member has anyone sought to deal with the basic problems affecting the operations of that Board. It is a question of personnel, it is a question of attitudes, it is a question of the recognition of the role of the Board in relation to the policy making arm of Government and the role of the Board in relation to the managerial aspects of the Transport Board operation.

I am calling upon the Minister to make sure that those fundamental concepts of good management in respect of public enterprises be adhered to, and that in the future there should be no compromise of those principles which he has had to deal with rather decisively on this occasion.

The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister has raised the question of financing. It is my view, Sir, and I made mention of it tangentially some time ago, that there are well known systems and methods of financing transport systems over a number of years, and that these facilities have been extended to various transport authorities around the world. In some instances you get bank financing, in some instances — and this is not uncommon — the manufacturers of the buses themselves actually provide the financing for the purchase of the buses over a period of time. I do not think you would get anyone to give you 15 or 20 years' money for buses. I do not think you would get past eight. If you get eight or nine years you will be getting a lot of years, but I doubt you would get anything in the region of 15 years at any given time from anybody for the finance of buses, and I doubt that the life span of any bus can be reasonably said to be 15 or 20 years.

We also support the principle of the standardisation of the fleet. There has been a lot of talk about this. I have heard a lot of criticisms of various types of buses that have been bought in the past, but what is very pertinent is that whatever type of bus you buy, standardisation is important, and as part of the package of purchase you should build in the matter of supply of parts. Many of these major suppliers of buses also would make available to you the technology and the skills that could be used in order to rehabilitate buses that have been broken down, or to help you to enter into a preventive maintenance contract.

3.00 p.m.

It can all be built into the cost of purchasing the buses and a whole lot can be financed at one and the same time. That is the kind of planning that I would suggest to the Government that they begin to enter into at this time.

Gone should be the days, Sir, when you exposed yourself to all forms of corruption buying 20 buses from here by people who were clearly unable to deliver the goods, or people who are unable to provide any form of preventive maintenance, people who have not got the capital to carry the stock in the island that would be necessary in order to meet the requirements of these buses.

You are not talking about running a fleet of two or three buses. You are talking about a massive operation that is a direct charge on the taxpayers of this country, and where you have available to you all sorts of management techniques in relation to supply, in relation to maintenance, in relation to maintenance of plant and so on, you cannot just ignore all the information that is available to you in the field of transport and feel that you can do your own thing and not look and see what is happening elsewhere in the world. It is a completely different ball game today than it was some years ago.

Government has created its own problems by its policy decisions to take away the buses from the private concessionaires. They have created a problem through the expansion of the fleet and they have failed to produce or to provide supporting elements necessary for the running of those buses.

The honourable Member who spoke just before me talked about theft at the Transport Board. I know it is very common in this country always to look at the farthest down the social ladder and believe that they are the only persons who steal. But there has been theft at the Transport Board at the highest levels, and I am glad that the Minister responsible for Transport has indicated to this Honourable House that he would follow up reports that several buses were removed from the Transport Board by persons unauthorised to remove them, and also would look into allegations that those buses were removed by Ministers.

I think it is absolutely important and I congratulate him for taking that very bold stand because when I hear of \$30 000 a week being stolen by conductors at the Transport Board, it did not make any sense to me. If you were to calculate that at 35 cents bus fare at the time, I think it meant that the conductors would have to be hijacking somewhere in the region of 200 full bus loads per week. I had calculated it at that time when the statement was made, and I believe that the figure was about 200 bus loads per week which would be clearly an impossible situation in the context of Barbados, but that figure of 200 is subject to recalculation. That is how my memory serves me in the matter, Sir.

Now, Sir, I believe that we can have a reasonable transport system in Barbados. I believe that it is necessary to look and see what we have now and see in what way we can improve on it. I believe that it is necessary to go in for long term financing that is consistent with the funds that are available. I think it would be necessary for Government to take early steps, because as it seems to me the sooner this is done in terms of the international money markets at the moment, the better for the Government, because if they are buying buses made anywhere in Europe, then they might benefit at the present moment from the relatively low value of European currencies in respect of the US dollar to which we are tied. And I believe that any contractual arrangements to be entered into should be done as soon as possible because some significant benefit might be got at least from the early deliveries even although the situation might change over a period of time, but at least we can get the benefit of the exchange.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is too much noise on the Government benches.

If we can get the benefit of exchange rates up front, that, Sir, might go some way in reducing the ultimate charges relating to financing of these buses. I believe, Sir, that there are major banking operations, — provided the credit-worthiness of the Government remains reasonable — and that is becoming somewhat doubtful now — that would readily provide financing on a reasonable basis. I do not have to tell the Minister of

Finance where to go to look for money, but I know that for this kind of financing when you are dealing with major reputable corporations, you can get financing. I cannot tell you at what rate or over what period, but it would not be a difficult matter in getting the financing provided it is backed by a Government guarantee. I am quite sure about that. As a matter of fact, I believe that not so long ago another Caribbean country has had a delivery of buses on the basis of financing by the suppliers, and the terms were relatively reasonable as far as I recall, taking into consideration today's interest rates.

In summary therefore, Mr. Speaker, our objection to this Bill is one on legal grounds and on grounds of constitutionality, and we have a duty imposed on us by convention, if not by law, but certainly by those moral standards to which we are committed. That duty dictates that we must vote against the Bill.

At the same time, Sir, bearing in mind the content of the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, and the content of my own speech which would demand a kind of new approach to the whole question of transport in Barbados, we will be giving full support to the Minister in his attempt to bring a mind that is clear to bear on the problems of transport, and also to support any action which he might have to take which is within the law and which is within his jurisdiction as prescribed by the Laws of this country in order to allow him to carry out his statutory duty.

We feel that we must take that stand because consistent to our decision to vote against the levy on the grounds of constitutionality and legality, we must take the concomitant stand of supporting the principle of ministerial government in the context of a parliamentary democracy.

3.10 p.m.

When we have to criticise, Sir, we have to be sure that there can be no doubt that when we make criticism in this Chamber, when we criticise a Minister, that we would not be told that it is not the Minister we should be criticising, it should be the Board we should be criticising. The moment that begins to happen, Sir, that is the end of parliamentary democracy, and the end of the concept of Ministerial responsibility. Therefore any attempt to undermine any Minister of this Government whether it be the Government in power now or whether

we should return to power at sometime in the future, I feel as parliamentarians we have a duty to take that stand.

I, Sir, I mentioned here a telephone call that I received from the Transport Board some weeks ago — I mentioned it on the Floor of the House where a secretary at the Transport Board was able to report to me that the then Chairman of the Transport Board could be making all sorts of offensive remarks about the Minister of this Government and that he could not be removed because he had support of three other Ministers, whom I referred to at that time. We cannot have that. We cannot have that because it is not good for this Parliament.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But that does not concern this House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, it is important because.....

Mr. SPEAKER: A secretary can tell you anything. It does not concern this House. It does not concern this House. I beg you to be the type of parliamentarian that you were just begging us all to be; that we must be. It takes a good teacher to follow his own instructions. Be that kind of teacher.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thank you, Sir. Anyhow on one other area, Sir, I would ask the Minister to set up proper systems for monitoring. It is in the area of corruptions in respect of the purchases of buses, the purchases of equipment, the purchases of parts and also the kind of tests which the honourable Member for St. Michael Central referred to during his speech. All these things have to be borne in mind because they all relate to the ultimate costs of transport in this country and the ultimate impact of a viable transport system in relation to the economic structure of Barbados. They can all have an impact on that and can defeat the objections not only of the levy but also those policy objectives.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has come to the end of his time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Can I finish the sentence, Sir, they can defeat those policy objectives which the honourable Minister has outlined in this Honourable Chamber today. Thank you very much, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning I had a meeting with representatives of the World Bank who are on their annual mission to Barbados examining the state of the economy, discussing recent decisions taken with the World Bank which may have some adverse effects to Barbados in the future. They have said that our per capita income is so high, that we

have passed out of the ranks of undeveloped countries and moved into the ranks of the developed and should be graduating from the World Bank lending programmes; but we are resisting this. That is a separate argument.

In the course of discussing fiscal developments generally, and how countries go downhill and how they stay afloat, it was indicated that the Mission felt that our transport policy was the one which gave them greatest concern in connection with the general fiscal management of the island. I said at one stage to the leader of the delegation — I am not actually going to say in the House of Assembly today that Mr. So and So of the World Bank has told me such and such — but I even indicated that I was going to mention some of the perimeters of the discussions in which we were engaged.

I myself had felt that the other matter which has been occupying the House in the last two days, our expenditure on the health services is perhaps the one where we have been, over many years, least efficient as a Government. I think we spend very much more in the health services than the quality of services would suggest, and I mean generally. I do not mean the Government. I mean what we spend on private doctors because if you believe the Statistical Department, you will find that the private doctors and dentists earn more than the Transport Board collectively.

I had thought it was Health. The World Bank thought it was Transport so honourable Members can see that although I have not been contributing to these debates over the last two days, we were talking on two subjects which have been giving the Government a great deal of concern and the Ministry of Finance, the international institutions and a number of members of the public all agree that public transport in Barbados is a drain on the finances of the country that the country cannot afford.

Now this is not a new problem. It has been so for many years. Certainly since the decision was taken to reduce the bus fares from a level that was just above the economic level to a standard level that could not possibly be economical and we have gone on now, year after year, in which successive Ministers of Transport — Dr. Caddle in 1975–76, the honourable Member for St. Andrew subsequently, the honourable Member for St. Joseph and now the honourable Member for St. Michael East — have found themselves in a highly frustrating bind dealing with the bottomless pit of transport expenditure in Barbados.

At the background of all the somewhat speechless arguments about the legality of the Transport Levy and whether it could be paid into the Consolidated Fund or not, is the undoubted delight of the Opposition about

the discords which have arisen on the Government side in respect of Transport. You do not have to say these things. You just get Cameron Tudor to publish them in the papers for you. You do not have to spell them out in here. You just get the gentleman who sells the *Nation* newspapers in New York to pour poison into the ears of persons who have the capacity to handle the problem but cannot handle it unless there is general support and general accord.

We have heard about the Transport Board. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has congratulated the Minister on dismissing the Transport Board. Honourable Members seem to have forgotten that this is not the first time in the last few years that the entire Transport Board has been dismissed.
3.20 p.m.

We have difficulties with un-road worthy buses. The Hon. Minister of Transport made an effort to point out that the normal course of action in the past when the police had been asked to examine unlicensed buses, was to report the owner of the buses and perhaps the driver. We had a whole Private Members Resolution about this. But there is a point. There has been a departure from the usual practice. Normally, if you are a policeman and you find an unlicensed vehicle; so far as I know, it is not your duty to decide that it has not been licensed because it has not passed a road worthiness test. It is your duty to prosecute the owner for having an unlicensed vehicle on the road. In this case something different was done.

I think that some intemperate language has been used by the Hon. Minister. But the intemperateness of his language should not conceal from us that an unusual step was being taken to the harassment of the travelling public. (*Aside*) Sir, I would not like to make a speech as appropriate to that. But I thought it was over, Sir. I am very sorry, Sir. I really thought that it was completed.

We now have another situation, where the impasse at the Transport Board is once again causing discord in the ranks of a Government and in the immediate offices of those whose duty it is to solve the difficulties. But at the bottom of it all, is the fact that we have a very tortured public transport system in Barbados; starved of capital in the past; having to run for many years without new buses; having to take over in this Government's time, buses that were unfit to be run and, therefore, Sir, faced with all the difficulties.

The Government has agreed that rather than put the remedy, as always in the past exclusively on bus fares, we will put the remedy on all users of the road — those who drive buses and those who benefit from buses because the buses carry more passengers than cars

and mini-buses. If there was no public transport system, the roads would be a lot more crowded so we say, put the burden on all of us to support some effort at rehabilitating the transport system. This is how the Transport Levy came about.

The levy has been used from the word, "go", Mr. Speaker, as a tool with which to beat the Government. First of all, you heard that the levy was a burden on the poor people. It is a burden on the better off, not the poor, and it is a burden on those who do not catch buses and yet have to pay to support the capital programme that the Hon. Minister spoke of earlier.

There are a lot of motor cars in Barbados. There would be more, if we do not have such a programme. Some very drastic remedies, Sir, have been used to make public transport systems pay. We will find that if we try to make political mischief and if we try to go through all the subterranean channels and we get to cause discord in the ranks of the Cabinet and the Government, that we will end up by just having a worse and worse public transport system. Eventually, remedies such as those which are used in Singapore where no motor car is allowed within the city unless it has four people in it — you do not have single drivers sitting in a car — remedies such as those will inevitably come and before you reach those remedies, you will reach a minimum bus fare of a \$1.00 too. All of these are the results of resisting honest attempts to deal with the transport system.

This is not the place — although it may very well be the time — to deal with the discords with which I referred to earlier that have arisen in the ranks of the Government. There are things that could be said about colleagues, whether parliamentary, ministerial or supporters in positions of authority that are better said within a closed location, than openly in Parliament.

I myself would never wish to be in the position of giving aid and comfort to what I consider was a biased article — deliberately biased one side in the newspaper — in the *Advocate* Newspapers today from one commentator anymore than I would wish to give aid and comfort to an article equally biased on the other side in the *Nation* Newspaper by Mr. Cameron Tudor. In each case, I regard these articles as expressions of special pleading, informed by parties to a dispute, and neither of them has the slightest value. Each is as mischievous as the other. But though it may be the time, it is scarcely the place to deal with this.

The Government dismisses any specious reasoning relating to constitutionality or legality in respect of the Transport Levy. It has to be passed. Its form is the same as was outlined in the Budgetary Proposals. The disposition

of the fund has not been questioned. The desirability of capital programme has not been questioned. The desirability of road rehabilitation out of the fund have not been questioned. The desirability of keeping down the bus fares by means of a levy has not been questioned either.

What I would like to hear is somebody who opposes the levy get up on the other side and say we should not have the levy, you should have a 75 cents minimum bus fare and \$1 to go to Pie Corner. That is an argument which, although I profoundly disagree with it, I could respect, because it would be an honest argument dealing with the merits of the Transport Levy and of the solutions which the Government is proposing to the problems which we have.

Above all, Sir, in deploring what I think is the speciousness of the Opposition's reasoning, I would like to deplore the rancour that has been injected into the Transport Debate — not just now — this is not the first time — there is a lot of rancour now — more perhaps than there has been in the past and much more than is needed. We had just as severe an incident when Mr. Shorey was dismissed with all his Board which included the honourable Member for St. Michael Central. The honourable Member for St. Michael Central avoided dismissal by a timely resignation. (*Laughter*) Perhaps, he was in the know a little bit more than some of his colleagues. It is not a matter to be trivialised. The real point is that transport is important to all of us.

3.30 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party will get back into power some time, Sir. This time five years ago, they thought it would be now, but I notice they are more sanguine in their chances and are making no predictions, but some time the Democratic Labour Party will get back into power.

They can choose now whether to embark on a course of mischief making and creation of confusion as to whether when they get into power in ten, 15, or 20 years' time they find a broken down fleet of buses, not knowing what to do with the mini-buses, having to ban passenger traffic in motor cars in the parish of St. Michael or the old limits of the City of Bridgetown, on Highway 1 or Highway 7 or whatever, because you can be sure, Sir, however much we develop Barbados — we may double its income in the next five years — we are not going to double its size, the size will still remain with us.

All of these are problems that deserve serious consideration shorn of the personal consideration that seem to be rampant at the moment.

The Government clearly is going to support this Bill, Sir, and I would apply to right thinking members of

the Opposition to reconsider their attitude towards public transport and see how barren their arguments have been of anything positive, anything useful, anything constructive that can help this island get over its difficult transport problems.

In winding up, I will just return to what I said at the beginning. Let us make no mistake about it, should Barbados find itself in recession for another year and should we find ourselves because of the international conditions having to appeal to an international Agency for assistance, it is my conviction that one of the conditions the first condition perhaps — will not have anything to do with the people that weed the highways; it will not have anything to do with reducing the number of nurses at the QEH; it will have nothing to do with the pensioners — certainly nothing to do with the pensions we pay..... well, finance it will have to do with reducing the subsidy to the Transport Board. That is condition number one which I foresee would be necessary as a prerequisite of a finding that things are being done as they should be. I believe that that is the greatest drain, the most unwarranted drain, on the Government's finances at the present time.

We have carefully to consider if we are really able to sustain the projected deficit, which I believe the Transport Board put at \$17 million. We have carefully to think if we can sustain a deficit of \$17 million at the Transport Board in the forthcoming year. In other words, spend perhaps twice as much on the Transport Board as we are spending on agriculture in the island, as we are spending on the general economic services provided by the Government.

I looked today, Sir, at Capital Expenditure this time last year and Capital Expenditure this time this year. This time last year in an accounting procedure, the Defence Force — because the loan was brought to book in March — was the biggest consumer of the Government's Capital funds, but that did not represent a drain because funds came in and funds had to be written out. The left hand takes them in and the right hand pays them out. The biggest single item of expenditure a year ago — the months in which the Boards call for their money — the IDC wants its money to pay off its factory building programme, settle its overdraft and so on; the Tourist Board wants its money representing payments made to its agents abroad for advertising and so on and so forth — the biggest was the Transport Board last year and it is again going to be the biggest this month. We really must ask ourselves when we depend on foreign exchange whether it is right to spend \$17 million on the Transport Board and only \$7 on Tourism, or \$17 million on the Transport Board and only \$7.5 on factory building.

It is a serious problem, and by discussing it in personal terms, we are wasting our time and wasting the time of the country. We are frittering away our talents, and

should be reflecting carefully on the problems that we are facing as a country and not as individuals, Mr. Speaker.

I support the passage of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is winding up debate.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few reflections on some of the comments which have been made, starting with the Minister of Health who spoke immediately after me.

I am absolutely sure that the Minister of Health did his best while he was Minister of Communications and Works, and there was no intention on my part to make any personal reflection on the Minister of Health in his functions as Minister of Communications and Works. But that having been said the objective conditions which I catalogued in respect of the Transport Board are there for all who have eyes to see. This is a situation I found and I reported what I saw in all of its objectivity reflecting in no way on any Minister.

Having got that out of the road, let me say that one of the points which he made that I consider to be constructive and of some significance, and to which I alluded, is the question of driver training. The driver training programme that the Ministry of Transport contemplates for the Transport Board must be comprehensive. It must be a programme in which a modicum of technical knowledge about the vehicle handled is imparted to the driver, but most important of all is this element — an element which I omitted to mention and which is crucial to proper driving and proper handling of a vehicle in any transportation system. A driver to the extent that it is possible, must drive one vehicle and no other vehicle.

The practice of assigning drivers to any vehicle that is available has contributed in large measure to the road accidents and poor handling of vehicles. So one of the central elements in the comprehensive driver training programme will be the restriction of a particular driver to a particular vehicle. In that way it is believed that familiarity with the vehicle will precede love for that vehicle, because he knows that if he handles that vehicle badly it will be difficult for him to operate and it will accordingly make his job that much more unpleasant. So that is going to be an important element.

Of course, the Minister also referred to attitudinal problems at the place of work. It is fashionable today to inveigh against workers describing them as perverse, lazy, and having lazy and negative attitudes. The fact of the matter is this:— that in every society where modernisation has been carried out as at rapid a pace as modernisation has taken place in Barbados, fewer and fewer peo-

ple indigenous to that society can be persuaded to perform tasks that are considered tasks of drudgery.

3.40 p.m.

If you look at any rapidly developing society, you will find that back-breaking tasks and tasks of drudgery tend to be tasks assigned to immigrants. It is therefore not surprising that in Barbados today, it is easier to get an immigrant from the Caribbean to do certain kinds of work that involves manual labour more readily than it is for a Barbadian to do it.

In New York City in sweat shops like the garment centres, you will find that the majority of people who are working therein performing the back-breaking tasks, are people who cannot speak English and are thereby excluded from other jobs within the society, or English speaking people mainly from the Caribbean who are operating outside the pale of the Immigration Law and can only find this avenue of employment available to them.

There is a host of other factors which I do not believe is proper to go into given the nature of this Bill, but we must eschew primitive approaches to dealing with serious labour problems. In better organised societies within Barbados, it has been found necessary to set up entire departments within institutions of higher learning funded by business to the tune of millions of dollars to study the problem of the psychology of workers in order to ensure greater productivity. It does the debate no good if people with the mentality of slave drivers keep repeating that the workers are lazy or have poor attitudes or are afflicted with some other kind of perversity, that they do not function in the way in which we believe they should function.

There are too many role models in the society who are perceived to live high off the hog while expending very little effort, and that is precisely why people in the lower echelons of the labour force think that if persons in the higher echelons can do little or nothing and enjoy the better things of life, they might follow suit. It might be better for those of us who are leaders in our particular area to make a special effort and by example encourage workers to strive harder.

It is not my business, Mr. Speaker, to use any of the primitive approaches that have been proposed elsewhere. I intend to give to the Transport Board the benefit of the most sophisticated knowledge available from other parts of the world to ensure that the workers at the Transport Board become more productive. Within the recent past the arbitrary and capricious firing of people has done nothing at all to boost the morale or increase productivity, and it is plainly a method that has no future if the Transport Board is to function efficiently and we are to produce responsible workers. I have already

proposed some of the things that we intend to do in order to improve the morale of the workers of the Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker, another significant point was made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central when he referred to the fact that it is no longer in the interest of the Transport Board or any properly conducted business to buy buses as if they were sugar cakes. In the first place we cannot afford the money, and in the second place it is a most crude approach to purchasing rolling stock that one expects to last for at least ten years. It is therefore upon the policy of the Ministry directed to the Transport Board that in future when discussions take place every facet of the Board's operation must be examined and discussed with potential vendors of rolling stock for the Transport Board, and every effort must be made to ensure the maximum technical assistance. This, Mr. Speaker, entails using the direct approach in discussions between the Transport Board and any potential vendor.

It is useless to have a general manager of the Transport Board sending messages through an agent who is abysmally ignorant of what the needs of the Transport Board are, for him to transmit the message to a multinational institution which then sends back an answer through him and he hands it to the general manager of the Transport Board. That is monumental nonsense.

One has heard much in recent days about the trip of the general manager to Germany. It is a trip that was urgently needed in view of the fact that 22 buses had been sold to the Barbados Transport Board by Mercedes Benz. These buses had arrived in the island and in order to save them the fate of being man-handled and butchered by drivers who were not properly prepared or by a mechanical section that did not have a preventive maintenance programme set up, it was necessary for the general manager of the Transport Board to go to Germany to discuss (1) the question of driver training, (2) the question of preventive maintenance and (3) the question of the kind of financing that I alluded to in my initial presentation. It is also a reprehensible untruth for the Chairman of the Transport Board to assert that he did not give the general manager permission. On December 18 when I left the country of Barbados to go to Canada, I spoke to the Chairman of the Transport Board and he told me that he had only one misgiving. It is a misgiving that I am going to talk about at length. Whenever they hold their press conference, I am going to talk about that misgiving. (A VOICE: He had the press conference this morning.) Well I will talk about it.

3.50 p.m.

The only misgiving he said he had is that a Kyffin Simpson might be involved in making arrangements for the General Manager to go to Germany. When I asked

him who is Kyffin Simpson and what is his relationship to Mercedes Benz, he told me that Kyffin Simpson is the man that the Prime Minister had instructed him not to have any dealings with and that there is to be only one agent to which I replied, "I am not in the least bit interested in whom the agents are. It is no concern of mine who the agents are because we are abandoning the policy of going through agents and we will be dealing with the people in Germany on a Board to company basis." His reply to this was "But who is going to get the commission?" to which I said "That is no concern of mine."

It was very, very clear that his primary interest was not the proper functioning of the Board in so far as the General Manager's trip was concerned but a completely extraneous matter which concerned me not at all. Of this I shall say more as well. I will wait until I get the results of that Press Conference and then make a definitive statement on this question of the disposition of a commission which ought not to be the business of the Chairman of a Board or a Minister or anybody else.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, therefore that we believe that it is absolutely necessary when purchasing vehicles to ensure that these vehicles come in a package in which case one element must be driver training, another element, Mr. Speaker, must be a system for preventative maintenance programme and another element must be the question of proper financing since the resources at our disposal are extremely limited.

Another point made by the Hon. Prime Minister is that certain people, the Opposition, are authors of articles in the newspapers and I am happy to learn that the Prime Minister has implicitly disavowed any association by any Member on this side with any article which might have appeared in any of the daily newspapers. (*Asides*). Well, that is my understanding of it. If he has not, he can clarify the position.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister alluded to the fact that there is much rancour concerning this issue. Wherever serious public issues are involved such as Transport and men of integrity are involved in a fight to achieve certain objectives for the benefit of the public, then much emotion is generated.

I personally make no apology for expressing myself strongly on these issues. It is an issue on which I feel very strongly and the Prime Minister has afforded me ample justification for speaking with such speed because in his report on a meeting with the World Bank body, he has said that that body believes that the transporta-

tion question is the greatest issue facing this country and that it is a matter of urgent importance for the deficit to be reduced. When one contra-distinguishes this with the reported comment of the ex-chairman, of the Transport Board that the deficit is really not a serious matter of the highest priority, then one can clearly understand why a Minister, committed to providing the public of this country with a reliable service and committed to easing the burden of the taxpayers had to act — and act decisively — in order to change a Board whose leader was crippled by this kind of thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that with goodwill, we can move forward to give this country in two years the kind of transportation system within the Transport Board system that I believe our passengers need. I am committed to doing this. I believe that it is important to combine the question of bus transportation with studies relating to other kinds of transportation.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central referred to a Transportation Authority which this Government will set up in the not too distant future and I am glad that he agrees with a view which I expressed here that there must be an integration, not only of transportation on land within the private sector and the public sector but also an integration of this with sea traffic. The Deputy Prime Minister is very interested in the development of a ferry service from Oistins to Bridgetown. He is committed to this kind of integration of travel by sea and by land.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by asking Members once again to support this Bill and I am sure that the levy, properly handled, will result in a few years in a substantial improvement in the kind of roads that are available to drivers of motor-vehicles as well as to people who have to use our bus transport system.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative.
4.00 p.m.

The bell was rung.

The question 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. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. A. TRUSS, Hon. L. R. TULL and Mr. J. G. ODLE.
— (13).

NOES: Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. B. M. TAITT. — (6)

On the motion of Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, 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 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 do now stand part.

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

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, one very brief inquiry, in this area. It is my understanding that the Transport Levy which constitutes a tax on the gross income of persons will not be tax deductible when the final returns for the year are returned. And I believe that there has been a circular sent out by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to that effect to employers.

Now if that is the case, it would appear to me that it would be quite wrong to deduct one per cent of the gross earnings of an employee and then that one per cent is not tax deductible but is taxed again, as though he had received it. There seems to be some confusion here. I think that there is a circular out saying that the Health Levy is tax deductible, but that the Training Levy and the Transport Levy are not tax deductible. This seems to me to be a tax on tax kind of situation that is developing here.

I wonder whether the Hon. Minister could respond to this or whether the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance can give us any idea of how this tax would relate to the income tax liabilities of persons in this country.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance a simple question. There is a circular out to the effect from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue — that the Health Levy is tax deductible but that the Training Levy and the Transport Levy are not tax deductible. I have asked a straightforward question. I want to know whether that is true or not or whether there has been an error because it would seem

to me that if that is the case, then you are taxing on taxes that are already paid.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. The honourable Member.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has not got to be too heated where this is concerned. If he ask the Hon. Minister a question and he is in no position now to answer or does not care to answer now, there are other procedures where he could bring it down as a question. Very simple. Cool.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must say — please take your seat — that the honourable Member is referring to an honourable Minister on the Government side. On the matter of a circular which he alleges to have been circulated by the Income Tax Department, I do not consider that an Hon. Minister need answer that question.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I wish to speak again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member have comments to make on Clause 3?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that as the person on this side responsible for shadowing the Ministry of Finance and Planning, that I consider it to be a great injustice if persons are asked to take a Transport Levy and then that Levy is not tax deductible. I make that as a positive statement. I do not wish any reply. I will investigate it myself.
4.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear him say that he is the Shadow Minister of Finance. I was inclined to believe that he was Shadow Minister of all the other things, but that is really a transport matter. Put it down on the Order Paper as a Question, you will get the answer even if it is in 1992.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: One question, Mr. Chairman. Clause 7 says here ".....acting on the instructions of the Minister;" I take it that these will be the instructions of the Minister responsible for transport. It seems to me, and I wish the Prime Minister could pay some attention to this question as well, that the Minister of Transport will then be giving directions to the National Insurance Board. I just want to know if my understanding is correct.

It says here that withdrawals may be made from the Fund. The Fund has been established under the National Insurance Board under a previous clause. "Withdrawals are to be made on the instructions of the Minister." In the Interpretation Section in this Bill, "Minister" refers to the Minister responsible for transport. I am just making sure that it is the intention that the Minister of Transport would give directions on the withdrawal of funds from this particular Fund. I am not sure if this is what is intended, I just want to be certain for my own purposes whether that is what is intended, because then the Minister of Transport will in fact be giving directions to the National Insurance Board. As far as I know, the National Insurance Board falls under another Minister.

I think that it is a matter which for tidiness ought to be clarified.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I draw the honourable Member's attention to Section 2. There he will see that "Board" is defined as the Transport Levy Board. The Transport Levy Board administers the Transport Levy Fund, so that the directions of the Minister of Transport to be given are to the Transport Levy Board.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I take the point made by the Hon. Minister. In other words, the Board is to be set up. This is the Transportation Authority presumably or a separate Board administering this Fund, so the Director of National Insurance is only being directed where to pay the money and that is all he does. Thank you, Sir.

The question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 to 13 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 14 was called and passed, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. A. TRUSS and Hon. L. R. TULL — 12.

Noes: Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. B. M. TAITT — 5.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
4.20 p.m.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF U. S. \$ 2 MILLION FROM THE OPEC FUND

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U. S. \$2.0 million from the OPEC Fund for the purpose of assisting in the provision of local cost funding of the Scotland District Development, the Community Health Polyclinics, Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Roads and Heywoods Holiday Village.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Barbados is a beneficiary under the OPEC Special Fund for international development. I have a copy of the Loan Agreement here which sets out in detail of the loan signed by the Director General of the OPEC Fund, Mr. Ibrahim Shihita and by our Ambassador to the EEC and to Austria.

The Addendum specifically sets out the terms and conditions of the loan. It is a Balance of Payments support loan based upon their rules relating to those of us who buy oil from OPEC countries, and we are assigning it towards the Scotland District Development Scheme, towards the polyclinics, towards the Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Roads and towards Heywoods to meet the parts of the local cost of these products, and I would not expect to find that anyone is against a loan from OPEC for the purpose of supporting the Government's capital works.

It is the third loan that we are raising from OPEC, Sir, and on behalf of the Government and people of Barbados, I would like to thank the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries for their assistance in this matter and their recognition of the development needs of small countries and of the sometimes difficult conditions into which more countries are placed as a result of having to meet the increased cost of petroleum.

We must try and get this Resolution passed because we have run almost up to the end of time for disbursement. I am instructed that we must try and get it through so that the funds can be paid out by the end of this month, and I think that I may have started to hasten it through Parliament, but last Tuesday we were unable to reach it and of course we would not have reached it even now were it not for today's Sitting.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister in introducing this Resolution took a few moments to thank the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries. He obviously knows more because of the position from which he is able to view them about the reasons for having to thank those countries than we on this side could. But before giving assent to this Resolution or acquiescing in its passage through this Honourable Chamber, there are a few remarks which I believe it is necessary to have placed on the record.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that some time back in 1973 and going on up until very recently, the petroleum exporting countries, members of OPEC caused to happen, as it were, what came to be described as the energy crisis. I do not believe that anyone from a developing country could argue that these countries which had received almost nothing in real terms from their tremendous wealth of oil, which during the late Sixties and Seventies decided that they would require a real economic cost for the products of their country, no one of the developing countries which recognises the struggle which had gone on on the international scene for recognition of those countries by the industrial giants, no one who understood the struggle between North and South and the sudden realisa-

tion that the OPEC countries had more power at their disposal than they had hitherto realised could in fact hold it against them for the price rises which they implemented.

Mr. Speaker, at that time the developed countries sought to suggest to those countries, many of whom had been members of the so-called Group of 77, that the only people who would be harmed in this sudden movement of prices upward would be their fellow members of the Group of 77 and other developing and lesser developed countries around the world. Mr. Speaker, I well remember that the members of OPEC indicated in the Organisation of African Unity, in the United Nations, in the Group of 77 and indeed for a substantial amount of time thereafter to the world at large, that they would in due course make some of the profits from their oil available by way of soft loans to the developing countries.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, after some considerable time, we are now confronting an expression of that largess which we were promised by those countries. We here in this Honourable Chamber have been asked to approve a loan of U. S. \$2 million. So for all of the trumpeting and all of the noise that was made by these countries of how marvelously helpful they were going to be to the developing countries, a sum of US \$2 million is the total of which we are to be the beneficiaries, to use the term that the Prime Minister outlined. Beneficiaries of US \$ 2 million, Sir? A whole country at eight per cent repayable in 1984? I do not consider that makes us a beneficiary. It is not an outright gift. It is a loan which we are able to get on so-called soft terms, eight per cent.

When we have a Balance of Payments deficit which no one seems to be able to identify accurately, when our National Debt at the end of November, 1981 is put by the Central Bank at \$702 million, I find it difficult to be enthused over the fact that the OPEC countries are going to make us the beneficiary of U. S. \$2 million.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister what is the actual cost to process this loan? I have every reason to believe that when we examine the procedure through which we go, including the time in this Honourable Chamber, we will find that it is not a significant part of the U. S. \$2 million itself which we are going to be expending to process this loan. And I do not believe that eight per cent can be considered a soft loan merely because other countries in the world have caused their interest rates to move in the vicinity of 16 per cent, 17 per cent, and 22 per cent.

I do not consider that OPEC is doing us any favour and it is clear from the terms of this Resolution that what has happened is that someone has drawn it to the

Prime Minister's attention — and he is scratching around looking for every possible cent he can find — somebody has drawn it to the attention of the Prime Minister — look, here is a small sum of money available from OPEC and as a result the Government has had to scramble around for projects to find to qualify for the loan and so, Sir, we have a Resolution that comes in here and ask for our assistance in allowing the Government to borrow money to meet costs in the Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Road, the Heywoods Holiday Village Development, the Community Health Polyclinic.

Mr. Speaker, I make bold to say that the only project included in this Resolution which is worthy of any consideration in terms of the size of this loan would be the Scotland District but the Government has thrown in the other projects in order to qualify for the loan. I believe that if the Government has to do that in its relations with the international agencies or regional agencies, that is fine, but they really ought not to insult our intelligence to come in here and say for example "And Whereas Government deems it necessary".....They really are in bad shape if you deem it necessary to borrow the sum of U. S. \$2 million from the OPEC Fund.

We must be in terrible financial straits. We must be in a position that the Prime Minister has not yet acquainted us with. It may well be that his discussions with the International Monetary Fund — his recent discussions of which he informed us a few minutes earlier — may have put him in a position to tell Barbadians and to tell Barbados finally what is the real state of our finances because why else would the Government deem it necessary to borrow the sum of U. S. \$2 million from the OPEC Fund.

I go further, Sir. We are borrowing money from an international agency to assist in the provision of local costs, Mr. Speaker. As for the Addendum that is even more goobledy goot. "The counterpart funds" — to read the second paragraph — "generated by this loan are to be used for the purpose of financing part of the local cost expenditure of any or all of the following projects" and they listed the projects, Spring Garden/St. Barnabas, Holiday Village etc.

As I said, Sir, that would be fine for the language you send out to OPEC. They do not know that the Heywoods Holiday Project has an over run of \$30 million. They do not know that.....The Prime Minister seem a little surprised. They would not know. That is euphemism — the revised estimates. I will take his language, Sir. The revised estimate of the cost is in excess of \$30 million — which was the original cost — by an additional \$30 million. The revised estimate of the Post Office.....Sorry, Sir, that is not included — that figure would be atrocious. The revised estimate of the

St. Barnabas Project, the revised estimate of the Polyclinic Project — it does not matter what they called it — I am saying that when we are dealing with projects of that magnitude and of that size, it is all right to tell OPEC that we have these projects and make a case.

Mr. Speaker, when funds were to be had from the EDF, the Caribbean as a whole had a little difficulty meeting the criteria which had been set out. I do not think it is unreasonable to say that the language used for the acquisition of the funds required a little stretching of the imagination and indeed a little drawing in of projects which might not even have reached the stage of development.

I recall, Sir, that the Oistins Project — the much trumpeted Oistins Project — was put together in this way so far as the EDF was concerned and that is how part of the funding for the Oistins Project arose out of the negotiations with the EDC. I have no quarrel with that. Developing countries have to do these things but coming to this Honourable Chamber, Sir, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance owe us a greater responsibility than to come and tell us that he finds it necessary to borrow U. S. \$2 million (*Asides*). Paragraph 3 in the Resolution. (*Pause*). Mr. Chairman, to continue. I paused because the Prime Minister apparently was not privy to the Resolution. In recent days his performance can only be described as sloppy, Sir. If he admits to that, Sir, there is no point flogging that.

The fact is that I am concerned that we have reached the stage where it is considered necessary to borrow U. S. \$2 million from OPEC when in fact all we ought to be doing — in fact we should be saying to the OPEC "Thank you very much but we do not need this \$2 million because we have borrowed so much money in the past few months."

4.40 p.m.

We were told, I recall, Sir — no reflection on the vote — when the question of the \$60 million from the Orion Bank came up certain projects were advanced. Are we to understand that every single penny which has been borrowed by the Government in the last year, indeed, the last two years, has been borrowed to assist the well known projects which even school children could rattle off now, Sir? I believe that the problem is deeper than that.

It may very well be that we are advancing these projects as the reason for the loan, but in truth there is a pristine honesty about this Resolution that supersedes any that has ever graced this Honourable House in the past. It may very well be that this is truly for generating local funds. I did not know that you could borrow money from an international agency and then call them local counterpart funds. I did not know, Sir, that that was a practice of sound financial management. That

reminds me of a character in Tom Clarke's book, "The Meeting Point" who used to go.....(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Talk about book, "The Prime Minister.") (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: "Tom Clarke's book.").....No, I am dealing with the one called, "The Meeting Point," in which he speaks of a character who used to go into the Royal Bank dressed in a three piece suit every week and come back out with his book showing an additional zero. Towards the end of the book it shows, Sir, that all he used to do was go in and stand up by the teller and write another zero in his bank book and come back out.

With the Government financing, when we talk about counterpart funds it begins to remind me of that character. Is it that we are in such a bad state that we are now using funds allegedly — I should not say allegedly — funds are located when they apply for them as project fund for current expenditure? Can it be that in spite of our charge that the Trinidad loan was used for the payment of salaries, a charge which has never been successfully denied and that the Orion Bank loan has been used for Current Expenditure? Could it be that throwing in the words, "Balance of Payments support" is an indication that it is true that the Central Bank has, in the words of the financial financiers, printed money?

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned when we see such bitumed sums as U. S. \$2 million coming into this Honourable Chamber in this way. That is precisely the point we are making. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Ten twos are how much?) The honourable Member says ten twos are how much? We are saying that these little twos which are coming in are indicative of the sickness which seems to pervade the entire economy of this country. And we are drawing attention to another fact.

The OPEC loan was supposed to be a soft loan, Sir. Do you know what I consider a soft loan for developing countries? Canada lent Barbados the money to build the airport. Canada gave a repayment schedule for some 40 years at four per cent. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Try and get that today.) Forty years at four per cent, Sir. That is what you can regard as a soft loan and even if the honourable Member is going to make the contention that in terms of interest rates in international communities today that eight per cent now is equal to four per cent then(Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Is equal to two per cent.) The Rt. Hon. Member is saying that perhaps in Barbados inflation has been so rampant that eight per cent is equal to two per cent. Let us not get into that.

What I am saying, Sir is that here we are going to repay this during the 1984-86 period. What is the use of borrowing money which you do not need, unless you really need it? Every evidence points to the fact that the Government needs it. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that we have agreed to either a guarantee or a loan that will be repaid during the 1984-86 period. And

the charge has been made in this Honourable House before and I am repeating it, Sir, that this bunching of repayment loans for Barbados in the period 1984-86 bearing in mind that the conditions we now see suggest recession going well into 1983 is painting a very grim picture for the 1984-86 period. More and more we are hearing the Government indicating that the Democratic Labour Party is going to win the next election. Time and time we are hearing them saying this. Let us not deal with who is going to win the next election. It does not matter. In one sense it does not matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is obviously expressing the votes of the Government of Cuba, not of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you speak of the Government saying that the Democratic Labour Party is going to win the Government, you do not refer to this Government, as saying so, say that you are referring to the Government of Cuba.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Is that a point of order, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point. I am trying to bring you up to date with what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is saying.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister knows more about the Government of Cuba than I Sir. He is better placed to discuss the Government of Cuba than I ever could. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is well versed in the methods of the Government of Cuba. We will deal with that in due course. He knows more about the Government of Cuba than I could ever know.

The fact is that 1984 - 86 is going to be a very crucial period in the development of this country no matter who is the Government then and no matter who becomes the Government thereafter. We must be concerned with what happens to Barbados as a country and we cannot afford to see these kinds of actions only in terms of who will win the Government or who will not win the Government.

I am saying that it is very poor financial planning — if not bad financial management — for us to be bunching these loans to be repaid during that period and here more specifically, a loan which appears not to be needed, or put another way, which ought not to be needed if what we are hearing about the finances of this country is true. If, however, it is not true then, the honourable gentleman should get up and acquaint us with what the truth is. Let us sympathise with him that he has got to scrape the barrel even for this U.S. \$2 million and that we do not have to raise questions about it.

But he comes with a Resolution which says that the Government deems it necessary to borrow the sum of U.S. \$2 million and then in the Addendum, funds generated by this loan are to be used for the purpose of financing counterpart funds. Mr. Speaker, counterpart funds, as I understand them — when you borrow money from a regional or international institution — are those funds which the Government because of its own financial situation at home will be able to generate through the use of local personnel, the use of local material, the provision of accommodation for technicians and a whole host of other things, together with such other funds of the local currency which will be necessary and which will be spent locally to demonstrate to the particular institutions from which the money is being borrowed that your (a) credit worthiness and (b) financial status are such that you are capable of borrowing the money concerned.

Sir, the point is we are not likely to vote against this Resolution, but the Resolution, in its present form signifies (1), shabbiness in the thinking, if not shabbiness, wooliness in the thinking of the Government or (2), it demonstrates more clearly than we have been told the particular problem in the Government concerning the real financing of this country and therefore, this country has a right.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable Member seeks here to tell us that the Government is insincere as your point (2) and I think you should withdraw it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I withdraw it, Sir. I am sorry that Your Honour interpreted it thusly. I am trying to make the point on the contrary, Sir, that the Resolution would give one the impression, not that the Government has given one that impression or that the Government is insincere. I am saying that in its present form, the Resolution is bound to lead right thinking people in a certain direction. That direction does not bode well for the financial health of this community bearing in mind what we have been told by the Government.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that you have withdrawn your point two.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As outlined, yes Sir. Mr. Speaker, I was at the end of my intervention anyhow, Sir. I was merely summing up, and I will draw it to the Prime Minister's attention that he has a responsibility and a duty to explain the necessity of this additional loan. Is it merely that the money was offered by OPEC under the OPEC agreement with the so called Lesser Developed Countries, and Barbados is merely catching it because Barbados feels that the terms are reasonable? Or is it that they find it absolutely necessary to deal in terms of U.S. \$2 million?

I would merely say before I sit down that I did not quite appreciate the Prime Minister's reference to the Government of Cuba in his point of order, when he was dealing with my having said that the Barbados Labour Party Government had been saying that we would win the Government. I am going to take the better interpretation of that and believe that he did not intend any sentiments concerning the ideological position of this party, but that Cuba is the first thing that came to his mind and he could have said Timbuctoo instead of Cuba. I am going to take it in that spirit. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You take it very wrongly). I take it very wrongly? Well, now I hear in an *Aside sotto voce* that he is saying I take it very wrongly, which seems to suggest that he is dealing with the ideological position of the Democratic Labour Party, and I am in a position to speak about the ideological position in terms of from whom we would or would not borrow money.

The honourable gentleman's political party has on more than one occasion in the past sported the red flag, has on more than one occasion in the past and was founded in a concept which could be described clearly and categorically as Communist, and in their application for membership in Socialist International, and in the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, to say nothing of another speech made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, and to say nothing of the speech made by the honourable Member for St. James about the blueprint for the Burnham model; in all of those aspects they have demonstrated clearly, and in their methodology as a Government have adumbrated their position.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am understanding the honourable Member for St. Michael West to be calling me a Communist? Is that what he is saying, Sir? I would just like to get some clarification, because he alluded to some speech I am supposed to have made that convinces him of my Communist inclinations. I would like him to tell me what speech he is referring to, Sir, or make him withdraw it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He does not even know the difference between an Adventist and a Communist, apparently.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the honourable Members are in no position to question the ideological position of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the Resolution now. We have had enough of that. As a former honourable Member for St. Andrew would say, I have given you enough latitude.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Your Honour. I think I will conclude my intervention

by just asking the Prime Minister not to come back to this Honourable House for any more monies which he intends to borrow. There are persons in this community who do not believe that the National Debt is anywhere nearly as low as \$700 million. There are persons in this community who have reason to believe that the National Debt is considerably higher than \$700 million. We cannot afford it, Sir. Some time during the last election they went to St. Lucy and they told the people that the National Debt under the Democratic Labour Party was so high that somebody would come down and take up their pigs.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What was said in St. Lucy does not concern this Honourable House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, I have taken it out of the Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please withdraw the "with respect" and do whatever you like with Hansard. I maintain from the Chair that whatever went on in St. Lucy from the mouth of any honourable Member does not concern this Honourable House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: A former Member of this Honourable House, Sir, sitting next to me indicated that these people in St. Lucy had been told that the Democratic Labour Party's debt was so high that the people's little sheep, and goats and pigs would have to be gathered up in order to pay the National Debt. At that time, Sir, it was \$256 million, now it is in excess of \$700 million. I do not know what is left to be gathered up from the people of St. Lucy or St. Peter or St. Michael East, or wherever, to pay this massive debt.

I will have some more to say, Sir, but I do not think that this Resolution warrants any more.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to stand here and support this Resolution. I am very surprised at the stand members of the Opposition are taking this afternoon on this Resolution.

First of all, I would like to say a few things about the Scotland District. We all know that that factory was built down there under the regime of the Barbados Labour Party some time around 1959 to 1960, and the Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961 and for 15 long years they did not see it fit to try to join hands with those people down there to help carry forward that industry. I am sure if the Democratic Labour Party was thinking of the high cost of building houses in this country, they would have run to the help of the Brick Factory in St. Andrew.
5.00 p.m.

This was a project that I was calling on the members of the Democratic Labour Party for a number of years to intervene in, because I always wondered why it was that at a place like the Brick Factory where you have only to take a traxcavator and dig the soil, throw it unto a conveyor belt and it goes to bake the blocks used to be dearer than concrete blocks. With a concrete block you have to buy sand, you have to pay rock blasters to blow the stone, you have to import cement from all over the world, and yet concrete blocks used to be sold at a cheaper price than the red clay bricks, and that used to always worry me very much, and I said something had to be wrong. I went to the Manager of the factory and tried to discuss it with him and he said that with the fuel crisis.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, I believe the honourable Member did not quite get the gravamen of the statement I was making. The Scotland District project here has nothing to do with bricks, cement and mortar. It is an agricultural project.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not know that the honourable Member for St. Michael West was the Minister in charge of the Resolution, and it is a question now of who is right.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that the Scotland District was neglected in all aspects. Since this Party came into power, it has seen where it could do things to cause even the building in this country to be in a building boom. We have it going where it can be improved to have a cheaper brick ordered from St. Andrew. I questioned the Manager down there and he told me that the oil crisis was responsible for the high cost of the materials down there. I told him that there was a fair amount of gas in the Turners Hall district, and I wondered why they could not run the gas in that district where he would have things a bit cheaper, but he said it was too difficult and it was too expensive to change up the whole system down there where you would have things cheaper. I am very glad to know now, Mr. Speaker, that this development will cause the oil line to pass through St. Andrew where the nice people of Walkers and Belleplaine can enjoy some of the niceties also.

I would like also to let you know that that parish was being represented by members of the Democratic Labour Party from 1961 to 1966, and so far as that is concerned, it was a very neglected spot down there. I am very happy to know that we have such a Minister who since we came into power, is doing all that lies in his power to see that this project goes from strength to strength.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, to the honourable Member for St. Michael West when he spoke on the Resolution

about health clinics in this country. Now I remember in the other place an honourable Member spoke of a person from St. Philip who had died at the Casualty of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but I would say that gone are the days now when you will hear or see people dying at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We have to agree that the Minister of Health is a Minister with a difference. We all have to agree that since we have these polyclinics all through the island that it has relieved the Queen Elizabeth Hospital quite a lot.

I am sure that no later than last week I had a patient from the parish of St. Lucy who went to the hospital, and in less than ten minutes the doctors went and took care of that person and took him in the hospital. I would say that is progress, and I am sure that nothing like that would have happened under the Democratic Labour Party regime. I remember going to the hospital about 3 o'clock one afternoon and I was there up to 2 o'clock in the morning under the Democratic Party regime, and they never saw fit to do anything of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Spring Garden Road. Now I live to the north of this island and we all know how difficult it is on afternoons to get out of town, because when we come to the neck at Eagle Hall, we all know how difficult it is. So I would like to commend the Government again for taking this step where it can relieve the traffic on that section and keep it moving at a faster rate.

I would also like to commend the Government in the area of the Heywoods Development, because it always seemed that when anything had to be done in the north, members of the Democratic Labour Party had a tendency to attack it. I would like to let you know that the Heywoods project seems to have the north looking a little brighter already, and I wish it all success. I believe that it will succeed and prosper, and I am sure that we the people out there are very thankful for what the Barbados Labour Party has been doing for the last five years.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to let the whole Honourable House know our feelings in the north on this Resolution. I think it is a progressive one, and as we think about the development of St. Andrew — I am sure that in developing the natural gas it will be closer to me — I am sure that the people over there would be happy to congratulate the Government on its foresight. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in the few comments that I have to make on this Resolution. I think that our position on this side has been very well put, and there are just one or two points I would like to raise. I would like to say, Sir, that when I reflected on this Resolution, I really felt a bit ashamed

that Barbados' financial situation had deteriorated to a point where we are borrowing money either for direct spending in counterpart funds which of course should be generated locally in accordance with usual project accords or if the Addendum is to be read literally, that the counterpart funds generated by this loan are to be used for the purpose of financing part of the local cost expenditure and so on.

It is a curious turn of phrase. It is either money that you are going to spend as counterpart funds, that is hard currency that you are borrowing to meet the domestic cost or part of the domestic cost of these projects, or it is not. So let us not get a little confused about this concept of borrowing money for the purpose of generating local funds, unless of course you are going to use the US\$2 million to support further monetary expansion by the Central Bank of Barbados. I do not think that Barbados can take any further expansion of its monetary base at this point in time.

The second point I would like to make is that I have called on Government, those responsible for the guidance of the fiscal affairs of this country, to review the use to which polyclinic programmes are being put in Barbados, recognise the inappropriateness of some aspects of that programme to a small country like Barbados, a programme which was initially designed not for a small land mass like Barbados, but for a larger South American country, but it was foisted on us by the funding at that time available from the IDB.

The third point I would like to make is that I believe that the Government is going to have to take a firm decision on the Heywoods Village situation.
5.10 p.m.

They have been caught up by bad planning of the phasing of the building of that area. (*Asides*). Phasing — everything starting at the same time. Now let us face the facts. They have been caught up in a World Bank Agreement which they are finding it very difficult to have the World Bank look at again in the light of the economic position in which this country finds itself.

I therefore, Sir, would like to draw to the Government's attention that one of their problems which would have led to this kind of borrowing is the escalating cost of their capital projects which have been swallowing up massive amounts of money in this country in terms of counterpart funds in relation to other projects. If this were only a temporary situation, it would not be so bad because we could look forward to some improvement in the domestic situation once the projects are completed but the nature of the projects are such that most of them would not be earning any foreign exchange for a long time and many of them have implications in terms of current revenue demands on the Government's purse

of Barbados. Therefore, I believe that the time has come when you are scratching the bottom of the barrel, and you are really scratching the bottom of the barrel now to find US\$ 2 million that things are really bad.

In fact, this is an indication really of bankruptcy in terms of Government finances. I shudder to think what the total amount of Treasury Bills, when you look at it on a turn-over basis would be like for the fiscal years, 1980-81 and 1981-82. I rather suspect that you will see a growth into \$750 million on a turn-over basis or more than that. It is a serious thing, National Insurance, the whole lot — anyhow we do not want to start a major debate on it.

All I want to do is to impress on the Government that there is a need — however embarrassing it may be at this point in time — to look very closely at their capital projects and see if any trimming can be made without compromising employment opportunities by redistributing the work force as far as Government is concerned in other areas. I believe the closing of many of the potholes in Barbados would be a worthwhile venture. These have petrified a large proportion of the population for quite a long time and are so big and so wide and spread throughout the country.

Now, Sir, one final point and this relates to the aspect of OPEC which my distinguished colleague referred to. I believe that recent events — and I do not want to refer to these specifically to spark off a debate on it — would suggest to me that the foreign affairs thrust of this country has been very deficient in its economic aspects. Far too much thrust and far too much emphasis has been placed on a North/South economic relationship and I believe that there is a good case for the Government of Barbados to take a significant step where in fact they would have more influence in helping inter-South institutions of a financial nature in relation to trade, in relation to loans. For example this, I guess, can be considered as an inter-South loan in that sense and I think that for the long term benefit for a country like Barbados that is now saddled with a debt and a debt repayment problem, that is going to seriously compromise, not only this generation — I will suffer for the rest of my life — but the next generation will suffer and it is a matter of years that we are going to suffer as a consequence of this.

I believe that if my repeated request for the Government to stop in their tracks is heeded — if necessary re-deploy your work force — tell the international bodies this is the situation that we have and we cannot go any deeper into these projects for the next six months, nine months or a year — re-deploy your work force in areas that demand less foreign exchange — I think that you might be on the right track.

Now, Sir, I am not in a position to specify which project should and which should not because that kind of detailed information is not available to me. Obviously it is only available to the Government but all I can say is this: My final point is that the message came across very clear to me today when the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance was referring to his discussions with the World Bank. There were a couple of terms or phrases in that statement and I can assure you that the significance was not lost to me in anyway. We are in deep trouble, very deep trouble. It is a clear hint that he has given.

I would not have made this speech, Mr. Speaker, if there were reporters in the Gallery. I would not have made it because I have done my best throughout this economy crisis not to make any statement that was not constructive or any statement which would have compromised the ability of this Government to get out of the crisis that it is in and no one on that side could make that charge against me in my capacity as Shadow Minister of Finance and Planning.

I have been extremely cautious and I have taken a clear hint. It is a hint to Parliament. Those who did not hear it, I heard it and that hint — along with this Resolution — tells us that we are in very, very deep trouble and the area to look for is your capital projects and I regret to see the kind of projects listed here as being the beneficiaries of this kind of loan, Sir, bearing in mind that the loan must have been obtained on a fairly general basis since it was obtained primarily for Balance of Payment support.

It means that the Government must have had a significant discretion as to how they could deploy that loan, whether they could have left it in the Foreign Reserves to reflect in the Foreign Reserves until April 3, because the biggest mystery in Barbados today, Sir — the biggest mystery that even I cannot find out — is the composition of Barbados Foreign Reserves but I will find out in 48 hours. Thank you very much.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are just two points that I think we should deal with. One is, Sir, that at long last the Opposition is beginning to appreciate the difficulties that Governments like Barbados have in getting soft loans from international institutions. Because of the progress made in Barbados in the last five years, we are finding ourselves now being crowded out of the traditional institutions for soft loans. It therefore means that we will well have to go to a multiplicity of institutions which have been set up by the South to borrow money if we wish to avoid the alternative markets at the present high interest rates.

5.20 p.m.

Normally, big companies go to the Eurodollar Bond Market. But with the present interest rate, it is impossible, even for the strongest company, far less Governments, to go to the Eurodollar Bond Market. So, I am a bit surprised that the honourable Members on the other side should scoff at Government's efforts to tap a source of lending such as OPEC which was specifically set up by the then major producers of oil and who were the chief beneficiaries of the phenomenal rise in the price of oil from 1973 on, and which price rise was the chief cost of Balance of Payments difficulties in countries of the world, the Third World countries.

We have to fight hard even to get a toe hole in this South institution. First of all, when it was first set up it was honestly set up as a Muslim Club. That was a fact. It was set up by the Arabs to give help to people who had a similar religious outlook as them, similar religious persuasion — not outlook — persuasion as them. Because of pressure in the international forum of a different type — not an open pressure but silent pressure in the international forum — they widened the band of beneficiary countries.

When we became eligible, unfortunately for us our per capita income was rising at a fast rate and although initial discussions were in relation to a much larger sum, the OPEC Fund administrators then said that we could not be regarded as the poorest country, being one of the poorer countries or the less Developed Countries in the world. That is the whole thing. I remember taking part in some of the discussions. Foreign Minister Forde spent a tremendous amount of his time trying to get eligibility from the Arabs. That is a fact. We had to point out that at that time we had not even had one loan from the World Bank, and we had to point out the difficulties we were having with the multi-national lending institutions.

So I hope honourable Members then, bearing in mind the effort that we have to make would now feel that having spent so long fighting to get eligibility then, it would be most ungracious of us, of course, having become eligible then to say, "man, I am not taking your \$2 million."

The verbiage that is written about counterpart funds — the truth of the matter is this, that if you are allowed to borrow from multinational institutions whether private or public, a certain given amount of money and the cost of the project come to more than the original cost and that is very easy to happen because most of the projects that were costing in Barbados were costed between 1977 and 1978 and the impact of the price rise of oil all over the world has had this effect.

Government has had to revise their cost estimates and I want to say this: I have been the leading exponent

not only in here, but outside, on what I call the racketeering — and I use the word because I have used it at a public dinner — indulged in by people in the construction industry called architects, engineers, quantity surveyors and others. I have been a leading exponent of this system of a scale fee because in my humble opinion it encourages them to fool people in order to get a commitment. But the true price is never the budget price. The true price is the big price but before you can get to the big price, you have to have a budget estimate and agree to send it out to tender. That is the position. The honourable Member from St. Philip would know that this is a world wide problem.

Even a Government which is as conservative as the one in England has recognised that it is necessary for Governments to intervene in this area. Because of the loans, the budget overruns, the cost overruns — not cost, the original cost estimates being exceeded, the budget figures being exceeded at bid, the Minister of Consumer Affairs in the United Kingdom has just given the architects, the engineers and others three months — three months only — within which to come up with alternative fee proposals or they will bring down legislation on it and we have been fighting here with them too and we intend to do the same thing. We have been rejecting bids, chucking them back at them. And in coming to that, that is going to be an area of price controls very soon, not only here.

Only last week the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance in Trinidad had to advert to the same problems — this scale fee. I had to fight it and I fight it all the time, this ridiculous nonsense of incorporating of British ARIBA scale in Barbados, when cost of accommodation, cost of help is completely different from here in Barbados. It is self evident and we are battling with it. We are going to battle with it and we have had some success. We have had jobs in which the totality of the fees have been reduced from the usual percentages down to overall percentage.

We also have to introduce — and which we are introducing within the Planning and Priorities Committee — Value Engineering which is a new concept that is being developed and increasingly used. I am going to tell the honourable Member what it is. I know that he is interested in these things — that having had the specified architect, engineer and quantity surveyor give you an estimate and do all the designs, you throw them one side. You hire a completely independent group of the same type and you say, evaluate these. Your fees this time will be paid on how much savings on designs, savings on costs and savings in suggestions on the building that you can make. You put two of them fighting against each other in order that poor Governments will be able to get the best value. This is a very, very serious problem.

Now, Sir, it is no use telling us that you can stop Heywoods Project. It cannot be done. When we came into power in 1976, the Caribbean Development Study and the World Bank preliminaries had already been done. I was confronted with meetings with them with respect to that project. We look at it. We had to fight with them on many things in relation to that project. In the end, by 1977, they understood our concept which was that you could not put such a major project in an area like that without integrating it into the whole of the community and we introduced some changes into the concept at Heywoods because we felt that a project like Heywoods should not only be judged on its financial return, you must judge it on its economic return in the whole area and its social return. So although we mentioned all of this, they had a flaming row between the engineers of the World Bank team and the Chief Technical Director in Barbados. The cost estimates that they put in were so low in relation to road building and drainage that we had arbitrate that dispute and when it was over, when the bids came in, the Chief Technical Officer's estimate was more in relation to reality than theirs.

5.30 p.m.

We had rows too on the inflation factor to put in, so that when they gave us a budget estimate, we told them it was under bidding. Their excuse when the final bids came in was that they did not expect that the oil prices would have risen by that percentage. Remember, it went out to bid, pre-qualification started in 1979, their report was 1978, they put in an inflation factor over a four year period of 26 per cent. You must therefore look at the true cost in relation to the *de facto* inflation factor on the original budget cost.

There is nothing exact about quantity surveying, it is the biggest myth that a quantity surveyor can give you a precise estimate of the cost of a building. The old time Barbadian system was to use a general contractor. A quantity surveyor cannot do the same thing. The quantity surveyors in Barbados are too lazy, because they do not go back and modify their techniques by doing a detailed piece-by-piece analysis of factual experience periodically so as to get good rates. They do not do it, because they are not interested. They are interested in the little percentage they get from whatever the cost is.

Do not tell me about building, Mr. Speaker, the first job I had in my life was in building. My stepfather was a builder and from the time I was 16 until I was 19 I worked in building and in those days there was one architect and the builder used to take off his own quantities, he had to take off his own quantities and he had a better appreciation of the current cost than the quantity surveyors. I have told them this, because I know this. When I was a student in England, my brother was a student in England and I used to see him all the time in construction. I worked on a construction site in Eng-

land too, I know, and this is a big problem, but the honourable Member will know very soon.

The Government of Barbados has done a good job in scaling down the Capital Development Programme. We have introduced mechanisms in St. Peter that we know part of the cost of Heywoods will be recaptured through the Development Tax rigidly applied within the whole area. Go down there and see. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: St. Peter? In truth?) Not the whole parish.

As a good socialist, Mr. Speaker, I know you will agree with the concept that where Government has introduced such a large area of expenditure which is beneficial to a total area, that the community is entitled to recapture some of that enhancement. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I thought you had removed the levy from the Paradise area). Paradise is a different situation, Paradise was a betterment, there is no betterment in this now, I will not bother to explain, let the honourable Member next door to you explain the difference between the two. That is a tax upon something that does not occur, this is one on something that occurs. Anyhow, a Betterment Tax is out now since they have changed the valuation system. The honourable Member for St. Philip North will explain that to you.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. You know, Mr. Speaker that since Heywoods has started, and particularly since the cement plant has started, there has been a generation of economic activity in Speightstown of a far greater nature than anyone could have imagined. You know, Mr. Speaker, you are very grateful to the Government. I always said that that would pull you out and pull along the gentleman from St. Lucy. When there was all this faint hope I always said that that area could not contain those two projects and not have a beneficial impact.

We are doing these things, but it is easy to talk about South to South, but what about Venezuela next door? (*Aside*). No, no, St. Peter is going to attract economic activity — it has already attracted it — but I do not think honourable Members can really envisage the impact of both the cement plant and Heywoods Holiday Village. You have to look at the growth that was generated by Sandy Lane and Sunset Crest together in the 1960s. It is a very serious thing.

The integration of that, Mr. Speaker, with the Springhall Land Lease Scheme can be something of profound significance in this country, to dairying and vegetable growing, and what is more, the integration of the jetty with the export of blocks from St. Andrew into that can be of even greater significance. But let us have some faith on these projects. Do not let us all feel that because at the present moment the world situation is bad that we must scrap these projects.

There will always be a demand for cement in the world. The economics of the transport of cement have now dictated that that cement can only be economically transported on land for about 500 miles, and on sea less than a thousand miles. Check that out. A lot of cement plants all over the world that were nearer to the market were closed in favour of very very big plants. All the economists are telling you now to resurrect some of those small plants, because although the small plants may not be as efficient as the big plants, they are nearer to where the market is, and the cost of transport will help to pay the differential.

This is something. Whether or not there is a recession in the world there will still be a demand for cement. The Windwards and Leewards, Guyana, Trinidad still have to buy cement. Do you think the Jamaican cement company with one thousand miles in shipping could compete with the one here? It cannot do it.

All Governments now are reeling under the impact of the United States high interest rates. So great are they, Sir, that the Chancellor of West Germany made a public statement recently in the EEC begging the President of the United States to do something with the interest rates there because they say they have sucked in Western Europe. Belgium just had to devalue, Luxemburg just went with them. Only two days ago a gentleman from Sweden, our Honorary Consul there, came to see me and he was describing to me the impact of the high dollar and high interest rates in the United States and Sweden. He said that last year when he came to Barbados his kroner was worth 30 per cent more than it is worth this year.

We recognise that we have to be cautious in our Capital Expenditure Programme, but wait until next week and you will see. I cannot deal with the social development programme here.

The polyclinics are mentioned in here. The honourable Member over there has been expressing views about the polyclinics which when they are rashly stated appear to me to coincide with the views over here, that it is no point having a wasteful duplication of medical services. He has already said that the phenomenon of medical costs is one that nobody has ever been able to control, in no society is this possible. He said that and he knows that too. This is what I understand — it is not my area — but as I understand it, the object of the polyclinics is to provide services near to the people who need the services and to relieve the Casualty at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital so it can get on with the work which a genuine Casualty does. That is my understanding of it.

5.40 p.m.

As to the staffing and all that, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Finance will deal with that, but do not say that the polyclinic programme is one that you

can cut. (*Asides*) Of course, you can cut. We cut one. I leave that. I know that everybody over there recognises that the Casualty was used as a general practitioner clinic for the whole of Barbados and that it was wrong to divert the time of the doctors for doing general practitioner work which could be done outside of there, so that Ladymeade has always been conceived as being necessary so that you will be able to deal with that type of problem in the right atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we are beginning to learn to discuss these matters in the light of reality. We cannot fool the public of Barbados that the impact of the world recession has no effect on Barbados. It has affected Germany, it has affected the whole of Western Europe. Some 9.5 per cent are unemployed in Western Europe. It is in the latest *Economist*. There are 10.5 per cent unemployed in the labour force, but we are trying in our way to handle the situation and I think that we are all wrong if we think that it is easy to make a change in mid-stream projects and talk. This is where I would like some more details from the honourable Member, because the honourable Member said that you should concentrate on your labour and try to preserve jobs.

With the best will in the world, the best economic advice has shown that make work jobs are bad, and worse still, make work jobs are bad at a time when you should be concentrating on productive employment. We have enough productive projects that will carry us over.

It is true that the method of executing the projects is highly capital intensive, but you cannot tell the people to send out the pile-driving machines now and when you come to drive piles, you can do it by hand. First of all the people do not want to do that kind of work. Let us get that straight in this community. The young people are interested in these jobs provided the jobs are being done in the same manner as they see them being done abroad on television. The Sewage Project can show you and the Post Office down there can show you that they will work in construction, but they will work in the same atmosphere as they see on television. They will drive trucks, but they have got to be big trucks. That is a fact of life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those few explanations will assure the honourable Member that there is no indignity in Barbados. It is not a question of Barbados being so badly off that you have to borrow \$2 million. It is four years that we have been trying to get into this because we were pursuing the very concept that the honourable Member advocates, namely that we should try to deal more with the South, so having gone there and opened the door to the south, you cannot look at them and tell them I do not want you because it is only \$2 million.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a slightly different aspect of this matter, but I could not allow the opportunity to pass without saying how very revealing a speech this has been by the Deputy Prime Minister. He told us how he has been exposed to building from the time he was six years old, and from the way he has spoken, I think if he had continued in that field, he would have been Barbados' most excellent builder. I believe Barbados is the worse off for his failure not to continue. (*Asides.*) I will admit that he is the best Deputy Prime Minister that we have in this country. Of course we only have one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The aspect of this matter that I really wish to speak about relates to the role the OPEC countries, the present crisis and the recession which the world economy and with it the Barbados economy is facing, and thirdly the role of this Parliament in relation to that particular matter, and I think I had better take the last point first.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance very kindly sent across the agreement which is at the basis of this particular Resolution with which we are dealing, and I am very grateful to him for that. But I wish to make the general point that when agreements are made with international organisations or inter-governmental organisations, I believe it would be proper and appropriate for the Government to ensure that these agreements are laid on the Table of this Honourable Assembly so that Members are fully aware of the nature and terms of these agreements.

I do not think it is a case of looking back to see whether you have a statutory responsibility to lay them or not. We cannot look at matters in these narrow legalistic terms. I think it is a case in which there is a higher duty — I may be going into the idiom of one of my parliamentary colleagues — on the part of those who negotiate and sign these agreements to ensure that they are laid in Parliament, and I would like to throw this out. It has to do with the role of Parliament in the administration of this country, and I believe as far as OPEC funding is concerned, this is an example where Parliament should have been provided with a copy.

That is my broad viewpoint because what has happened, Mr. Speaker — and I am making a serious point here — is that from my observations, the role of Parliament in terms of public affairs in this country, has diminished in relation to the role of the Executive in this country, and unless fullest information comes to the Parliament, we will find that that role is further diminished and that we may go through all of the forms and do everything with the greatest propriety under

your very keen eye, Mr. Speaker — and you ensure that we do things with propriety..... I noticed today that you called upon the Minister of Transport and Works to get up and second the Resolution to ensure that it is done with propriety. You could not allow that Resolution to fall through.

Mr. SPEAKER: Erskine May warns it is a Government measure and a Minister moving it must be called upon in case he fails to do his duty. Erskine May the 19th Edition warns of this, and please familiarise yourself with it for the future.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You mean when I become a Government Minister again! I will familiarise myself with that then.
5.50 p.m.

The position that we find ourselves in today is this, that during the mid-1970s there was a four-fold or five-fold increase in the price of oil leading to a high level of inflation and it was the first time in the post war world that the international economy had to deal with that question. The root cause of the matter at that time was those OPEC countries which quite naturally and perhaps correctly protecting their own dwindling assets, proceeded to charge for what they called or what the Shah of Iran called "the noble commodity." They therefore generated a lot of funds and out of those funds they then proceeded to make, not gifts or grants, but loans back to those very countries — particularly the developing countries — which had to pay those exorbitant prices for oil.

Now part of the problem of 1974, 1975 and 1976 in this country stemmed particularly from that four-fold increase in the price of oil. Of course at that time the Democratic Labour Party was under seige and we got little quarter on those occasions for the international conditions affecting the economy of the OPEC countries. The one from whom we are borrowing this money, they were at the root of it and it was particularly a difficult method to handle because the world did not have the experience in dealing with that particular situation before in that manner. It was novel and that made it more difficult.

Of course after you have rolled the wicket and you have managed the economy effectively and efficiently as was done during those years of the Democratic Labour Party rule, you have come in and you have taken over from there. We have had increases since then and I would like to underscore the point that when we get this money from OPEC, it is the money that we are paying for the oil. It is no gift or largesse. We are paying for the oil through our noses and we have to pay it back at interest and so I do not get up and do any thanking on this occasion. It is a business arrangement and the amount of

money in terms of the Barbadian economy is a small amount of money.

The money will be put, as the Government has said, to some constructive use in terms of the projects that have been set out and when I heard the significance of the projects on which it may be spent — Heywoods and the cement plant, the latter in St. Lucy and the former in the good parish of St. Peter. (*Asides*) The good parish? Yes St. Andrew too with the Scotland District project. Yes, they are all good parishes, but I could not allow the matter to pass without some comment when it was said that the Heywoods Project would pull the Member for St. Peter through and carry along the Member for St. Lucy with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Member simply meant it would pull me up front. That is all he meant, up front.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I believe he meant that.... again, again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Up front.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Up front and to an elevated position. That is quite true and I was about merely to gloss and say that you did not need that. You would be up front anyhow. You have demonstrated that in your political career so you did not need the Heywoods Project for that particular thing. I have heard you speaking on other projects which we hope you would be able to see get done. I mean certain areas in other places like Boscobel and other places like that but nothing is in here for water storage. It is being done under another arrangement so you are getting things done. We are pleased about that.

Now my colleague, the Member for St. Michael South Central has spoken about caution and about cutting back on Capital Works projects without affecting presumably the employment content of these projects. I am not really going into that nor do I wish to make any extended speech on this.

I merely wish in conclusion to express the point that it is my view that with international organisations or with intergovernmental organisations as this one, that the agreements as a matter of course, should be made available in public. It is not a contentious point but I think it will make for the better administration of the public affairs of this country.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am really not going to be long and I sought to take the opportunity shortly after the last honourable Member sat down since in his oration he mentioned the question of making these agreements available to Members to be studied and said

they should be either laid on the Floor or on the Table of Parliament. It is unfortunate that that honourable Member sought to make such a suggestion when after the signing of the Sewerage Agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank, nobody knew anything at all about it until we were able to discover in somewhere other than in Parliament the nature of that Agreement. (*Asides*).

I am sure if he wants to correct me I am willing to give way. You want to correct me? Is there a point of elucidation on that? Is it a fact that Parliament was not aware of an agreement that involved in the first stages over \$54 million? All right, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, Mr. Speaker, has surrendered and put up the white flag and therefore I am not going to pursue it.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, seeks to borrow U. S. \$2 million from the Organisation of Petroleum and Exporting Countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, this U. S. \$2 million equivalent to Bds. \$4 million, is a sum of money although not large as mentioned by the honourable Member who has just sat down, is still, nevertheless, a useful sum of money and it is money which is coming in. It is going to serve some useful purpose.

What I want to say about that is this: that there are countries in the Caribbean and in certain parts of the world which would be happy to get a quarter of this money let alone this sum of money, that in the face of all of the problems which are dished up by the Opposition saying that we have Balance of Payment difficulties, that the country is financially bankrupt, that we are still in a position to get money and negotiate for the monies at comparatively reasonable terms because you cannot say in the light of a situation where people can get over 20 per cent of that money in United States of America, that when you can borrow money at 8.5 per cent and still have a grace period of repayment, that you are not doing well.

6.00 p.m.

I want to congratulate the Ministry of Finance and Planning in the first place for negotiating this — not my own Ministry — the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and also to congratulate them on the fact that they have made some of this money available for use in the polyclinics in Barbados. (*Asides*) Now, we know that five clinics have been built — the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister said that we have dropped one — we have delayed the construction of one, not exactly dropped one — but we will be starting very shortly on the one to replace Enmore, Ladymeade. Enmore is in a very bad state of repair and it is thought that the time has come when we should move quickly into giving them new housing quarters. I therefore appreciate the fact that some of this money will be spent in the direction such as this.

The building of the Ladymeade is going to cost in the region of about \$6 million, \$7 million and that is a substantial sum of money. We have to build and equip it and it is no easy matter equipping polyclinics in Barbados. And I want to say further that the polyclinics are doing a very good and useful job. One has only got to go to Wildey and see how quickly that polyclinic has caught on; Black Rock as well. I cannot say that I like what I see when I went to Maurice Byer. I have got plans in my mind about how we can really activate that area. I do not see as much action as I thought I would have seen and therefore I want to congratulate the Government on making some of this money available for use within the polyclinics.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker. The fact that part of this money will be used in the Scotland area is very useful and significant since the Scotland area represents one-seventh of the total land mass in the country.

A lot of the lands out there are lying useless — not serving much purpose, and I was pleasantly surprised when only two weeks ago I was in Belleplaine on Isolation Road and I saw the beginning of the construction of a road on the back river on the top of the hill which would take you from Haggatts on the northern side to Mount All on the southern side — a road which in my opinion is going to be in the region of one and a half to two miles. Within that area, it is hoped that Soil Conservation will be able to plant a number of trees whereby you will not have to import the amount of fruits which you are now importing in this island. Therefore, that is a very substantial contribution.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central dealt with the project at Heywoods. He said that it should be phased in and by inference should be scrapped. But I hope that in the fulness of time when the Democratic Labour Party is holding forth in the country — I mean in the north — I hope that I do not hear that Heywoods is one of the projects of the D.L.P. I hope I do not hear that, because not only did you not go about the construction of it, you are now suggesting from the Floor of this Honourable House that it should either be phased in or scrapped. That is an unfortunate step.

When the honourable Member for St. Lucy was dealing with the question of the Brick Factory and what can flow from the Scotland area, he was not in turn removing the Resolution from its context. He was talking in terms of the total development of the Scotland area and its contribution to the overall welfare of this country, Mr. Speaker. I have been persistent in this Honourable House and elsewhere, in my convictions that the Scotland area and in particular St. Andrew should be well treated. If for argument sake, you found

yourself in a situation where concrete blocks could not be made, you can still by the use of the clay in St. Andrew and the bricks coming from that area do a measure of construction with very primitive cement. Therefore, St. Andrew itself is making a terrific contribution towards the development of this country without any Foreign Exchange.

There was a time as well when you had the natural gas and the Scotland area of St. Andrew alone supplied that natural gas. More significantly now, God forbid, if the roads were blocked in St. Andrew tomorrow for some reason or another and sand could not be brought out, the whole construction industry would be brought to a stand still. And, I hope, Mr. Prime Minister, that you will see the reason and the justification for imposing a levy on that sand that is coming out of St. Andrew — and the bricks as well — so that the country would not have to draw money from the public revenue for the repairs of the roads in St. Andrew that are so badly mashed up at the moment by these heavy duty vehicles that are running down there to remove the sand. St. Andrew by itself can take care of the whole Scotland area including St. Lucy and St. Peter with the revenue to be derived because a fortune is being made down there.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talked about cutting back on Capital Projects without reduction of labour. How are you going to do it? There are no means of doing it. If you have to cut back, labour might be affected in your cutting back. So, I do not understand this milk and water approach, this hot and cold approach towards the economic development of this country and as spokesman on the other side for economic matters I think he should get his orders straight because it does not look right to me that you can be talking on the one hand of cutting back on Capital Projects and at the same time say that you hope that employment would not be cut back. It just cannot be worked.

He said that the money could be spent on the fixing of the amount of pot holes in the country and all types of things. Mr. Speaker, we have always had pot holes. They were terrible under the D. L. P's regime.
6.10 p.m.

There were certain areas in this country where no roads were built for 15 years under the DLP because they thought those parishes were represented by members of the Barbados Labour Party and they did not seek to build a road or to repair any, and therefore they are not qualified to speak on these subjects. It would be a good thing if they were to stop speaking, it would be useful, Mr. Speaker.

This Resolution commends itself, and I am surprised that the Opposition is opposing it. As a matter of fact, I

hope they will have the courage again — as they have been doing through the day — of voting against everything there is — even voting against a levy that would make provision for more buses to bring the people from St. Philip North. I did not know that that honourable Member would have voted against such a Bill, I could not believe it. The other Members are in Bridgetown, or close to it, and their constituents could probably walk in or they could probably buy a car, but I hope that when you hear me holding forth you do not cry, because I am going to repeat everything about your vote on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, as I said, commends itself and I want to congratulate not ourselves as such, but the Ministry of Finance and Planning for the forward looking approach to tap sources such as OPEC, and I hope they will look for more sources such as OPEC. The argument by the honourable Member for St. Michael South that OPEC has charged large sums of money for the oil and is now lending it back to us is nothing. Mr. Speaker, we produce sugar and I hope we get the very best price in the world for it. If the OPEC people have the oil and they want to use oil as a weapon on the world scene, it is entirely a matter for them. The United States has food and they use the food occasionally as weapons in the world. (Aside). I do not know what they do, I do not know when they overcharge and when they do not, but I am here to put it as I see it.

The OPEC people figure they have a scarce resource, a diminishing resource, and if they figure that it is their resource and they want to charge for it, they are entitled to adopt that attitude. If on the other hand we can get funds on concessionary terms from the very OPEC countries, by all means get it and bring it in.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a good one and deserves the total support of the community.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, the speeches made by the honourable Members on the Opposition on this Resolution were really the sound of the scraping of the bottom of the barrel and to a large extent is very good reason why we ought not to be delaying the House on this matter. Nevertheless, Sir, I thought I would take this opportunity to make one or two comments relating to the position of Barbados today *vis-a-vis* lending agencies, and to comment too on the general development strategy of the Government in the present time.

I do not think it is fully appreciated that with the retirement of Robert McNamara as President of the World Bank, and also with the election of Clouston as his successor, Barbados and the developing world have really lost a very great friend when Robert McNamara resigned from that position in the World Bank, because the American Government — and they are the dominant

voices in these western structured lending institutions — has now worked out a policy which is the official policy of these lending institutions whereby countries like Barbados face very severe difficulties in getting concessionary loans. In fact, it has been said that Barbados is now in a position, because of its level of development, to mature out of what is known as the eligibility structure for these loans.

It therefore is unwise for anyone to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Barbados is in a position to refuse eight per cent loans such as we are getting now from OPEC. In fact, I would contend that notwithstanding the present economic difficulties which we are facing, that Barbados should be lining up as many concessionary loans as possible for the immediate future, because we may very well be faced with a situation in another two or three years where we will have to face the Euro market and other expensive markets in order to get development funds.

That is a point, Mr. Speaker, which all of us who are concerned with the economic development of the country and who speak on these matters have got to appreciate. Barbados has reached a point in its development as perceived in these international agencies where we are not amongst the least well off, we are seen as among the best off, and to that extent we no longer qualify for development assistance from the traditional institutions. We cannot therefore afford to turn our backs on eight per cent money. It is in today's world very cheap money indeed.

The second point is this, Mr. Speaker. The whole world is now subject to stop-go as far as economic development is concerned. Today, if I may shift the metaphor, the sun is shining and tomorrow the sun is under a cloud. At present the sun is under a cloud. The world is in a prolonged and relentless recession, and Barbados as part of that world is suffering accordingly.

The point has been made by the Opposition repeatedly that in the last five years we did too much, we overheated the economy, we over invested in Capital Projects and that to some extent, we are paying the penalty for that. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned, we have no need to make any apology for the massive expenditure which we undertook on behalf of this country in the last five years, because when the sun is shining as far as this economy is concerned we have to run as fast and as hard as we can, because you can rest assured that the sun will not always shine, as indeed it is not shining now.

The next point is that even when the sun is under a cloud, you still have to do enough to prepare yourself for when the cloud disappears and the sunlight emerges,

and that is precisely what we are doing now. We have de-escalated our Capital Expenditure and at the same time I am happy to say that we have not adversely affected employment levels in this country, because in the last six months there has not been any decrease in unemployment in this country.

Not only are inflation rates still kept within tolerable limits, notwithstanding our economic difficulties, but the employment level is still at a very high rate, to the point that we are not faced with the unemployed youths that, for example, we experienced immediately before the 1976 elections and immediately after. In fact, the Prime Minister has just reminded me that a greater proportion of our adults are working than is the position in the United States and indeed in several other countries across the North Atlantic.

6.20 p.m.

These are points that we have to be proud of, Mr. Speaker, and the particular fact that I was trying to get to is that the majority of projects, all the projects here that have been identified in the Addendum to the Resolution — the Scotland District Development, the Community Health Polyclinics, the Spring Garden/St. Barnabas Roads and the Heywoods Holiday Village — may be regarded as projects of a productive nature, if not financially and economically productive, socially productive.

The great advance that we made in this country in the last five years where we doubled the *per capita* income could not have been realised had it not been for the fact that we were geared up, we were prepared to take the youths and make use of good opportunities when they arose. As the Deputy Prime Minister has said — and the point can bear repetition — the Heywoods Holiday Village project along with what is planned by the Industrial Development Corporation in St. Lucy — St. Peter, along with the cement plant, along with all the other services and secondary economic activity that will follow, will ensure that the north of Barbados will become one of the major areas of economic activity, and that is part of the deliberate policy of the Government — the decentralisation of economic activity.

We have in the south a major township developing around Oistins and we also have in the north a major township along with all the supporting services developing in the Speightstown area. That is very consistent with the deliberate strategy and policy of the Barbados Labour Party Administration.

The Spring Garden Road will open up opportunities for industrial activity in the form of warehousing and other light manufacturing activities which are very badly needed. It will also, Mr. Speaker, ensure that there will be a smooth flow of traffic on the West Coast to Bridgetown and out and avoid all the congestion that presently

exists on the Black Rock road going into Eagle Hall. So that this is an important road from the point of view of economic activity.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the arguments that have been adduced by the Opposition against this Resolution are very unfounded and that they ought to be ignored. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has in effect one speech which he has been making in here for the last three or four years, and every time he gets up to speak it is a variation of the same theme, and that theme is that the National Debt is growing, that he is not sure about the foreign component and that if we are not careful we will find ourselves in a position where we are not able to repay our debts. That is in essence the one and only speech which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central makes, and I know that his colleagues take great delight in laughing at him, but we on our side have got to expose his emptiness for what it is.

I now want to conclude by referring to the speech made by the last speaker from the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Michael South. He has in effect told us that the power of the Executive is increasing, the power of Parliament is decreasing and that we ought to arrest that trend, and one way of so doing would be to ensure that all agreements that are made between the Barbados Government and international agencies be laid on the Floor of this House for consideration.

This is not the first time he has made that speech, and there is some merit in it. It is the sort of speech that I believe we may say bears repetition, but it is good to see, Mr. Speaker, that he has repented from his evil ways, because he was not only a member of a Government that made an agreement with the IADB in relation to the Sewage Project which has resulted in intolerable water rates and failed to bring it to the attention of this Honourable House, but he was also the particular Minister who was responsible for signing that agreement. So it is good to see that having sinned he is now repenting and that he has become a convert to what is the proper thing.

I myself support that, Sir, and I would say that though it is not done in the form in which he suggests, the Barbados Labour Party Administration, consistent with its policy of open Government and taking the people of Parliament in its confidence, has repeatedly laid bare all that it has done if not immediately when it is done, certainly immediately thereafter, and though these agreements have not come to the House in the manner suggested by the honourable Member, they certainly come in the form of Resolutions seeking the support of the House or in other respects. So that on

that particular count I do not think that this Government can be faulted.

There are very good reasons why this Resolution ought to be supported. It certainly has the support of this side of the House and I have no doubt that having made a few critical remarks on the other side, that they too will in truth and in fact support the Resolution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will be very short in reply. My colleagues on this side, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture have dealt so comprehensively with the arguments of the Opposition that there is very little really left to say.

With respect to the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael West — I think it was he who said that the Orion Bank loan was used for Current Expenditure — honourable Members would surely be happy to hear that the excessive money creation at the Central Bank of which, from the instructions of Mr. Howard, they complained, has now been much diminished. The Central Bank placed a limit of I think \$110 million on credit to the Government. It is not even half that at the present time. There is or certainly was last year still some small amount of money left in the Orion Bank loan. We have drawn it down from the bank and it is in the Central Bank but the Government has not drawn it down.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of explanation.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. Is the honourable Member admitting the contention that the agreement.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is not elucidating. Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I cannot help the honourable Member in his point of interruption, but I am certainly not admitting that the Government has any alternative at the given time to using Central Bank credit for the shortest possible time that is possible for the purposes of the cash flow of Government. We had a choice — to get money from the Central Bank or don't pay the civil servants. You pay your money or you take your pick. I preferred to pay my money and not have to take that choice in the circumstances.

The general burden of the argument that \$2 million is too little to borrow defeated me. In effect it means that whatever you do is wrong. If you come in and you borrow \$20 million, it is too much. If you come in and

you borrow \$2 million, it is too little. If you come in and you do not borrow and you print at the Central Bank you are printing money and if you do not print at the Central Bank and you borrow you are increasing the National Debt and if you raised taxes, Sir, you are putting a burden on the people. If you cut expenditure, you are sending home civil servants.

6.30 p.m.

It is the duty of an Opposition to oppose and to oppose vigorously and when they are forced to agree, to do so only with the worst possible grace. Those are the words of the late Norman Washington Manley. This Opposition — at least the honourable Member for St. Michael West — seems to have absorbed those words to the full.

When we wrote to OPEC, we applied for some sum of money and OPEC's response to us was that we were better off than most OPEC countries and did not need any support from the Organisation. Mr. Algy Simmons and then Mr. Oliver Jackman cultivated their contacts with various countries. I also paid a visit to Nigeria, a prominent and influential member of OPEC and we were able to persuade OPEC to lend us money on a number of occasions.

The first funds that we used to borrow were at four per cent interest. That was in 1979 and they particularly identified Community Health projects as being areas where a country as well off as Barbados — as they put it — could justifiably ask for funds. In 1980 we again borrowed at four per cent. When we came to negotiate — it must have been in 1981 — there was a great deal of correspondence — let me see if I can find Mr. Seaga's comments — and a new set of perimeters was worked out. They indicated that they would make loans for agricultural development purposes and various other purposes. *(Pause)*.

I am seeing if I can see the others — agricultural project application — they suggested that we apply to the Shah in Rome who administered OPEC funds and they said that that would be given favourable consideration and I expect that the next OPEC funds that we get — because I am sure these will not be the last — will be related to agricultural projects. *(Asides)*.

I am not sure that the Minister of Agriculture knows that. I do not think that he knows that. It was before he was in the Cabinet that OPEC said they would support the Integrated Rural Agricultural Project and I do not think he would be aware of these old papers. There is a paper — Agricultural Credit Infra-structure and Agriculture — *(Asides)*. Well I would not have said the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is tentative in his speech. I thought he was forceful and penetrative. I thought he inflicted some wounds on the other side. If by

tentative you mean he did not stab you to death, well you may be right but I thought that some shrewd blows were inflicted in more cogent terms.

I am trying to find the pages. *(Pause)*. I am sorry to delay the debate, Sir, I cannot find the latest analysis but for what it is worth, Sir, it is since August last year that I approved the proposals for this particular loan. It is just that it has not moved as quickly as it should. We did question the interest rates because the interest rates are higher on these than it was on the earlier one but we did question it and that meant that it has been delayed a little longer.

I really deplore this business of saying that we should not be borrowing \$2 million. I mean it is like spitting in the eye of OPEC. They are lending us \$2 million. They have put a very reasonable argument that Barbados has a higher per capita income than many OPEC countries — indeed, Sir, of all the large ones — and I thank honourable Members opposite for their confidence in what we have done for Barbados that they can think that U. S. \$2 million is a trivial sum and can be ignored and that we can take \$2 million in our stride. However, Sir, I fear that I cannot share the sentiments. Eight per cent money is first class money to have at this time and U. S. \$2 million is a proper sum to have in Foreign Reserves at this time also.

Did the honourable Members think that OPEC was lending us this money in Barbados dollars? Now the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that we should be raising counterpart funds locally. Traditionally overseas agencies finance project basis is that they cover the Foreign Exchange cost and the Government raises counterpart funds on its own. It has never been a condition that the Government is obliged to raise counterpart funds locally.

The OPEC funds are fully associated. They are fully aware of these projects that are here being considered and nobody has the slightest objection to borrowing foreign funds as Government's counterpart contribution. If I may take an example which is the Defence Contract which we had in Great Britain, if all our projects could be run like the Defence Contract, we would have many fewer Foreign Exchange worries because the Defence Contract cover cost overruns in foreign currency on concessional terms, — just as good per half and also as good for the other half of the overruns.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West really puts it quite admirably. They are selling hardware but they were also buying the services of workmen in Trinidad and workmen in Barbados, doing the reconstruction of the shrimp boats in Trinidad and building the workshop in Barbados. It is true that the majority of the funds were going on hardware but there is no hesitation on the part of the British Ministry of Defence and

Lloyd's Bank to allow us to meet the entire costs of the Defence works from foreign sources by money borrowed on more generous terms than we can now get in Barbados. We are paying less overall in interest on the whole works than it would be if we were trying to raise money at today's Treasury Bill rates right here in Barbados.

On the other hand, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was very cogent in criticising Heywoods because the World Bank deals with an estimate. They estimate it must cost X and as the Deputy Prime Minister said, when it cost XX the World Bank says, well that is up to you — either do not have the project or fund the difference. That is the way they go about business.

The Government in the case of Heywoods decided that because of the nature of the project — we inherited it after all and we were a little more careful with the ones we inherited than the ones we might have conceived — you can always put off your own but you do not want to open yourself to criticism that a wonderful project is handed down to you and you throw it away — we had to restructure it because it was not such a wonderful project as it turned out. We have had to restructure it.

The honourable Member also questioned the general structure of foreign borrowing. I do not quite know what he means by that. If he means the interest rates and the repayment dates, that information is not normally published. It is not published abroad in the Public Service far less given out to the general public for one reason or another but I can give him a very general profile of the Foreign Debt, in general terms. I do not know what the whole amount is. The Central Bank's statistics would show the whole amount.

6.40 p.m.

But during the last five years when the going was good — as the honourable Member for Christ Church East put it — we developed the country and at the same time we made use of the country's financial reputation to establish lines of credit to protect us against recessionary conditions. These recessionary conditions became visible last April, last May — I can not tell you the exact date — perhaps, last June. Perhaps. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: In November 1980.) Not November 1980 as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying *sotto voce*.

The honourable Member should ask his friends to provide him with a copy of the Central Bank New Year's advice to the Government at the start of 1981. Ask for that because if the honourable Member is saying that he, against the Ministry of Finance, the Central government, the politicians who had the figures and general economic thought considered that the island was in a state of col-

lapse in November 1980, then he, I fear, was standing alone at the time. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Indicators) Obviously in 1980, indicators were that recession would come to Barbados and I said so in my New Year Message. My New Year Message was markedly less optimistic than that of the Central Bank. But things began to be a little acute when the crop was not producing the supply of sugar that it should have been producing and when there was a really devastating winter season in the tourist industry.

The difficulties we have had in the sugar crop, Mr. Speaker, are well exemplified by the fact that sugar was sitting down in the warehouse up to this year and the earnings from the last shipment of sugar — \$19 million — have now had to be added as recently as the last couple of weeks — the last year's earnings in the sugar crop. It was always a notional figure that the sugar industry was giving for its last year's earnings. It never put its hands on any \$60 million in exports at all during last year. In the last couple of weeks it has got in some money.

Now about June last year — the end of June after the election — we began to draw down the stand-by credits which the Central Bank had built up over the previous good years. These stand-by credits are of a short term nature and at current interest rates, six months a year and so on. We can roll them over what is today a third. One fell due last week, we paid \$750 000 on another yesterday, we have to pay another \$2 million next week — later in the month I think another \$2 million. (*Aside*)

The honourable Member for St. Michael West is saying that the Minister of Finance is playing the role of *Old Man River*, just keep rolling them over. It is a pleasant thought if one could just keep rolling them over. But one has to look at the underlying trends in the economy. In fact, we have not rolled over all. We have repaid some during the last few weeks. The Foreign Reserves are bearing up moderately well; they are not increasing, they are not falling they are taking.....(*Aside*).....the strain of some repayments and they are taking the strain of meeting imports.

The short term borrowings might amount to \$50 million, the project loan to \$100 million — I am giving very ball part figures — longer term borrowing \$12 million. In Trinidad, we have another few years to run, and some balance with the Orion Bank and we also have another few years to run on that.

The structure of foreign borrowings is less bunched paradoxically than it was a few years ago, the reason being that the bunching which is apparent in 1984, 1985 and 1986, is less apparent because we have more short term borrowing, standby credits which are coming up for

repayments in 1982 and 1983 — 1982 perhaps, pay half, roll over half, and 1983. I would not suggest to honourable Members that we will get through another year of recession without further foreign borrowings. I think that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is now sufficiently instructed in the economics of running small, fragile, open economies to know that you borrow in the bad years as long as you have nothing structurally wrong.

I had an interesting comment made to me this morning when we were discussing a structural development loan with the World Bank — it has been on the cards for some time — it is not anything new — the discussions have been going on for a year and a half, Sir — about terms and one of the things that was said was what structures do you think we have to adjust in Barbados because they were discussing it in relation to Jamaica.

There are really very few structures, very few of our economic institutions which need an entirely different approach that can be created by the insertion of money. But honourable Members can make what they can out of the size of the National Debt and out of the foreign component. There is no alternative — and I make no excuse for using Mrs. Thatcher's most famous phrase — there is no alternative in an economy which imports 80 per cent of its GDP and to short term measures, primarily borrowing, to support its Balance of Payments in years of foreign recession. There is really no alternative.

If the foreign recession gets more and more intense, you may find that you do have to take decisions which involve very substantial adjustments by the population. But, God willing, Sir, the international economy also willing, we will not have to reach that stage.

I would welcome this at a little length because the honourable Members' arguments on all sides have been that we must trim our Capital Works, that we carried on Capital Works too quickly, pushed them too hard and that that has put us in the trouble we are in. It may interest honourable Members opposite to know that we have received exactly opposite advice — not only from the World Bank but from the IMF and the IADB — exactly contrary advice.....(*Aside*).....It is open to the honourable Member for St. Michael West to say that the IMF knows nothing about economics. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, about running this country). Well, that may be a legitimate argument.

But the point of view of the agencies is that the axe should fall on Current Expenditure not on Capital Expenditure. That is the point of view of the agencies. This is not an unusual view held only by conservative agencies. It is the point on the circle at which the two extremes

of political views meet because it is a fundamental of communist economics that you pay as small salaries as possible, give as little in the way of consumer goods to the people as the political situation will stand and you invest the money in Capital Works.
6.50 p.m.

It is also the point of view of the International Monetary Fund at the other end of the political spectrum that you must maximise investment, the investment typified in the Capital Works, and cut down on your Current Expenditure, and the honourable Members and all the Third World countries which attack the IMF forget that what they offer is the same remedy as what communist countries have always offered, which is very low wages and a concentration on Capital Expenditure. It is one of the paradoxes of international economics that the things about which the most extreme ideologies agree are the things which societies object to, the freer they get.

I mean, the conservative economics of the IMF are to keep down wages and invest, and the communist economics of the Soviet Union are to keep down wages and invest. (*Aside*). The honourable Member for St. Michael South admirably says conservative in its own way. The communist countries do not join the IMF, because they have no need for the IMF's remedies, they have already applied its policies. But I pass these arguments out for the sake of a general discussion and a grasp of all the difficulties which small countries meet in trying to run their economies.

In the last analysis, you know, Sir, we have a perception of Barbados now as being a hard hit country. Nobody else is seeing us that way. I have to say nobody else but members of the Government perhaps are seeing it that way, because I think that we are taking more care, and we are worrying more about the economy than the Opposition is, if anything. Certainly I cannot complain that the Opposition is presenting things as worse than they are. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a little alarmist and his statements have to be devalued by a certain percentage. Fortunately the percentage is less now than it was before the election. Before the election you had to devalue them by 90%, now only by 60%, but it is almost impossible, Sir, to get perceptions on the part of aid donors to Barbados to come to harmonise with our view of how things are in Barbados. It is almost impossible. They say Barbados is still well off.

I had a telephone conversation, a somewhat bitter one, with one of the officials of the State Department whose name you saw in the papers a lot a few days ago, and he asked me how many months of Foreign Reserves Barbados had. I said two and a half. He said, do you know how many years it is since Jamaica and Guyana have had any foreign reserves at all? And he asked if I wanted to hear about Costa Rica and I told him I was

not worried about Costa Rica, but we do not want Barbados to get into that situation.

The final point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, about the arguments of the Opposition relate to the criticism about Capital Works again and they really arise out of the reply made by the Minister of Agriculture.

We have seen two approaches in Barbados in the last ten years. You had a mild recession compared to the present recession in 1974 and 1975. In 1974 and 1975 you had a drop in tourism in one year — 1975 that would be — a drop of four per cent, a very small amount, and in 1976 it started to pick up again. In 1980 in Barbados you had a drop, and in 1981 you had another drop. In January 1982 you had an even more severe drop, according to provisional figures. You had increases in oil prices from \$2.90 a barrel to \$8.00 a barrel. We had to put up in 1979 with increases first of all from a little more than \$13.00 a barrel to \$26, and then to \$33 and \$34. Those are the increases we had.

Now, in their time facing these things they did absolutely nothing. They had no Capital Works, with the result that unemployment went to 22 per cent in 1975, the productive sectors collapsed in Barbados, they made no effort to develop in those years the export industries as we fought with them when the honourable Member for Christ Church East was Chairman of the IDC, and so they had depression without ever having had a recovery. When the sun came back out, as the honourable Member was saying, the earth was already flat, there was nothing for it to shine on.

We, at least when the going was good, not only built up the country's own wealth, doubled the GDP — I heard some honourable Member on that side question the Deputy Prime Minister's figures — but I have the figures here in the House — the GDP in 1975 was U.S.\$1 100 a year and in 1976 \$1 400, or something like that. The GDP per capita at the moment is \$3 300 in 1980, \$3 700 odd in 1981, and projected to be \$4,400 this year. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Why don't you deflate it by inflation?)

The honourable Member is asking to deflate it by inflation. We did not have the benefit of 65 per cent inflation in two years as you did. In 1974–75 you had more inflation than we had in our five years, so if we deflate ours by inflation, what are we going to do to yours? I am not saying that the island had doubled its real growth, obviously there was a deflation.

The Central Bank could not believe the increase in the national income in 1980, and the deflator used in 1980 was well in excess of the inflation rate to produce growth rates for the year, and we cannot feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have followed bad policies in reducing unemployment from 22 per cent to ten per cent. (*Aside*)

The honourable Member must just accept that he must not any longer contradict me with the unemployment figures. (Mr. TAITT: When you were in the Opposition you said it was 28 per cent). I said 28 per cent when in Opposition because the fellow that read the confidential study and gave me the report, he read the figure for women by mistake for the total figure. It was 28 per cent for women, it was 22 per cent overall. It is only now running at ten per cent. It fell in the last quarter of last year.

As I may say later on in the month, we pay for a recession in the Balance of Payments. Some countries pay for it in unemployment and inflation, we are paying for it in the Balance of Payments. The remedy when you pay for it in Balance of Payments is a moderate borrowing programme. The remedy, if we had decided to keep the Balance of Payments high and pay for it in unemployment, is impossible to find within Barbados, because in 1975 the former Government, faced with unemployment — it had reasonably high Foreign Reserves during 1975 — did nothing.

It did nothing about unemployment, and indeed it did nothing about protecting the Balance of Payments when it engendered a consumer reflation with a general salary increase in 1976, the Central Bank's financing of the sugar industry, and there was no projection for the Foreign Reserves. So you had a Foreign Reserves crisis in 1976 ten times worse what ours is. Fortunately I was not in Government at the time and therefore can plead ignorance of the underlying trends. I am replying to a *sotto voce*, Mr. Speaker.

Whatever you say about the current effect and impact of the recession on Barbados, at least Barbadians have reached a new plateau from which they can bear the pressures that the international economy is putting on us. We have not had the misery that the island went through in 1974 and 1975.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is clearly a Resolution for a good cause. It is inconceivable to me that anybody does not want to see the polyclinics built or the Spring Garden Road completed, or the Scotland District rehabilitated. I cannot believe that anybody is going to vote against the rehabilitation of the Scotland District, Sir, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.
7.00 p.m.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 10.00 o'clock a.m. on Friday, March 5, 1982.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

7.04 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, Sir, that Item No. 6 under Government Business be the instant Order of the Day.

DOMESTIC EMPLOYEES (HOURS OF DUTY) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Order No. 6 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the category of workers in which we normally designate domestic employees is one of those categories which for the most part conjures up in the minds of people an age, long since pass when people provided labour for a comfortable class of people who did not care to perform for themselves tasks which they identified as menial tasks. Even today, Sir, we have to live to a great extent with that kind of image in our minds.

Barbados has gone through a long evolutionary process in so far as the emergence of a new class is concerned and we have now a very comfortable middle class element and as a matter of fact, Sir, some of those persons to whom we ascribe the title of domestic servants may themselves be able to fit very comfortably into that category which we will call middle class because some of them are able to drive motor vehicles — I am told — to work. One of my Cabinet colleagues told me only yesterday that he heard a gentleman whom he knows well, expressing surprise that his maid is able to come to work in an automobile. She would clearly be one of those better off classes of domestic servants because for the most part, they are still not paid adequate wages in today's context. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: She should be a housekeeper.)

When I speak, Sir, of the evolutionary process through which the island has passed I can refer to the fact that a good many housewives who at one time were expected to remain at home and perform certain domestic chores have themselves taken opportunity to reach out and take hold of the broader horizons of their own personal attitude and have qualified themselves in certain areas which puts them squarely in the class of professionals or para-professionals with the attendant conse-

quence that the domestic chores are left undone and in order to have them go on, it is necessary for that emancipated woman, so to speak, to provide for that job to be done by some person other than that individual.

So when I speak of the category called domestic employee, we have to be careful, Sir, that we measure their importance not in the historical context necessarily but that we apply the present day criteria to the work that they perform and to the niche that they occupy in the social ladder in Barbados because this group of workers, Sir are so disperse and therefore, there is a great deal of difficulty associated with organising them into trade union movements. It is therefore necessary for the Government, from time to time, to make enactments that would provide for those domestics at least to keep pace, as nearly as is possible with the others in the society who are represented by trade unions.

A long debate has gone on — and I suppose will continue to go on for a long time — that seeks to demonstrate that domestic employees are an exploited class of workers in today's society. Some people justify the low wages that they pay the domestics by saying that they have ancillary benefits which are not easily quantifiable in terms of dollars and cents but which nonetheless, go to augment the hard currency payments that are made to them on a weekly basis. They cite that they give them clothing, that they provide food and some people have even gone as far as saying that they provide shelter when they require domestics to work around the clock.

However legitimate these arguments are, I feel, Sir, that in order for us on this side to be certain that domestic servants and that category are not exploited, we have come to the place where we feel that there must be paid a wage that would equate with what we regard as a barest minimum upon which somebody might be called upon to live.

So when we come to legislate wages, Sir, we are not saying to anybody that this is what they must be paid. What we are saying is that they must not be paid less than this and obviously, those workers who work in circumstances that may be regarded as very comfortable circumstances — for example, Sir, if a maid is privileged to work for the honourable Member for St. Michael North would be expected to be paid a very comfortable wage indeed while we say that somebody who happens to be working for somebody who is not as comfortably situated should not be paid less than \$60 a week and we want that they be not required to work for more than 44 hours in any given week without making provisions for over time compensation.

This Bill which is before the Honourable House, Sir, is a Bill to amend the Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act and the purpose is to provide for these periodic enactments of wages and hours of duty during which a domestic employee can be called upon to work. And Sir, we do not want to create the impression that this is the last word that we have spoken or we will speak on these workers because from time to time, as the situation warrants, we will make the necessary Orders providing for changes in the rates.
10.10 a.m.

But we will specify now, Sir, that no domestic servant in Barbados shall be paid less than \$1.50 per hour. We have chosen to express the compensation in terms of an hourly wage as opposed to a weekly wage because there may be persons who will want to hire domestic help on a part time basis and we will want that there be no question as to what the part time rate should be.

I have made the point before, Sir, perhaps not as strong as I would like, that there are a number of people now who by virtue of the fact that they have to work — husband and wife in the same household working — some of them only newly starting middle class types — have to employ domestic help to look after the children at home, and we want to be certain that when we fix wages we do not at the same time provide for massive layoffs in this particular category of worker.

Bearing in mind, Sir, that while domestics do have to earn a living wage, it may be possible for example for somebody to use as an argument that laying off their domestic help was the fact that we have increased the wages payable to them. In fixing a wage we have to fix a figure that takes those two things into consideration: (1) that the domestic must earn a living wage, and (2), that we do not at the same time inadvertently lead to a situation in which there are massive layoffs in this particular area.

I believe that with the improvement in modern technology, particularly household technology, it is now possible for many homes to get on well with automatic equipment like washing machines, dryers and all the other household appliances that make domestic work easier than it used to be at one point in time. Therefore a good many people may be able to justify the investment in these appliances as opposed to hiring manual domestic labour, and we have taken those two considerations in mind.

We have had a large discussion and long discussions with a number of people, including the trade unions..... (Mr. B. M. TAITT: A large discussion?) Perhaps that is not the most elegant term or phrase, but we have had extensive discussions with various people who are in a

position to advise us on these matters in order to arrive at a figure which is reasonable in the circumstances. We would like to provide more, and indeed in the future we will be providing more, but we did have to begin at some point in time and I have chosen, with the best advice available, to begin with the figure which I have just quoted.

Only a few weeks ago the Minister responsible for Immigration — the Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office — brought to my attention a situation in which a domestic worker was being paid \$48 a week, and that domestic worker was a non-Barbadian, an alien. We have a situation where a number of persons from other CARICOM countries who have been able to come to Barbados have been employed in domestic situations where they are able to accept less wages for domestic work than a Barbadian person might be able to accept.

This is not a new phenomenon. I remember in my own case when I went to live in New York, I took my first job and they were paying me \$50 a week to work in a hospital as an Orderly while I was going to college, and that figure was a lot of money to me, because I multiplied it by two, and thought that I was working for an awful lot of money. I am talking about 1958, and I was very happy to receive that wage, but no self-respecting American would have been caught dead in the circumstances working for that wage.

This phenomenon is not new to Barbados, it happens throughout. If you were to go to the United States now, again you would see large numbers of Asians and Mexicans who swim the channel and do all sorts of things to get to New York to work for substandard wages, wages that are significantly below the established minimum wage legislated for the various categories of work, and they tend to create problems for the resident population.

In Barbados we have some people who are turning to foreign domestic workers for the purpose of paying them less than Barbadians will accept. We hope that any person, be he Barbadian or otherwise, who is getting paid less than the prescribed minimum when this enactment is passed will have the courage to make the necessary complaint to the Department of Labour so that we will be able to investigate and take remedial action, because there are still too many people who are willing to exploit people who are not placed in circumstances which will allow them to fight back.

I have right here on this file before me a complaint from a domestic who works down in Queen's Street, Speightstown with one of the wealthy people, and she complains bitterly about the inhuman treatment that is meted out to her and her colleagues. The situation is

that even though she has complained to the Department of Labour, when the Department of Labour attempts to intervene she begs hard not to do anything because she might lose her job. So it puts us in a very invidious position of having to hear complaints of exploitation, but we are asked not to do anything too radical by the same person who is making the complaint lest they lose their job.

I would like while I occupy the position of Minister of Labour to be in a position to extend some kind of solace to workers, and that solace would reside in the fact that I can promise faithfully to anybody who is exploited in this country that I would use the full weight of the law in Barbados to make certain that that position is remedied. We have come a long way and I do not believe that there is any room in this society now for any category of worker to be exploited by any unscrupulous employers. Wherever it is shown to exist I will be prepared to take whatever action is necessary to remedy the situation, and this is a promise which I make with the full authority that is vested in me as Minister responsible for Labour.

Mr. Speaker, I beg with those brief remarks to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the principal Act which commenced on July 1, 1961, a bare six months before the then Government fell. I do not know if this Bill is a harbinger of things to come.

We on this side intend to support this Bill, but there are a few comments which I should like to make. I am very glad to see that this category of worker — probably one could call it a long forgotten category of worker — is being remembered now.
10.20 a.m.

It is not the kind of worker that is easy to organise. They do not unionise. It is not labour intensive although there are many persons employed as domestics or as maids in various households, because the individual hardly employs more than one or two domestics at any one time. But I would like to make a few comments here. First of all, the principle Act deals with the keeping of records for overtime work and it also deals with the applicational sanctions for those who breach the Act. I have never heard of the Ministry of Labour taking any action under the Act, but frankly I believe that the records of the inspectorate at the Ministry of Labour can include this among their work just to see if in fact the provisions of the Act are being complied with.

There are other aspects of the Act, and frankly I believe that Section 4 dealing with the hours of work, is being observed more in the breach than in the observance.

Now, Sir, the Minister gave some indication as to the kind of wage he has in mind legislating for by Order, and I think he referred to \$1.50 an hour. Although this is a minimum wage, I think this is one which is perhaps still a bit low for a minimum wage. (*Aside*) Well he referred to the honourable Member for St. Michael North just now. I myself pay my maid quite a bit more than that, yet my maid is not able to come to work in an automobile. Maybe she is only a maid and not a housekeeper, but I believe that in fixing the wages that one should fix what is really a living wage.

A wage of \$1.50 an hour works out at \$12 a day. If one employs a maid for five and a half days a week, that amounts to \$66 per week. Nowadays although that person probably — as the Minister himself says — eats in the household of the employer and so on, personally I think she should have a better salary because these people do have large families, and I would urge the Minister probably to look at that wage again to see if perhaps it could be increased beyond \$1.50 an hour. I would also urge him to have another look at this Schedule to the Act and prescribe that these workers should be given at least one and a half days a week off.

At the moment, Sir, the Act provides — I think it is paragraph 4 of the Schedule — in addition to the daily break of one hour for lunch, the domestic employee shall be granted two rest periods each of not less than 24 hours consecutive rest every month, so it only allows two days in every month. I think that that really and truly in this day and age is not giving the domestic a fair chance, and I think the domestic is entitled to at least one and a half days a week, not just two days a month, and I am asking the Hon. Minister to have a look at that paragraph in the Schedule and see if something better can be worked out in that regard for the domestic worker.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to support the points made by my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael North. He has made some very cogent points, and they have been logically put forward and we do hope that the Minister will give some response to these points that he has made.

I myself would like to look at a few aspects of this matter, and the first one relates to the very terms that we are describing. This Bill is entitled the "Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act", and the Minister in his introduction referred to the fact that work in households sometimes still carries a certain tinge of the old world, and of a class-ridden society and is a tinge of menial

work, and I believe that the very term itself "domestic" carries an imputation of menial work.

I am a bit surprised that when we are talking about dignity of labour and dignifying work in our society that we could still attempt to put legislation on the Statute Book bearing the term "domestic". I believe that we should be able to find a different term. It is said that a rose by any other name is just as sweet, and we know that we have certain circumlocutory terms as soil technician and other roundabout expressions for describing other types of employment, but I do not think there is anyone who would disagree that the term "domestic" does conjure up and does raise certain kinds of thoughts and certain kinds of views about the work that is performed.

I believe that we could find a more dignified and dignifying word for this kind of employment, and I believe that if we look at the *International Classification of Jobs* that the term "house maid" would be a much more appropriate term to use for this kind of employment. It is put out by the International Labour Organisation and it is classified as "house maid", and Mr. Speaker, the functions and duties relating to that category of worker termed "house maid" include "the house maid cleans the room, prepares food, serves meals, cleans floors and performs similar related duties in the household, the furniture and so on", exactly the duties that one expects a domestic to perform in the household.

I will add to the urgings made by my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Michael North and I would urge the Minister to amend this particular Bill and strike the word "domestic" from the Statute Book and substitute "house maid" as the term for describing this kind of work. (*Aside*) Whatever you want to call it. I am going by the international classification. If we are agreed that "domestic" should be out, you can find an appropriate term. (*Aside*) I think a housekeeper performs duties other than those performed by the house maid.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must address the Chair.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have made the point on that.
10.30 a.m.

The second point I wish to make relates to the manner in which the wages for the house maids or domestic employees as set out in this particular piece of legislation that is before us is fixed. It has to be done by an Order and I believe, Mr. Speaker, — and I will be making this point from time to time because I believe it relates to the position of Parliament and the way in

which Parliament carries out its functions — the chamber passes legislation which entrust to a Minister or to the Cabinet as the case may be — which entrusted to the Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot have this heckling of the honourable Member.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would be glad if you would protect me, Mr. Speaker, from the heckling over there.....which entrust to the Minister certain functions in terms either of fixing wages or conditions of service. These are done by means of Statutory Instruments, by means of Orders and so on but there is very little machinery that is either in existence or functioning for this Honourable Chamber to actually monitor Statutory Instruments which flow from parent legislation. I believe that the time has come when we will either have to make these Orders which are made under parent legislation subject to the affirmative Resolution of this Honourable Chamber or we will have to set up a Select Committee of this House in order to monitor the many Statutory Instruments that are made from time to time.

I think we have a responsibility to scrutinise legislation and a major part of legislative work is done by means of Order and other Statutory Instruments and if as a Parliament we are to carry out our functions, I believe we will have to get in place the kind of machinery which will ensure that we are efficient to carry out our legislative functions fully in respect of that kind of subsidiary legislation.

The final point I wish to make of course relates to the work of the domestic employees, house maids, however they are styled. It is very difficult to discover the difference between the work performed in the private household as distinct from some of the offices in our commercial and business sectors but in the commercial and business sectors, the business is able as an Income Tax deduction or a separate tax deduction, to have the cost of that particular service rendered by the employees who perform such roles deducted as a cost.

I think it is time that in a service economy such as ours — because however much we strive, our economy will continue to contain a large service element for several years to come — that we consider the private households as businesses in their right. The duties performed are similar as far as this category of employee is concerned and I will draw this to the attention of the Minister and ask him to give some consideration to this point.

As my colleague, the Member for St. Michael North said, we are not opposing this particular piece of legislation but we are suggesting areas for further consideration which can actually improve the operation of those

who perform most useful services in this particular area of work. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy this morning to stand here and support this Bill. I believe that this Bill was badly neglected for quite a long time. Now I remember in 1951 when the Barbados Labour Party was in power that it had made a law where it gave all the working people of this country two weeks holiday with pay. The Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961. From 1961 to 1976 they could only see fit to add one week to that two weeks to make it three weeks. Since the Barbados Labour Party came back into power in 1976, it speeded up again and added another week which is three weeks, the equivalent of 15 years for the Democratic Labour Party regime.

Now I am very disturbed with the honourable Member for St. Michael North East. I would say he spoke like one who never was in Government. From 1961 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, the maids of this country or the domestics were working for nothing as we saw it and he lasted in there for 15 years and he never had the guts to come out and call on his Government or the Unions of Barbados to come out and support the maids of this country.

I am very happy and I am satisfied to know that we have a Government with guts which will come out and do not care who it offends that would try to see the working classes in this country get a good break. I used to wonder how all sorts of workers in this country used to have Unions and people representing them but I would only ask, who took care of the domestics in this country?

It is sad to know, Mr. Speaker, that some mornings some domestics go into work at 7 o'clock and they stay in those people houses up to 9 or 10 o'clock at night and you would be ashamed to see the salaries that are being paid to such people. I had the privilege to look in certain books and I saw some of the salaries that the big boys of this country and some that I would not even call at this time — were paying to the domestics. So this morning I am sure — and when you say \$66 as the minimum I agree — that somebody like me would say that it should be a little bit more but I do not believe that those people on the other side — the honourable Members on the other side — should be able to get up and say that this should be a little bit more, because they were there too long. I mean they had the right, they had the privilege that they could have improved this amount.
10.40 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that there are some people and you have to explain this very well — that are working for approximately \$150 a week as a domestic. But when I listened here this morning, I do not think that those

people are really so outstanding because you see some nights some of those people leave those people houses at 12 o'clock. So when you compare it with \$1.50 per hour as the honourable Member said, and compare that from 7 o'clock up to 12 o'clock at night you can see that when a wealthy person pays that \$1.50 a week they are really giving nothing. It is really what they are working for.

But this Bill, this morning, Mr. Speaker, is only to safeguard those people who do not find themselves in that category of employer who is able to pay that money. So, I would say this morning that the minimum wages would be \$66 and I am sure that there are a lot of domestics who would commend the Government and an honourable Member for this this evening, as it comes over the news. And I am sure that all of us here should be very happy about this.

But you would have to make it abundantly clear to those people who pay the \$1.50 and so on to watch the hours because there are some of them who might go around telling the domestics — and I believe that there are some honourable Members on the other side who would do it too — those people who are getting \$1.50 — that they have to cut it back now to \$66. That is the minimum but the maximum could be as high as \$200 because nowadays when you get a good maid in your house who can take care of your home — you go out and leave your children and they take care and you can relax and come in at 1 and 2 o'clock on mornings — I feel that such people(Aside).....that is right and the money at least too — I feel that such people should be better taken care of.

I am very very happy this morning to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and support this Resolution. I thank you. *(Applause)*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments to make on this Bill which seeks to amend the Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act, to extend the scope of that Act and make provisions for the enactment of a minimum wage and maximum hours of duties from time to time.

I am not sure whether the honourable Member for St. Lucy would have appreciated the extent to which the cost of living has risen in Barbados over the past six years and in the light of that, I think that appeals made from this side for consideration as to whether the minimum wage is too low should be carefully considered.

Now Sir, one of the two things that have really shocked me since I entered political life was to find two of the wealthiest families in Barbados paying maids who had been in their service for 40 years and more, the total of \$25 a week — \$25 a week after 40 years of ser-

vice and two of the wealthiest families of this country. In fact, I have had to ask both of those persons why do they bother to work at all. Yet they had continued to work in the hope that they would get some compensation some day for the hours of work and the years of work that they have put in.

But, Sir, I believe and support very strongly the view put forward by the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Michael South that the term "domestic" should probably be not used in this Bill and either the term, "house maid" or "household attendant" should probably replace the term "domestic". But even more fundamental, Sir, one has to consider whether household attendants are part of the productive force — labour force — in this country or whether they are not.

It is my believe, Sir, that some 40 years ago the majority of household attendants employed in Barbados would probably have been employed in order to promote the leisure of the ladies in the household who employed them. I believe, Sir, that this situation has changed very drastically, over the years. I would suspect that not more than three per cent to five per cent of all household attendants can be said to be employed now in circumstances that are non productive and nearly for the purpose of promoting the leisure of the persons who employed them.

I think that the overwhelming majority of persons employed in this capacity must be considered part of the productive work force because it is through their efforts that in many instances husbands and wives are able to go out and work and earn a living and contribute to the development of the economy, contribute to the development of their families and also by being able to earn additional income, contribute to the employment of persons who wish to be employed in this category. In other words, Sir, if such persons were not available, it would mean that either the husband or the wife would have had to stay at home and the community would be the worst off because one person who might well be specially trained in a given area and very vital one to the development of the community would have had to stay at home and be unable to work.

One of the major functions of household attendants is to look after the children of this nation and I do not think, Sir, that this is a bad thing, where people can go out to work and create employment opportunities.

Now it is one thing to say that one would like to see the day when there are no domestics in Barbados. But the fact is that the way in which this society has developed, it is likely that today there are far more domestics in employment in 1982 than they were in 1940

because there has been a massive expansion of the middle classes over the years.

Many people have had new opportunities created largely by the Democratic Labour Party and there has been a tremendous emancipation of women in this society who now possess a large range of skills and not only has the demand for domestics or household attendants been expanded by the type of economic development that has taken place in Barbados, but it is unlikely that you can wish it away. I think the time will come only when Barbados becomes a fully industrialised society that you will find fewer and fewer household attendants being in that occupation.

Our task, therefore, Mr. Speaker, must be to face up to the situation as it stands and see in what way we can improve on the law of household attendants. I support the view and I think I have established very clearly that household attendants are generally speaking part of the productive force of Barbados. They also help to look after the children of this nation and another very important area that is very often omitted is that there are many household attendants who look after the debilitated and the elderly in our society. If those household attendants were not available, many of those persons would have to end up in Government institutions at a much greater cost to the nation.

10.50 a.m.

Indeed, Sir, in a very similar way that category of domestic attendant is very similar to the Home Help Plan which was improved by the present Administration. (Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Introduced). The Hon. Minister for Transport said "introduced". All right — introduced by the present administration in that the work that they perform is partially that of a household attendant, and in many ways they perform a paramedical function. It is just that in the one case the Government pays for the services of household attendants for those persons who cannot afford them, whereas in the other cases the people pay for these services of the same household attendants themselves. In many instances, Sir, as a physician one is able to keep patients out of hospital by being able to give specific instructions to the household attendants as to how to handle a particular debilitated patient, and even to carry out minor duties, for example, such as physiotherapy, that do not require great skills and so on.

The range of functions performed by household attendants by and large are quite wide. I believe that they must be considered part of the productive work force of this country, and I believe it is not only by the prescription of minimum wages but also — as explained very elegantly by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition — by giving appropriate tax deductions to those persons who

employ domestic labour, or — to use the word that I prefer to use — household attendants. This would be a definite stimulus for giving higher wages to the domestics or household attendants and not, in my view, necessarily giving assistance to those who would be getting the benefit of the tax deduction.

What is the objective? My objective in this area would be to give some stimulus and some incentive to persons to pay as much as they possibly can above the minimum wage in order to make sure that the domestics get a better wage. And in any event, Sir, the quickest way to get domestics out of the ranks of the domestics is for them to be able to earn enough money in order to generate some savings and probably provide for better training for themselves in some area, or in the alternate, to create alternate job opportunities within the community.

Here in Barbados, Sir, we have people working — I would not like to say in sweat shops — under conditions in industry for less money and under worse conditions than many of the persons who work in the domestic field in Barbados. So I think a measure of objectivity is required about this, and I think we have to take the bold decision some time and ask ourselves whether or not such persons contribute to the overall productive capacity of this country. I firmly believe that they do in the context of 1982, although I would be doubtful if they did in the context of 1942, and therefore we have to be looking ahead and we have to face the realities of the situation as they stand.

I hope that none of us, Sir, feel very happy about females working in the sugar fields of Barbados loading canes and so on. I believe that most of us would like to see I am just drawing a comparison, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want you to make this kind of comparison. Stick to this Bill and nothing else but this Bill.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Even in circumstances where females work under conditions which most of us would consider to be more degrading — if you have that conventional type of thinking on the matter — than domestic labour, yet that does not stop us from making provisions to ensure that whilst that situation obtains, nevertheless those who have to work under those conditions or in that sector of economic activity would have a better deal.

I myself feel that reactions to policy proposals of this kind — such as the creation of a nation of domestics and so on is unrealistic in the context of 1982 and I think that it is the duty of the Government not only to look at the question of minimum wages, and it is the duty of the unions to see what they could do in terms of unionising such workers. However difficult it may be,

I think it is time that such persons should be given better protection.

I am the first person to recognise that it is not only difficult for unions, but perhaps it is more difficult for a person working in a domestic household to seek to be unionised because of the intimate contact that they have from day to day with their employer. But I think that once people understand on a general basis that household attendants or domestics are unionised — once that is publicised — once there is evidence of union activity in that area — that it would not only make for better protection not only of the wages but of the conditions of work of domestic employees.

I think it would make the job of the Chief Labour Officer a lot less difficult, because I believe that much of his time and the time of his staff is taken up with complaints relating to domestic employees in terms of the hours of work, unfair dismissals or dismissals that are perceived to be unfair or genuinely unfair dismissals. And I think that if a union existed which would be dealing with these problems in the first instance, that a lot of that administrative work would be taken off the shoulders of the Chief Labour Officer.

Another fact, Sir, is this: that many domestic employees do not know what their rights are under the labour laws of Barbados, and many of them find themselves in difficulties when they may take a particular course of action to find that they are not protected by the Laws of Barbados, or in the alternate they might have impositions placed on them which they do not object to because they do not realise that their rights are being frustrated by their employers.

11.00 a.m.

I believe that it should be possible to establish a register of household attendants and that the Ministry of Labour could probably let such persons know in brief outline what their rights are in relation to wages and hours of work, in relation to dismissals, in relation to sick leave and this kind of thing.

There is a growing tendency in Barbados, Mr. Speaker — and I have had to be very firm about this one — where employers would have the nerve to call you up as a doctor and ask you what is wrong with their maid when they are given sick leave. It is almost incredible, and my standard answer to such persons is "if you had come to me and I had given you sick leave, what would your response be if you discovered that your maid had called up your doctor and asked what was wrong with you", and that is usually the end of the conversation. That kind of thing should stop. It is a very common thing.

I have heard a former Member of this House — my colleague Dr. Caddle — complain bitterly about that kind

of attitude of employers in Barbados in relation to sick leave being granted to persons in domestic service in Barbados. That kind of thing must come to an end. It is unfair and it is unjust, and the big problem that is created here is that when that person goes back to work, she faces an employer who seems to believe that because a person was ill that in some way she was negligent because of her illness, and from the floor of this House I would like to see the time come in Barbados when it should be unlawful for any employer to be calling up doctors in this country trying to find out what is wrong with their employees when they go to their doctor.

Doctors I know will stick to their precepts of the Hippocratic Oath and not disclose the illnesses of their patients. It is a waste of time for most doctors in Barbados to put up and to deal with that kind of nonsense. And it never used to happen in Barbados before. It is not only among Barbadians that you find that kind of attitude. You find that attitude among a lot of foreigners who have come into this country and try to sabotage the rights of Barbadians even to go home on sick leave with a doctor's certificate.

Many persons, Sir, have complained to me — persons who were not patients of mine who were given sick leave by other doctors — about the kind of treatment they received when they went back out to work, and that is why I feel that a strong element of unionisation in respect of domestics is very necessary in this country, and that is why I feel that unless there is a concept and the understanding that such persons are not slaves — that such persons are part of a modern work force in Barbados and are entitled to the rights and privileges that other workers enjoy — then indeed you will find that kind of attitude towards domestic servants in Barbados.

One final point, Sir. If these people feel that domestic work is degrading, I wonder what would be their comments in relation to domestic work in offices, in hotels and other areas. The final answer to that problem is whether you yourself have employed or do employ domestic labour. I say that I do employ household attendants and I will say that it would be impossible for me to carry out my functions and for my wife to carry out her functions unless we had the assistance of household attendants. (Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: How much do you pay them?) Very very well. I do not wish to say that this is necessarily a typical situation, nor am I making any special plea for any tax deductibility for myself or anything like that. All I am saying is that as a general rule, if you yourself employ household attendants either in the present or in the future or have employed them in the past — and I believe most members on the other side do employ household attendants — they cannot come in here then and say that these household attendants are not part of the productive force, because they must have come to the conclusion at some point in

time that they can only carry out their duties either individually or in the case of those who are married as husband and wife if they have the benefit of household attendant.

Another point, Sir. The character of the work of household attendants has changed considerably over the years with the use of a lot of ancillary equipment within the home — I refer to things like washing machines, Hoovers and things like that — and I believe that much of the drudgery has been taken out of the work of household attendants. And whereas we all look forward to the day when the society will develop to the point where anyone going into domestic service or service as a household attendant would be a matter of choice and not a matter of necessity, I think in the current circumstances that we have to see how best we can use all the force that the apparatus of state can bring to bear for better conditions for those employed in that category of service.

And so, Sir, I will wind up by saying that I fully support the position of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the observations he has made both in relation to the description of the Act, the recognition that the house unit is part of the productive force and a final plea to Government to look and see whether or not the minimum wage as prescribed is not too low in the context of the present cost of living in Barbados.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that much of what has been said on this Resolution so far will be considered as worthwhile, but I believe that we in this Honourable Chamber every now and again come to what can be described as crossroads or landmarks along the way in the concepts we have about the development of our country.

I would say at the outset that I will not describe my attitude to this Bill as supportive, although I would say also that I could not find myself unable to support it.

11.10 a.m.

I think there is a difference between saying that I would support the Bill and saying that I find no reason not to support it but this whole question of the so-called domestic in Barbados or the household helper, or the household attendant or by whatever name called is in many ways, Mr. Speaker, a no wind situation.

If one takes the position that one is supporting the maids in the community, those persons who now lay claim to being members of the middle-class would turn upon one as being a traitor and if one takes the position of those in the middle-class, one recognises that one is deserting those persons at the lower end of the socio-economic scale who need the support of honourable

Members in this Chamber and people like us in the community more perhaps than those who belong to our class. Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to formulate a position on a matter of this kind and feel a depth of sincerity in one's heart if one's position is only informed by the political colouration which one has or which one aspires to.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this matter is looked at on principle, that it becomes easier to understand and accept a position on it. Mr. Speaker, there are certain questions which have to be asked. Is the work being done honest work? If the answer to that is in the affirmative, then the question always has to follow: Is the remuneration for that work reasonable in the circumstances? Those, Mr. Speaker, seem to me to be the fundamental questions which have to be addressed and responded to if one is going to deal with this whole question of household help.

My position in this matter, Sir, tends to be extremely personal. I think that I can say without fear of contradiction that from the point of view of the domestic, I am an expert. I have had a lot of experience in the household of a domestic and so, Sir, the problem is not one for me of which position I should take, the problem is one of how one can take one's position and be reasonable in the circumstances.

We have in this country today a number of persons who themselves are either the children of or the descendants of maids — people who worked in households. Those persons must be aware of the degradation which people who worked in those households of yore suffered in the cause of rearing their families and promoting the development of their own children.

They therefore ought to be among those who understand best the need to treat the people who find themselves in the position of having to seek employment in their households as in the first instance — persons, meaning genuine persons. Those people recently emerged into the middle class ought to be experts in the whole question of humane treatment of people who work for them. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in this country today we still have in the households of a number of people in Barbados — who ought to know better — persons in those households working as maids — they may be called household helpers — and I agree with my colleague that perhaps renaming the class of work might assist in reforming the attitude to the work — but by whatever name they are called, Sir, we have people in those houses who are being ill treated. They are ill treated not necessarily physically but they are ill treated psychologically.

Mr. Speaker, it is still a fact that Barbadians who now employ maids who only a few decades ago — maybe as long as even one decade ago — were themselves on

equal terms with those who are now described as maids having their children addressing big women 40 years old and over by their surnames. You get a young boy or a young girl seven years old addressing a woman as Johnson or Richards or some other surname, a matter which, Mr. Speaker, is indicative of the attitude which is brought to bear on this whole issue.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States, the Department of Labour, taking cognisance of this kind of problem and recognising that a country that has grown and is going to be developed, will not grow and develop on the distribution of labour in the household in such a way as to have one family or one group of people feeling superior to the other group have established certain standards for household help. And, Mr. Speaker, within those standards they set out what is required for a person working in a household — what is required by the employer, what is required by the employee, what is required for the employee and by the employee and both sets of persons become aware of their rights.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when a person enters into a household, that person knows fully well what he or she is getting into and there is no question therefore of status and class except this: no country which has succeeded in reaching the level of a developed country has found it desirable to include the category of household helper in its desired category of workers — no country, Sir, east, west, or in between. What they have sought to do is to improve the standard of existence within the household so that the need for additional hands is considerably and continually reduced so that those parents who feel able or willing to go out and participate in the productive areas of the economy may do so without in anyway feeling that they have neglected their homes.

Mr. Speaker, they have been largely successful but that is not to say that it is not the privilege of an individual to employ a household helper or to become one. That is not the gravamen of my argument or my position. I am saying that it is not the business of the Government to assist in creating a class of domestics. I am saying that whether a Government is on that side or this side, that any such attitude smacks at the level of chauvinism which we as a country cannot afford. That is not to say that the Government has a duty to abolish the class of household helpers or domestics. That is not the point I am making but I am saying that I would have great difficulty in assisting or agreeing with any arrangement whereby we sought to perpetuate a system which we all accept as worthy of condemnation.

11.20 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, when I was Consul General in New York, soon after I was appointed, the question of staffing came up and as the head of that department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it was my responsibility

to make recommendation for the remuneration of the so called unestablished staff — the unestablished staff including household help in the residence of the Consul General — and when the proposal was made for a reasonable living wage to the then Ministry of Foreign Affairs — or External Affairs — it was a source of absolute embarrassment to me that that Ministry's Officials were informed by what I considered to be an anachronistic concept of how a maid should be treated and what a maid should be paid and it was only by resolute and tenacious application of one's skills that one was able finally to get the officials of the day to accept that a maid working in the household of a country's representative was as much part of the representation of that country as was the head of that household.

I believe that that is a principle which has been accepted on all sides in this Honourable Chamber and I believe it is fair to say that generally speaking the maids and other such household staff in the various countries working for Barbados now get a wage that is comparable with the wages which the other people get. As to whether all the wages are reasonable is another matter which does not concern us here. But I draw that to Your Honour's attention to make the point that we have to change our total attitude to this concept of household help.

It seems to me that the Government's problems may very well be that if they set a minimum wage that is higher than \$60 a week, they will be accused of opening Pandora's Box on this question of wages. I would suggest to the Government that they ask the questions which I alluded to at the beginning of my statement and that they determine what is a fair wage for someone to be paid while working in a household and that they set that up as a wage and he who can pay it will pay and he who cannot will not.

To the question as to whether persons will be dismissed wholesale because people feel that they cannot pay, the short answer is this: as the Hon. Minister has said he would fix the wages by the hour and those who cannot pay for six days will pay for five and those who cannot pay for five will pay for two. If the wages are properly fixed, those who pay for two will be paying what they pay now for six days anyhow. So that, the people who are working will not be any worse off and those who have to pay will pay or do without.

This is not a matter on which we ought to be trying to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. This is a matter of fundamental importance to the development of this country and it is a question which we as a people must address in the same way that we attempt to address a number of the fundamental social issues in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I make this statement, not to gain any particular political or other kudos but because it is how I feel about this matter. And, I believe that from time to time in this Honourable Chamber when matters such as these come before us, we as representatives of the people, will have to say what we think, say how we feel and vote the way our consciences dictate. I do not believe that the question of household help ought ever to be allowed to become a political football and so long as I am in public life I will not engage in any attempt to turn it into a political football.

I would hope that the Government would accept the very same and substantial recommendation of the honourable gentleman on this side who shadows the portfolio of Labour — the honourable Member for St. Michael North. The honourable Member for St. Michael North suggested to the Hon. Minister that he may re-examine the position on the question of the minimum wage. I would like to suggest to the Hon. Minister on that side and to the Government that if they propose a reasonable wage in the context of the entire community, as long as it is considered a fair wage for a fair day's work that on this side of the Honourable House, there is unlikely to be any argument against it.

So you may feel free to examine it and only if we are resolute in these ways can we free ourselves of the fair that if we take one position the middle class will be against us and if we take the other position the lower classes will be against us. We are the only people who can free ourselves from that particular hegemony.

I am recommending that this is a Bill on which that can be done. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, hoping that I have clarified my own position on this matter, I thank you for your indulgence.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the longer I remain in this Honourable Chamber — probably the longer I remain in public life — the more hypocritical I find some politicians to be — not necessarily parliamentarians — politicians.

If one had listened carefully to the speeches made by honourable Members on the other side putting their case, what they have tried to put across is "the down-trodden" "these poor workers," Sir; "this wicked party refusing to give them additional money," Mr. Speaker, "in the light of the present day economic problems, \$66 is not enough." You heard, Sir, how employers telephoned the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and asked the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central what is wrong with the patient.

The employers did not have to do that. The employers could have come and asked me about the

honourable Member for St. Michael South Central because you do not have to telephone him to ask him about a patient. He goes on public platforms and talks about his own patients. He talked about me and he talked about the Hon. Attorney General and we were his patients, Sir. Now what is the case they are putting forward here this morning?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has never done that in this Honourable House, so it has nothing to do with inside here.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it has a lot to do with in here because if he talks about it on public platforms I have no doubt that in his own medical jargon, he would also tell us in his medical way about it too, Sir. So I mean that it has a lot to do with this, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not on this occasion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: This party still stands today, as the foremost party in the vanguard of the workers in this country. It was in 1961, Sir, when this party introduced legislation into this country — 1961 — 21 years ago — regulating the hours for the domestics in this country — on July 1, 1961. Not a single amendment was even made, introduced or even examined to improve the lot of those domestics for the past 15 years that they have been in power. In 1961, Sir, we introduced legislation when we went out of office in December. The honourable Member for St. Michael North was Hon. Minister of Labour. He never introduced one piece of legislation to assist the very domestics that you are hearing of today — that \$66 is not enough — never look at the legislation. This Party, the founders of the Barbados Workers' Union, the Party that carried the vanguard for the workers in this country to improve their lot is now subjected to some indepth criticism by the honourable Members on the other side. For what? For political mileage.

11.30 a.m.

What political mileage can you get out of the type of speeches you made on that side? What are the points you made? They should not be called domestics, they should be called household attendants. One referred to a maid, the colonial thinking still that the Deanes, the Wilkinsons and the Thornes used to glorify themselves in saying "tell the maid to come." We gave them a degree of sophistication by referring to them as domestics. This morning we are hearing you should call them maids. Tell the maid to bring the water, tell the maid to change the child's diapers, tell the maid to bring me a rum and coke. That is the colonial mentality, the colonial thinking, and I am surprised to hear it coming from the honourable Member for St. Michael South, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. And I feel even more depressed to know that I am his M.P. for St. James North, to hear that type of

thinking this morning. The only contribution was to change the name.

On the Statute Book of Barbados is Chapter 344, Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty). When they used to work from 6 a.m. until 10 p.m., all they had to take home was a paltry wage and some of the scraps from the tables of their masters. This great party came in and introduced legislation to protect them from working these long and wicked hours with no days off, from Sunday until Saturday, and then they went out with the master and the mistress in the car holding the child. This party stopped it. For 15 years you were in power and never examined it, and the only contribution this morning you heard was "when I was a Consul General in New York." You should be the last to introduce talk about being a Consul General in New York, but I will not deal with that because it is irrelevant.

Sir, I believe that this particular amendment is designed to avoid further exploitation of the domestics in this country. I know as a fact that there are some people who set out to pay domestics a very, very bad wage in today's economic conditions. I know they have been exploited, because when I was Minister of Labour many of them came to me — not from the very wealthy Barbadians as I heard about on the other side, but from some civil servants whose wives went out working with them and they had to get domestics. Many of them live in St. James, so they came to me because they were being paid anyhow and then fired. They were then told to go to the Labour Department. They had to be trotting up and down, because they are not unionised. Then they were told to go to the courts to get the money — but then they would have to pay some of the legal vagabonds like Simmons' brother — like Michael Simmons — who held on to the Central Bank's money to the tune of \$700,000.00.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He is not a Member of this Chamber, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Central Bank money before this Chamber.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know it is not. It could not be, Sir, because it is not there. Some of the legal vagabonds down in James Street had the poor people running up and down, and charged them more to do cases in court to get paltry sums of money from the very high ranking civil servants.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the Bill that is before this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, it is dealing with money, the Bill to amend the Act. My argument is that

we have to amend it because of the exploitation of some of the very people in our society like ourselves.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central say that it hurt him, it grieved him to hear about two persons working for two of the wealthiest people in this country for \$25 a week, and they have been in the service of these people for 40 years.

Now, Sir, I believe this is a very simple analogy, but I might be wrong. If a person works 40 years in the service of another person, I believe that person would have started work in those days at the age of 16 or 17, maybe 15 for that matter, because there was nothing to protect them from being employed at such a tender age.

But if you work for 40 years — and let us assume the person spoke to him seven years ago — the person would have gone out to work at least at the age of 18, and they would be 65 now, so that person is an old age pensioner. Though I do not believe the honourable Member — not that he is lying to the House — that is my personal view to which I am entitled — that person is now an old age pensioner, and when they were in power, to get the old age pension there had to be a Means Test — and I am speaking subject to correction, Sir — you could not work for more than \$15 per week. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is true). I am told that is true, and he is talking about these people who are maids. How could you be a maid at 65? You mean a great-grandmother. You could not be a maid at 65, you would have to be a caretaker, because if you can work for 40 years for any one person you must be very very trustworthy.

What he is trying to pinpoint is the exploitation of those two ladies, Sir, and the former Minister of Labour — the Member for St. Michael North — should hang his head in shame even to get up. Do you see Ezra Alleyne? I do not know why some body does not hold him and beat him with a bull pistol? Do you see what we have been reduced to? The Member for St. Michael North — the former Minister of Labour — is in here criticising something with which he was charged and never even looked at, never examined, and the member for St. Michael West is saying you must re-examine it. Re-examine what? Something that was never looked at? I thought you would have to examine it first and then re-examine, but you had no interest in those people.

You would find the Member for St. Michael South Central in the BIGWU business now, I know that for sure. You might be financing the BIGWU, you will soon be marching with them in your soft shoes, because you want public recognition cheaply. You will be the medical adviser to BIGWU just now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Kindly address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am addressing the Chair, Sir. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Medical advice?) You will be medical and legal adviser, because you seem able to talk on all subjects before this Chamber, so you will be medical adviser, legal adviser and economic adviser. (*Aside*). Once you are getting a piece of change out of it, because it is coming from Cuba.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North should have gone to St. Vincent when he heard that it was likely we would deal with this matter. He should not be in the island to talk on it. All through the years when inflation was rampant under their regime, unemployment high under their regime, they had no interest in those very workers, but now all of a sudden you can hear from the house top that the poor workers are not getting enough money.

11.40 a.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said on one occasion that shop attendants should get \$200 a week. Why don't you go and tell Mrs. Grant at the corner of Brittons Hill so and see if you could keep any political meetings by her shop? You see, Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is politically irresponsible and he is medically irresponsible as my colleague the honourable Member for St. Joseph would say — not me.

A lot of irresponsible statements come out of his mouth. He is talking about somebody telephoning him and asking why somebody did not come out to work. That is one of his friends. Only one of your friends who is an employer could telephone you; for example, the honourable Member for St. Michael North. I would not doubt if he has got a maid that he would telephone and say "Richie, what happened that Janet didn't come out to work today?" Do you see the work? Janet and Richie and the honourable Member. Nobody has got to ask me as a patient what is wrong with them. You got on the platform and told thousands that I have psoriasis. That is the irresponsible person you are.

And you have the gall and the nerve to associate yourself with the honourable Member for St. Michael North speaking on this when we were the Party in the vanguard in assisting the workers. I am not dealing with any downtrodden working class. I am talking about workers. The Bank Manager is a worker. The Managing Director is a worker. The doctor is a worker and the teacher is a worker, but you like a lot of cheap talk about working class people. All of us in the society must put our hands to the wheel. That is why we have come in here this morning and are asking for a minimum wage of \$66 a week, and also empowering the Minister of Labour at any time he thinks that it should be increased,

to give an order to increase it from \$66 to \$166, \$1.00 per square mile.

And, Mr. Speaker, sad sack. I do not know, but some of us are born young and get old, but the honourable Member for St. Michael North from the time I saw him looked as if he was born old, so he has to think old. He belongs to Clarendon Galleries, or Owen T. Alder's Antique Shop. Ezra Alleyne gave me this opportunity to be dealing with an antique thinker this morning.

In 1961 this Act was put on the Statute Book to look after domestics. They were 15 years in power and never even opened a chapter in it. In 1982 this great party took up the cudgels of the workers again by setting out to give them a minimum wage, and I sincerely hope that those people who employ domestics would not try to tell them that the minimum wage is \$66 a week, let them work for a couple of weeks and then change them. That is the way I know you can very well get around that.

The only thing I support that you have introduced in here this morning is if it is possible that they would bring themselves into a union, because I am a firm believer of a workers' Union movement. We are the founders of it and I believe in it. That is the foundation this party was built on, the foundation of this great party that was able to snatch the country out of the grips of economic disaster and give them a beacon to follow.

Sir, it has my wholehearted support, and I do not want to refer to any particular group of nationals in this country. I know sometimes it hurts me when I see — I have to be very careful how I am talking because I observe — not you, Sir, because you cannot see beyond this Chamber — that we have multi-nationals in here. For example, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West could not be a negro. He is a creole with soft hair and dark skin; so I have to be very careful how I am talking. I have to say that I hope the people of Barbados would not set out to exploit these workers.

Mr. Speaker, that is my contribution and I hope that in future before honourable Members on the other side start off on their lack of content and lacking in depth addresses to this House that they will do a little more research, because they can hang their heads in shame this morning for being critical of the Government for bringing such a Bill before this Parliament.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that it has fallen to a Barbados Labour Party Administration to address its mind once again to the question of the improvement of the conditions of work for domestics in this country, because as has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that it was in the dying days of the Barbados Labour Party Administra-

tion in 1961 that the first Act was put on the Statute Book relating to regulations and hours of work for domestics in this country. And indeed I think it is a matter for regret — even though I am proud of the fact that it has fallen to us — that 20 years have passed, 15 of which the Democratic Labour Party was in office and they did not see it fit to return to this subject and to do anything for the improvement of the hours of work and indeed of the wages of all the domestics in this country.

We have got to be firm in dealing with the Opposition on a question such as this because when you listen to them, you get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the domestics all of a sudden have new-found champions in the Democratic Labour Party, when in truth and in fact they have been in office for 15 years — and this point bears restating — and did absolutely nothing for the improvement of the conditions of work of that class of person in this country. It is not for me to accuse them of insincerity or of hypocrisy, but I think it needs to be pointed out that one would have seriously to question the depth of commitment that they have when they can speak now with such passion about domestics in this country, when as far as they were concerned, the domestics were a forgotten class.

The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister reminded us on the last occasion that he addressed this House of a statement made by the late Norman Manley of Jamaica in writing about the role of the Opposition when he said it is their duty to oppose insofar as they have to agree to do so with the least possible grace. There can be no doubt that the Opposition in agreeing with this measure before us has done so with the minimum grace possible, and that is very understandable given their history in this matter.

There is nothing that I would want to comment on in relation to the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central because apart from his tendency to address this House on everything that comes before it, he also reminds us when he speaks that there is a rule against calling honourable Members liars. There is no rule against honourable Members using fiction for illustrative purposes, and I have reason to believe that many of these speeches are characterised by fiction for illustrative purposes.

11.50 a.m.

With respect to the speech made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, I think, Sir, that we have got to appreciate when we are dealing with public administration and devising social policies generally, that there is often no ideal solutions to social problems and there are often multiple factors that you have got to reconcile and bear in mind.

There is no doubt, Sir, that there were a few approaches available to us as we addressed our minds to

this question to the middle-classes. We could have set a minimum wage which would have been incomparably higher than it is now all will be when this Bill is passed but at the same time it would have resulted in large numbers of that class being put out of work. Many of these are no longer qualified to get alternative employment because in so far as people are amazed nowadays they are for the most part over 40.

On the other hand, Sir, we sought to put the minimum wage at such a level as one could reasonably regard as the minimum level that would be acceptable in Barbados, bearing in mind that they are very important mitigating circumstances as it were, Sir, which would support us in so doing. It is, Sir, that a maid's relationship to her master does not end at service and compensation. It embraces more than that.

I would like to think, Sir — though I know it is not the norm — that most domestics are also members of households, with all of the emotional satisfaction that arises from being a member of a family — eating, receiving gifts from the family, eating with the family at the family's expense and so on. So in truth and in fact, even though the minimum wage may be \$66, some of the maids get comparatively more than that in so far as they receive clothes, they receive gifts, they go on vacation with some of the families — even vacations within the island, Sir — they are treated really as members of the household.

The fact that the class is a dying class is a reflection of the fact that this economy has been transformed over the last 20 years and many new opportunities have been created for persons who would normally have gone into the maid occupation over the last 20 years.

In addition, Sir, the size of families has been reduced. Most middle-class families now have two children as opposed to the norm of six when I was a boy. Many men have come to recognise that they have a responsibility in the household to help in a way they did not help 20 years ago, and as has been said by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — and perhaps it was the only non-fiction part of his submission, Sir, — household gadgets are now in widespread use in most middle class homes. That too has reduced the needs for maids in many of these households.

There is, Sir, as I said, no ideal solution but I believe that it is a significant step that we have taken on behalf of a very important class in this country. It is a dying class but the contribution which they have made to the development of a lot of people in this country who are today prominent citizens, Sir, cannot be overlooked. And this is not necessary the end of the matter because the Minister has given himself, Sir, the opportunity within the framework of the Bill to take certain further correc-

tive steps on behalf of this class if it appears to him, Sir, that there is any evidence of exploitation.

This is a significant step that has been taken. I am proud of the fact, Sir, that it has fallen to the Barbados Labour Party Administration again to address their minds to this class of persons in this country and indeed, Sir, the point has got to be made that this is a Party for all classes in this country. This is a Party for all the country, not part of the country and not the whole country. The record of legislation, Sir, in the last five years when we have been in office attest to that, Sir. The scope of our social economic policies, Sir, attest to that and as far as we are concerned, we have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of in this Party as far as our social legislation is concerned, Sir.

The Members on the other side, Sir — particularly the new Members — behave as though the Democratic Labour Party is a Party that was founded in 1981 or since the by-election in 1978. In truth and in fact, Sir, they cannot be separated from the performance of the Party between 1961 and today and I am hearing *sotto voce* that some of them are proud of it. Some people are proud of small achievements, Sir, and I am not surprised that some — not all of them — would shout that they are proud of it. But it is our duty, Sir, to point that in so far that this class or persons that we are dealing with is concerned, Sir, they have got absolutely nothing to point to and their policy has been one of neglect.

I do not think, Sir, that the opportunity could have been allowed to pass without our stating for the purposes of the record, Sir, that the Democratic Labour Party has nothing to be proud of in relation to domestics in this country and it was the proud responsibility of the Barbados Labour Party in 1961 to address themselves to the conditions of the domestic then and it has fallen to us again in 1982 to do likewise. And I have no doubt, Sir, that before we rest on this side and give the other side the opportunity to govern, Sir, that we will again be addressing our minds to the plight of the domestics in this country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not really want to prolong this debate very long but perhaps to bring a bit of a new perspective to some of the arguments which I heard in here today and in some respects — I really would not like to use the words hypocritical because it would be un-parliamentary — some of the opposing attitudes that have been taken by Members as they speak on this type of legislation and the sort of attitudes which unfortunately are creeping into the history of our country.

Although I understand quite well the historical reasons for some of the current ways of approaching discussions on subjects such as these and although I under-

stand quite well the political reasons why certain stances are being taken, I believe that there is lacking today in public affairs a certain candour and a certain candidness — if I may use both words — in discussing matters of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial, the greatest domestics — or the persons who have been recognised as domestics in the household — have been women — the wives or in-laws — the spouses — who carried out the duties which are the duties and areas applying to domestics.
12.00 noon.

Many of them were never rewarded adequately for them and indeed the system of law and the sociological attitudes of the dominant male class was such that on termination of the relationship women got nothing at all for these domestics chores which they perform. Now these domestic chores were never considered in themselves so long as they were performed by a woman in her capacity as a married woman or as a spouse to be degraded. And I want to make the point because I feel we must get our philosophical attitude right: it is absolute nonsense for people to get up in here and to pretend that to carry out the duties that are carried out in households by persons who may not be wives nor domestics happens to be sociologically and otherwise degrading and they want to see it disappear as a form of exercise. That is bunkum of the worst sort.

I want to make it quite clear, Sir, that if a largely dominant Parliament is going to talk about exploitation of people who carry out those duties, we should have seen long ago the reform of the Statute Law of Barbados dealing with the conditions of women who were in common law associations and who were married women and who carried out these duties for the men by and large without adequate compensation. The Barbados Labour Party did something about that in the Family Law Act although, in my view, there is still room for going even further in relation to it. That is the first point I want to make in this debate to get it back on the rail.

The second point I want to make, Sir, is a historical point. This very Act which commenced in July 1961, was used viciously against the Barbados Labour Party at the time to defeat the Government. One of the reasons for the defeat of the Government in 1961, was that the then Barbados Electors Association — subsequently known as the National Association — in conjunction with the Democratic Labour Party — campaigned the length and breadth in areas like Belleville and parts of my present constituency and said to the white people and the middle class that we were bringing terms and conditions of domestic service that was contrary to their own interest and they would have to pay them a lot of money and

they could no longer have domestics in those conditions. I recall very well and that is why I said we have to get back some candour in public life.

I am not saying that every member on the Democratic Labour Party today was then a member of the Party. I am not saying that. Far be it from me to say that. What I am saying is that political expediency demanded in those days that they kept silent and/or by their attitude represented the view of the National Association — the Electors Association — as the correct view which should have been put forward in those days.

I considered that hypocritical in political life and I would not like the history of this country to be ridden when it comes to social legislation. You know the Democratic Labour Party likes to refer to me as a conservative. I never understand that you can go around looking decent and speak properly and behave well and yet be a social democrat in the strong views that you hold and issues of this nature.

My own view is that wherever workers work and their conditions of employment are not satisfactory — regardless of whether they are members of the family or not — they are entitled to adequate compensation for their hours of work and proper living conditions. You can call them domestics, soil technicians, agricultural workers, whatever you like, I think those must be the underlying criteria which we use.

And further we have to look at a few other things too, because in such circumstances, there is not only one party, there are two parties. You must see that the persons for whom they are employed also get fair conditions by way of productivity, punctuality and performance up to a proper standard of the job. That is what should be our concern in this Honourable House and in this country, because if we do not hold that sensible balance, but continue to pretend there is only one type of attitude to be taken for political expediency to show in the 20th Century — everybody now has all of a sudden become a more than radical person losing the pragmatism balance that is necessary in public life — we will soon bring our own society down.

And I think the honourable Member for Christ Church East was right and so was the Hon. Minister. You have in the peculiar economic and employment conditions of Barbados to ensure that in approaching this problem, you do two things — fix a reasonable rate of remuneration, do not fix remuneration that will at the same time cause people who cannot afford it to run other people out of employment when we have not created other conditions for further employment for those persons losing their jobs, and try to

educate employers and employees in the true responsibility which they ought to have to one another. That is most important, Sir.

Even the conditions that honourable Members of Parliament themselves as servants of the people operate under sometimes leave a lot to be desired in the terms either of the surroundings under which they work or, Mr. Speaker, with respect even to their remuneration sometimes. On that too, we have a lot of hypocrisy. The State in relation to the domestic — if I may merely use it as an analogy and an illustration and not to stray from the debate — all the honourable Members of this Honourable House who are other than Cabinet members drawing salaries and allowances are allowed to work otherwise in their profession or their employment and are better paid than Cabinet members although the Cabinet members carry the primary responsibility for running the affairs of the country. That is the sort of test that we have to look at and you will hear a lot of hypocrisy on the terms and conditions of how they ought to be remunerated, Mr. Speaker.

Building up on the matter — because I have a different approach on these issues in so far as they may be a legacy coming down from the days where workers were ruthlessly exploited in this country — and in many other countries — and in so far as terms may have had adverse sociological implications then — we must look for a way of avoiding those adverse sociological implications. But I do not believe that we are going to solve the problems of Barbados by merely getting up in here and trying to fool people outside that we are really so much on their side — in particular that we pose rather than be realistic — and I think the time has come when it should stop, Mr. Speaker, and every speech I intend to make I will try to bring a little bit of realism into it.

12.10 p.m.

Let me go outside the domestics in the house, because similar domestic chores are performed by persons working in hotels. They are still doing the same duties, so there is nothing wrong with the chores. Similar domestic chores are performed by people who call themselves air hostesses, because most of the time they are really only being domestic in serving up meals on an airline and cleaning up things. Similar domestic chores are performed by nurses. Let us face up to the fact. So it is nonsense to say that you want the word “domestics” out, that there is no room in the society for them. I began by saying that they perform in our own households by our own families and by our own staff.

What we need to change are the attitudes of people to people — the human relationships. We need to change these areas. Some of the human relationships still continue to be wrong. But, Mr. Speaker, some of the worse offenders as well are not the former plantocracy nowadays — some of them have adjusted — it is *nouveau*

riche -- the recently poor -- as my friend, the honourable Member for Bridgetown had said -- the new middle class. They too need being educated properly and correctly.

I have known of messengers and a gardener being sacked because of their so called love for the Barbados Labour Party by members of the Democratic Labour Party, being fired in conditions that would have been considered unfair dismissal merely because you work with a person and you do not politically support them.

I do not ask anybody who work with me whether they support the DLP or the BLP. As a matter of fact, I have some of the strongest supporters of the Democratic Labour Party in my constituency. It is your attitude to the people that counts, otherwise I could not maintain such a large majority. It is the attitude, it is how you treat people.

There are some people who walk the streets and see people that live near to them or next to them -- whom they have known from their school days -- and they would not speak to them; and yet I have heard them characterise me as a snob. I heard that on the political platform from the other side before I was in this House. They have accused me of most things.

When it comes to dealing with people, you treat them as other human beings. My only regret in relation to people who carry out the chores associated with being domestics or maids, or whatever you call them, is that we believe that because they carry out those chores -- just as we believe that people who carry out the chores of cleaning the streets -- who were formerly called scavengers and now are called technicians or something -- that they too are not men and women as we are.

We must start a campaign of education along those lines rather than pretend that there is something basically wrong in honest work carried out by people under fair and proper conditions. The Labour Party should be congratulated once again for having the courage of the founders of this great party in social legislation that would better the conditions of the underprivileged and the underdog. The party's history from 1937 to date has been an outstanding one of standing up for the underdog. We have done it in conditions that nowadays -- because the old stalwarts like Sir Grantley and Sir Hugh Springer -- others may have passed on -- they believe that those of us over here -- some of their sons, relatives and associates -- have not got the same consciences, the same philosophy and the same perspectives, but we do have them -- never mind we do not have to wear shirt jacs to pretend that we are social democrats.

That is another foolishness that you see. People believe that if they wear shirt jacs and come in here that they are more radical than other people and that they are

more on behalf of the domestics than other people. People believe so, Sir. The pretence and the hypocrisy of public life today is that all that matters is an impression rather than substantial considerations of fighting for things that should be better. If you wear a shirt jac, then of course you are a social democrat; if you wear a suit you are an imperialist and a colonialist and you are not in favour with the working class.

I have heard all of that sort of mumbo jumbo nonsense creep into the policies and the attitudes in Barbados in the 1970s and the 1980s. Let us become realistic, let us look at substance and forget form, and get down to the true problems of the country rather than the pretence and talk that I am hearing from some of my political associates in both political parties these days, Sir.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am deeply indebted to honourable Members on this side who have so eloquently placed in proper perspective, the conditions surrounding the emergence of the first Bill on domestics passed in Barbados and the first amendment to that original Bill passed in Barbados -- both under the leadership of the Barbados Labour Party.

It has always been a source of great surprise to me to see how men can so eloquently articulate positions in which they have absolutely no sense of feeling and to which they bring no sincerity at all, because it will continue to mystify me how it is possible for a former Minister of the Cabinet who presided over the portfolio of Labour for almost 15 years and did nothing about the plight of domestics, can come into the Chamber today and articulate a position that seeks to call into question the attempt which we have made today to rectify a problem that in our minds needs addressing.

I can understand the questions raised by the Member for St. Michael South -- a distinguished gentleman -- a Barbados Scholar -- a man who believes in the elegant use of language -- being a little bit upset by the fact that we are continuing to call those persons who perform those household duties domestics. He says we ought to call them a different name, and reminds me that he is representative for that fair electorate called Bayville, but his constituents continue to make him the inglorious representative of the Bay Land.

No matter how much he might think he might like to represent Bayville, he is destined for evermore to represent the Bay Land. No matter how long we cry that Penny Hole is a very poor name to describe a fair village in the eastern part of this island, people say for evermore it shall be called Penny Hole. A name does not mean a great deal. It is the attitude that we bring to that nomenclature.

12.20 p.m.

Speaking on the subject of domestics, I am reminded by the illustrious gentleman who sits on my right hand — distinguished historian that he is — that it was Anne Boleyn who served in the Court of Henry VIII and rose from a position of maid to the distinguished and eminent position of Queen of the United Kingdom. They tell me that she rose to occupy the position of Queen of the Realm which goes to show that the name or the chores themselves do not limit the heights to which one might reasonably aspire.

Sir, I do not think we need to prolong this debate. I believe that the honourable Member for Christ Church West has made a very useful speech in his normal brilliant style, and he has catalogued the history of the Barbados Labour Party with respect to this type of social legislation. And in spite of the fact that we were forced to spend 15 years in the wilderness as a consequence of our social conscience, we will not be suppressed. Today again we come back to the subject and we are carrying on in that noble tradition which we feel we have always been noted for, bearing in mind that the social emancipation which this country now enjoys has been the result of the deep concern of the Barbados Labour Party.

It was this party that broke the back of conservatism; it was this party that strangled the kinds of attitudes that kept our people down for centuries in this country. We said then in times when it was extremely dangerous so to say, down with oppression and give the Barbadian masses, oppressed for so many years, an opportunity to bask in the sunshine of social and economic emancipation, and today, Sir, we continue in that tradition.

I do not believe that we need to spend much time with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central although he did make a useful point in his discussion this morning. He referred to domestic employees as a category of worker who might be described as representing part of the productive sector of this country. We have a situation in Barbados which has been perpetuated by politicians — mainly because I believe that as a class they find it extremely difficult sometimes to be objective on a number of matters for political expediency — where workers are made to feel less than adequate if they had not had the opportunity to be counted among those who have been able to prepare themselves for what in our minds are lofty jobs, so we tell domestic servants that the chores they perform are menial.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West has just put it in excellent perspective for us: the wives of all of us in this Chamber at some point in time — and perhaps even now on a full time basis — perform these chores.

It is a condition of affluence when you can afford to have your wife home working doing the washing of

clothes, cooking and cleaning up. When our wives perform these domestic chores, we have no difficulty going home every evening and asking for dinner, asking where is my blue suit or my blue shirt, but those same politicians who go home and look to their wives for these chores can come into this Honourable Chamber and say that people who do it for a living are performing a menial function. It is something that I have not been able to deal with. I cannot comprehend it and therefore, Sir, I would like to admonish that far from creating problems in the minds of people about the work they do we ought to try — as we are trying now with this Bill — to pay people an adequate wage for those functions which have to be performed by somebody in the society, and which I have just demonstrated are performed by people particularly dear to some of us.

I began to hear — although the Chair did not entertain it — the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central refer to another group of workers. (*Asides.*) I am not saying it. I am just referring to the fact that he was stopped from saying that another category of worker was performing menial tasks.

That Sir, will continue to be a problem in Barbados as long as you tell people that the jobs which they are prepared intellectually, psychologically and otherwise to perform, are menial. Let people earn their honest living at things which they are capable of doing. All we need to do is to invest that labour with dignity. Let us invest their labour with dignity and let us compensate them adequately, but do not tell people that because they are not lawyers or doctors they are performing menial functions in this society. It is a disservice to our society because we do not at the same time tell these people what we feel they ought to be doing.

A domestic servant who has gone to the Housecraft Centre and learnt what I believe they call "Homemaking" is performing in a highly skilled exercise. When she goes and prepares herself to do that work, do we have any business to tell her that that is not the kind of work she should be doing even though she brings a level of skill to that particular function? It is unfair to her and it is unfair to this society, and all you need to do is to pay her what she can live on and what that skill is worthy of. We will continue to do that and that is one of the reasons the Bill is framed in the way it is, because it will give the Minister of Labour an opportunity to review on a periodic basis both the wages and the hours in which those functions are performed and by Order make adjustments as adjustments are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in some way the honourable Member for St. Michael West made an attempt to deal with that very topic I have just moved off and I was beginning to say that he was making an excellent speech — perhaps one of the better speeches in this Chamber —

until he succumbed to the temptation to drift off on to a lower plane. He would have made a very excellent and very worthwhile contribution to this debate if he had kept to that level. He postulated "is the work being done honest work?" That was postulate No. 1, and postulate No. 2 was "are the wages being paid adequately?" I had hoped that I was going to be treated to a fine and well-reasoned debate on his part until he began to drift into a point where he allowed himself to be heard saying "set the wages at a level and those who cannot pay, let them do without."

12.30 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, I believe that when the honourable Member captured the first half of the statement, he did not pick up the nuances which the statement was expanding. I did say that, that is correct. But I also said that I agreed with the setting of the wages by the hour because the concept of wholesale disbanding of all people who are now working would not occur if the wages were set by the hour. All that would happen would be the number of hours which the people work would probably be reduced in some cases but that the people would be getting the same wages that they are being paid now even though they might work a shorter time.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I am grateful to the honourable Member for clarifying what would have appeared to be a misunderstanding on my part and I had put down here the question of the course of maximum utility as my response to him. By realising that as a Minister — not only a Minister of Labour but as anybody — if you are a doctor, if you are a lawyer, or if you are an economist — you have to chart a course of maximum utility — when a particular function or a particular service calls for a level of compensation that is beyond what is reasonable in the circumstances, that function ceases to perform because people would no longer demand it. (*Asides*). Maximum utility — you do not like it?

Sir, I would like to say that the dilemma that we had was to find a level of wage for today that would allow us to adequately pay attention to the fact that people do need to be properly compensated for a certain job but at the same time recognising that a large number of the people who are now employed in these jobs are employed by people who are not going to be in a position to pay a great deal more in the present circumstances. Rather than putting people out of work wholesale, we felt we would try to find a line of "best fit" and fit a wage that would meet both contingencies.

Sir, I would like to say again that it is an indication of the social consciousness of this political party to which I have the great honour to belong, that it has again, in 1982 — almost 20 years from the first attempt that was

laid — returned to the subject of the domestic worker in this island and it seems to me, Sir, that domestic servants will continue to be the concern of the Barbados Labour Party and we will continue therefore — regardless of how people may categorise our concern — to move in the forefront to make certain that the workers of Barbados — regardless of what level they occupy — are properly looked after.

With those remarks, Sir, I would now move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, 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 separate motions of Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY LOANS GUARANTEE ACT, 1982

Item No. 8 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to regulate the participation by the Government of Barbados in projects of the Caribbean Community either jointly with other member states or severally, and also to regulate the giving of guarantees, with the approval of Parliament, for the repayment of loans for the financing of the development of the projects.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: At the fifth Meeting of the Standing Committee of Ministers of Caricom responsible for our finances, it was discovered that many of the Caricom territories lacked statutory authority for entering into joint enterprises if these enterprises involved guarantees of loan agreements.

12.40 p.m.

It was therefore agreed as a CARICOM measure that the Parliaments of the region should all pass legislation giving Governments power and several guarantees — make

available direct loans, purchase shares and reason out enterprises and so on — as part of joint ventures between CARICOM states. This Bill represents that Agreement, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and if honourable Members studied the Bill, they will see it relates to loan guarantees. It is limited to guarantees of \$50 million and the jurisdiction of the Honourable House of Assembly over any given guarantee is carefully preserved in Section 3(1). It is a very simple matter, Sir. It corresponds really to public loans in respect of non-domestic loans made within CARICOM and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill introduced by the Rt. Hon. Minister responsible for Finance is in itself a fairly straightforward measure and it would be difficult for the members of the political party that participated in the creation of — and the development of — the Caribbean Community to disagree in principle with the Objects and Reasons given for this Bill.

It envisages that guarantees would be given by the state members of the Caribbean Community and as long as it was a CARICOM measure, it would require approval by this Honourable Chamber. It however, Sir, accords this Honourable House an opportunity to examine in some detail some of the projects which may occasion the necessity for the guarantee referred to here.

Very recently — after some considerable anticipation — the President of the United States announced what has been described as the Caribbean Basin Plan. That plan, Sir, as I understand it envisaged that the Caribbean Community would be participating in projects either jointly — or to use this word very loosely, Sir, given the statement made by the honourable gentleman — severally in arrangements for their own benefits and towards development. Mr. Speaker, no plan in recent times had been anticipated by so many with such fervour and received by the same many with such disappointment. Mr. Speaker, so far as Barbados is concerned, our perception of what has been stated so far is that nothing really has been offered to Barbados.

I shall state at the outset that what is proffered as assistance to this country in 1982 is less than what was given by the European Economic Community to the Caribbean Community in 1975. Mr. Speaker, you will recall, Sir, that after some considerable negotiations, the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries and the European Economic Countries signed what has come to be called Lome 1, the Treaty of Lome. It is a treaty that was concerned primarily with trade cooperation and with economic development. It envisaged, Mr. Speaker, that they would be joint projects that would require the

approval of the Caribbean Community jointly, severally, and it was a monument. It was hailed as a monument to the wisdom of the Caribbean people and the Caribbean leaders that such a treaty became possible.

Mr. Speaker, Chapter 1 of the Treaty, the Convention of Lome, in the very first article under trade arrangements states, "Products originating in the ACP States shall be imported into the Community", (meaning the EEC) "Free of Customs Duties and charges having equivalent effect." Those are the opening words. In other words, Sir, in 1975 the European Economic Community agreed by solemn treaty to give free access to the products of the Caribbean Community to the EEC. Of course the European had a caveat. Their conditions did not include certain products as described by them and for example, rum — one of the products which Barbadians would wish to have sold in the European Economic Community — has had extreme difficulty finding its way within the description of rum given by the Europeans arising out of that treaty.

But Sir, the concept of free access to the Community was spelt out in the Lome Treaty. The CBI — now the CBP — the Caribbean Basin Plan as announced informs that they will give free access to the United States market, and Mr. Speaker, under the Generalised System of Preferences — which was negotiated through the Group of 77 in the United Nations — which forms the basis of trade between the developing world and the developed world — now fully 87 percent — and this was acknowledged — fully 87 percent of all items which we could have in Barbados have been allowed free access into the United States market.

12.50 p.m.

What we are talking about when we hear that there has been free access announced, Mr. Speaker, is 13 per cent of all the items we can possibly produce. It is my contention — and the contention of this side — that that 13 per cent is hardly being produced in Barbados, and of that 13 per cent, the only two products which are of considerable importance to us have been excluded for want of further discussion — sugar, Sir, and rum.

Only a few weeks before the announcement of the Caribbean Basin Plan the United States Congress passed a law which increased the tariff on sugar from Barbados, and it is a fact that for in excess of 25 years Barbados has been unable to get rum into the United States on *most favoured nation* or even reasonable terms when one examines the tariff. We have been unable to compete with Puerto Rico where, although a duty is collected at the border in the United States, all of the monies so collected are returned to that territory for that territory's development.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975 the European Economic Community agreed that there would be no quantitative restrictions against Caribbean Community goods of any kind under Article III of Chapter 1 of the Treaty of Lome. When we look at what has been offered in the Caribbean Basin Plan we find that the question of quantitative restrictions has not been alluded to, and we note that textiles which had formed the basis of the modest industrial effort we have been making in this country during the last 20 years, we find that textiles have been excluded from consideration by those whose business it was to put together the Caribbean Basin Plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the reason why we as a country can be so regarded by the United States is for example, that they are able to include in a plan for this region a concept of bilateral relationships when more than two decades ago the people of the developing world were fighting against bilateral arrangements because they believed that the stranglehold which the metropolitan countries would put on the satellite countries surrounding them through bilateral arrangements was unacceptable to developing countries, thus through the United Nations such institutions as the Caribbean Development Bank was born — where as a regional institution, it would not be subject to the kind of pressures which are the norm in terms of bilateral negotiations and relationships.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member will give way, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 2 o'clock today.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

When the Sitting was suspended the honourable Member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair. He may continue if he so desires.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am obliged to Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, when we had the Suspension, I was in the process — in relation to the Bill before this Honourable Chamber — of drawing Your Honour's attention to the provisions which may lead to the necessity for use of this legislation and for this legislation to achieve its objective, and I was laying the background for the cir-

cumstances under which this Chamber will again be called upon to pronounce on the measures which will flow out of this Bill.

I had made the point, Sir — and I say it briefly again — that the Caribbean Basin Plan which is deemed to be concerned with providing from our neighbour in the north — or should I say our neighbours in the north — a form of technical, financial and other assistance which should redound to the credit of the Caribbean Community and other states, and I was focussing more particularly on the position in which Barbados finds itself within the Caribbean Community in relation to the offers of assistance or the plans for assistance of the United States Government.

It is well known, Sir, that developing countries who emerged as independent countries mostly during the late 1950s and 1960s have to depend to a large extent on the attitude of the developed countries around the world for a measure of assistance in their development efforts and on the pre-disposition or disposition of those countries to assist in the development of the so-called developing countries. Mr. Speaker, I was making the point as we came to the end of that session, that the question of bilateral arrangements had been canvassed for some considerable time during the past two decades, and that it appeared to us who pay keen attention to these matters, that that battle had been won or at least the possibility of winning that battle appeared on the horizon.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the immediate post colonial days — if it can ever be said that there are post colonial days — the developing countries found themselves in a position where the metropolitan countries that had either been their masters politically, or had been the hub around which activity occurred in their respective geographical areas, had brought a carrot and stick concept to relationship between the two sets of countries. In the case of the European metropolitan developed countries, they continued for some time in a posture of what has been described as neo-colonialism where under the pretext of offering technical and other aid they demanded of the newly emergent developing countries — the newly independent countries — a certain allegiance which while it could not and did not often take the form of a specific statement, one saw it by way of the attitude in the arrangements made between those developed countries and the developing countries.

It has been extremely difficult for developing countries to make their way in a world over which they have and they have had hardly any decision-making power. Developing countries have had to watch as the super powers play out their very strange games which are nurtured in the very foreign offices of those financial and economic giants. Developing countries whether they

were in eastern parts of the world or the western parts of the world have had to be dependent on largesse in some cases, and in other cases they have had to be dependent on a willingness to pay their new-found political power for economic gain.

Mr. Speaker, during the two decades before the Eighties, the developing countries were able to use their numbers in the international forums in putting their cases before the court of international opinion, they had been able to force many of the developed countries to take a position of assistance through multilateral institutions. Countries such as Sweden and Canada — countries which I choose to call the middle countries — all agree that either one was giving a developing country assistance and that that assistance ought to be untied — that assistance ought to be without strings — or one was not giving those countries such assistance.

To put it in another way, Mr. Speaker, developing countries had come to believe that they could anticipate a steady growth into a position of integrity as envisaged for independent countries. Thus we had in the United Nations, a thrust for the establishment of economic commissions that were regionally based, of economic development institutions that were regionally based, and that would as a result of their multilateral nature be free of most of the pressures which the metropolitan countries used to place and could place on the developing countries. Mr. Speaker, it did not in itself eliminate bilateralism — it could not eliminate bilateralism.

If one looked at the number of countries which still require their attraction for capital far from their own physical surroundings, one could still see the hand of bilateralism playing a role in the international affairs of the world community. But that notwithstanding, they could bask in the belief that the multilateralism which had started in the Sixties would grow into something more substantial by the Eighties and certainly into the 21st Century.

It therefore must come as a disappointment to right thinking people — serious-minded people in international affairs — that in the finally outlined Basin programme, we find an element of the need for bi-lateral negotiations of each of the countries in the Caribbean with the United States, and presumably the United States would be speaking for the other three countries which according to the statement of the United States President, form the donor group of the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

Now the statements which we have had in this Honourable Chamber so far from the Hon. Ministers responsible in their various ways for the economic development of this country, have tended to suggest that the initiative was going to be culminated through a collective effort on the part of donor countries — that is to say,

Venezuela, Canada, the United States and Mexico meeting over a table and discussing with the countries to the south including the Caribbean Community. 2.10 p.m.

One understands that in a substantial paper prepared by the Caribbean Community Secretariat or some such agency we had sought to put in perspective the collective views of the countries in the Caribbean Community, Mr. Speaker, when the Caribbean Community came into existence, among the majority of reasons given for the movement to a wider and deeper integration of Caribbean countries was the strong belief that as a community — that collectively — we would be able to bring a stronger voice to bear on our relationship with our neighbours to the North as well as to the European community.

In those days, Sir, there was every reason to believe that when States like the United States felt constrained to notice the region, they would at least notice the region as a region. I make bold to say that the negotiations between the ACP countries and the European countries were held together largely because of this singular effect on the part of the Caribbean Community. The representatives from the Caribbean were able, through their own spirit of community, to transform the loose group of states that subsequently came to make up the ACP States to transform that loose group of States into a cohesive unit, a union which the EEC Council of Ministers found quite formable in terms of negotiations.

That was possible, as I said, because of the Caribbean Community spirit and that Caribbean Community spirit was engendered because the leaders of that time considered it necessary and desirable to face each other from time to time in the same room. That is to say, there was as required under the Caribbean Community Treaty regular — by their standard — meetings of the Heads of Caribbean Community states.

It is not my business to seek to ascribe blame to any Head of State or Head of Government in the Caribbean as to why we have not had a Heads of Government Conference but it is my view, Sir, that from 1975 to 1982 is much too long a hiatus where the high contracting parties of a solemn treaty require that that treaty be fulfilled through the regular meeting of the highest organ of the community — the Heads of Government Conference. The failure to have a Heads of Government Conference, has resulted in my view, in the belief in some areas such as in the State Department at Washington, that the Caribbean States are here to be picked off one by one and that the whole concept of the divide and rule would be available for use in this region during the 1980s and beyond.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make bold to say that we on this side hold no particular beef for any particular Head

of State in any particular Caribbean country. Our first and primary concern is in battling for the people of Barbados and to this extent we reserve the right to criticise the Head of Government of the Barbados Government fully, completely, and regularly. We believe that it is our duty to see that for the time being, when they are entrusted with the responsibility of decision making for this country, that they do such decision making as efficaciously as possible.

We can however, as responsible political people, take note of the fact that a particular Head of State has been singled out for praise in a region where jealousies at that level are not unknown in the decision making for the whole region. It seems passing strange, Sir, that in a community of some 11 or 12 entities, that a country which is a Member of the United Nations and which therefore understands the principle of non-interference into the domestic affairs of other member countries, would choose to single out a single Head of Government for gratuitous praise.

Mr. Speaker, one of the tenets of the United Nation's Charter is that each country is entitled to pursue the path or course of development as chosen by that country. We in Barbados can look with horror at some of the atrocities which occur in countries which are not unknown as democratic countries. We can look with horror at the strangulation in some other countries which have put forward themselves as champions of the democratic cause, but, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis we are concerned as a West Indian people with what happens in the West Indies — primarily with the future of our brothers and sisters in the West Indies. And it is for that reason that we put ourselves to the trouble some time ago of trying to form a closer economic link with a hope expressed already in this Honourable Chamber — that those who follow us would be able to march on to the greater goal of a West Indian Nation.

It bodes us no good when anyone — be he friend or foe — chooses to use economic might, political power or any other device to seek to divide us West Indian people. We must have our quarrels as families are entitled to have. If in the end we disagree, we are entitled to disagree, but I do not believe that it is the business of anyone to seek to cause us to disagree as a West Indian Nation.

I say to the honourable Member for St. Thomas — the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister — that he has a responsibility as the Head of the Government of this country to resist as strenuously as he is able, any attempt on the part of any Head of Government, or any Head of State anywhere, to interfere into the domestic affairs first of Barbados, and secondly of the Caribbean region. And he has a further responsibility in that regard, in

my view, Sir, to seek to have a Heads of Government of the member states of the Caribbean Community sitting down in the same room that those who it is considered are going in the wrong direction can be told so directly to their faces by those who are their colleagues in every true sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have had the privilege of observing a Heads of Government Conference in progress in the Caribbean, it is a rare exercise in unity when we see Heads of Government and their advisers and Ministers who come into a room with a point of view that was purportedly rigorously held who after discussion and consideration bludgeoning and negotiation, comradery changed that view sufficiently slightly so that that view becomes acceptable to all of the other colleagues. 2.20 p.m.

I well remember, Sir, the question of the so-called Part IV countries — that is to say the non independent countries in the Caribbean — the then CARIFTA Caribbean Community. The non independent countries whose only access to the EEC would have been via Part IV of the then convention that governs EEC relations were faced with the possibility of the British Government threatening them that if they did not come in as "Part IV countries" they would have no access to the EEC. Then again, Sir, they were told that if they persisted in trying to stay with the four then independent countries they would be catching at the shadow and they would lose the bone. Because of the tenacity of the people in the then Caribbean Community Secretariat — and the political will perhaps — I should say the political goodwill of the persons representing the various countries at that time — after some considerable negotiation *intra* Caribbean, the Part IV countries were able to see the light and to recognise that what the British purported to offer them was nothing more than the proverbial, "wolf in sheep's clothing".

Mr. Speaker, I think history has confirmed that those countries were right and to the extent that there is benefit or has been benefit from the ACP — EEC countries' arrangements, those countries have benefitted more or less equally even as they have achieved their independence because we were able to point out to them that that particular exercise was a clear demonstration of the necessity for them to proceed to independence as a matter of urgency.

Now, Sir, only a very few, a small few of the country members of the Caribbean Community remain to become independent. What will happen with Montserrat is a question which will exercise the minds of a number of scholars and no doubt will exercise the minds of the people in Montserrat. I have no doubt that St. Kitts-Nevis will proceed to independence within the next few months. What

happens to Anguilla as much as we as thinkers in the region might have our doubts about the sensibleness — if you would pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker — much as we may have doubts about their position, the fact is that whatever happens to them they have been able to self determine what they wish to happen to them because in the end, Sir, independence is self determination.

So we believe that by forging that relationship and by having that spirit of unity which was evident during the time of the coming of the Caribbean Community and the negotiations of the ACP — EEC and those — if I may say so — interesting times when the West Indian nation was marching forward, we believe it is because of this that those other territories which are now independent could move on as quickly and with as much goodwill as we have come to see.

Mr. Speaker, I go further. Although from time to time in debates in this Honourable Chamber — and in the public debate which must go on in a democratic country — there is bitter division between the two sides in this Honourable Chamber, one of the things which has continued to be constant is the pride which all of us can take in the performance of Barbados as an independent country in the international forum of this world, and Sir, the position Barbados has always taken — and as I have reason to hope will continue to take in any meeting of Caribbean countries inside the Caribbean or outside the Caribbean — is that we must function as a region. We must try at all cost to put a united position, a Caribbean Community position.

“Lo and behold”, Sir, the President of the United States announcing what was supposed to be a momentous conglomeration of the thoughts of the people of the United States who matter towards the Caribbean insisting that there be bilateral negotiations so that each state in the Caribbean will have to face the United States itself in a negotiation to determine what it will and will not get. And, by that device, Sir, he was able to single out a member of the Caribbean Community and say that that member will get the stick while the members of the west, for example, will get the carrot. The carrot and stick diplomacy endemic in this region for practically all of its existence is a thing which has to be condemned — no matter what ones ideological position may be. From as far back as that agreement, it was expected, anticipated and assumed in the corridors of power in the United States that this region rightly fell within its sphere of influence and despite the fact that historians from time to time proceed to indicate that there is a sphere of inputs theory of development in this region, we still hear it adumbrated in a speech of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, let us look now, Sir, in a little more detail at the technical and financial arrangement. It has been trumpeted and unfortunately we do not have a

sufficient number of well trained, knowledgeable analysts in the Caribbean writing or commenting in the public media. We have a few, Sir, but we do not have a large enough number. I give you an example.

Mr. Speaker, I was mortified to read in the newspaper that one of the plaudits, one of the kudos for the President of the United States is that he did not read his speech. Mr. Speaker, any honourable Member in here who has passed through the United States could tell any journalist or any editor who allowed that to be printed in the newspaper that the teleprompter has been in existence for well nigh over 25 years, in one form or another. The teleprompter is a very interesting device which fortunately so far has been kept out of Barbados — but kept out is not desirable necessarily, because the teleprompter allows people to say what they wish to say as opposed to making foolish errors and having to have their advisors hold further Press Conferences to explain what they ought to have said. So the lack of knowledge that teleprompters exist is the level at which some of the commentators operate in this region.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that because of the lack of analysis of these matters in this region and more particularly in this country, a lot of misinformation is spread abroad and that itself becomes, the tenet, that misinformation becomes the norm.
2.30 p.m.

For example, it has been said that there will be an upsurge in industrial activity in Barbados, that there will be suddenly a change in the industrial fortunes of Barbados. Mr. Speaker, as one who has spent a substantial amount of time searching in the North American market for those companies which feel able to put their money in a place like Barbados, I can say — and I believe the honourable Member for Christ Church East will confirm — that for every company that locates in Barbados that less than 50 companies would have been canvassed or dealt with or spoken to, and indeed that might be a very high average.

In the early days, I recall I spoke to 69 companies before the first one deigned to come and see what Barbados was like. Some people being led by a facile turn of phrase into believing that industrial development is a mere case of the White House directing some company to locate in country A, country B or country C. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing farther than the truth.

I go further. When I hear some of my colleagues in the business world saying that they are going to spur their other colleagues to greater effort to produce so we can catch the U.S. market, Mr. Speaker, I shake my head with a certain amount of sadness knowing fully that their intentions are extremely good but their capacity and capability are almost non-existent.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what we in the Caribbean need — and more particularly what we need in Barbados — is the kind of assistance which will allow our own manufacturers to be able to produce maximally, to be able to produce at the highest possible quality, to be able to understand the very fundamental principles of marketing — whether it is marketing in the domestic CARICOM market or marketing in the international market — in such a way that their quality and their capacity to move forward would have been so established that the question as to which market they are going to sell in would be secondary.

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter how many markets are open to you. If the quality of the product you are selling is not up to the required international standards or if the capacity to produce and meet the required orders is not there, it does not matter how many markets are open to you, so it is a fallacy for us to be told — and it is a sin for us to accept — that the markets have been thrown open and therefore prosperity will reign.

As I have said, no markets have been thrown open. What has been done so far, Mr. Speaker, is that we have been given to understand that the shackles which might have been put on people in terms of their psychological approach to investing in the Caribbean could be lifted if we behave ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, another point. It would be impossible for any manufacturers in Barbados to produce if the money market in which they have to find the wherewithal to get their raw material is such that they are incapable of existing within it. If the United States wished to be of great assistance to Barbados, then the United States through its policies — either through the Federal Reserve or through the policies of the President himself — will seek to reduce the interest rates so that money will be available once again for use by those whose business it is to produce.

I am not stating that the United States interest rates will have to be lowered for the Barbados interest rates to be lowered, but we have a very strange psychological approach to development and Government, especially on the part of the Government of Barbados today. Whatever happens in the United States, it seems as if they feel that they must follow what goes on there.

The interest rates in Barbados are so high, and the price of money is so high that many of the manufacturers in spite of statements to the contrary find themselves unable to move their raw material out of the Port, thereby increasing the cost of that raw material and thereby adding to the inflationary spiral, and thereby adding to the recessionary conditions which seem never ending as far as the eye can see. What use is it, Mr. Speaker, to have markets if you have nothing to send to them because you

do not have the money to buy the raw material to produce? Another fallacy, Sir. As the honourable Member is reminding me, even if they could get the money to buy the raw material, the situation in the country is so bad that people would not be able to purchase the finished product anyhow.

So we see, Mr. Speaker, to use the new term of running when the sun is hot, what we see, Sir, is that the rain is falling, the snows are tumbling down, the sky is cloudy, but what we have is electric light being turned on in a room and somebody is saying the sun is shining — what you hear out there is not rain, the sun is shining. That is really what the CBP, as I now call it, appears to be doing. To use the honourable Member's concept of the sun, it appears to me that in a snow storm people are being told that the sun is really shining — it is just that some snow is intervening between the sunlight and you.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have put the position on the CBI in the context of this Bill, but there is one other aspect which really needs to be explored. Some \$375 million has been put forward as the sum that will be added to another \$400 million, roughly \$700 million plus, for the Caribbean basin countries, including those whose ideology do not fit the master's direction.

Some of us in this country heard recently of a debate over the AWACS. The price of an AWAC as reported in the New York Times is far in excess of the amount of aid which is promised if that aid is given every year for 15 years. Mr. Speaker, we recently had a demonstration here of some aeroplanes. I think those were the ones which MONALI complained about — I think they were F.14s — but one of those planes I believe, costs more than the total package offered for the Caribbean basin countries as their spur to development by our friendly neighbour to the north.

It is the right of any country to determine what it does with its own money, and as was the policy of the Democratic Labour Party, we tried when we were responsible for the Government to run our affairs with whatever resources we could get. It would be wrong for me to stand here in my place and suggest that the United States ought to give us more money. What I am saying, however, is that when they offer us \$375 million for the region, plus \$400 million, they ought not to seek to suggest that that sum is going to make a tremendous amount of difference in the lives of the people of this region especially when it is well known that a substantial part of that amount has been earmarked for military expenditure in two countries or so.

2.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to the people of this country to tell them like it is. We cannot necessarily be unfriendly merely by telling the truth, and it

is wrong for the friends of Barbados, the United States, Canada, Venezuela or Mexico to allow people of the Caribbean who after all are not steeped in the intricacies of these various things, to believe that a Daniel has come to judgment, that manna is going to start flowing from Heaven, that as they walk the streets of the Caribbean something new and different is going to happen.

The Alliance for Progress twenty years ago, was President Kennedy's answer to the plaintive cry of those in the Caribbean for some notice from the people in the State Department. The Alliance for Progress was directed primarily at the Latin-speaking countries. Now we have the CBI and that too has been directed at the Latin-speaking countries. The English-speaking Caribbean countries have managed their affairs so well according to them that they have reached the point where they do not really need assistance.

Mr. Speaker, you and I as representatives of the people know that that is not true. We know that we have a long way to go in this country towards bringing all or a substantial part of the people of this country to a level of living which we all anticipate for them or which we should anticipate for them. Recently in the United States a group of Roman Catholic Bishops who are deemed to have a tremendous amount of influence in the Latin-American region have called on the President of the United States to change his policy in El Salvador. They have called on the President of the United States to recognise that the people in El Salvador ought to be left to determine for themselves in their own way what their destiny is or should be.

From my understanding of the information coming out of the United States, these are not merely three or four Catholic Bishops. This is the largest and strongest lobby of Catholic thought in the United States, and it is spearheading a group made up of not only Liberals US style, but other thinking persons who are concerned that the Caribbean region or the Caribbean basin region will not become through the ineptitude of any officials — another Vietnam.

I myself will not take the opportunity of this Bill to discuss matters relating to defence and security because we on this side have a spokesman who will be better able to put our position from his vantage point, but I would say that we in the Caribbean have to pay attention to these matters. When we ourselves develop a small defence force and when our small defence force begins to feel that it forms part of the community defence force, and when the United States Generals begin to believe that defence of their region requires some input from us and therefore our primitive weaponry is to be replaced by their not so primitive weapons, we begin on a treadmill that leads us nowhere but to destruction.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Caribbean Basin Plan and the Caribbean Basin Initiative pays little attention to the human condition of the people in this region than it does to the security of the United States, and well it might, better after all it is the US Caribbean Basin Plan. What we must have is a Caribbean Community Plan.

This Bill which comes before this Honourable House seeks to give authority for us to participate in ventures with the Caribbean. I am saying that they have their plan; that is their privilege. We must through our efforts have our own plan. We had a plan which could only be the first plan.

When the honourable Members on that side were seeking to take over the reins of Government, they indicated that they found things wrong with the Caribbean Community Treaty and promised that they would do all in their power to correct those areas. We have looked forward with some interest to those changes, whatever they may have been. We cannot say they have not been done, Sir. What we can say is that we have seen no evidence of it. But I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for us to put the Caribbean Movement into a higher gear. If we are going uphill, let us change gear, let us find out what has to be done with the Caribbean Community.

We employed some 12, I believe, wise men and we asked them to examine the Caribbean Community with a view to recommending improvements. Mr. Speaker, as a Caribbean man myself, I would not attempt to speak on that because it is my understanding that the Council of Ministers would be meeting in Belize shortly and that when they meet in Belize shortly, they will examine the recommendations of those 12 wise men. I hope that they will not wait so long to implement any recommendations which these men have made that we have another five years before the Caribbean Community starts to move again.

I believe that the fundamental concept of the Caribbean Community has demonstrated itself as a desirable method of development for this region, and in spite of the failures of the Caribbean Community which are reported sometimes with glee, I do not believe that all is lost. I feel that it is the duty of all the Governments — but more particularly the duty of the Barbados Government, whichever political party is in power — to strive to become a mover, a catalyst if necessary to bring the Caribbean region towards the direction we have all sought for it. I believe that if necessary the honourable Member for Christ Church East — I am not now sure which of these honourable Members is the CARICOM Minister — the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will find no more difficulty in supporting the concept

of a CARICOM thrust now that he has been steeped in the ways of the Community. I believe he is probably less strident in his relationships than when he was outside of the Government, but be that as it may, I see no reason why Barbados cannot take the initiative in bringing the Caribbean Heads of Government to the table. I see no reason why they should allow six years to pass and utter such feeble excuses themselves or listen to the feeble excuses being given by others.

I have a few other things to say about the finances. Mr. Speaker, in the same Lome Convention that I spoke about, under Title IV, Article 42 – I am not calling the page because this book is not a publication as such, it is a conglomeration – Article 42, of the Lome Convention says in its opening sentence “For the duration of this Convention the over-all amount of the Committee aid shall be 3 390 million units of account.” At that time a unit of account was equal to \$1.2864 US if my memory serves me correctly.
2.50 p.m.

So you can see that when they negotiated money for financial assistance they talked about 3 390 million units of account. I offer that as comparison and I say, Sir, that since that was Lome I in 1975 Lome II in 1980 has sought to improve on that.

I shall not detain this Honourable House by seeking to read the relevant parts of the Lome Conventions into the records because those documents are or ought to have been by now documents of this Honourable House but, Mr. Speaker, if the Europeans are so far away from us and we are in the region for which the new thrust is being made and we were able to unify ourselves to deal with the European situation, there is absolutely no reason why we should not be able to unify ourselves to deal with a neighbour, to deal with a friend.

If we are dealing with the United States, it has been clearly demonstrated that the United States is a friend of the Caribbean. At least the United States people and the Caribbean people have long had a close association – they have intermingled and they have benefited each from the other because of that relationship. I do not believe that it is in the interest of the Government of these two regions, the Caribbean and the United States – to try to separate the peoples of the Caribbean and the United States.

I believe that if proper arrangements are made through the Caribbean Community that we can face the United States and we can face them with dignity and we can tell them that we are independent and that we will brook no nonsense from them, we will brook no nonsense from the Russians, we will brook no nonsense from the Europeans. The only people we are prepared to stand any nonsense from is when we are quarrelling among ourselves but when we face the rest of the world I

believe that this Caribbean region should be able to go forth as a community. That is why I would be able to support this Bill notwithstanding the fact that on the face of it, it seeks to increase the borrowing of the Government even more but, Sir, that has already been and will be the subject of a separate discussion. I would not wish to mix the two on this day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which seeks to regulate the participation by the Government of Barbados in projects of the Barbadian community, either generally with other member states, or severally or also to regulate the giving of guarantees with the approval of Parliament for the repayment of loans for the financing of the development for the projects is one which we on this side do not propose to vote against. However, the whole relationship between this region and the recently announced Caribbean Basin Initiative has been amply dealt with by my colleague and I believe only the Member for Christ Church East – the Hon. Minister of Agriculture – is likely to be the only person not to see the political and economic significance of that plan.

I believe, Sir, that the whole programme as it affects this has been very succinctly put by Dr. Solomon of Trinidad in a recent publication. It is very nicely put and very carefully put together and that proposes the kinds of problems and reaction which this region should take into serious consideration. However, Sir, I would like to ask some questions on the various joint projects which the Government envisages. What is the status of the current ones, and if there are any new areas for joint projects envisaged that we in this Honourable House do not know about?

For example, we wish to know what is the current status of CARICARGO and what are the projections for the future development of that area of aviation policy? What equity situation the Government of Barbados would get itself involved in and how the Government envisages further development in relation to the acquisition of hardware and the expansion of CARICARCO in the future? It is one area that I would like to know something about.

The second problem is that quite clearly the region is facing a major crisis in the area of Aviation in respect of the transport of the people of the area and visitors to the area. All of the airlines functioning in this area are facing serious problems. Our own airline – Caribbean Airways – as we all know – has had a very acute and difficult situation recently and it would be interesting to know whether through joint ventures of the Caribbean, some effort could be made to rehabilitate that airline.

The question of BWIA being the regional carrier is being hotly canvassed at the moment in Trinidad to the extent that I saw one or two irresponsible statements and certainly in one editorial that does not really impinge on

reality dealing with the question of the contribution which BWIA makes in tourism in Barbados.

Air Jamaica — and I believe and I think that a new arrangement has been made in respect of Air Jamaica flying into the Eastern Caribbean — that too is in serious financial problems.

BWIA anticipates heavy losses this year and it would seem to me that it would be a legitimate question to ask what kinds of response does the Government have for this kind of aviation situation in the region and whether or not any aspect of aviation other than CARICARGO is being currently considered as a possible joint venture project for the Caribbean.
3.00 p.m.

The status of the cement plant which will be located here in Barbados is one that we would like to be brought up to date on. The status, Sir, of regional shipping arrangements — what plans does this Government or the Governments in the region have for the further development of inter-regional shipping? What further plans are there for expansion in this area, what further plans to ensure that there is an adequate supply of transport by sea to facilitate development projects on an inter-regional basis? In other words, Sir, this relates back to the whole question of transport — whether the Government perceive this as an area for joint ventures and what are the particular problems facing this Government in respect of participation?

I appreciate very much that any involvement in BWIA on an equity basis for a country the size of Barbados with a small budget might well be a major disaster, bearing in mind the management limitations of that airline. But it would seem to me that the only way the question of air transport in the area can be dealt with efficiently on a long term basis is going to be on some basis of joint venture — a joint venture programme by the Caribbean Government. The situation in respect of LIAT — I do not wish to go into that. As another joint venture, that has been canvassed recently in this Honourable House and certain pertinent questions were asked.

But I believe there is also the question of management and the need for an updating of the hardware of that airline which plays a very important role in the economic life of the Eastern Caribbean countries in particular and certainly contributes to Barbados as well, in many ways.

Agriculture, Sir, would seem to me to be a possible area of development where joint ventures would be of tremendous value. There are several heads that one can detail under Agriculture. But certainly I wonder if anything is being done in respect of fertilizers in the area

of the petro-chemical industry. I know that this is wrought with certain problems. Does the Barbados Government intend to get involved in that area on a regional basis? We know that there have been certain problems attendant on the establishment of such a plant in another Caribbean territory. But the question arises whether such an area of development is one which the Barbados Government envisages that it would participate in in the future.

The long term gains, Sir, in these areas, if they are properly managed and properly structured and if feasibilities are properly done, it is quite clear that the region stands to gain substantially, so I would be very interested to know how the Government of Barbados is thinking in these particular areas.

Then there is the whole question of the role of the private sector development in the region in participation with public sector. There are many smaller projects that I see coming on stream, but it would seem to me that many of these projects would be much more successful if they had the full backing of the Governments of the region along with the private sector commitment — then I think that the rate of development of these projects could be accelerated considerably.

An initiative that I know about certainly in the area of agriculture is being established and I wonder whether the Government of Barbados in association with other Governments would be getting involved on an equity basis or what kind of facilities they would be offering to that organisation? I believe the name is CATCO which seems to have some kind of potential for the development of the area and it would seem to me to be the kind of joint private sector — Government operation that might be of some value. Whether Government would necessarily get involved on an equity basis or a guarantee of loans or by providing appropriate markets and assistance, that is the matter that would have to be determined by the Governments. But I believe on a joint approach if these things are going to be successful.

I do not wish to make a long speech on this. I think the matter has been dealt with already. And, in brief, Sir, I have asked some questions related to the question of extra-regional aviation at the passenger level and at the cargo level, questions related to one on-going project namely, the cement plant; questions related to the development of shipping, questions related to the development of agriculture on a regional basis and questions related to joint private sector and Government sector projects on a regional basis.

One final point, Sir. It has seemed to me for a long time that although we have had a regional research organisation in tourism — and some of the work put out by

that organisation has been quite good in respect of analyses of various aspects of the tourist industry — it has always been able to attract some of the finest brains and some of the finest institutions — well known institutions in the world to look at aspects of the tourist industry within the Caribbean — it has always seemed to me that there needs to be a greater joint effort in terms of promoting the Caribbean as an area for tourism.

The cost is so great that it is doubtful whether the efforts made by the individual territories have much impact in relation to promotion. When one considers the cost of advertisements in the industrialised countries, it only indicates how difficult it is for a country like Barbados to maintain a high profile in promoting tourism. I wonder whether some of this promotion could not be done on a regional basis, and whether it would not have the greater impact in terms of attracting more of the north-south traffic in respect of tourism.
3.10 p.m.

Many people do not realise that only somewhere between five to ten percent of the total world trade in tourism actually takes place in a north-south direction. In fact, the central core around which world tourism takes place is among the northern countries themselves — among the industrialised countries — and the southern countries really fall into the category of peripheral tourism, and this is not often realised: that there is a tremendous market there to attract some of that north to north or central tourism towards the periphery. I believe that this can possibly be done on a regional basis. I am fully aware of the very many constraints on that approach, but it would seem to me that that is a reasonable joint project that the Government should be thinking about and giving some consideration to.

I do not wish to get into the area of trade or in fact any other particular area now, but these are the things that certainly have sprung to mind — some of them already in train — and certainly there is room for further development. Some of them I think need promotion and my questions are really trying to get a response from the Government as to their attitude towards those existing joint ventures, and what particular areas they envisage would be covered by this particular Bill — what areas they foresee at the moment would be proper areas for investment either by way of guarantees or equity participation or otherwise.

I rest at that point.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this legislation has provoked a number of interesting observations by honourable Members who have taken part in the debate so far.

The Government of Barbados has taken a positive decision that its position on the Caribbean Basin Initiative

will be made known as soon as the Government is in a position to consult with its colleagues, and I believe that there will be consultation very soon among the Foreign Ministers of the Caribbean Economic Community in Belize at the end of March.

It is very important for all — and I say all — to understand that Governments in the Caribbean have spent a tremendous amount of time and effort in building up regional institutions and in their steadfastness in the continuity of these institutions. We ourselves have been among the prime leaders in the Caribbean of the concept of a harmonised foreign policy, a harmonised trade policy, and indeed within the context of Caribbean Economic Community great steps have been made in that direction.

The position therefore is that all I can say at this stage is that I have listened with interest to the observations of the honourable Member for St. Michael West. Of course, Mr. Speaker, no doubt a more appropriate occasion will arise when in the fullness of time after all the consultations have taken place, and in particular after all the information is had as to the precise details of the Caribbean Basin Initiative. I think Caribbean people are people who love to live in hope, but I think all of us as politicians know that you cannot go along for a long period of time exciting hopes, giving expectations and not have to deliver. It is very important that we do not raise false hopes or expectations.

Now, Sir, I think also that this is an appropriate occasion, of course, for the Government to state that it remains totally convinced that the Caribbean Economic Community must be strengthened, new areas of initiative taken, and it is precisely because of that that we have today under consideration a bit of legislation which had its origin in a Ministers of Finance meeting of the Caribbean Economic Community.

It is true that in the last five years there has not been a Heads of Government conference. That does not mean that there have not been consultations at Heads of Government level. It certainly does not mean that the institutions of the Community were not working. I think we have had more ministerial meetings among separate Ministries than ever before, and it is a good thing that you can have Ministers of Finance meeting regularly in the Caribbean Economic Community. The Trade Ministers have always been meeting, but we are now reaching the stage where the institutional framework is functioning in such a way that in nearly all the important areas of Government, meetings are taking place and efforts are being made to fashion out common legislation and common initiatives.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central raised a number of points in specific areas. I am

very satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the progress that has been made in its first commercial year of operation of Caribbean Air Cargo. I understand from the Board of Directors of Caribbean Air Cargo that the accounts are now being audited and I want it to be clearly understood that every effort has been made both by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and by the Government of Barbados to ensure that Caribbean Air Cargo is allowed to function as any other properly run commercial organisation in the private sector would function. I do not think any one at all, either in Barbados or in Trinidad, can legitimately say that any of the Ministers responsible have in the slightest way attempted in any way to influence the Board of Directors other than to ensure that the fundamental objective of that organisation is carried out — that is, that it is to be run along commercial lines.

As soon, of course, as the auditors are finished with their work there will be a general meeting of two shareholders and the results of the financial year will be made known and this Honourable House will be entitled to that information.
3.20 p.m.

I understand that the number of flights and the demand for services have increased to such an extent that the Board of Directors are considering additional capacity for the airline. I know that in many respects there has been a great improvement in the service. We have had interest manifested by a number of other Governments in the Caribbean to participate in the shareholding. It has always been the view of both the Government of Trinidad and the Government of Barbados that this institution should have the widest possible membership so that no one should say that the two starters of this operation regard it as an exclusive club.

We have been also trying to convince third party governments — and this is a most important point — that all Governments in the Caribbean must understand that if we are ready to secure legitimate landing points in third countries that we are entitled to on a bilateral basis, we have to be able to satisfy that criterion that is known as substantially owned by nationals of the particular country. (A VOICE: Caribbean Airways.) Well there were objections that that was not substantially owned and managed by Barbados, but I think even our greatest critics would now be convinced that the Government has such a degree of interest and control that they were able to keep it in the air while others crashed, so that we feel — and this is the view in the Ministry of Civil Aviation — that these territories are too small individually to allocate capital resources necessary to fund a multiplicity of airlines to be able effectively to compete in the markets where we are entitled to a fair share of the market.

I want to say this also — and it is a good opportunity to say it: I have never seen more protectionist atti-

tudes being adopted today by developed countries who openly pronounce that they are genuinely interested in helping you provided it does not touch the Government's economic interest or of course, particular sectors of the economy. We have had the greatest amount of trouble with trying to negotiate agreements with third countries. All kinds of obstructions have been put up. Little countries in the Caribbean who can never be great competitors to big airlines are having the greatest amount of trouble either in getting their airlines in there or even supporting a sister country's airline to get in there. So that it seems to me that whether they like or not, all of these countries particularly in the Eastern Caribbean will have immediately to try to fashion out some institution which can be multi-government owned with respect to this area.

We have always said that the formation of CARI-CARGO was our attempt to look at the situation and see how it would work in practice, so that if that was successful it would give encouragement in other areas of aviation. I think that LIAT has improved considerably over the course of the last five years. It is another example of a wider form of cooperation. I think we should learn from that. The only problem of course with a multi-government owned airline is that the decision-making process is probably a little bit more tortuous in that you have to have more unanimity than just a Board of Directors' decision. That sometimes can act as a constraint.

If I have a criticism of LIAT and its operation in this respect, it would be that the concept of the need to ensure that in the commercial world decisions have to be taken quickly is something that all of the Governments have not quite understood, but there has been very great improvement in this respect.

Now, Sir, obviously in a debate like this, questions will arise as to what we see will be the future of Caribbean Airways. The Government of Barbados has never made any secret of its view that it feels that Caribbean Airways is an instrument which should be used to ensure that there are adequate air services at economic levels to service the Barbados tourist industry. We have never made any secret of that. We have never made any secret of the fact and indeed it is in the Heads of Government agreement and in the bilateral talks between the Government of Barbados and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago that we felt at that time that the time would come when Caribbean Airways and BWIA should cooperate as fully as possible particularly in the use of aircraft, particularly also in ensuring that there is competition between themselves, and particularly also in pioneering new rules.

When the Laker battle took place — I am in a position to inform the House although I was abroad, that steps were taken at an early date — well before the

actual collapse — by way of contingency — to ensure that BWIA and Caribbean Airways worked closely together. As is well known, the Board of Directors of Caribbean Airways offered B.W.I.A. certain lease arrangements with respect to some of the services, and discussions at the Board level as well as at the ministerial level, took place with a view to seeing how a short term arrangement could be made whereby maximum use could be made of the capacity of B.W.I.A.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect of North America there is no problem because Caribbean Airways does not fly into North America. With respect to Canada, there is no problem because Caribbean Airways does not fly to Canada. With respect to Luxemburg and Frankfurt there is no problem because B.W.I.A. does not fly there.

Now in London the problem was different and it arose because of the fact that the needs of the Barbados tourist industry from London are far greater than the capacity of B.W.I.A. given its present plane type. Mr. Speaker, we had two DC-10, 348 seater flights from London. In addition, Sir, through Barbados there were two Tri-Star 248 seaters — and this is most important — because the traffic from London is mostly holiday traffic. 3.30 p.m.

That traffic to a large extent is generated by tour operators and tour operators feel that quite rightly, if you have to compete with other destinations, you have to compete at that period of time when people predominantly like to take their holidays, and apparently what is called weekend departures are most important.

We are getting rid of sharing of capacity in low season of 250 seats, in high season of 400 seats at seat rate — I will not disclose the seat rate — the seat rate was such that it was subject to negotiation. The price rate was not within the range of what we would regard, having regard to the tour operators known payment for those seats as to allow reasonable contribution to overhead.

The Board of Directors of Caribbean Airways quite properly looked at the situation and, in their opinion, the number of seats that were offered — particularly on the same day — were not sufficient even to cover a third of the free existing capacity because you cannot reduce 348 seater planes. That is nothing at all to do with the independent arrangement which was Laker Airways own arrangement with tour operators in the north of England for another 348 seater from Manchester to Barbados in the Winter Season — that is July and August at peak time so that 400 seats in their opinion was an inadequate amount.

This was fully explained to the management of BWIA so that it is totally untrue for anyone to say that

efforts were not made (*Asides*). I am not saying that any honourable Member in this House — not in the House — but I think one honourable Member made reference to newspaper articles and it is true that there have been a number of newspaper articles. The only thing I can say about them is that they manifest a great ignorance as to the factual situation. No airline subsidises the tourist industry in Barbados.

The airlines fight daily with the Air Traffic Licensing Authority in Barbados to increase their fares in this direction. Some of the levels of fares are far lower per seat mile than they charge across the North Atlantic and they get better occupancy levels of their seats on this run. So it is a question of whether the hotels do not feel that the airlines are trying to overcharge passengers coming down here.

As far as the ignorance of the writer of the editorial is concerned — it is quite clear — really quite clear because if he had understood anything about Aviation, he would learn that BWIA as a freedom carrier through Barbados charges fare levels which are fixed by ATLA having regard to the bilateral agreements between the countries. So what he is really saying is that American Airlines subsidises the tourist industry, Eastern Airlines subsidises the tourist industry, BA subsidises the tourist industry and of course that it is utter nonsense because if one looks at the charges that American have per seat mile in some of the other routes in the Caribbean, you will find that the ATLA is quite correct in resisting — except upon proof of great justification — many of the applications which these airlines put in.

The ATLA — as I had to tell one High Commissioner here who was quite rude to the Government of Barbados — but he is lucky that the Government is tolerant — but if the Government was not tolerant and we understand and we can tell people to their faces when they are rude — we had to tell them that just as the Government cannot give a Ministerial directive to the Canadian Civil Aviation Authority, the Minister of Civil Aviation has no intention — not even to satisfy the whim of any particular High Commissioner — to give any directive to our ATLA.

I think it is sheer cheek on the part of all of those people who feel that because we are a small developing country that we do not understand proper procedures in our country. And they have been told so in no uncertain terms and no threats, no false cables that they can send back to their Ministry of External Affairs saying that they can get the Minister fired by going to the Prime Minister, can frighten the Ministers in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: When they send out their despatches to their Head Office they must not tell lies

because we have very good relations with the Government of Canada, excellent relations with the Government of Canada. I have had the privilege of meeting the Minister of Transport in Canada. I have had the privilege of meeting the Foreign Minister of Canada. They are great gentlemen. They understand the legitimate aspirations of the Barbados Government to insure that we share on a bilateral basis full opportunity to explore commercial opportunity in Civil Aviation.

I am having no cheek from anybody who think that they can walk in the office of Civil Aviation or attempt to bully the ATLA to satisfy their own particular whims. That is the position with respect to that and it is relevant, Sir, because in my opinion, the Caribbean as a whole will do much better if they have a joint negotiation strategy with some of these Third World countries.

We are negotiating and our view is that decisions embodied in the Report of the Wise Men which in a section on Civil Aviation made specific recommendations and which were endorsed at the last Trade Ministers' Conference — we endorsed those recommendations that as a matter of urgency the whole future of financing hardware — as the honourable Member calls it — for all of the airlines in the Caribbean should be undertaken and the Barbados Government pledges itself to work as fast as possible, particularly now in the context of what is happening to the other partner in Caribbean Airways. Now is the time. Now is very appropriate to get ahead with this study because I am still convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we are operating in a false paradise if we think that any of these individual islands can run an airline on its own. It cannot do it so I think I should give the honourable Member a clear indication of how we feel.

3.40 p.m.

We have been talking to the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and in the interim, we have informed them, quite fully, quite clearly, that we would like to see other Governments in the Caribbean participate in the shareholding of Caribbean Airways. We have informed them that as soon as the legal difficulties are cleared up because, Mr. Speaker, let us not fool ourselves. A receivership of an operation such as Laker Airways bristles with legal difficulties.

It has only now been discovered that there were a number of companies involved under one umbrella company — a Jersey holding company. (*Laughter*) Our agreement is not with Laker Airways, our agreement is with Laker International and apparently Laker International also owned the licences from the CAA in England. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh yes!) I understand that the receiver has only now got authority over the international head group. But he did not have it at first. We are trying to get in touch with the receiver now that we understand

that he is invested with the authority over the international company which of course, owns our share. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Fire Sisnett.) It is nothing to do with Sisnett. What is it to do with Sisnett? (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Fire you then.) What is it to do with me?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the honourable Members really do not appreciate it: that the *Times Newspaper* in England and the British CAA took a long time to appreciate that there was such a thing as the Laker Holding Company. We have the High Commissioner in England, Sir, as he has been doing for approximately five months, monitoring the situation very carefully and our lawyers — Caribbean Airways lawyers — have had a number of questions put to them. Some of these questions involve the impact of British laws, some will involve the impact of Barbadian law.

I also want to make clear, Sir, that Laker Airways is only one of the companies. Laker International Airways is only one. There were also Arrow Smith Travel, Laker Travel and a multiplicity of others — Laker Services Limited — a multiplicity of companies.

Our immediate concern, Sir, is with the question of who owns the 49 percent of the shareholding in Caribbean Airways. We now know, Sir, that there is a receiver in respect of that. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You do not know who your fellow shareholders are?) The British Government did not know who had the licences either.

The position is Sir, that obviously, for continuity — particularly on the London run — we have to make an arrangement and bearing in mind the need to ensure adequate seat capacity on this run, arrangements of approximately a year because it is envisaged by all of the technicians not only here but in Trinidad, that you cannot work out a rational arrangement under the period of a year. It just cannot be done because not only do you have to have agreement between the respective shareholders, agreement among the technicians of what type of aircraft you should have bearing in mind that on a run like say London that you really need per week, on those week days 800 seats.

That is what we are looking at, bearing in mind that you have then to get agreement with the British Government. Similarly, you have to get agreement with the United States of America. If you are dealing with Canada, you have to get agreement with Canada. Bearing in mind all of these things, it is necessary that you have a period where an independent and objective study can be carried as to the optimum choice available to the Government. But, once there is commitment on the part of the Government, I think that that is important.

Now, in respect to the Luxemburg service, two problems arose about the use of BWIA. It was offered to them. A lot of time was spent quoting and so forth and were well within the range, but the tour operating Market, again, in Europe is very important. You cannot run airline services which are not satisfactory to the people who provide the business. Now once a plane originates in Barbados, it means that you have to have what is called a Saturday to Friday service. The impact of that is that instead of offering the European a seven day service, you have to offer him only six days.

Now some of these countries have very stringent consumer protection laws in respect of travel and the marketing of the summer in Barbados for this year started around November to December last year. There is a tremendously long lead time. Apparently, many people in Europe spend their time in winter anticipating when the cold is over, what they are going to do in summer and a lot of decisions are made during the winter among the families as to where they are going to go to in summer. So a lot of tour operator brochures were actually advertised with a Saturday to Saturday holiday and when it was put forward that we would bring in our summer schedule on a Saturday to Friday, objections were raised.

We were able to try and smoothen that with the co-operation of the hotels because obviously, they have contracted for seven days and you could not make the hotels give a low rate. The hotels did co-operate in Barbados and said that they would only charge for six nights. But we still had objections from one particular country and it is Germany where the tour operators live in mortal fear of what they call their "Domestic Consumer Laws" because you cannot change the conditions in your brochure under four months notice — otherwise you would have to pay damages.

In addition also, Sir, the technical officer of BWIA raised the point with their management which subsequently came to light, that they had taken a decision to phase out the 707 for the Tri-Stars and although they have three Tri-Stars so far and they will be getting one in June when the summer peak comes, they could not guarantee us that they could supply us for a whole year. What they said they could do was that they could give us April, May and June not July and August, they could come back in September and October not November and December.

Well, of course, Sir, it would be impossible for you to market something in that manner because there is one thing you have to do, and that is you have to ensure you publish your schedule and subject to the normal rule which all airlines have of cancellations on economic grounds, you have to maintain your schedule.

So regrettably, it was not possible for us to get a year's agreement with respect to Luxemburg. All of these matters have been discussed with BWIA.

So the situation is that our negotiations are going along, full discussions are taking place with the relevant Ministers and we will soon be in a position — as soon as the legal situation is clarified — to give the Honourable House a full report on the steps that we are taking beyond the year to plan for the long term. That is the position, Sir.

Now, Sir, I understand that at the recent Board of Directors meeting of the cement plant they were very pleased with the progress that has been made. I think that at some time the Honourable House of Assembly should be invited to see the infrastructural work that has gone along. I was clearly amazed to be told that within three months or four months, all of the road works are in — that it is possible now to drive from the top of the hill right down to Maycocks Bay. A phenomenal job has been done in the site preparation for the road works. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I cannot get one in Bayville.) It was done by a local contractor. The local contractor — I believe Rayside. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Does he belong to you or us?) I do not know I do not want your things. He is a good businessman because I know that he tendered against all competition. I understand that his tender was good.
3.50 p.m.

I do not mind what the other side say, Sir, we do not carry on any victimisation policy. They have prospered better, because we have had a good Capital Works Programme. Good progress has been made. I understand also that now that the roads are in they have now started on the foundation preparations for the actual building of the cement plant. My understanding from the Barbados' Director is that the project is proceeding according to schedule. It cannot be any more satisfactory than that — it is proceeding according to schedule.

Now, Sir, on the question of agriculture I suppose the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will speak — I believe that the Ministers of Agriculture at a recent meeting had just looked at the recommendations of the Demas Report. There is no doubt about it, that the Agricultural Marketing Protocol and its functioning is one of the areas of great disappointment to true Caribbean integration. We have not really got an agricultural common market. There are still problems in getting licences within the Eastern Caribbean for some particular projects. It is a great challenge. I feel very sorry when I know that at this particular time of the year Barbados has a great surplus of carrots, tomatoes, cabbage and beets, and I know that when I look at the newspapers in our sister territories next door that the prices they are paying are way higher than the prices we are paying here, and I

know there is capacity but somehow or the other we have not been able to match that demand with this productive capacity.

This is what the Caribbean Agricultural Trading Organisation, which significantly is a joint Government-private sector organisation — and the Government's contribution comes through the inter-governmental institution, the Caribbean Food Corporation — which are the agencies that the Governments as a whole have established to try to deal with this area of agricultural development. Now, they in turn have decided in their mind that in order to market properly you have to look at the people who are among the biggest buyers and people who have experience in agricultural marketing, and I believe that the private sector interest within that comes from among those people. So that is an example of a joint public and private sector organisation.

I think that also answers the question of agriculture, because I dealt with the Ministers of Agriculture who have just met and have made their decisions. The Trade Ministers have requested that they deal with the question of the operation of the Agricultural Marketing Protocol so as to have a genuine agricultural common market. Of course you can never have a market unless it is subject to health and sanitary regulations, because it is known even within unitary systems that you must have residual powers in the event of disease in one particular area so that you can prohibit trade. You must have that.

Now, Sir, I think that that sets out very clearly what our position is on all this, so I can sum up by saying that the Government, by bringing this Bill, is indicating clearly that it has great faith in the concept of the Caribbean Economic Community. We feel that on all matters of trade and investment in Third Countries that it is in the interest of all of us in the long term to negotiate jointly. That is my view. Whatever the blandishments, whatever short term immediate benefits you feel you can get, I still feel that in the long term that when you are bargaining internationally and you can offer the totality of the market, you are likely to get better concessions than if you are only offering a part of the market. That is our view, and the Foreign Minister of Barbados I am sure will be so instructed. I am sure that he is going to eloquently put the Barbados view next month. I am positive.

I think basically, Sir, that I have answered as much of the problems as I can. I do not know of any new initiative other than in the area of passenger airlines and in the area of the question of a tour operating company. This is a very important point. We feel that the question of a tour operating company should really be dealt with by the private sector, but the Governments of course through their Tourists Boards or through their airline companies can have shareholding. But this is a commercial market area and I honestly feel that it is better for them to get into it.

We should really see if we can get the Tourist Boards in the Eastern Caribbean in particular, because there are three hubs in the traffic really. There is a northern hub which is dominated and influenced by Florida, which dominates the tourism of the Bahamas, Jamaica and those areas, because they are so near to Florida that whatever happens on the North Atlantic to Florida it has an impact on them — Jamaica and the Dominican Republic. Then you have the hub around Puerto Rico, which is really a hub by itself, but the Leeward Islands and the Virgin Islands, St. Kitts, St. Maarten and Antigua, they are also within the Puerto Rico hub. Then you have the Eastern Caribbean, Barbados, Trinidad, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Dominica, and the French islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe. That is another hub, so that what is necessarily of interest to the Eastern Caribbean is not necessarily of interest to the Northern Caribbean.

The Northern Caribbean, for instance, had the benefits of the mad fares. I call them mad fares, because I knew that somebody would have to go broke out of them. They really have benefited greatly from the advantages of those very low fares from Europe to Florida, because all you had to do to get to any of those territories was to go to Florida, go to Miami and then come across, because you were so near, but you could not take advantage to come all the way down.

The Eastern Caribbean is therefore by itself. We must look at our interest because we are geographically within this area and it is quite difficult to envisage us using Florida as a major gateway, or using Puerto Rico as a major source of airline traffic to us. It will have to be small because most people are interested now in direct services. That is the problem. I think the whole of this comes out very clearly in two very major reports which were done by way of regional co-operation, where the Governments of the Caribbean supported the request of CTCRC to get international funding to do the North American study — seven volumes have just come in — and to do the European study.

4.00 p.m.

That is an example of how we are working. I will say for the benefit of the honourable Member because he did raise it, that there are efforts being made at joint promotion. At this year's ITD Fair the Caribbean Tourism Association had a Caribbean Village.

Efforts are being made, but it must be remembered that at the regional level constantly this difference in interest arises between these three groups that I have talked about, because the north regard themselves as part of that area. They have better opportunities because of their proximity to the United States for certain markets in the United States. We have to try and get markets wherever we can get them, and we feel that the Eastern

Caribbean has a better chance of more intimate promotion together.

Of course that does not mean that the whole Caribbean cannot do what is called image promotion in overseas markets, but you still cannot give up the direct promotion within the context of this image promotion. When you are promoting the Caribbean at a regional level, you are promoting it as an alternative to Hawaii, as an alternative to Europe and things of that kind. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the contribution that I have to make on these matters.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I have always learnt to suspend judgment on matters until I am fully apprised of all the implications. It is therefore a little bit difficult for me to state a position on my attitude of the Government of Barbados and indeed of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Caribbean Basin Plan until such time as we have taken a closer look at a number of the proposals contained therein.

I believe as the Deputy Prime Minister has said, that the type of commitment that the Government has to CARICOM is such that perhaps before we have the next meeting of the Foreign Ministers on the Caribbean Basin Plan which perhaps will be the final meeting, all Governments should take it as their duty to read very carefully the Treaty of Chaguaramas and more particularly the Report of the Wise Men that was put before the CARICOM Council of Ministers some time last year, because the treaty itself and the recommendations of the Wise Men are quite clear as to the direction and the rules of conduct of members of the Community. They stress in particular that there should be coordination of external trade policies of the members of the CARICOM group. They stress that any external bargaining power can better be emphasised by joint action of all the members of the Community.

Now it makes reference particularly to the incidence of bilateral agreement. There is no attempt to deny any particular country of the CARICOM Community of its national sovereignty. As members of the Community and signatories to a treaty, it is necessary for the respective particular country to bear in mind the provisions of the treaty which they sign, and in relation to bilateral agreements with third parties, it has always been in the treaty and in practice, that there is full consultation with other CARICOM members before — not after — member countries entered into bilateral agreements particularly in the area of trade with third countries.

This Caribbean Basin Plan, Sir, was conceptualised some time last year as a four-party donor effort to assist the beleaguered economies of the countries of Central America and the Caribbean. The Heads of Governments

of the United States of America, of Canada, of the Republic of Mexico and of Venezuela met and talked in very general terms of a package for economic rescue of the countries of Central America and the Caribbean.

We have heard very recently, Sir, the statement by the President of the United States in relation to the United States component of that plan. What I am in fact saying is that the Plan that was conceptualised last year is only now in its embryonic stage because we have not heard from the Government of Canada, the Government of Mexico or the Government of Venezuela as to where exactly they will fit in in this over-all strategy.

In the days of the old Roman Army, to keep the economies — they were not called economies — they were called provinces — to keep the provinces in line, the Roman Emperors used to operate on the basis of divide and rule. There is a common feeling and a feeling abroad that the Plan in some way is a divide and rule plan. Now I am really at this stage not in a position to articulate that point of view, but CARICOM has been a body established by these countries to do the external bargaining in relation to trade and investment and in terms of tax incentives for the countries of the CARICOM region, and the Caribbean Development Bank has been set up by the countries of the CARICOM region to carry out the important duty of financing regional projects.

There is a distinction between the Caribbean Community and the members of trading communities, because CARICOM represents a lot more than just a free trade area. There are several areas of functional and non-economic cooperation between the countries of the CARICOM membership, and I need only mention, as I heard earlier, shipping and sea and air transportation, and perhaps one that is particularly significant and would bear some reference to me in a later stage of my contribution.

The University of the West Indies is itself a little bit more than a trading community; it is a community of functional cooperation in many areas of public life. Only this week we are confronted by a situation critical in some ways brought on by a number of English Test cricketers going to South Africa to play cricket. The West Indies cricket team is one of the oldest areas of functional cooperation between the countries of this region. We have to see all this against the background of the history of the peoples and the Governments of this region.
4.10 p.m.

Now I do not know, Sir, precisely where a lot of the proposals contained in the statement of President Reagan would lead us. Barbados at first was told that it

was going to be a multilateral contribution to this plan, Sir, and we have had a number of meetings.

The Foreign Ministers of Caricom met in September last year in Jamaica to discuss the seminal statements made on the plan because at that stage there was very little that one could actually point out as a firm recommendation in the plan. The Caricom Foreign Ministers met, Sir, and they agreed to set up a committee of technical persons who would look at the needs of the region and from the very broad — and in some cases nebulous details that have been articulated by the four heads of the donor countries — to try to put together a comprehensive plan so that we could meet with our donor counterparts and hammer them out.

The experts met in the Dominican Republic — I believe, Sir, it was in October last year — and the plan then was for them to report back at the Foreign Ministers' Meeting who would then take a number of decisions in relation to the report and hold meetings with our counterparts from the donor countries. Perhaps it would be useful for me at this point to say that the meeting was extended beyond the Caricom membership in that the Caribbean island states were invited to the meeting — Haiti, the Dominican Republic and indeed Suriname — and we were to have this meeting to discuss and consider the recommendations of our technical committees.

We were overtaken by events because before the Foreign Ministers, Sir, had an opportunity to meet again to deal with the report of the technical group, Part I of the plan has been promulgated by the President of the United States. Now we meet again towards the end of the month, Sir, to deal with the reports from our technical people and also the statement made by the President of the United States and we will have to do projections as to the likely input into the plan of Mexico, Venezuela and Canada.

I listened to the statement of the President, Sir, because I have a responsibility to very closely monitor external matters and one of the things I was a little disappointed about, Sir, was the fact that Trinidad and Tobago was not singled out also, may be doubled out or whatever the term, for its contribution to the energy needs of the Caricom members by the provision of a oil facility.

Now we hear about the oil facility of Venezuela and the oil facility of Mexico but we can say quite categorically that the contributions made by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the petroleum needs of the CARICOM States have been very exemplary and if others chose to omit that contribution, I feel I have a paramount responsibility based on strong moral grounds to put that into the records, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want, as I said, to go into the details of the plan although at this stage I have my own views but one or two things can be mentioned in terms of questions. One of the components of the plan is the free trade area and why I say that we are not in position to comment comprehensively and definitively on the plan is because we have to await the result of certain procedures to see how they will operate before we can go making statements.

We know, for instance, that the Secretary of Agriculture in the United States retains authority to adjust the tariffs on duty free imports, so we have a 12 year period for duty free importation of goods in the United States. It is important to add to that, that the Secretary of Agriculture in the United States, if he feels or if he has evidence that the United States domestic industry is being threatened or endangered by the free flow of products into the United States, has the authority to adjust the policy in relation to this free flow.

It is things like these that we have to look at very carefully. We have to sit down and discuss it with our counterparts in the United States and find out the *modus operandi* for all these for all these provisions before we go and make reckless statements about the inputs of the statement made by the President of the United States.

I understand too, Sir — I think in the United States they called it the International Trade Commission of the Federal Government — that also has the use of a safeguard mechanism that would do roughly what we mention in relation to the Secretary of Agriculture. If we are under the impression that any substantial or serious damage will be done to indigenous American industries through the open access of the United States markets by goods from the region, that commission has got the authority to make such adjustments as are necessary in the circumstances. One of the tools that is available to that commission, Sir, is to restore the tariff on those terms.

I hear a number of private organisations, business people and so on making statements. I know that the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce have been having a number of discussions with their private sector counterparts in the United States — and maybe they have a list of guarantees that are not yet made available to me — but I will be using my good offices to cooperate with the private sector in the Caribbean and in Barbados and to meet at the appropriate time and exchange our own perceptions and our own data — what data is available to us — to see if we can develop the kind of co-ordinated policies and practices that will enure to the benefit of Barbados and to the Caribbean.

One of the things that I should say in relation to the age old policy of divide and rule, Sir — a perception that again, Sir, I will suspend my judgment on for at least another three weeks or so — relates to the fact that unlike the EEC, Sir — the European Economic Community — where all the members of the EEC trade equally in any relationship with the third groupings or indeed the ACP; the trouble now with this, Sir, is that with the bilateralism as the key to the first part of this plan, there is bound to be a bit of fragmentation between CARICOM members in as much as each country is in a position under its plan to negotiate with the United States on its own personal behalf without having to take into consideration the interest of other CARICOM States.

These are the sorts of problems that one needs to look at very carefully and to see where they will all lead before this Government rushes off making a lot of grandiose and grandiloquent statements about this new initiative.

4.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, earlier I made reference to the University of the West Indies, one of the older areas of functional cooperation of the CARICOM States, Sir. I want, Sir, only very briefly to express my own opinion on what is happening in the University — a very important area of CARICOM activities.

Universities, Sir, all over the world, like economies all over the world, have been booming in the place since the Second World War, Sir. More and more western economies have been pouring more and more money into university education at a pace that is quite startling when one looks back on it. But now that the western economies are in trouble for whatever reason, Sir, we find that every Government is looking very closely at the cost of university education.

Indeed, in the United States, Sir, a number of university colleges, Sir, are being closed down, a number of Faculties in other universities are being closed down, the number of intake in a number of universities is being drastically reduced, a number of university teachers are being made redundant, the cost of university education to the private consumer is tripling and quadrupling because Governments certainly in the United States — you are dealing with Government — are cutting back severely on the expenditure that they make to tertiary education.

In the United Kingdom too, Sir, a number of universities have had their grants from the public purse cut by as much as 35 per cent and indeed, a number of new universities and the ones that were supposed to be the salvation of British industry — even those are being savagely cut back. Sir, I am talking about the new univer-

sities like Salisbury University — universities that were technically oriented Sir, that moved away considerably from the traditional university disciplines and had the type of delivery and content of university education that produced people who were well fitted for a new, industrial development take-off in the United Kingdom.

Now, against this background, Sir, it is necessary for us in this country to look at what is happening in the University of the West Indies. All the way back in 1975, Sir, at the last Heads of Governments Conference of the CARICOM Governments, Sir, a decision was taken to appoint a committee headed by William Demas who would look at the universities and come up with recommendations as to the restructuring of the university, taking into consideration the new demands that were being made throughout the region. That Committee, Sir, put in a report I think it was in 1977, a report that was nearly unanimous which means absolutely nothing in the CARICOM context because if you cannot get all the countries to agree, you are spinning a top in mud. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago took a divergent view from the rest of the countries in CARICOM and answered the Demas Report with the publication of a white paper dealing with setting up of a national institute for higher education, research, science and technology.

The pertinent part of that report, in relation to what I am saying now, dealt with the restructuring of the university and the Trinidad and Tobago Government took the view that Trinidad had its own internal domestic problems to address itself to and since the Government of Trinidad and Tobago was spending vast sums of money in the university of the West Indies, they wanted to have a say in what was happening at the St. Augustine Campus of the University of the West Indies.

The Trinidad and Tobago Government took the position that the vast expenditure from their public treasury and exigencies of Trinidad and Tobago's domestic development required that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago should push autonomy of the Trinidad and Tobago Campus. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago wanted an autonomous campus removed from the day to day control of a central university administration in Jamaica.

Over the last four, five years, Sir, there have been very inconclusive discussions back and forth. We have had a meeting of Ministers of Education Sir, I understand a few weeks ago, and I really have not heard what happened at that meeting, what conclusions were reached. But that is beside the point, Sir, because what I am trying to say transcends the result of any particular meeting. The fact is, Sir, that if the campuses of the University of the West Indies become autonomous — and I think, Sir, they are destined to become autonomous in the not

very distant future — that the burden on the Government of Barbados in keeping the University at Cave Hill going is going to be a burden that is almost too hard to bear. I therefore, Sir — in context of any debate on CARICOM, Sir — would like to throw out a warning to all these CARICOM member states.

I think seriously of the importance of the University as an institution in this region trying to assist the level of contribution it has made to the development of all the countries in this region and I think seriously also Mr. Speaker, of what the future holds for this region without a university whose integrity is tarnished in some way. It is important, Sir, and there is talk in the region that there will be — I am confident that there will be, Sir, — a Heads of Government meeting of the CARICOM States sometime this year. The projections are that the meeting will be sometime around the middle of this year and it is imperative that Heads of Government take this very vital issue out of the hands of Ministers of Education and deal with it themselves. It has far reaching indications for the future integrity of tertiary education and indeed, for professional training in the whole English speaking Caribbean.

I want to make one further point, Sir, before I close. I do not want anybody to be fooled that any new initiative taken by any donor country or a group of donor countries is based on any altruism. That does not operate in the area of international relations. You do not suddenly wake up and feel that you have a bigger heart than anybody and therefore you are going to spread manna all over a particular area. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Tell Johnny that.) There is a generous amount of self interest and you better believe it, — a generous amount of self interest — and I want in this regard to talk about the increasing interest in the Caribbean, Sir, not only by the traditional people who dealt with us — the United States, Canada — and you know, the Canadian Government has been one of the best friends of the Caribbean, Sir, (Mr. B. M. TAITT: True, true, true.) The Government of Canada, Sir, has over the years been doing all sorts of things in this region and giving a great deal of assistance to the Government of Barbados. That should go on the record. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: With no strings attached.) 4.30 p.m.

There is an increasing interest in the Caribbean. It is not very long ago that the Latin American countries and the Caribbean countries were worlds apart philosophically. They were worlds apart in terms of political perceptions, worlds apart in terms of their international perspective..... (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Culture). Not culture, Sir, because anybody who is acquainted with these things would know that a similarity of culture between all the peoples both in the Caribbean and in the Latin American countries that are washed by the Caribbean Sea, and who developed

out of a plantation economy — Costa Rica, Honduras, Brazil — but now Latin America has been showing increased interest at a startling pace in the Caribbean.

Barbados at the moment has got three embassies in the South American countries of Venezuela, Brazil and Columbia, but we have any number of other countries — Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Chile, on and on, Sir, Nicaragua — all of whom have expressed an interest in recent months to establish resident embassies in Barbados. You have to ask yourself why has the Caribbean suddenly become such an area of interest, and it has a lot to do with the geo-political situation in the world. (*Aside*).

The honourable Member for St. Michael South is thirsty for a debate on foreign affairs, Sir, and I am very anxious to bring before this House at any time the House meets the opportunity to debate what is happening in the world and Barbados' relationship with what is happening in the world, because it is very easy for us to believe that we really are an island.

We are no longer an island, except you are talking about the definition of an island in the eight cents geography book that they used to have when I was going to primary school. All an island meant then was a piece of land entirely surrounded by water. In those terms I guess we are an island, but whatever happens in every corner of the globe bears directly on and affects whatever happens in this country, Sir, and there has been hardly a single debate that I have heard since I was in this Chamber that has not been affected somehow or other by what is happening in external forces outside Barbados.

I sit back, Sir. I do not really like to get into a lot of debate that goes on in here because I really cannot waste my time repeating a lot of trite statements and trying to ennoble trivia. I have no time for that. I sit down and I hear debates on one thing or another which both sides agree on that are desirable, they are not of earth shaking impact when introduced and everybody has to get up and show that I am brighter than you and talk a whole lot of circumlocution instead of addressing issues fundamentally important to the integrity of this country.

I feel that it is necessary to bring into perspective all that is happening in this country in the context of what is happening in the Caribbean, in this hemisphere and worldwide. I will welcome the opportunity when we have had our final meeting on the Caribbean Basin Plan at the Foreign Ministers' meeting later this month. There Barbados has a position to articulate, and believe me, Sir, I am going to articulate that position, and when that decision is taken and we have come to our various decisions, I am ready then to say what is our position. I will be ready then to talk about the foreign policy implications of international largesse, I will be ready to

talk about how the Caribbean can maintain its position that it worked so hard for in the face of the new difficulties that are confronting countries all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more I can say in this regard but I believe it is timely to come to an end, because I believe that a word to the wise is enough.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, much as reference was made to me — negative though of facetious content — I had really no intention of participating in this debate.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West made an interesting and wide ranging speech in relation to the Caribbean Basin Plan, but for many reasons — some of which have been alluded to already — I thought that the debate which he sought to stimulate was really a little premature, because the Plan in the first place has got to be presented to Congress and there is no guarantee that it will emerge from Congress in the form in which it now is. In addition, Sir, the other donor countries that are supposed to form part of the Plan — Venezuela, Mexico and Canada — have not indicated what their particular contribution will be. So for many reasons it is indeed too early — a bit too previous, as it is fashionable to say — for us to be having a useful discussion on the Caribbean Basin Plan.

As far as we on this side are concerned, we find it difficult at this point to determine our response not only for the reasons which I have indicated, but because of the fact that the Foreign Ministers of the region are due to meet very shortly to discuss the matter, and until that discussion has taken place it would be difficult for the Government to make its position known. Even then it seems to me difficult to understand how the Government will be really able to take a definitive position, since even then it is not expected that the proposal could have gone through Congress or that the other donors by then would have indicated precisely what would be the nature of their contribution.

It does appear, however, Sir, as though the plan from all reports and reactions seems to be something like the Curate said, good only in parts. Notwithstanding the fact that it is premature, in my view, to have a wide ranging debate on the Caribbean Basin Plan, it seems to me nevertheless that we in the region have to start thinking about what we may be able to achieve from the opportunities, particularly for trade, if indeed they come to pass. I am referring in particular to the abolition of quotas in relation to certain products going from the region to the U.S. market, the extension of products that would be available for low duty or duty free entry

into the U.S. market, and generally, Sir, the special regime which is being talked about in relation to rum. 4.40 p.m.

Among the matters which the Caribbean Foreign Ministers will certainly have to look at will be whether the plan is not divisive, whether the proposal to have bilateral relations will be consistent with the aims of the Caribbean Common Market in so far as the reception of aid and bargaining with third parties are concerned.

We will have to look too to see whether the collapse of the tariff barriers in the United States as far as manufacturing products in particular coming from the region are useful for those countries that are at such a low level of development that they do not even have their infra-structure in place. We know that unless a country has reached a certain level of development when it starts, with its telephone and telecommunication system, with the training of its manpower, with the development of its market facilities and so on, it cannot begin to manufacture goods on a scale or at all that would be able to take any advantage of the collapse of the trade barriers in the United States of America.

What assistance would the collapse of tariff barriers be to a country like Dominica that has little or no manufacturing base at present? Would it be significant to a country like Montserrat or St. Kitts or St. Vincent? These are some of the questions that they will have to look at.

They will have to look specifically at the question of the textile industry and stitching industries because there is a very powerful lobby in the United States of America which does not support textiles and stitching goods coming into the United States free of duty. According to the speech made by President Reagan, textiles and stitching goods as I understand it, is one area where the collapse of the tariff walls will not apply. And it seems to me that because the stitching industry constitutes so significant a part of the industry of islands that have manufacturing industries, a special case may have to be made for example for us to have at least a large quota even if not a total collapse of the tariff walls as far as textiles and stitching goods are concerned.

These are some of the multiple questions that we will have to look at, and it is not too early to start looking at them even though the final shape of the plan is not clear at this moment. So much for the Caribbean Basin Initiative and Plan at this stage.

What I want really to respond to most specifically, Mr. Speaker, is the comment made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central with respect to the regional activity in the area of agriculture that may be affected by the Bill such as we are about to pass here today.

I think I ought to begin by saying that in so far as there is regional agricultural activity, it is for the most part accommodated within what is called the Caribbean Food Plan and which itself falls within the institutional structure known as the Caribbean Food Corporation.

This Caribbean Food Corporation, CFC as it is referred to, has had a very unsatisfactory history to date. It is about seven years old. It is headquartered in Trinidad and Tobago and it is only in the last 18 months that it has managed to attract a General Manager for the first time, so that we may fairly say that for the first five years of its existence it has really been marking time and has existed only as a paper corporation having no regional significance whatsoever. In the last 18 months they have managed to identify a large range of projects which they think they can with time, implement on a regional basis.

As far as we in Barbados are concerned, they have in particular identified two projects for us. One is a so-called feed lot system which was supposed to be located at River Plantation in St. Philip, and the other is a broiler hatchery project which is supposed to be located in St. Lucy.

With respect to the feed lot project, it is now very doubtful whether that will come as was conceived, because River Plantation which is owned by DaCosta & Musson is about — if we are not careful — to go out of production.

I say "if we are not careful" because Government has got to do its utmost best to ensure that it is brought back into production — at least the part of the plantation that can be viable and it does not fall into what is known as waste lands. The plantation is about 600 acres big. Except for Drax Hall and Kendal it is perhaps the biggest plantation in Barbados, and it would be a major blow to agriculture in the island if a tract of land as large as River Plantation were to go fully out of production.

What we are hoping is that with the new equalisation of income formula which will be applied in the sugar industry, the owners of River Plantation could be persuaded to look anew at the arithmetic of carrying on agricultural activity at River Plantation, and be persuaded finally to bring back the plantation into production. I am making arrangements for a presentation to be made to the Board of Directors of DaCosta & Musson with respect to the significance and the operation of the equalisation formula in the sugar industry so that they could give new consideration to the likelihood of bringing back River under cane production.

It might very well be that a small part of it in order to make the whole transaction viable may have to

be taken out of agriculture, but that is a matter on which we have not come to any final agreement. But it has to be understood that when we have good years in sugar, it is the marginal plantation that gives us the extra tonnage that allows us to take full advantage of any windfall, not to mention that in the sugar industry you need what is called a critical mass, a minimum tonnage of cane in order to spread your overhead and reduce the cost in the industry. So you have got to be very careful how we allow large tracts of land like 600 acres to be brought out of sugar cultivation and out of agriculture.

As far as the feed lot project for Barbados is concerned, it is hanging in the air enveloped in doubt, and I am in no position at this point to say whether or not it will come to pass as a Caribbean Food Corporation private sector and public sector project.

With respect to the broiler hatcheries project in St. Lucy, the project was first written up and costed about three years ago and with the passage of time, given the high inflation rate which is existing, the arithmetic of the project has had to be recast. It was first talked about as a \$6 million project, but the most recent figures indicated that it would cost something like \$10 million, so that the contribution which the Government originally had agreed to make was doubled and the project had to be brought back up for recasting of the arithmetic and that exercise is currently being undertaken. 4.50 p.m.

I am assured by my technicians, Sir, that that exercise will come to an end within another week and the indication is at the present moment that we may still be able to go ahead with the Broiler Hatcheries Project which will be situated in St. Lucy.

Generally speaking, we have livestock projects, seeds projects, fertiliser projects, bulk purchasing that is on a regional scale. We have a packaging project, one that I would particularly like to attract to Barbados and all of these are some of the projects, Sir, specific sheep projects, goat projects, for different islands. But one I would particularly like to attract to Barbados would be the packaging project because I think we have reached a stage in Barbados where we can well do with a packaging house.

I should mention that in addition to the two projects which I have just spoken about, we have had in recent months another regional project falling under the umbrella of the Caribbean Food Corporation which is being headquartered in Barbados and which is about to get off the ground. It is CATCO — the Caribbean Agricultural Trading Company — which has its headquarters at the Old Grantley Adams Airport and which will be operating in the area of Marketing agricultural produce.

This is an important area for agriculture, not only in Barbados but in the region because it makes no sense that the farmer produces the crop and then cannot be assured of a market — or worst still has no market. As we are encouraging farmers to produce on a much greater scale, we have to ensure not only locally but regionally, that there are institutions that will take care of the Marketing problems and allow farmers to concentrate on the difficulties of productivity. I myself entertain great hope for the future of agricultural Marketing with the coming into being of CATCO and I very much look forward to the role which it has to play in the marketing of agricultural produce in the region.

The Deputy Prime Minister has referred to the Agricultural Marketing Protocol which has not had a successful history. Now there is considerable difference of opinion among the Governments of the region as to how we can structure a useful Agricultural Marketing Protocol. Without going into all the problems which attend the working of an Agricultural Marketing Protocol, it ought to be said to the extent that most of the countries in the region produce the same projects — the same crops at about the same time — it makes it very difficult to rationalise the marketing of agricultural products when we are in a competitive rather than a complementary situation.

Nevertheless, Sir, the technicians under certain general directions of the Agricultural Ministers of the region are hard at work seeing whether they can arrive at a new formula that will be more successful and more useful in realising the objectives of an Agricultural Marketing Protocol than what we have realised and seen at work in the last few years.

With these remarks I wish to lend my support to the Bill which is before the House.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I shall be very, very brief. I rise only to say in this area of guarantee that I am relatively satisfied with the answers given to the questions and I hope that when projects are being entered into before guarantees are agreed and so on, that there should be a debate in this House.

I think that the responses to a specific question asked have been satisfactory as far as this side is concerned. It is often said that we on this side do not say when things are reasonably satisfactory. I think that the answers given have certainly satisfied me and I would really like to think that in that kind of spirit when a project is being entered into that will result in a guarantee, that we only know about it when we get a Resolution calling on the House to guarantee a particular loan or something like that.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: It seems, to me, Sir, that the honourable Member is making a useful point because it would affect the contingent liability of the Government at a time, Sir, when we have to be concerned — I would not put it any stronger than that — with matters such as contingent liability of the Government and to that extent, I think, Sir, that these guarantees should not only be entered into with caution but with having done considerable work to justify the project on its own.

I also feel myself, Sir, that before these guarantees or at the time when they are entered into, that the House should be treated with the courtesy of being informed and being provided with the opportunity for comment.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: In moving Clause 4, Clause 4 has been drawn for a specific matter to ensure that information is given to the House on a timely basis. If the honourable Member would look at Clause 4, it says:

“A loan may only be guaranteed under sub-section (1) of Section 3 for such time, on such terms and subject to such conditions as the House of Assembly approves.

A proposal for the guarantee of a loan brought before the House of Assembly must be accompanied by a statement setting out the aggregate amount of all principal moneys then remaining unpaid in respect of all other loans previously guaranteed.”

5.00 p.m.

It is a very definitive statement in that Section imposing obligations of full disclosure and at the same time ensuring that any third party with whom you are negotiating understands very clearly that whatever negotiations take place, that they are subject to the fiat of the Honourable House of Assembly. When you do these international loan negotiations, the bankers or whoever you are borrowing from always insist on a legal opinion — that the guarantee has complied with the domestic laws of the guarantor. And this is an attempt in Section 4

to reinforce the position of the supremacy of the Honourable House of Assembly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just a few words, Mr. Chairman. I do not think at this stage the Honourable House is really interested in a long debate on this. But I am very glad for the assurances given on this particular matter about information coming before the Honourable House. I know the heart of the honourable Member for Christ Church East is in the right place.....(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Still in the right place.).....as the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and other honourable Members.

But in fact, it does happen that we do not get timely information. That is a fact. I recall quite well on an occasion, dealing with a loan from the Orion Bank, activities were going on elsewhere while the Honourable House of Assembly was going through its procedures.....(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Activities here and there).....and when we sought from over here to get certain information, they seemed to have some difficulty. Up to now, I have not quite yet sorted out in my mind the various time frames that were going on to determine whether everything was done in all due propriety or not — so we are making that point.

The other general point I wish to make is that I think the Government realises — but we must keep pressing that particular point — that it is necessary in terms of our regional policy and in terms of our foreign policy to ensure that a consensus of support is built for the actions that we may take. As a Government, we can talk all we like about CARICOM, as a Government we can talk about Caribbean Basin Initiative or whatever it is. In the final resort it is going to be necessary to build a consensus of support not only within the Government, but within the political system itself, because if we cannot get that kind of support you are going to find that you may be building super structures and no base on which those super structures may be maintained.

Let us take as an example this question of the Caribbean Community. I cannot recall the last occasion on which we have had a debate on the Caribbean community and whither it is going. The "Wise Men" met. I believe they had discussions with members of the Government. They have submitted a report but those of us who represent almost 47 per cent or 48 per cent of the population in a major territory got very little consultation or no consultation at all and that has been the nature of these inter-governmental relations. We are not quarrelling at this stage. We are simply pointing out the facts and are asking for a new approach on these particular matters.

I do not think that the very report of the Caribbean Community has been laid in this Honourable Chamber yet. But here we are — passing laws to guarantee loans or financial arrangements as far as the Caribbean Community itself is concerned. But a major document related to that very Community which itself was under very serious consideration — I believe there were some comment — some commentators even went so far as to pronounce the subject dead. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Only Lennie St. Hill.) These are the things I am talking about.

It is fortunate that I have friends elsewhere and I may be able to get a copy of relevant documents. But as a member of a major regional Parliament, I should not have to be dependent upon such sources for a copy of a document relating to a major regional institution and I do hope that the Government will take note of this and take the necessary steps to improve the flow of information in respect of these regional institutions as well as in respect of the projects which may be entered into on a joint or other basis, as far as the Caribbean and beyond may be concerned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. The honourable Member makes an important point on the question of consensus. I am one of those who believe that foreign policy in a country should be conducted upon the basis that there should be a consensus of the major political parties otherwise you run into the danger, in the event of a change of Government of a change of policy and there is one thing that you learn in Constitutional theory or in Constitutional Law: that the long term stability of your country is dependent upon its foreign relations being relatively consistent.

Now, on the question of the debate on the CARICOM document. The Chairman of the Committee which was set up was instructed by the CARICOM Council to have the widest possible consultation and I am sure that notices were put in the papers requesting submission from anyone within the Caribbean Economic Community and a number of people did send in memoranda and they were invited to come and justify their memoranda. So the delinquency in that respect is not with the committee nor with the Community. I think the delinquency in that respect is more with the internal machine of the political party. We know how difficult they are to finance. We know that they do not have enough staff to really perform their function in a manner in which a great political party should do it. But that is a limitation that we all suffer from.

Since the report was submitted by the Committee, the Council of Ministers insisted before they discussed it that it was made public and Caribbean Secretariat

was authorised to print it and circulate it. So they were available. This is really a Caribbean Council of Ministers job. It is not a domestic job of Governments and we insisted that it was published.

5.10 p.m.

We delayed consideration of that report for a long period of time, and indeed the recommendations of the report only just went to Council. The Council at trade level has adopted some of the ones that relate to trade — subject of course to further comment, and we hope that when we get the comments from the various other Ministers that there will be further scope. The Ministers of Agriculture have already met and those of Foreign Relations are meeting in Belize.

We are reaching the stage now in CARICOM in which the institutional structure has to be fashioned to suit the consensus which has emerged after ten years of working. There is a strong feeling now for CARICOM throughout the area, even in the territories where it was felt before that there was no feeling. There is a lot more feeling, there are a lot more bonds and a lot more links, and we have to fashion the machinery now.

I would really like to see a consultative Parliament. I feel so, I really feel that the time has come when both the Government and the Opposition should be able to nominate somebody to a consultative Parliament. When I raise these matters people tell me that I want to reinstitute Federation in a different form. I am saying that we must devise institutions for ourselves. I feel that the time has come. These are my views on that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, just a brief rejoinder here. I would not like it to be felt that I was criticising the Caribbean Secretariat itself, because I did receive a copy from the Chairman of the Committee himself, and I would like that to be known. I was in fact talking about the arrangements.

Here we are going to go off to some kind of conference on that particular document, but we are going to go off without the Minister responsible sharing with us or exchanging any views on the position of Barbados in relation to that particular institution. It is these areas that I am going to talk about, and we are going to go and talk about Barbados' position.

Now, I believe, like the Minister, that it is time that we work out some new arrangements. Like him — and I was very surprised — I thought his brain had gone moribund. I am very glad to see that it is still very much alive and he is thinking constructively and positively on these matters. He must have been privy to my own thoughts in respect of the Caribbean Community and the need for associating some form of popular representation with that body. He can rest assured that we see eye to

eye on the broad design, we are in agreement in that particular matter.

We would like to say that obviously you are not going to get any member of the Opposition — I do not know about the Government — referring to a public notice in a newspaper to come before a Committee to give testimony or anything like that. It cannot work that way. That is for the general members of the public, that is not going to work in this particular way, but I do not think that was a serious suggestion. I do agree that for members of the general public, yes, but I think we have to work out some other mechanism for Members of Parliament.

I hope that coming from this very positive statement the Government would take the necessary steps to see that the proposal for a Foreign Affairs Select Committee of this House be put into place, as indeed other Select Committees should be put into place.

The question that clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE OF THE
REPAYMENT OF A PRINCIPAL SUM
NOT EXCEEDING \$10 MILLION**

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to provide a guarantee to the Development Bank so as to enable the Development Bank to have a bond issue in the sum of \$10 million for the purpose of financing clients who are interested in engaging in development activity in Barbados and who find that it is impossible to receive loans from existing commercial banking institutions on favourable terms.

Honourable Members are well aware that the Development Bank is the Government's major arm for long term financing of projects in the productive sectors of industry and tourism.

The availability of funds from external sources is to date \$43.8 million in aggregate. Domestic loan funds by way of National Development Bonds amount to

\$13 million and the third source of funds is the capital subscriptions in equity. These now total \$15.7 million. The Central Bank has contributed \$5 million and the remainder has been contributed by the Government. So it will be seen that the external funds are the primary source of borrowing by the Development Bank.

5.20 p.m.

The intention of the Government is to ensure that the Development Bank continues to play a major role in medium and long term financing in Barbados. If we are to borrow abroad, we must show and demonstrate that we have a commitment to the utilisation of our own savings in our community. Previous issues have been made in Barbados and we have been successful. I know that honourable Members will appreciate that part of this success has no doubt been due to the generous incentives introduced by Government whereby holdings up to \$25 000 in development bonds are tax free.

The last issue was issued at seven per cent tax free. Obviously if one was to go to the market today, it would be impossible even with its tax free status to get money at that rate. We feel however that a couple of points up on that rate will be attractive having regard to its tax free status. We also feel that Development Bonds guaranteed by Government are attractive to insurance companies and other similar financial institutions.

We hope that with the authorisation by the House of Assembly, we would be able, after a study of the market, to have an issue which will be attractive to various financial institutions and individuals in Barbados, and of course it is our only hope if we are to provide capital in the productive sectors in Barbados that we ourselves show our confidence in our institutions by investing therein.

The Government has done everything in its power to give the inducement. This is a period of time when all Barbadians must recognise that our only hope of working ourselves out of the impact of the international recession is by greater work, more savings, more marketing and greater production.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago I made a major address before this Honourable Chamber on some aspects of the Barbados Development Bank. I do not propose today to do that because many of the issues which I would raise would be repetitive in a sense. However, Sir, there are some very pertinent

questions in relation to this bond issue which are a matter of concern to the Opposition, and the first one that springs to mind is the capital status of the Bank in relation to its borrowings.

Now I see here — and I am looking at a document which I think is already a document of the House — the Central Bank of Barbados Economic and Financial Statistics, January 1982 — that up to the end of September 1981, the paid up capital was in the region of \$12.1 million. I presume that the extra \$3 million would have been paid up either by the Government or by the Central Bank of Barbados, and I would hope that the borrowings, both domestic and foreign, would be in conformity of the provisions of the Act which I think set a ceiling on borrowings in relation to the capital paid up in the Bank.

The second point which I would like to raise is that looking at the liabilities of the Barbados Development Bank I see up to the end of September last year, a fairly substantial investment using National Insurance funds to the extent of \$13 million and National Development Bonds to the extent of \$12 million at that time. I also note and have commented on the significant increase in the foreign borrowings by the Development Bank, and I had made a point which I wish to repeat today: that foreign borrowings by the Barbados Development Bank should be used in a manner which would generate foreign exchange in the short and medium term.

There is no point, Sir, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister recognising at this late stage that we can only get out of our difficulties by hard work and productivity and by savings. If they had recognised that 18 months ago we would not be faced with the present problems, because it would appear that the general approach then was to get out of their difficulties by borrowings and other gymnastics in relation to the allocation of domestic funds.

I believe that the allocation of borrowings from the IDB would have gone up since September last year, and there is another section here which is of some concern to me — the section in terms of liabilities where a figure of \$8.9 million is under "Other Liabilities".

Now I do not know the extent to which the Central Bank has been providing bridging finance to the Barbados Development Bank. I gather that that was alluded to some time ago on the Floor of this House. I can quite understand the Central Bank investing in the capital structure of the Barbados Development Bank out of the profits made by the Central Bank, but I think we have to be very careful where we have had such extensive money creation to avoid a situation where the Central Bank finds itself providing bridging finance for other Government

financial institutions, namely, the Barbados Development Bank and the Barbados National Bank. We have to watch that because I am not quite so sure what these other liabilities to the extent of \$8.9 million at the end of September, 1981, constituted — and there is no note to that effect — nor would that have been reflected in the last annual report of the Barbados Development Bank which was laid in this Honourable House, since that would have encompassed the period up to March 31, 1981, and we are a little beyond that in the reports available at present.

Now, Sir, again I do not wish to get into the details in this area. But it looks to me, Sir, as though the trend of investments in the hotel industry has continued certainly up to the end of December 1981 where there has been a tremendous weighing of investments in the area of apartments and so on. You see I think we have reached the point where apart from the economic considerations, the viability of the Bank itself could be somewhat threatened if you have such a large amount of money invested in one portfolio and you run into one or two bad areas where the Bank might then be faced with a situation where it would have to do vital refinancing of the projects to which they had made the original loans because there is no point having a hotel that is not making money and which is unable to meet its mortgage repayments and telling them that they have to pay.

5.30 p.m.

You may have no choice but to refinance and you may have no choice but to reschedule payments and so on which means of course that you must compromise the viability of the Bank particularly as its paid up capital is relatively low in terms of its lending which I think would have gone over the \$60 million mark by now. It is over \$60 million and the paid up capital is about \$15 million or something like that and you are not dealing with a commercial bank where there is a pretty rapid turnover in terms of your liabilities.

You are talking of the Development Bank where your liabilities are long termed so to speak, so that that aspect has to be looked at. And I think that there should be some greater diversification of the portfolio of investment by the Barbados Development Bank to make sure that if one particular sector goes into decline you should have other sectors that can take up the slack because we are unlikely to find ourselves too often in a situation where every sector of the community is in a state of depression.

The other concern of mine, Sir, is that the level of interest rates being charged by the Barbados Development Bank at the moment might put some of their own projects into a tail spin. I am not saying that the rates are as high as the commercial rates. Do not get me wrong. I am saying that a rise of one percent or two percent in a

project that has a lower equity input as is not uncommon in projects financed by the Barbados Development Bank — I do not say that it is necessarily wrong where you are trying to help people who do not have a large amount of capital to get off the ground — you have to watch the interest rates being charged by the Development Bank because you might find yourself in a situation where the interest you charge might destroy the viability of the very project that you are funding.

As a corollary to this, Sir, I think that one of the saddest things in the banking system today is that in our own Barbados National Bank and the Barbados Development Bank should now be in a position because of the special and preferential treatment which they have in relation to the banking system, to be using their capacities and their capabilities to help keep interest rates down in Barbados.

Now, they themselves are in fact caught up in the spiral. And contrary to what some persons might think, I understand that some of the highest rates of interest being charged in Barbados today are being charged by the Barbados National Bank because the only access of fund that they would have would be from the Central Bank and you know you have to borrow those funds at something like two per cent for onlending. So these banks should be in a strong position when you are in a recession to take up the slack in respect of small manufacturing to keep small commercial enterprises going and so on.

I have lumped the two together but quite clearly there would be different functions for the two different banks. Nevertheless, there are now roughly in the same position as the commercial banks and the trust companies of those commercial banks in respect of the level of interest that they have to charge for their own survival. So I think that it is necessary to review the long term planning in respect of our financial institutions both of which are very important — one totally founded by the Democratic Labour Party, the other one representing an amalgam of banks founded by the Democratic Labour Party. Let us face it. That is the situation.

If my advice had been taken a year ago when along with the honourable Member for St. Andrew we have been pressing for the removal of Agriculture from the Barbados National Bank, I think the Barbados National Bank would be in a position today to soften the impact of high interest rates on the economy of Barbados. I think that would have been possible. I really think so because when I look at the distribution of loans to the agricultural sector from the Barbados Development Bank, and when I look at the distribution of loans to the agricultural sector from the Barbados National Bank, it is quite clear to me that it is the agricultural portfolio that is killing the Barbados National Bank. The Barbados Development Bank accounts look much better because

they have not been lending in the area of agriculture. So it is obvious to me that we need now to look for a separate financial institution to deal with the whole question of agriculture in the context of Barbados — one that is relevant to agriculture.

With these few comments, Sir, I would like to close my very brief address except that I would have liked to have expanded a bit more on other areas of expansion.

I think Fisheries could certainly come under the portfolio of the Barbados Development Bank or certainly to a greater extent because I noticed that since 1978 — and I believe that Agriculture and Fisheries are lumped together — that there has hardly been any lending in that area; none since 1978. There is a complete blank, no lending at all in that area. The Government has got to make up its mind whether Agriculture and Fisheries are important and whether or not a development institution similar to the Barbados Development Bank would not be required to handle Agriculture and Fisheries or whether Fisheries should be separated from Agriculture in terms of its financing and Fisheries placed again under the portfolio of the Barbados Development Bank.

These are the only comments I have to make because I think my reservations in respect to specific loans and specific approaches to lending by the Barbados Development Bank have been fully canvassed on the Floor of this House only two weeks or so earlier. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to be very long in my contribution but I think that the speech made by the last honourable Member made it necessary for us to restate the resources from which the Barbados Development Bank gets its money and to indicate precisely what is the contribution of the Central Bank of Barbados which is the shareholder, Sir, of the Barbados Development Bank.
5.40 p.m.

Generally, Sir, to comment on the spread of the portfolio of the Barbados Development Bank and to comment, Sir, on the last point made by the last honourable speaker, Sir, which deals with the financing of agriculture and particularly the financing of the fishing sector. There are four sources, Sir, from which the Barbados Development Bank gets its money.

The first source, Sir, is one which can be regarded as external to Barbados and here I am referring to institutions such as the World Bank, the IADB and the European Development Fund. To date, Sir, the Barbados Development Bank has negotiated loans from these external sources of \$43.8 million in aggregate.

The second source, Sir, is by way of domestic loan funds. Here I am referring to mechanisms such as the one we are dealing with namely, National Development Bonds and as you know, Sir, this is the fourth National Development Bond issue that we are contemplating. To date that source of National Development Bonds has provided \$13 million.

The third source, Sir, of funds is the capital subscriptions in the Bank's equity. This now totals \$15.7 million, Sir, of which the Central Bank has contributed \$5 million and the remainder. I repeat that, Sir, the third source of funds is the capital subscriptions in the banks equity. This now totals 15.7 million of which the Central Bank has contributed \$5 million and the Government, the remainder.

The fourth source of funds, Sir, arise from recoveries from loans and earnings from its operations, from the banks operations.

Now the bank, Sir, is a major arm of financing, Sir, for the long term financing of projects in the productive sectors of industry and tourism. And I want to make a point at this stage, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party Government, in the last five years since we were in office, has invested extremely heavily in the productive sectors of this economy. Indeed we would not have been able to realise the gains which we were able to realise in the last five years had it not been for the fact, Sir, that the productive capacity of the Government of the country was in place. We do not take all the credit for that. Successive Governments in this country have invested in it. But I think it is fair to say that a good proportion — a more than adequate proportion of the money which the Government invested in the last five years, Sir, went into the productive sector.

Indeed at one point, Sir — to take the Industrial Development Corporation — we were accused of over building, of over investing in plant capacity in the development of industrial parks in this country. But I am proud to be able to say Sir, that you cannot get into Newton Industrial Park because there is no space available. We have exhausted the area earmarked for building. You cannot get into Wildey. We have exhausted that, Sir. Indeed when we at the IDC gave away the remainder of the land that was available there for an expansion and for the building of a warehouse by Banks and also for the building of the Polyclinic in Wildey, that was effectively the end of the land for industrial development policy, Sir.

So except for the industrial park at Grantley Adams Airport, we have in effect no land left now in the parks which have been in existence for the past few years. That is not strictly correct, Sir, I would have to amend

that and say that there is still some land available at Six Cross Roads but that is the reason, Sir, why we have decided to invest in an industrial park, Sir, in the north of the island between St. Peter and St. Lucy. Just to illustrate in the area of industry, Sir, I think it is fair to say that significantly large and indeed adequate portions of funds which the Government invested in the last five years went into strengthening the productive capacity of this country and we can illustrate that not only in the industry but we can illustrate that also in tourism.

With respect to tourism, Sir, the large lending by the bank in the tourist sector in the last several years, reflected the fact, Sir, that this was a tremendously high growth area in the economy and where there is money to be made, Sir, when you have a sector that is growing rapidly obviously, Sir, there is going to be a high demand for the investment of funds in that area.

Apart from the fact, Sir, that there has been a slowing down of growth in that sector, it must also be said, Sir, that the Government as a deliberate policy has now decided that the Hotel Aids Act, Sir, which used to apply to all hotels over 10 rooms regardless of where located in the island, be amended and between the middle of Christ Church and some point beyond Holetown, Sir — which would cover much of the South Coast, the St. Michael area and much of the West Coast, Sir — you can no longer get hotel aids.

We feel, Sir, that the purpose for which the Hotel Aids Act was put on the Statute Book has been realised and except you are now putting a hotel on the St. Philip Coast, the St. John, St. Joseph Coast or parts of lower St. Peter, St. Lucy or indeed, eastern Christ Church, you cannot now qualify for hotel aids regardless of the size of your hotel and I think you must be outside of the zone which I have just indicated.

The reason why that particular area has been left out is because we would like to do our best to promote and encourage the development of hotels in the East Coast and eastern Christ Church and also in the north of the island. (Hon. H. B. St. John: That is right.) But except for that area, Sir, you can no longer qualify for our hotel aids. I think it is fair to say that you may still qualify for funding from the Development Bank. The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister corrects that Sir. The position is that once you fall within the area that I indicated, you cannot qualify either for loan financing from the Development Bank or for hotel aids. So the Government's new policy would arrest and put an end to the trend which you have been concerned with and have been commenting upon. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: For three years.)

I will go further, Sir, and say that the fact that a large part of the portfolio of the Bank has not been con-

cerned with manufacture relative to tourism is not a reflection of the fact, Sir, that there has not been a considerable amount of new manufacturing activity going on in Barbados in recent years.

What has happened — as the honourable Member well knows — is that for many years in Barbados, manufacturing activity was financed by overseas funding because a lot of the manufacturing activity resulted from foreign countries coming here and taking advantage of the Fiscal Incentives legislation on our Statute Book.

In addition to that, in so far as local companies until recent years had been involved in manufacturing, they have tended to be the companies that form part of the first six of the big company groups in Barbados and they have been able to finance themselves either from reserves generated from within or through dealing with the commercial bank in Bridgetown.

5.50 p.m.

Recently, however, there has been a lot of Barbadian owned manufacturing activity which has been originated in the country, but that is for the most part small business activity where the demand is not for one or two million dollars, but often for only \$75 000, \$100 000 or \$200 000. If, for example, you are building a hotel — and here again there is a difference with tourism — because if you are putting up a hotel of 25 rooms at today's costing you may very well have to use \$1.5 million. On the other hand, you could start a small business employing about 25 people, or perhaps even a little less, with a capital perhaps only of three or four hundred thousand dollars, depending on the nature of the business.

So you ought not to read into the fact that tourism has a large part of the portfolio of the Development Bank, any conclusion or any inference that they have not been supporting manufacturing activity or that no manufacturing activity has been going on. I thought it was necessary to put the whole thing into its historical context.

With respect to the agricultural sector, Sir, and the fisheries sector, the Barbados National Bank is the lending arm for those sectors. Considerable doubt has been expressed in recent times — and perhaps you were not even in the House — the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — but when the legislation came before this House seeking to put all of the lending arms of the Government under the umbrella of the Barbados National Bank, I myself went on record as being concerned about the likely outcome of that policy.

I felt then that the commercial bank, the Barbados National Bank, could not do commercial lending and developmental lending at the same time — that it was asking

too much of one institution. It would be to give it a kind of schizophrenic personality and that perhaps we ought then to have kept an agricultural bank in existence, however named or however structured, by itself, and that for sure the Barbados Development Bank ought never to come under the umbrella of the Barbados National Bank.

The position is today, Sir, that the Barbados Development Bank never went within the structure of the Barbados National Bank, and I think that it is a good thing it never happened. I think too that with the passage of time we can say that it was perhaps unwise to put the agricultural division within the framework of the Barbados National Bank, and consideration is being given to what sort of alternative institution or mechanism we may devise so as to have a lending arm to the agricultural sector separate and apart and outside the framework of the Barbados National Bank.

But the point has got to be made that the Barbados National Bank has been lending to the agricultural sector, and on a very large scale too — particularly to the sugar industry. They have also been lending to the fisheries sector, so if you do not see fisheries loans reflected in the Barbados Development Bank's Report, it is because of the fact that the agricultural division of the Barbados National Bank has been responsible for lending to that sector.

There have been in recent times considerable and exciting developments in the fisheries sector because, for example, we now have the intermediate size boat which can go out for about a week equipped with ice facilities and also with modern navigational aids — a boat of between approximately 36 and 45 feet — we have now reached the point where there are about 12 of those boats in existence, and there are seven others in the process of preparation. That is a very significant new development in the fishing industry, so reading the Report of the Barbados Development Bank one ought not to get the impression that there has been no activity and certainly no lending to the fisheries sector in Barbados.

A large number of small fishermen doing artesial fishing — fishing within the reefs — go out early on mornings and come back in on evenings to catch the householders and the housewives at five, six and seven o'clock in the evenings. A large amount of lending has been done to that sector by the Barbados National Bank.

Now, with respect to the point made on interest, Sir, in 1981 there was a dramatic increase in interest rates around the world as far as banking institutions are concerned, and the first three bond issues went at a reasonably low interest rate — I think it was perhaps seven per cent — and they were very successful except for the last

strands of the third issue. Clearly it would be unattractive for the insurance companies and the other financial institutions to take up Development Bonds at anything less than ten per cent. That is why this issue is going out at ten per cent.

I have reason to think that the secondary financial institutions — the insurance companies, banks — are particularly keen on these Development Bond issues. They represent an effort at self-help, because we are generating funds from within, and I very much hope that these issues will be as quickly taken up as the first three bond issues have been taken up, because the point has got to be made — and I conclude on this point — that the developing countries much as they are right in demanding a new deal from the developed countries — as far as concessionary loans are concerned, and as far as the developed countries opening their markets to their produce is concerned — in the final analysis, Sir, we have to help ourselves, and that is what an exercise such as the one that we are seeking to give parliamentary sanction to is concerned with. It is in the final analysis an exercise in self-help, and I hope that all Barbadians who can afford to take up some of these points will do so with the understanding that the country has got to help itself.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to support this issue, the fourth issue of the National Development Bonds put out by the Barbados Development Bank, and would urge Barbadians to go out and buy as many as they can, because it certainly is a very good deal for them and for Barbados as well.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made the point that perhaps the Charter of the Barbados Development Bank needed to be looked at with the possibility of some review, but the establishment of the Development Bank Charter basically states that the primary purpose of the Bank is to provide medium and long term finances for development enterprises, co-operatives and small businesses which contribute to the economic development and the well-being of the country and to mobilise domestic and foreign financial resources by encouraging savings and investment, to attract foreign long term capital for investment in the productive sector and to encourage the development of an indigenous entrepreneurial class.

6.00 p.m.

I really to not see where this charter would have to be revised because it certainly covers now what it was meant to cover even in 1969 when the Development Bank was set up, and the methodology remains the same: to provide financial assistance by way of loans by issue of its own debentures, to promote, effect and to induce guarantees and the right to participate in and so on. So the charter in my view does not necessarily need any further consideration. It covers basically the requirements for the moment.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central stated that perhaps we had spent more money in tourism than in any other sector. This is true and the records will prove him out in this particular detail, but one must remember also that the Development Bank has been very involved in industry, and over the last five years through the Industrial Development Corporation over 1.4 million square feet of space was created by the IDC.

Mr. Speaker, the space now required on the books of IDC as far as people who are interested in opening industries are concerned is approximately 120 200 square feet and there is an on-going programme. Presently there are 52 500 square feet of building space being created as well as 37 500 at a different stage. Also being created and scheduled for April 1982, was an additional 61 000 square feet of space.

Now as these industries come into the mainstream and are finished, you will find that the differential of the Development Bank will be greatly reduced because more money will be put into industry than in tourism. Because of the measures which the Government took as outlined by the last speaker — the honourable Member for Christ Church East — this would also ensure that there is a better distribution of the money from the Development Bank.

Sir, though I agree that previously the Development Bank has been involved more in tourism, a change started back in 1980, but certainly in April, 1981, the loan disbursements for tourism from the Barbados Development Bank were \$197 000 and for small business it was \$161 000, so the differential is not too great. In May 1981 tourism received \$265 000 approximately, industry received \$589 000 and small business \$273 000, so in May of last year both industry and small business received more money from the Development Bank than did tourism, and in July of the same year again perhaps tourism may have escalated in that particular month, but in August and September of the very year — 1981 — industry and small business surpassed that of tourism. The amount of money which was given to these two sectors exceeded what was given to tourism.

One must also remember that in 1976 manufacturing totalled approximately \$78 million while manufacturing in 1981 totalled over \$243 million. So as has been said by the last speaker, a lot of money has been spent in the productive sector.

Mr. Speaker in November and December of 1981, and indeed in January 1982, we see the same sort of significant decline in all sectors as a result of the recession, if one wants to call it that, that we are experiencing. But immediately one gets the impression — and one

can see from the figures — that the Development Bank has taken note of the point which has been made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that perhaps too much money is being spent in the tourism sector, and certainly something is being done to redress the imbalance.

Now he talked about the Development Bank's interest rates being too high. The interest rates now from the Development Bank to those persons who want to borrow money I believe is 12 per cent. I do not believe that in Bridgetown any commercial business wanting to borrow money today, industry or otherwise, can get it for less than 16 per cent, 16.5 per cent or maybe 17 per cent. So one must still consider 12 per cent to be a very good rate based on the present circumstances, and only last Tuesday when we borrowed some money from OPEC at 8 per cent it was considered a soft loan, so 12 per cent is not really a bad loan at all based on the present circumstances.

Interest rates in Barbados have to be forced upwards because of what was happening to the Foreign Reserves in Barbados, Mr. Speaker. You see when in the United States of America, in Europe and in Canada interest rates are at the level of 22 percent and 23 percent, when they reach these unprecedented levels and the private sector imports a lot of goods and services from overseas, when these goods were normally granted 30, 60 or 90 days' credit from the overseas creditors and from the confirming houses or by their suppliers in 1980, no interest charges were passed on to the Barbadian purchasers.

But as a result of the high interest rates which escalated in North America and in Europe, what happened was that many of the suppliers were refusing Barbados' creditors any more credit saying that from thereon in you must pay for your purchase by sight-draft, and if we had to extend credit 30, 60 or 90 days, it means we would have to charge two percent per month.

While this was happening of course the rates in Barbados were only 10 percent, 11 percent and 11.5 percent, so it made it easier for the private and business sector in Barbados to borrow money from the commercial banks here to pay for the goods and services which they purchased from overseas rather than waiting the usual 30, 60, 90 or 120 days. This has accounted for the sudden decline in our Foreign Reserves during the earlier part of last year and in fact the latter part of last year as well.

It has been pointed out where as a result of the recession, some countries suffered high unemployment or high interest rates. Barbados has done reasonably well by being able to maintain employment levels and the inflation rate has not indeed been that bad. Barbados'

inflation rate last year was 14.6 percent, and when one compares that with Jamaica, 18 percent; Mexico, 27 percent; Britain, 11.5 percent; Canada, 12.5 percent and of course in Central America — Costa Rica, 32 percent; Argentina, 138 percent; Israel, 130 percent; I do not think for a small country that we are doing that badly.

So in spite of the recession, we are able to control our inflation, we are able to maintain tolerable levels of unemployment, but we are suffering through our Foreign Reserves, and all these factors have to be taken into consideration. Under the circumstances, I do not see how the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central could think that 12.5 percent from the Barbados Development Bank is high. I think it is quite reasonable though I would like to see it a lot lower, say 10 percent where it was prior to 1981, but eventually I am quite sure it will go back to that.

In conclusion, Sir, let me say again that I would like to support the Barbados Development Bank's issue of National Development Bonds and I urge Barbadians to go out and buy as many as they can.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Item No. 4.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BANK HALL, ST. MICHAEL

Item No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the abandonment of the acquisition of land at Bank Hall, St. Michael.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on October 21, 1980, this Honourable Chamber approved a Resolution which sought parliamentary approval for the acquisition of a portion of land in Bank Hall which measures 63 052 square metres or .776 hectares. This land belongs to the Yellow Transport and the purpose of this acquisition was to provide land for the purpose of building houses.

Since this Resolution was passed and assented to by His Excellency, soil tests were carried out on this land and it was discovered that it was of limited use. In other words, Sir, it was discovered that the land was suitable only for chattel houses and not permanent structures. It was also discovered that there was a drainage problem and that the foundation was in some cases some 12 feet deep. The technical advice available to the Ministry suggested that it was rather expensive to erect houses on such land and in addition to that the drainage problems would be very serious indeed.

Added to this is that when the land was first sought and the owners were approached with a view to reaching a compromise on the price of the land, it was felt that our suggested figure of \$2 per square foot was then mooted around. But since 1977, circumstances which one does not know have developed, and when the Ministry sought to negotiate a reasonable price for the land, the Ministry was told that the vendors were now asking some \$5 per square foot. Considering that the land was — in the technical adviser's opinion — not suitable for erecting permanent structures and consideration that there were acute drainage problems, it was thought that to pay \$5 per square foot for such land would be quite unjustified and therefore it was felt that Government should not pursue the purchasing of this land.

Alternative use for the land was considered but the Government feels that to purchase land at \$5 per square foot to provide recreational facilities would be an abuse of the responsibility which it is endowed with. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Government feels that whenever it has to pay for land, that it should reflect a reasonable price.

Now the Government has decided by acquisition which was brought before this Honourable Chamber recently to acquire a portion of land at Bank Hall and the purpose for which this land was sought at first will be now realised by the acquisition of this land. It was felt when the acquisition of this land was considered, that people who had to be resited as a result of the Spring Garden Road and Church Village would be resited on this land belonging to the Yellow Transport but having found an alternative site, it is no longer necessary to use this portion of land. I have stated all the factors which operate against purchasing or continuing to negotiate for this land.

I must also point out, Sir, that when one considers that an offer of \$5 per square foot is exceptionally high and in addition to that one considers that the infrastructural services have got to be put in, when the final figure is realised, one then finds that the land will work out at somewhere in the region of \$7 or \$8 per square foot and that is asking too much of a sensible Government.

We are charged, as I have said before, with a responsibility to see that the public's money is spent on wise projects and I remember on reflection honourable Members on that side calling on Government to abandon projects or even acquisitions of land when it is considered unsuitable or operating against the interest of the Government and the economy. We feel that this particular acquisition will operate against wise judgment.

The Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, the Laws of Barbados, provides that if land is acquired through that

Act that in order to abandon such acquisition, parliamentary approval must first be sought. The Act clearly sets out the process by which this should be done. In order to publish in the *Official Gazette* notice of the abandonment, this Honourable Chamber must first give approval of a Resolution. It must also have the blessing of the other Chamber and His Excellency's assent.

So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reason for having this Resolution brought before this Honourable Chamber is to get parliamentary approval so that the relevant notice could be published in the *Official Gazette* thereby signifying that the Government has abandoned the acquisition. 6.20 p.m.

I must point out that we are also aware that any compensation which is payable to the vendors or the owners of the land is provided for under the same Act. So there should not be any questions as to whether or not the owners of the land will be compensated for any work like soil tests or any disruption that took place on the land.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said, I have set out quite clearly the reason for bringing this Resolution before this Honourable Chamber and I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the Hon. Minister of Housing for having acceded to a request made last week in bringing here the plans of the land to be abandoned. Certainly it is in this spirit that I think Parliament works better. I am grateful to him and I hope that this practice will continue.

On this occasion, I also want to say that in my opinion this is a sensible decision by the Minister of Lands to abandon this particular portion of land having been given the facts leading up to it. But I am a little bit surprised that the things he spoke of were not discovered before the actual acquisition of the land had been done because under Section 3 of the Act, it says quite clearly that as soon as it appears to the Minister that the Government will be likely to need any particular land, that the Chief Surveyor can enter after notices have been published on three occasions to carry out surveying, bore holes *et cetera*, *et cetera*.

I think that the Hon. Minister and his Ministry might have been let down on this occasion by the technical personnel advising the Ministry in this particular matter since the location of the land and the purpose for which it was needed should have been dictated to the technical advisors or to the Minister that things like bore holes *et cetera* should have been done before it had reached that stage.

Secondly, I think that the process of negotiation having reached the point where the owners of the land were asking \$5.00, I too would have acted similarly in this capacity. It is approximately \$1.50 per square foot now to provide infrastructural work for houses and as so rightly said, you would have certainly ended up by having house spots at about \$8.00 and \$9.00 per square foot. I am taking into consideration that some kind of percentage would have to be added for the expenses of the corporation concerned.

Cap. 228 of the Act specifically sets out that on abandonment any expenses incurred by the person up to that point should be taken care of under the Act. The only thing is that the Act uses the word, "actual expenses," and I would like the Hon. Minister to consider the fact that the owners might have incurred some actual expenses in the preparation of their case or in presenting it for compensation to the Ministry. The Ministry should have a very careful look and see what part of this expense is incurred by the owners of the land and should be returned to the owners by way of compensation for the actual damages to it.

On the topic, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to see that the Ministry is taking an approach to the whole idea of compulsory acquisition in as fair a way as possible both to the Government and to the other persons out there since I am a little bit surprised — I heard and I subsequently read that the Minister said some time in this Honourable House that there might be outstanding as much as \$10 million due by way of claims for lands that the Government has compulsorily acquired.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair amount of money and if you look at the ramifications of this, it can spell quite a lot of hardship for people. I understand that some of the claims go as far back as 1978 and it is quite obvious that people would have been without the use and privilege of their lands in some cases since 1978 and without the compensation paid for them to acquire comparable accommodation or comparative land if they want similar land to do something. Those four years can mean a lot of hardship to people in lots of ways.

First of all, in cases where there were properties that were acquired, it would mean that the people would have to have been paid or looking for some type of accommodation over the period that they were waiting for the compensation to acquire alternative accommodation. During that period that they have been waiting, as I said before, unless there is a breakdown in the negotiations and the compensation has to be fixed by a judge, there is no interest given on the waiting period — the time the Government enters into actual possession and the time compensation is paid out and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is not at all fair because you have people who are

incurring the expense of actual everyday expenses of living.

Secondly, they are further deprived by the fact that the alternative property that they may seek to purchase is rising at a substantial annual increase. And thirdly what is making it even worse is that they may not get any type of interest on the funds unless as I have said, it has gone to the courts before.

I can only implore the Hon. Minister and the Ministry.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Junior division.)..... that they should have a careful stock taking of all the parcels of land that have been acquired or are in the process of being acquired and if in the Ministry's opinion that there are portions of land — compensation of which cannot be paid quite readily or as soon as possible, he should not be afraid to do what he is doing here now — abandon some of those acquisitions. If the economic trend and the Government's financial position dictate that there should be abandonment of some of these acquisitions it is better, Mr. Speaker, for them to do that than to have people continually waiting for compensation from year to year which is creating hardships on the people.

I think now is a good time for the Ministry to do some stock taking, see what they must actually have for the development of Barbados, see what funds are available to the Ministry for payment of compensation, list those in order of priority, pay for those that they have funds for and those that they cannot see funds for coming in the immediate future, I think they should abandon some of them so we should have a clean slate and people would know exactly what is happening as far as the Government acquisition of land is concerned. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply to the honourable Member. He has raised a very interesting point on the question of compensation — the length of time that actually elapses during the time of the actual entering upon the land and the time for reaching an agreement. I think what has happened is that an amendment to the Act needs to be made to make it possible — in fact to make a stipulated time during which negotiations or settlement should be reached. In the absence of failing to agree during that stipulated time, I feel that we should go to court or arbitration. I think that is what it should be amended to reflect.
6.30 p.m.

I have noted the other points raised by the honourable Member and I will not on this occasion seek to prolong the House any longer.

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 QUEEN STREET, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken with honourable Members on the other side about this. It is not a very difficult Resolution, all that happened is that there has been a flooding problem at Queen Street, St. Peter, and it has occupied the attention of the former administration for some time now. Since 1974 negotiations with the respective owners of the land in that area had taken place, and what has happened is that those persons have decided to allow Government to acquire narrow portions of land in order to provide for an outfall drain so that the flooding in this area will be relieved.

The reason for this Resolution taking so long to come before this Honourable Chamber is because of the difficulty in obtaining the relevant plans. We are now in possession of these, and accordingly I now ask that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to underline one point made by my colleague — the member for St. Philip North — and I hope that the good people of St. Peter for whom this land has been acquired will not have to wait for an unduly long time.

There are a number of people who are awaiting compensation for land acquired, and I think it has reached the stage where some of the public servants may feel themselves endangered because they tend to the first line that the vendors may come to when they go to ask about their payments. I am certain that the Minister realises this is a problem.

He is suggesting that it may be a question of an amendment to the Act. I am not too certain that is what is really required, but I would suggest that in the interest of some of the public servants who may have to meet the wrath and ire of the public that some type of solution to this problem be found.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point here which I think is the final point. I would like all honourable Members to know that I have been meeting with those persons who have outstanding matters. I have settled the ones at Workmans, St. George and I have also met the people from Ellerton, St. George whose lands were purchased since 1976, so I think that if I continue in this light there should not be much of a problem.

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

THE OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us seeks to amend the Occupational Training Act of 1979. That Act came into force in order to establish a National Training Board which would be responsible for all occupational training in Barbados.

The rationale for this legislation was based upon a comprehensive analysis of the demands for training among youths in Barbados. It was recognised that the apprenticeship programme which was operated under the aegis of the Ministry of Education had atrophied and virtually nothing was done for the development of apprentices since the 1950s. This is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in many other countries where occupational training and vocational training co-existed within the Ministry of Education, occupational training tended to suffer.

Ministries of Education have traditionally been oriented towards institution building. The glamorous polytechnics, community colleges and other expensive educational infrastructure were given priority over occupational training — a more mundane, less glamorous, less conspicuous kind of activity.

Not only was this deficiency manifest in Barbados, it was also manifest in the United Kingdom, Canada and most other countries whose thrust in the area of technical training I am led to conjecture that we were in. We found that there were thousands of youths unemployed who might otherwise find employment if they were provided with minimum basic skills. I myself was instrumental in recruiting a United Nations expert called Monsieur Bazinet in early 1978 to advise the Government, and out of this advice came the establishment of the Skills Training Programme — a short term highly intensive training programme which was designed to last some 12 to 16 weeks in order to equip people between the ages of 16 and 25 with some proficiency in an aspect of a trade.

This programme which became operational in 1979 has been very successful. Since that time well over 600 persons have received training and the Ministry of Labour has had a phenomenally successful placement rate of approximately 90 percent of the people who graduated from the short term skills training programme.

It is open to these graduates, if they so choose, to transfer to another aspect of training in the same trade or a different trade known as a module, and over a period of time it is possible for youth to be trained in every

module in a particular trade and thereby become fully fledged apprentices.

The period of training of an apprentice normally takes four to five years, but it is recognised that many young people have financial responsibilities to their families, and therefore the short term programme — the Skills Training project — enables young people to go into the job market after 12 to 16 weeks of training. 6.40 p.m.

Now this type of training was removed from the Ministry of Education — wisely, in my view — to the Ministry of Labour because apprentices are hybrids in the place of work, for while they are trainees and students like students at the Polytechnic, yet at the same time they have the attributes of workers since they function within a work situation and alongside normal workers. It was therefore felt that if we were to modernise and revamp our apprenticeship system, it was better to do it under the confines of the Ministry of Labour rather than the Ministry of Education having regard to the fact that historically Ministries of Labour have been able to perform the task of running more effective apprenticeship programmes than Ministries of Education because of the dualistic nature of an apprentice.

It became necessary after further examination to provide for occupational training in a much more comprehensive way. It is one thing to have an *ad hoc* programme training young people in short term activities, but we felt that the demands for apprentices were so great that it was necessary for the National Training Board to devise ways of longer term training, and thus the Occupational Training Act which created the mechanism through the national training programme which would be responsible for coordinating all aspects of occupational training.

I do not want to go into a lengthy historical disquisition on the iniquitous institution of apprenticeships in this country, but this Act of 1979 extirpated from the Statute Book the remaining conceptual relics of slavery.

Terms like "master" in relation to people who trained apprentices were removed and in particular the diabolical provision which required an apprentice who did not obey a so-called master to be ordered by a magistrate to repair the master's home or sweep his yard or perform any other menial tasks until he was considered purged of whatever his insubordination was.

So it was a landmark piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that has abolished the grosser forms of apprenticeship which I am sure had fallen into desuetude before this Act was enacted, but they still represented the law of this country.

This legislation before us is an amendment to that Bill in order to facilitate the rapid implementation of the Act of 1979 and to expand its purposes.

One of the things the Act does is to change the way in which the operations of the National Training Board will be financed. Under the 1979 Act, among other things, the Minister of Labour could have imposed a levy of one per cent of the total wage Bill of an employer. Now the power to impose a levy is conferred upon the Minister of Finance and the levy proposed in the Budget of 1981 was 0.25 per cent.

At the same time part of this money will be used to finance a non-military service training scheme for youths which will be carried out in conjunction with the Defence Force. This is nothing new. Over the past 14 months, the Skills Training Project of the Ministry of Labour and the Defence Force have undertaken joint projects of training which include certain kinds of discipline which I believe are sadly lacking in our society today.

The third provision in this amendment would be the establishment of a revolving fund which could be made available to employers who were conducting training programmes approved by the National Training Board, and the fourth basic objective would be to authorise the National Training Board to make available funds for the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity in the execution of its training programmes.

Most of the other provisions, Mr. Speaker, are straightforward provisions which are common to more statutory bodies and enable such organisations to carry out their functions with a greater degree of flexibility. I think these provisions are non-controversial and could find ready acceptance of this Honourable House.

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

Mr. A. TRUSS: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very, very brief. I notice that 7 o'clock will soon be upon us. I would just like to refer to one or two general principles in the Bill just introduced by the Hon. Minister of Transport. I believe that the Hon. Prime Minister would agree with me if I quote him by saying that this is another manifestation of the sloppiness of the Government in the management of its financial affairs where a budget was introduced on March 31 last year where these levies had been collected since July 6, and where in breach of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act the enabling legislation is now brought before this Parliament

almost eleven months after when the Act stipulates that it should be four months, and I presume that he has taken the position of the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister that all the money collected so far should be considered as voluntary contributions. That is one point. The second point, Sir,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister has not spoken to this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am referring to the principle, not the Clause.

Mr. SPEAKER: But I say the Deputy Prime Minister has not spoken on this matter.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Of collections and other matters. Secondly Sir, ...

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Hon. Minister rise?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of elucidation. No money has been collected under this levy. This is a new arrangement and there has been no money at all collected under this levy. This Act does not give retroactive effect to any revenue that has been collected. It merely seeks to transfer to the Minister of Finance the power under the old Act that the Minister of Labour had, but which was never exercised.
6.50 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thanks for the point of elucidation. The second point, Sir, I would like to make is that whereas I noted that in respect of the Transport Levy fund that the Minister responsible for Transport will be responsible for withdrawals from that fund and supervision of that fund, I wonder what reason exist.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the Transport Levy to do with this?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am just drawing a comparison because in this piece of legislation the Minister of Transport is actually in charge of the financial arrangement for the fund as distinct from the other levy from which the fund was established. I was just wondering what that point was and the third point was whether.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. You are not going to travel too fast for the Chair. You alluded to the Transport Levy. What is the Transport Levy to do with the Bill before this House?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, all I was trying to point out is that in the one instance the fund and withdrawals

from the fund is under the control of the Minister responsible for that area and in this instance it is under the control of the Minister of Finance. I am just pointing out the lack of uniformity in approaching these matters.

The final point I wish to make very briefly, Sir, is whether the Hon. Minister of Finance would indicate to me whether the amount deducted — 0.25 percent — would constitute a tax deductible expense or in the alternate, whether there will be a tax credit. If you regard it as a tax, obviously you cannot deduct a tax but whether the employer would be able to treat that as a tax credit at the end of the year and whether the same would obtain to other levies except the Health Levy, I think it was.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER reported the passing of one Bill in Committee accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business for today and I would like to thank the Opposition for keeping the Government here on the ball and having a very interesting debate over the past four days. I think this is the first time we have ever had this kind of debate for so many days outside of the Estimates.

I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until Tuesday, March 9, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that the Sitting be suspended until Tuesday, March 9, 1982 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, with the pleasure of the House, I am seeking to revert to Government Notices. I have a couple of Items of which I would like to give notice at this point, if it be the pleasure of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it you are seeking the leave of this Honourable House. If there is no objection, the Hon. Minister may proceed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Sanitation Service Authority for the period April 1980 to March 1981.

In doing so, I would just briefly like to say that the law does not call for the laying of this Report in Parliament, but because of the quality of the Report and the fact that the Sanitation Service Authority is carrying out a very important function in the country, the Cabinet considers that the document should be laid on the floor of this House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the Mortgage Insurance (Amendment) Regulations, 1982.

And on behalf of the Prime Minister, again, I beg to give notice of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982;

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$5,183,027 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. 24 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a little later in the day I will probably discuss this matter with the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with reference to the Resolution for \$5 million. Hopefully — I can only say hopefully, Sir — if it be the pleasure of the House, this can be dealt with in all its stages today.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you will observe that we have a supplementary Order Paper, and I propose to deal with Item 10 at this stage.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY THE
MINISTER OF FINANCE TO THE CENTRAL BANK OF
BARBADOS OF THE REPAYMENT OF THE
PRINCIPAL SUM NOT EXCEEDING \$2.5
MILLION AND OF INTEREST THERE-
ON ADVANCED TO THE BARBADOS
DEVELOPMENT BANK

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Resolution is to approve the Government guarantee to the Central Bank of the repayment of the sum of \$2.5 million and of interest thereon advanced to the Barbados Development Bank for short term financing pending the raising of loans by the Development Bank on the bond issue that we gave approval to last week, and the implementation of the loan agreement which has recently been signed with the European Investment Bank.

This is purely a question of commitments in anticipation of these long term funds and this is only a short term loan. It will be repaid as soon as the funds have come in from the bond issue, as well as the disbursement of the European Investment Bank's second tranche of the loan.

We had a long exhaustive debate in respect of the Development Bank on the last occasion, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a general feeling on the other side that brevity should be the order of the day. I fully agree that there is no need to get into a major debate on the Barbados Development Bank since we are *ad idem*, I think on most of the problems facing that bank at the moment.

However, Sir, there are one or two pertinent questions which I think it is my duty to ask of the Government. Firstly, I would like to draw the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister's attention to the Addendum which states that the sums are required to provide the Barbados Development Bank with short term bridging finance with respect to externally funded transactions.
12.10 p.m.

My problem, Mr. Speaker, is to try to find out why it is that on this occasion the Government is seeking a guarantee of Parliament. A week ago, Sir, I raised a ques-

tion as to whether or not the Central Bank had been providing bridging finance for the Barbados Development Bank in the past without a guarantee. In the Barbados Development Bank's 12th Annual Report 1980-81, page 20 which is already a document of this House, there is a clear statement that the Bank's short term borrowing requirements were met by way of a series of promissory notes to the Central Bank with six months maturity. These notes are renewable and have met a critical need bridging the period between disbursements by the Barbados Development Bank to its clients and receipt of re-imbursements from the lending agencies.

The point I am trying to make, Sir, is that the process of the Central Bank providing bridging finance for the Barbados Development Bank has already been taking place, and I would like to know why it is that on this occasion the Government comes to Parliament to seek a guarantee.

Is it because the Central Bank would share the view that there is an urgent need for capital injection into the Barbados Development Bank in relation to its levels of borrowings? Is the Central Bank concerned about the ability of the Barbados Development Bank to repay this loan and therefore seeks a guarantee in this instance, a guarantee to do what in fact it seems to have been doing before?

I do not think that a guarantee by this Government at the present moment is worth anything. I believe a personal guarantee from the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister would be worth more than a guarantee from the Government of Barbados, because, Sir, I wish to seek to establish that Government is not really in a position to guarantee anything.

The Consolidated Fund at the moment is little more than a notional concept, and what in fact has been happening is that on the domestic level, we have been having virtually a game of monopoly money in the financial affairs of this country whilst externally we have been accumulating massive debts.

Now, Sir, I wish to express my concern on the Floor of this House on certain activities relating to the Central Bank of Barbados. The record of that bank has been impeccable until the early months of 1981. I still have the greatest confidence in the bank, all officers of that institution and the reports which it issues to the public of Barbados. But all of us must be concerned, Sir, by the political directorate which has caused a massive expansion of the monetary base of this country with the consequential printing of money, and which, Sir, has been one of the immediate reasons for our massive borrowings abroad and for the perilous position in which the Foreign Reserves and the Balance of Payments of this country find themselves today.

I now know, Sir, the composition of the Foreign Reserves of Barbados and I know that only a small component of these Foreign Reserves represent earned foreign exchange, and that the overwhelming component happens to be borrowings of foreign currency. Now, Sir, having committed the major error of expanding the monetary base in Barbados, I believe the Hon. Minister of Finance said on the Floor of this House a week ago, that that base was extended to the extent of \$110 million at one stage and that it has now been reduced to \$60 million.

Recession apart, Sir, externally and internally many of the present policies introduced by the Central Bank are a direct consequence of irresponsible decisions taken by the political directorate of this country to print money in Barbados. I refer, Sir, to the deepening of the recessionary situation in Barbados. I refer, Sir, to the need to remove almost all credit from the banking system and the need to push the interest rates in Barbados up to make sure that people cannot borrow money. It is leading to a paralysis of the private sector which contributes more than 60 per cent to the Gross Domestic Product of Barbados.

Now when you get a paralysis of the private sector and a bankrupt public sector, then that combination means that we are heading for trouble. Sir, these policies introduced by the Central Bank will in due course erode Government's own revenue base, because this Government, in an open economy like Barbados, has quite unwisely linked its revenue far too closely to consumption patterns in the society.

This, Sir, will in turn lead to inevitably much higher levels of direct taxation much of which has already been introduced in the pre-budget period. It will lead, Sir, to a fall in disposal incomes in Barbados and will lead to the need for Government to impose or to seek to impose a policy of wage restraint, thereby creating further problems within the field of industrial relations in Barbados. It is going to mean further increases in unemployment, and it is going to mean further increases in the prevailing levels of prices in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, the Central Bank, which has had the extraordinary experience in the year 1981 of having to cope with a decline in the Foreign Reserves of Barbados in the first six months of that year for the first time in its history and which has had for the first time to resort to lines of credit with overseas banks, in the present state of the Barbados economy is not in a position to be putting more new money into the economy of Barbados.
12.20 p.m.

I would say that in the present state of the Barbados economy that the Central Bank is not in a position to be putting more new money into the economy of Barbados. In the long run it is not going to

be helpful. These short termed solutions to problems have created serious disasters in the long term and will continue to do so.

The Central Bank of Barbados has already provided, as I understand it, some \$5 million to the Barbados National Bank to assist in the financing of this year's sugar crop. It now, Sir, seeks to provide \$2.5 million in bridging finances for the Barbados Development Bank. We cannot go on like this. Not only has the Government itself been forced to rely far too extensively on Central Bank financing but now we see that two of its major institutions, namely the Barbados Development Bank and the Barbados National Bank, find themselves in this position.

This is not a healthy situation. The solution cannot be a game of monopoly money. That cannot be the solution. The solution, Sir, must lie in an area where Government takes positive steps to break the vicious cycle which I have outlined, namely, monetary measures which have damaged your Foreign Reserve position and your Balance of Payment position followed by monetary measures which would have the overall effect of dampening economic activity throughout the economy.

The answer clearly lies, Sir, in greater productivity in those areas of producing and you will never get greater productivity in Barbados at the prevailing levels of interest rates. I think, Sir, that this conservative approach to the financial management of this country is going to create more and more problems and the only people who will finally have to face the burden would not be the administrators, but the people who put them there — particularly the least privilege within our society.

There is a serious problem, Sir, whether or not the middle class citizens in Barbados can survive this pressure for too long. And I believe, Sir, that what is happening at the moment is that that upward mobility within the society which was one of the foundations for social stability is being seriously threatened by the present economic policies being pursued by this Government, Sir. These policies have virtually hijacked this economy in the interest of a few persons — that is the majority of our citizens are either suffering or facing serious uncertainties in respect of their own future and the future of their children.

Now, Sir, I do not believe that this is the answer to the problems of the Barbados Development Bank. I pointed out, Sir — and this is already a document of the House — that at the end of September 1981, that the paid up capital of the Barbados Development Bank was \$12.126 million. I understand since then that there has been some increase in the paid up capital. I think the answer is to put capital into the Barbados Development Bank. Put real-real money; make real-real money

available to the Barbados Development Bank as far as its capital structure is concerned.

Better, Sir, for the Central Bank to invest a substantial proportion of its profits in increasing the capital of the Central Bank which would put it in a much healthier relationship in relation to its borrowings — not borrowers — locally and externally. And that capital injection would reduce any demands made on the Barbados Development Bank for further increases in interest rates which in the long run would not be helpful to the kinds of projects which they have financed in Barbados. There are many — quite rightly so, but it is a fact that we have to live with — that the overwhelming majority of projects financed by the Barbados Development Bank have a relatively low equity input.

We all know how that has happened. I do not think that Members on either side would particularly quarrel about that particular position because if Barbadians are to participate in the development process of the country, I believe that some consideration has to be given from time to time as to the equity inputs demanded by them. We know how this has been got around but I am not quarrelling about that. That is not the substance of my quarrel.

What I am saying is this: unless there is further capital injection into the Barbados Development Bank, for that bank to operate it would be faced with a need to further increase interest rates bearing in mind that a very large section of its portfolio has been committed to the hotel industry which is in a state of chaos at the moment. And the returns on the investment at individual plant level may not be enough to meet capital and interest repayments as required by the banks. We just have to face that fact.

We also have to face the fact again that the Barbados Development Bank may find itself in a situation this year and next year were as a matter of policy it may have to go into the area of refinancing all existing projects because many of the projects financed by the Barbados Development Bank in the hotel area can hardly — I doubt whether many of them could withstand two or three bad years in respect of tourism. These are the facts that we have to face.

12.30 p.m.

So, I would be much happier coming in here and seeing a Resolution which would increase the equity capital available to the Barbados Development Bank rather than a Resolution seeking a guarantee for the Central Bank to advance \$2.5 million when in fact according to the Report of the Barbados Development Bank itself that is what the Central Bank has been doing all along.

I will finish, Sir. I said I intended to be brief and I will finish where I started. If the Central Bank has been providing short term financing for the Barbados Development Bank over the years without a Government guarantee, why is it that the Central Bank is now seeking a Government guarantee in order to perform the same function? Why is it? Is it a question of confidence? Is it to meet some legal requirement? I do not know. It is a legitimate question I am asking and I expect to get an answer to it although, I suspect Sir, I know the reason why.

Thank you very much.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I must confess, Sir, that this business of politics is really something that I have to give a little more thought to. I always say, Sir, if I had to relive my life, I would do it all over again my way. And after hearing the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I would really have to say to myself, I would not like to be in the same Parliament as the honourable Member hearing the same thing at the same time.

The Resolution before us, Sir, is for \$2.5 million whereby the Government is guaranteeing this money to make it available to the BDB to assist small people in particular for the purpose of generating additional employment. As I understand it, Sir, if money is made available to the BDB and the money is allocated to the persons, the applicants.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I merely want to say to the Hon. Minister, I do not want to understand this BDB. I much prefer the honourable Member to address his mind to the Barbados Development Bank. I am only advising him.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you very much, Sir, but you know BDB is only an abbreviation. You want development.....the Barbados Development Bank to be able to develop for the small businessman to develop their businesses for generating additional employment in the country. That is the gist of it.

We had a long debate on the Barbados Development Bank sometime last week, Sir, and I was amazed this morning to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and Minister of fine ants — f-i-n-e a-n-t-s — shadow Minister of fine ants — to get up this morning and almost recite, Sir, the speech which he made last week. But what is so horrifying about it this morning is to hear the praises, Mr. Speaker, showered upon the Central Bank, the Governor of the Central Bank and its staff.

Just a few years ago between 1976 and 1981, the Governor of the Central Bank and the Central Bank and its staff were taken to task in here and on the public

platforms. It was the worse institution that ever came to Barbados, Sir. You know why? On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, things were going very good, Sir, and all of the statistics that came out of the Central Bank Reports were challenged and they were wrong by the very honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. The Central Bank Governor was wrong — he did not know what he was about, the institution was wrong, everything was wrong with it because things were going, very, very, very good during those five years.

Now today, Sir, like all over the entire world — and Barbados is not to be isolated — there are economic problems facing the entire world. Because the reports coming out of the Central Bank do not reflect the previous picture, the brightest picture for the country today, we are hearing this morning what a wonderful person the Governor of the Central Bank is, Sir. That is the hypocrisy in some politicians. When things were good the Central Bank's Governor was wrong. Now that things are bad the Central Bank Governor is supposed to be an outstanding person. That is the problem with politicians — or some of them, Sir.

I believe the honourable Member made one of the most irresponsible statements that I have ever heard come out of his mouth in here. And he is capable of making irresponsible statements. I recall very well on one occasion the honourable Member said the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — that he does not care what comes out of his mouth. His is prepared to catch the press because facts are not important, only impressions. And this morning that is what he set out to do.

He made reference to Barbados' fair name. It is nowhere in the hands of the International Monetary Fund like some of our Caribbean neighbours. Out of the pressures of recession from out of North America and Europe and because of good management and stringent measures taken to correct the imbalances in the country's economy, we are hearing that Barbadians today are the worse off, the worse off, Sir. It was never so bad, never so bad. That is the picture painted by the Opposition and it is their duty.

But what I would say is this: they must first remember that Barbados must come first and if you can get up on the Floor of the Honourable House and say, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados money is only monopoly money, play-play money, fit for children to play with — if I heard such a statement coming from the Shadow Minister of Finance on the Other Side and I was a visitor to this country, I would be afraid to even go into a supermarket, Sir, with the currency of the country because it could be possibly rejected. That is what the honourable Member is saying and this is where he contradicts himself all the time.

Now, I would have thought that he would have been in support of the Resolution immediately, so as to make money available to the Barbados Development Bank to carry out its development programme for the people in this country, whereby they can help generate employment in the country. But rather, he is saying he is not in favour of the Resolution in its form that what we should do is give them a lot of money.

Not \$2.5 million — this bankrupt Government, as we are hearing — not a Government that just came in here this morning and as Honourable Leader of the Honourable House I gave notice of a Resolution for \$5 million. But a Government that is bankrupt, it has no money in the Treasury is now being castigated for guaranteeing — only on its fair name.

We are guaranteeing it because we have a good name at home and abroad. You can only go and borrow something from a person, if the person feels that you have a good name that they have confidence in you that you can repay the debt — that you can service the debt.

And the only contribution the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has made so far this morning, is to tell the country that the money we have here is bad money — do not carry it to St. Lucia, do not carry it to Trinidad, do not carry it to Jamaica or Guyana. They would not take it, it is bad money. But yet, our overseas countries in the international financial institutions can see it fit to make money available to us, money because of our good name.

Sir, to harp about the country's economic problems is something, Mr. Speaker, which has been told, not by the Opposition, but by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance. The Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance has made it very clear that things are not as bright as they were before because of external factors — recession in the United States of America and interest rates at 22 per cent, millions of people laid off in England. In South America, in Africa, across the entire globe, Sir, there are economic problems and in particular, in the Western world. Therefore, we are not isolated. What resources have we really got — apart from our human resources, the sun and the sea, good manners by the people and a good Government?

12.40 p.m.

Every time the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central gets up he paints a picture of gloom. This is not something we are hiding. We know it is bad, but it is not bad for us alone. It is bad across the western world, and we have to depend on them to give us assistance by way of tourists, buying our products, what we manufacture, all of these things, Sir. In the meantime we have to take stringent measures to make sure that the

country's economy does not collapse as it has in other countries. In Guyana they are laying off civil servants — not temporary staff. Senior civil servants are being retrenched without pay.

I have not got to spell out the problems of the other territories, because we are all *au fait* with them, and what are we trying to do here? Use every conceivable measure, whether it be tough or not, for the good of all the people in this country. That is the measure which we set out to use. I do not own Barbados, Mr. Speaker, you do not own it. The Member for St. Michael South Central does not own it. All of us must put our hands to the plough and make sure that this country survives under the economic pressures throughout the entire world.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Resolution. But I must also say that if ever there was an irresponsible statement coming from the mouth of any parliamentarian in my 16th year in here, I heard it this morning coming from the mouth of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. We all know his contributions are not to come up with the answers to the problems, but to make criticisms and create impressions, and nothing to do with the facts of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have met quite a number of political clowns in my life. There is in every village, Sir, a village shoemaker but you will also find a village idiot. I have no more to say. If I were in a pub in London or in a rum shop in Barbados, I would refer to the honourable Member as a parliamentary joker, but that language is not permissible in here.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, only last Tuesday when I spoke in this House, I cautioned and advised that this period in the history of our country calls for less rhetoric, greater objectivity and realism, and what is more important, the ability of politicians to be able to get up and tell the truth and not merely to be posers and try to present to the public an image that they are *Die ex machina*, gods from above.

The weakness of the Shadow Minister of Finance is that he has not yet learnt restraint — restraint either in language or restraint in putting forward arguments even when he has something of a case to put forward. Nor indeed has he learnt the art of arguing logically. He has the habit of throwing together a series of high sounding phrases — most of which make economic nonsense, and a large number of which have no realism about them at all. He has the habit — particularly where the international economic position is adverse to this country — of coming in and giving the people the impression that the solutions to the problems of Barbados are solutions that exist without giving any proper thought

to them, and that the problems confronting the economy of Barbados are problems that have been created internally by the Government of Barbados.

For his benefit, Mr. Speaker, it may be good to remind him that Barbados is a very small and insignificant economy measured against the economies of the industrialised countries who are our main trading partners, measured against the economies of the larger segment of the developing economies of the world with Gross National Products *per capita* or Gross Domestic Products in excess, or even similar to ours: and that there is a large area of the international or economic activity over which — no matter how much he may shout — Barbadians themselves have no control, and over which they would have very little influence.

One of those areas is the rates of interest. I am going to return to that, because I think he does the country less than justice in giving the impression that interest rates in Barbados can somehow be kept down at a depressed rate and yet the country will be in a position to find itself eligible to borrow on overseas markets — because we happen to be some fabulous people — at rates of interest only peculiar to Barbados itself, and that internally in Barbados it is fair to the people of Barbados as a whole, including the people in the lower socio-economic grouping, for funds to be lent at rates of interest that are inordinately low and unrealistic, if one is looking at the source of funds from which those rates of interest are coming.

Let me say why, Mr. Speaker. The large majority of funds that are available in the economy of Barbados today for lending in the private sector — except from outside financing — are coming from pension funds. Whether it is the National Insurance Board or whether it is private pension funds, those funds are being invested to earn income to pay higher pensions to the working class people, to the workers who are going to depend on those pensions in the future. And unless the pension funds can earn reasonable rates of interest, having regard to inflationary spiral the world over, it would mean that a man's pensionability in the future would be depressed, and therefore you would be taking from Peter to pay Paul.

He must be realistic in approaching the question of interest rates in Barbados, and it is foolishness — economic nonsense — for him to get up in here and give people the impression that because interest rates have to go up — having regard to prevailing economic conditions outside — that Barbados can somehow hold down interest rates here without doing damage to the overall economy, and to the people themselves whose funds are being lent out.

Let us assume that I am a contributor — as I am and many of the workers in the industrial estates and

agriculture are today — to the National Insurance Board, and the National Insurance Board's funds are being lent out at six percent. Tell me where in the future when you want to increase pensions, unless you do it by way of taxation, is the National Insurance Board going to earn enough in order to keep up with inflation and increase the amount of pension to people retiring in ten to 20 years' time? He does not make economic sense.
12.50 p.m.

I believe the Honourable Member knows better. His problem is that he is too intent on making political capital out of a situation without concentrating on trying to tell the people the plain truth although it may be hard facts. But any politician who is worth his salt, is prepared when the going is rough to tell the people the truth as he should be prepared to tell the truth when the going is good. And we are finding from the honourable Member this lack of candour which should stamp him out if he really wants to go down as a Shadow Minister of Finance — a lack of candour that I expect from him in his public life after four years in this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, whether you look at the Eastern bloc countries, the Western bloc countries, the developing countries in the South or anywhere else, the position today is that the world economy is in recession and has been for some time.

A few days ago Rumania was defaulting on the repayment of interest loans due to western banks. If you are one of those new-fangled people in Barbados who boast and think that the socialist economy is the answer to every problem, look at the state of Rumania and Poland and Cuba where they cannot meet their interest payments. And in the case of Cuba, the increase in prices has been steeper than any increase in prices in Barbados whether it be on basic goods or indeed on services in the last few years.

I do not understand these posers that have suddenly come into public life in this country that seem to be afraid to tell the people of Barbados that as a small country, we have it hard and we therefore have to be prepared to be sensible, to tighten our belts because the winds of change outside are rough and against us; and to use our cohesiveness as a nation and our resilience to work harder to save more and to be more productive in order to answer these problems. That is what we have to tell people.

Do not go around shouting the nonsense that I have heard from the honourable Member that the Central Bank of Barbados and the Government of Barbados, because of the Consolidated Fund, is in no position to guarantee a debt for \$2 million, and that the Deputy Prime Minister is more in a position to do it. That is the reckless statement of an irresponsible person without any

basic understanding of economics. He does not even look to see what is the true value and worth of the Balance Sheet of his country and its ability not only to pay back foreign external debts but internal debts — and what are its long-term holdings.

The honourable Member has never ever read a book on economics that makes any sense to him — or studied public finance enough, otherwise he would not come in here and make that careless, reckless statement. If he were in the House of Commons, not only would he have been shouted down but his party might have asked him to leave as Minister of Finance and resign his portfolio. It is nonsense and the honourable Member knows that.

What is \$2 million for the Government of Barbados to find to pay back under any circumstances — a Government that has enough rating that it could only as recently as last year gone on the external market and got a series of banks led by the Orion Bank to give us one of the most favourable interest rates possible, a Government which has never — even under the honourable Member's party — once defaulted on paying on time as the Governments of Rumania and Poland have done and several other Governments like Argentina and Brazil. Not one cent of the Foreign Debt is owed by this country.

I call that the height of recklessness and I am surprised that people with any commonsense in his constituency will continue to support a person who cannot show restraint and commonsense in approaching problems such as these.

I think one has to pummel the honourable Member until he understands that he is not talking to idiots outside, and remind him that the people of this country know a little better than he believes he is posing to make them understand.

I do not expect these types of statements to be made from the House of Assembly even although I know that in the height of an election you showed recklessness in making that sort of statement.

The honourable Member must recognise that he is dealing with people who are capable of reading economic trends externally and internally, and he must try to understand that he must put forth a case where he has a case with restraint and with candour and not with the reckless attitude that he continues to show in this portfolio that he is supposed to be managing.

I want to move on, Sir, to bring a few facts to the honourable Member. The honourable Member wants to know why a guarantee is given. Why doesn't he read the Barbados Development Bank Act to see that once the Development Bank is borrowing, a guarantee has

to be given. That is the law. The first thing he should do as a Minister of Finance is to study the Statute that he is dealing with, and if he had read Section 9 of the Barbados Development Bank Act, Cap. 323, he would see that the Minister of Finance must come in here and get approval for the necessary guarantee. He has not done his homework. It is a lot of reckless rhetoric. He has not done his basic homework as a person.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I asked why a guarantee is being asked for now, when the Central Bank was providing bridging finance before without guarantee. That was the question I asked.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The honourable Member should know that the answer is contained in the Act — that is what we are dealing with — why a guarantee is being given. The honourable Member has scarcely ever read the Act. Why doesn't he read the Act and understand it?

The honourable Member gets up and gives people the impression that the Central Bank is printing money willy-nilly and that this particular loan has no external source of financing. If the honourable Member had taken the care of reading the Addendum in here, he would see that it is clearly written that the sums are required to provide the Barbados Development Bank with short term bridging finance with respect to externally funded transactions.

If he was reading the newspapers, he would have found that a couple of days ago, the Barbados Development Bank signed a loan agreement with the European Investment Bank for Units of Account amounting to about \$9 million. Is he telling us that an institution such as the European Investment Bank would put the hard-earned money of Western Europe into an institution in a country — in Barbados where the currency is worth nothing and the credit worthiness of the Government is a minus quantity? What is he trying to make the people understand with this sort of reckless statement?

He must stop being reckless, and that is what we have to correct him from being because he is damaging the country every time he makes statements as reckless as he has made in here. He must not get away with it at all. When he wants to come in and argue on basic logic for logic, we will deal with him, but when he is going to be like this, he will always get the sort of very harsh reply that I hate making sometimes in this House when you have to deal with people like him in public life.

Now, Sir, he said the answer is to put in more capital into the Barbados Development Bank, capitalise

it more. I have not got the figures to hand, but let me give the honourable Member the basic figures. The share capital of the Barbados Development Bank in 1969 was \$1.4 million. By the time his Government left in 1976 it was \$4.6 million. Between 1976 and 1980 — I have not got today's figures — it was \$10.1 million share capital, and now it is \$15 million. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Read out the borrowings.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, the Government benches allowed you to address this Chair without any interruption whatsoever. Kindly behave.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not only can't he understand economics but he cannot understand good behaviour. That is his problem.

Mr. Speaker, between 1976 and 1981–82, the capital has moved from \$4.6 million to \$15,742,670 of which the Central Bank has put in \$5 million during our period.
1.00 p.m.

In short, under the Barbados Labour Party there has been more than 300 percent of the capital structure of the bank in order to enable it to borrow outside and to diversify its source of borrowing. So this so-called solution is something that we saw when we came in and we were recommending it ever since we were in operation. We were recommending that ever since we were in operation, and we did it and we continued wherever possible to make the changes.

I go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that if you were to look at the share capital to the loans due and you relate them, you would see that it is roughly in the proportion of 50 per cent. It is a fair equity ratio in this type of situation. The honourable Member does not understand that. I wonder if the honourable Member has ever read and understood a Balance Sheet of a company or anything.

He cannot come in here and talk as if he is talking to a series of half-baked lunatics outside who do not understand these factors. He is talking to a Government — a front bench composed of people with ability and knowledge, know-how, experience and expertise; a back bench that is equal to any Parliament in the world today as well — so who is he talking to — a party that has a history of outstanding performance and a people who despite the fulminations of the honourable Member are able to discern the truth between impression and truths. That is what he is dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member will read from the Central Bank of Barbados Annual Report for 1980 as well you will see that during our time, the borrowing from the National Insurance Board by the

Barbados Development Bank has been increased and that the bank did a sensible thing of diversifying its borrowing and its credit overseas to bring in foreign capital and at the same time not to be leaning too hard on internal sources of funds. If the honourable Member wants to see that and to see its performance, that is in the Report at page 6.

If the Honourable Member wants to see, he will see that the loans approved by the bank increased as well from 1975 – 1976 from \$3.7 million – and I only have the 1980 – 1981 figures – to \$17 million under this Government. He will see that the Barbados Development Bank for the first time made a profit under this Government instead of writing off, even though we had to write off loans lent under his Government which turned out to be no use at all. Those are the sort of performances that he turns around and says today that we do not know what we are doing.

And what are his so-called solutions, Sir? His solution is a pure *non sequitur*. I supposed he has taken a few of the things I have said – and the Minister of Finance and a few of us have said – and he is beginning to understand and to learn one or two things. He is not a good pupil. His head is too hard for some of these matters.

He is saying we need greater productivity in the economy. But let us follow him through – he says that we cannot make greater productivity at the prevailing rates of interest. I have never heard more nonsense than that. Which economist would link an increase in rate of productivity simply to increase prevailing rates of interest. It is a *non sequitur*. What is the honourable Member asking us to understand in this Honourable House – that the rates of interest are too low or the rates of interest are too high? What does he want to say?

If the honourable Member is saying that the rates of interest in Barbados are too high, is the honourable Member at the same time prepared to get up and tell us at what level he would place the rates of interest and where he will get the money from? Will the honourable Member tell us what are his external sources of finances brought back in internal economic activity – particularly where if you have Barbados dollars. You cannot exchange those dollars for goods bought in hard markets overseas. Let him tell us that.

The honourable Member is reverting to my learned friend who is giving him a brief. I hope that he learns his brief fast enough. He cannot understand. He has to go and lean on a lawyer. You see, Sir, we lawyers can take on the worst of clients and make the cases sound good as soon as possible – so he has gone to the back bench to rely on my learned friend for Christ Church

West Central. He cannot understand the fulminations and the answers to him so he has to run and try and ask the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central to get him out of the problem, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Back to the point.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Yes, Sir, I am back on the point, Sir. During the time, Sir, one has noticed that the disbursement ratio of this bank has improved considerably as well and one of the reasons why we are asking for money now is that with the economic recession outside affecting our internal position, we want to press on particularly with the small business sector and the private sector as a whole to increase economic activity geared particularly to export industries so that we could earn Foreign Exchange to improve your own internal or external liquidity position and at the same time improve the employment situation.

The honourable Member does not understand the purpose of the whole package as I have summed it up shortly for him. If he wants me to put it in layman's language I will. Once you make more money available in the hands of the people who can use it – and use it rapidly – so that they can put it into productive areas of the economy and produce goods and services that we can sell overseas to earn yens, dollars, pounds, and Swiss francs, then our Foreign Reserves will improve. If you even make it available in the tourist sector provided that the economies of the countries of particularly North America improved, and people are prepared to travel, then we will be able as well to improve our Foreign Reserves position and withstand the buffeting from the world outside.

There is no point in imagining that our economy could have gone unscathed by the international economic position where even the monolithic economy of the United States – one of the strongest economies particularly because of the heavy base it has in agriculture – not only in industry – has had to suffer the effect and buffeting of the chain in the world economic situation; where even centrally planned economies like the economy of the Soviet Union has found itself having to increase transportation cost, the cost of Government goods and services in the public sector. And where the honourable Member wants to follow the pattern of Cuba, even that country has been buffeted by the adverse terms of world economic conditions.

A lot of it – not all of it – a major part of it – is due to the changes which occurred in 1973 with an increase in oil prices and the downturn which affected everyone with inflation following as a result thereon. It had to catch up with us some time. That we have withstood it is to the credit in the first place of the people and in the second place to the wise leadership which we

provided in the last five years in this country and continue so to provide.

1.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is our ill luck that we had a bad crop, to have found ourselves losing Foreign Exchange from one third of the crop last year unreaped, to have found ourselves with commodity prices, particularly in sugar, falling — that would have meant that that would have affected the Foreign Reserves. The honourable Member knows that as well as I do.

It has not been that the Government has gone and said that there must be rain — and there was rain, and therefore we could not reap and sell the crop. It has not been that the Government has any control over the price of sugar outside. These are external factors that Barbados could not escape.

And the Honourable Member would be more honest and would be more respected for his views if he got up and said to the people: these are conditions which even if I were Minister of Finance, I would have had no control over and I would have to admit to you that you must have some restraint in the pattern of consumption both in the public and the private sector, except in the productive sectors of the economy. It does not take any wizard to understand that, but there is many a wise person in appearance who is a fool in the manner in which he speaks. I would not like to tell the honourable Member into which category he falls.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has another minute in which to wind up.....the honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was only on Friday last, Sir, when the Honourable House was discussing the fourth bond issue which the Government is proposing that the Development Bank raise, Sir, that we had a full discussion on the Barbados Development Bank and generally on the economy.

I think, Sir, that it is a credit to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he has managed to generate a full scale debate again, Sir, on this matter the Development Bank and the economy. But he has done so, Sir, by making the wildest and the most irresponsible allegations, Sir — the charges about the nature of the economy.

And I think it is time, Sir, that it be said to him that extremism and irresponsibility in the building of a political career is not a virtue, Sir — it is a vice, and that is what he has got to understand.

What he has said, Sir, with respect to the capacity of the Government to guarantee loans can only create

panic in the business community in this country and cause confidence among the Government's creditors to be seriously eroded. And I think that all honourable Members on this side, Sir, who have had reason to condemn his puerile approach to serious matters and his irresponsibility, Sir, are very much in place, Sir.

On Friday last, Sir, I made the point that there are four sources of finance for the Barbados Development Bank. First of all, Sir, it gets money from external sources — external funding agencies, principally the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank — the European Development Fund and that together, Sir, it has received about \$43.8 million in aggregate from these sources.

I also made the point, Sir, that money is secured by the Barbados Development Bank from domestic loan funds, principally domestic bonds. The third source of its finance, Sir, is capital subscriptions in the Bank's equity which is mostly from the Central Government and also from the Central Bank and to date the Central Bank has provided about \$5 million in capital subscriptions to the Development Bank and the remainder of its money, Sir, is made from earnings on its operations.

The position right now, Sir, is that the Barbados Development Bank has recently signed for a loan from the European Development Fund, (EDF), but until that money comes through — maybe in another few months — the bank is in need of a short-term bridging loan which it is currently seeking from the Central Bank of Barbados.

Now the first point that has got to be made is that there is nothing strange or improper in the Development Bank seeking a short-term bridging loan from the Central Bank of Barbados nor is it anything strange for the Central Bank to ask that that money be guaranteed.

It is my understanding, Sir, that small transactions involving short-term loans have been made by the Central Bank to the Development Bank in the past. But on this occasion Sir, the amount involved is bigger than it has been in the past and the bank — as it is entitled under Statute to do — has said, Sir, that they need a guarantee.

But it is highly improper — and false too — to suggest that the Government of Barbados is in no position to guarantee a loan from the Central Bank to the Barbados Development Bank. The difficulties which we are having in the economy of Barbados are not such, Sir, that the Government cannot guarantee a loan for \$2.5 million.

In fact, the Government's credit standing is still so high, Sir, that we can go into the Eurodollar market

and get a loan at the best interest rates available — the sort of interest rates that you would give to your best customers. That is still the standing of the Government of Barbados in the international financial community.

This is still highly regarded by all commentators, Sir, and I was very pleased to see Michael Manley writing in the Sunday Sun only two weeks ago referring to the Barbados economy as one of the few tightly run economies in this part of the world. That is only two weeks ago and that is a man who knows about economies that are not tightly run. He is in a position better than most others to recognise economies that are tightly run and he was able to pay the people of Barbados and the Government of Barbados that credit, Sir.

So the point has got to be made, Sir, that there is no foundation in the allegation that the Government of this country cannot guarantee a loan of \$2 million or \$10 million or \$15 million.

In fact, in many respects, Sir, this economy is still in good shape because you have not got to look, Sir, at the amount of money that the Government has borrowed. That is not the only index of whether the economy is in good health or otherwise. Sir, you have got to recognise that the inflation rate in Barbados is still within tolerable limits, about 11 per cent or 12 per cent. You have got to recognise, Sir, that unemployment in Barbados is still relatively low — it is only about ten per cent or 11 per cent. These are important indices, Sir, of whether or not an economy is in good health.

It is a fact that in the last year, the Government has had to resort to borrowing. That is a fact, Sir. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Printing money.) But nobody lends a private individual, no banker lends a private individual money, no banker lends a Government money unless the banker first satisfies himself, Sir, that either the individual or the Government can repay. And it is because of the capacity of the Government to repay that the Government has been given loans, Sir, and at some of the best rates prevailing, too.
1.20 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has an enormous capacity to contradict himself when he speaks. I have formed the impression that he really has no serious quarrel with the way in which the Government — in the difficult circumstances in which it finds itself — is handling the economy. Indeed, he himself in the past — in so far as he has been pressed to say what he would do which is different from what we are doing — has agreed that we have got to restrain our spending both on Capital Account and on Current Account. He has agreed that we have got to reduce our imports of non-essentials, and he has made the

point — which we all agree with — that we have got to increase output in the productive sectors of the economy.

No Government in recent years has done more to increase and to secure the productive base of this economy than the Barbados Labour Party Administration. If you look at the massive investment that we have made, both in tourism and in industry, outside of sugar — still the three principal bases of the economy — you will recognise that we have done as much as any Government could have done in the five years that we were in office in terms of investment in the principal productive sectors of the economy.

It is one thing to invest in the productive base of the economy, Sir, and it is another to have your output brought in the outside world, and that is the point at which we have lost control. The tourist plant is there in good shape, the bed capacity is there, the services are in order and indeed of a high quality, but we have no control at all over whether or not the tourists come from North America and other parts of the world.

It is well known, Sir, that Barbados has relied for many years on the North American market — particularly the Canadian market — for its winter traffic. This year there has been an enormous shortfall in the number of Canadians coming to Barbados, and that has been directly related to the fact that the unemployment rate in Canada is extremely high, interest rates are crippling, and the Canadian economy — in the words of Pierre Trudeau — the Prime Minister — is in very rough shape indeed. That has been the reason why we have had a shortfall as far as Canadian tourists are concerned, but that has got nothing to do with Barbados.

I think that we politicians who do not make the point to the people of this country that the whole world is one economic unit, and that Barbados cannot stand apart and alone, are doing the economy a disservice. That is what I charge the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central as having done in his speech today.

Barbados cannot stand alone. We cannot stand alone in relation to interest rates either, and that point has been very effectively made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West. If we had interest rates in Barbados at ten percent and the interest rates around us are 18 and 20 percent, all it means, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be an enormous flight of money out of Barbados and not in. Who can stop the large corporations that have got permission to keep money in Barbados from going to the Central Bank and asking for permission to carry that money outside and put it down at 18 or 20 percent, if interest rates in Barbados are only eight and ten percent? If we are to arrest the enormous flight of money which is likely to take place out of Barbados, we have to carry the interest rates up.

But that is not the only reason in relation to the interest rates. Apart from the fact that Barbadians will try to take money out of the country through all sorts of means and put in banks overseas, we had the problem of trying to take the pressure off the Balance of Payments and take the pressure off the Foreign Reserves, and to that extent we had to slow down the economy.

One monetary technique which was available to us for so doing was to raise the interest rates. That is precisely what we have done. To put it in any other context, Mr. Speaker, is to mislead.

I want to make the further point that it is totally misleading for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to give the impression that you can have a reckless wages policy in circumstances in which you are trying to take the pressure off the Foreign Reserves and off the Balance of Payments and succeed. Increase of wages feeds itself into the Balance of Payments and into the Foreign Reserves, and if you are trying to protect your Balance of Payments and to protect your Foreign Reserves, it means that you also have to protect wages.

Whether or not that is fashionable among the trade union movement, or whether or not it is fashionable among the workers in this country, those of us who have the responsibility for managing the country's affairs have got to make the point. If the honourable Member has been told by his economic advisers — that you can protect your Foreign Reserves and protect your Balance of Payments without at the same time restraining wages, he has been misled. It is as simple as that.

The policy with respect to the increase of the productive capacity of the country is one on which both sides of the House are at one, because the loans which we are seeking to guarantee are all designed to improve the productive capacity of the country. The loans are for the small manufacturers in this country. The money which the Government is getting from the European Development Fund is not to pay wages and salaries, it is money which will be given to small manufacturers, which will be given to co-operatives, all of them involved in the productive sector of this country.

If the honourable Member is saying that the solution to the present difficulty is to increase output, this is precisely a measure designed to increase output. So I do not understand what is his quarrel and why this has become the occasion for the wild allegation he has made with respect to the management of the economy of this country.

The other point, Sir, which I think needs to be made — and which has been made repeatedly — is that the economy of this country has stood up well, very well

indeed, given the enormous strength of the external winds blowing against it.

The Guyana economy has collapsed, and that is not an allegation, that is an admission by the President of Guyana himself, Forbes Burnham. The Tanzanian economy has collapsed, the Dutch economy has collapsed — the leaders themselves have said that, and any reading of those countries' balance sheets would show them to be in a worse position than we are here in Barbados. This is not the position in Barbados today.

It is a fact, Sir, that the Government has had to borrow a lot of money both on short term and long term basis, but we are not falling down on our repayments, and there can be no question that the Government does not have the capacity to repay. Our unemployment rate, as I have said earlier, is still lower than it is among the North Atlantic economies, and our inflation rate is still within very tolerable levels. These are very important indices as to whether or not an economy is in fairly good health.

1.30 p.m.

I want to give my support to this Resolution before the House, Sir, and I want to join with my colleagues on this side in condemning the irresponsibility of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in his anxiety to catch the headlines and to grandstand.

And this is where the press of this country too has got to bear some responsibility because we have reached a point of sophistication in this country where you must not only give a man the headlines, but you must come in your articles and say that we too as journalist must say from our analysis that it is an irresponsible position. But all they are doing is giving people headlines, however irresponsible, however damaging to the national interest.

You never get a well considered and informed article following up, analysing the position that the man has taken in public life, because if that were to be done, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would be exposed for what he is — and empty grandstander. That is what he would be exposed for, but that is where we in public life in this country can get away, because our press still has a lot to learn. They have got a far way to go.

It is not enough to run around and get stories. You also have to take some time out and analyse your story and make your position known, and this is where the press in this country has fallen down very badly indeed. Tomorrow he would get the headlines for the irresponsibility, but he would also get some damaging editorial and feature comments condemning his position. But he knows well that he can get away given the state of

relative immaturity of the Press, and he has been exploiting that position.

Our position on this side, Sir, is that this is a very worthwhile Resolution, designed for good reason, and it deserves the support of all patriots — and I sometimes doubt whether I can include the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central among the patriots.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief speaking on this Resolution, but there are a few comments I would like to make after listening to some of the comments coming from the other side.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West in my opinion spent his entire time trying to show that the honourable Member — my colleague from St. Michael South Central — does not have much idea about economics. He did not address himself, Mr. Speaker to the important point that my colleague was trying to put over. My colleague was trying to ask, since money was being lent and given for the longest time without guarantees, why is it that now you have to come for a guarantee? Not a single person so far who has got up on the other side has answered that. Why is there a need now for a guarantee? That is the important question.

Mr. Speaker, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I would like to deal with one aspect of the Barbados Development Bank's policy and the Central Bank's policy, and that is the rate of interest. Whom does the rate of interest affect? The rate of interest affects every single person in Barbados or in any country which borrows money. As far as the businesses are concerned, it decides whether business people are going to employ people or not. As far as the consumer is concerned, the rate of interest decides whether the consumer can now have his dream house or not. As far as the planter is concerned, the rate of interest decides whether the planter can now buy seeds, fertilisers or anything of the sort. So the rate of interest affects everyone.

What has the rate of interest done in Barbados? This expensive and scarce money in Barbados is driving home builders, auto dealers and businessmen out of business. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that at Harrison's — I am giving you one example of the problem of the high rate of interest — today there are people who are on half-day and who are working on half-pay, who are going in and working from 10 o'clock until 2 o'clock or from 8 o'clock until 12 o'clock and are not working on Saturdays. And these are people who have been sent on courses, which means that these are people who are established in the firm of Harrison's. This is a serious problem we have in Barbados with the rate of interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: When you say Harrison's, kindly explain. Do you mean C. F. Harrison & Company?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Yes. C. F. Harrison & Company. People are working from 10 o'clock until 2 o'clock, or from 8 o'clock until 12 o'clock because of the high interest rates. I am asking, Mr. Speaker, what is the result of all this? If you go to buy clothes, when you go to buy cars, when you go to buy kitchen appliances there is a great deal of pain because you cannot borrow the money unless you pay very high interest rates for the money you want to borrow.

I am saying, that as far as the interest rates in Barbados are concerned, even the Hon. Prime Minister will advise his colleagues that the interest rates in Barbados have got to come down in order to get this economy moving again, because as I have said, if businessmen because of the high interest rates cannot employ people, it means that the unemployment situation will rise. The Hon. Prime Minister will say that this is only a temporary measure, so when people get up and try to tell you that high interest rates are the best thing that ever happened, that is not the true situation.

As far as the Barbados Labour Party is concerned, all I can say on their position on borrowing money, Mr. Speaker, is that it amuses me, because I have heard them on platforms and I would have thought that that was only for platforms. I never thought that I would live to see the day when they would come in here with that same sort of nonsense that they can now borrow this big set of money because of this and because of that.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this: when you borrow money from anyone, he loses respect for you, and you know this. Whenever you have got to borrow money, Mr. Speaker, it is a sort of inferior position. If I am borrowing money from you, Mr. Speaker, I feel inferior. They went about boasting and I will give you one example. If every week I had to come to you, Mr. Speaker, and ask you to lend me \$30 or \$40 so that I could buy sugar or meal or something so that my wife and children could survive, what sort of respect could you have for me unless I could not find a job anywhere?

There was a poet, I do not remember his name, who said "neither a borrower nor a lender be, for borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry." Borrowing makes one inferior, but these people over there are bragging about how much money they can borrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot refer to honourable Members on the other side as those people over there.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I heard it on platforms, but I have heard it today from the honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot refer to the honourable Members on the Government Benches as those Members over there or those people over there.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Honourable members on the other side. I have heard it today again because I heard it from him at a meeting in Bridgetown and I thought that that was only for the platform. I have never come to the conclusion that borrowing is a virtue. I will never come to that conclusion. So when they are telling me that the fact that they can borrow money shows how great they are.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member would give way. The honourable Member obviously does not understand, with respect, the point that I was making. The point was that unless the Government had credit worthiness, it could not borrow. The honourable Member seems to be saying that the Government must borrow willy-nilly. I have not made any such statement either on a platform or in here. If the honourable Member did not have the wherewithal to repay you, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would not lend him \$40 every week.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Government as far as I can recall always had credit worthiness. In Mr. Errol Barrow's time, he always had credit worthiness.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no such person as far as we are concerned.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: In the time of the honourable Member for St. John as Prime Minister, the Government of Barbados always had credit worthiness.
1.40 p.m.

As they, the honourable Members from the other side were saying on platforms — they have not said it in here — they were saying that Mr. Barrow never borrowed money.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. Just calm yourself. Please, please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The honourable Members from the other side had said on many occasions that the honourable Member for St. John when he was Prime Minister never got any money from this person and the next person but Barbados always had good credit worthiness. The simple fact of the matter is that the honourable Member for St. John — when he was Prime Minister — never saw the need to borrow money as the present Government is borrowing. That is what I am trying to say so to get up and boast that you are now getting money from the Orion Bank and this bank and the next bank — borrowing as though borrowing has suddenly become a virtue — I say it is a lot of nonsense because as far as I am concerned and as far as you are concerned, borrowing will never be a virtue.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. The Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance knows that if the Budget deficit is not trimmed very shortly that instead of interest rates going down they will have to go up even more. The Hon. Prime Minister knows this. Economists all over the world agree that to get the economy moving — this is the debate in the United States everyday — bring down the interest rates in order to get us out of the recession, to get the economy moving because businessmen are not going to borrow money at these high interest rates and therefore people will get laid off. And they know it.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this. You have heard from the honourable Member for Christ Church East that the unemployment rate is ten percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the longest time we were hearing it was ten percent but within the last two or three months I have been hearing about layoffs here, layoffs there and layoffs everywhere. I cannot understand how it is still at ten percent.

There is nothing wrong in getting up and saying anything but we have to take these statements like a pinch of salt. How can you lay off people at Transport, lay off people at MTW and still tell me that. And not only that, but there are people coming out from schools every year — thousands are coming out in July every year — yet the unemployment is still ten percent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: In all the years, Mr. Speaker, in which auto sales and housing constructions in Barbados were at their highest, in all the years that they were at their highest, interest rates were half the amount they are now. I am saying this, Mr. Speaker — finally I am saying this, Mr. Speaker — and I am saying this because I know and what is happening in here: every time and on each and every occasion honourable Members on this side get up and make a suggestion, what do you hear? — you are trying to get at some person on the other side. If you say that you want interest rates to come down, you will probably hear that they were high in our time and why you did not do anything about it.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this: that every time a suggestion is made from an honourable Member on this side, you seem to get the reaction from the other side that we are trying to get at some particular person. That is not true, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are playing cricket know that if you go out to bat and the wicket is a bit difficult and you are playing back and you get out, when you meet the fellow going in you tell him try and play forward. It makes no sense for him to tell you, "you just played back how are you telling me to play forward." The honourable Member for St. James North knows this. He knows this.

Every time we make a suggestion here it does not go well for honourable Members over there to think that we are trying to get at them. It could be that we are seeing the light. It could be — but we are not trying to get at any person.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the Hon. Minister of Finance would advise all the rest of us that interest rates in Barbados will have to come down in order to get this economy moving again.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you that I caught your eye first.

Let me deal with the honourable Member for St. Philip South since he just sat down. He said, "Barbados always had a good credit worthiness." I tend to disagree with that statement, Mr. Speaker, because the Barbados Development Bank was hamstrung for funds in 1976 simply because the then Directors of the BDC got involved with the Bath Plantation deal to the tune of \$3 million and when this Party came into power, the BDB was hamstrung for funds because no respectable institution would lend them money until they got off that bad debt of \$3 million. That is a fact.

This Government had to repay the BDB \$3 million to clear up Bath from their books — to clear the records as it were, Sir — in order to make it once more a financially viable institution. I cannot accept that, because the Government's contingent liabilities in 1976 by way of Carib West, International Sea Foods, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the same Bath Plantations and the North Point totalled \$22 million. The Government was bankrupt up to 1976. That is an absolute and positive fact, Sir.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West gave the figures of capital before the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talked about more capital injection. Sir, between 1969–1976 from the time of the inception of the Barbados Development Bank until the Democratic Labour Party lost power on September 2, 1976 — the total capital invested by the Democratic Labour Party to the Barbados Development Bank was \$20 million or thereabout.

Between 1976 and 1981, this Government put in \$56 million in the Barbados Development Bank and we get a call from that side — the Shadow Minister of Finance — that we need more capital when the ratio in terms of capital and long term borrowing is basically 50 per cent for every dollar that we borrowed, Sir. Now when we borrow outside there is a 50 per cent ratio of that that we put in terms of capital and the loan disbursement, Sir, because you cannot talk about capital alone.

Between the years 1969 and 1976 under the Democratic Labour Party, there were able to disburse through the Barbados Development Bank a total of \$7.479 million and between 1976 — 1981 under the Barbados Labour Party, the very same Barbados Development Bank disbursed \$40.874 million. These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. They cannot be denied.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talked about the irresponsibility of the political directorate, the paralysis of the private sector, high interest rates — very catchy phrases, Sir. I can just wait to see the *Advocate* and the *Nation* tomorrow "Fall of Disposable Income", "Unemployment Will Rise," — the latest prediction, Sir — and "The BDB Needs More Capital."

Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is trying to give the impression that the political directorate of the Central Bank is responsible for misleading the public of Barbados when in truth and in fact the Governor of the Central Bank was appointed by that side. The same Governor that is there now was there when the Central Bank was formed and appointed by those Members on that side when they were in Government. So if he is political, they made him political, Sir, not us.

Then I cannot understand the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central because on February 9 in this Honourable Chamber, he quoted from the Central Bank's Statistics and he said — I wrote it down — he said "Central Bank figures can be depended on because there are reliable". So on February 9 he comes in here and tells us that the statistics are reliable and today he comes in here and tells us that because of the political directorate, there are no longer reliable.
1.50 p.m.

He gives the impression, Sir, that we are trying to mislead the country or that the Central Bank statistics or publications of the Central Bank Reports prior to the General Election of last year came out in such a way as to distort the truth and mislead the Barbadian public. Sir, in a speech delivered by.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I rise on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member does not give way. He does not give way. Please take your seat. He does not give way, so take your seat.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, the Governor of the Central Bank, in a speech given to the Life Underwriters' Association of Barbados on Friday June 16, 1981 stated, Sir, and I quote if I may, from this document to prove — I can make it a document of the Honourable House because it is a Press Release by Central Bank, Sir — and it states — this is the Governor speaking:—

"I shall use the forum which you have so graciously provided me this morning to give my economic outlook for 1981. It is not rosy. The world economy is in trouble and frankly, the economic depression is simultaneously bankrupt of solutions. We are badly in need of a John Maynard Keynes to cut through the under bush to the roots of our problem. The monetary policies so much in vogue in the West seek to fight inflation at the cost of massive unemployment and the widespread destruction of capital through the bankruptcy of viable corporations."

He goes on to say, Sir:

"The darkest shadow on our economic horizon is the continuing recession in the USA, record high interest rates with a prime rate peaking last month at 21.5 percent."

This is January of 1981, Sir — long before the Elections — the Central Bank Governor predicting that 1981 — 82 picture would not be so rosy.

Sir, on February 26, 1981, at the Barbados Hotel Association meeting at Rockley, the Governor of the Central Bank stated — I can also make this a document of the Honourable House, Sir — it is a Press Release issued by Central Bank — do not forget, this is February 26, 1981 :—

"The current weakness in tourism reflects a conspiracy of external circumstances ranging from recession in North America and slow economic growth in Europe to the higher airline fares brought about by increased fuel cost."

And, Sir, on May 21, 1981 again, shortly before the General Elections of June 1981, in a Press Release issued to all of the Press in Barbados by the Central Bank in a review of the first quarter of 1981, the Governor states:—

"As the recession in North America and Europe continued, the Central Bank tightened credit and raised interest rates at the end of 1980 in an effort to restrict consumer expenditure and dampen inflationary pressures. The first quarterly results confirm these expectations. The level of economic activity in the first three months fell below that of the first quarter of a year ago."

And he went on, Sir, to say that tourist arrivals were down, sugar production was down and the manufacturing sector was down as far as production. He predicted that for the balance of 1980:

"The weak build up in foreign exchange reserves were down and therefore things would not be rosy for the balance of 1981 and this would run us right into 1982."

In closing off, he said, Sir that in keeping with the Central Bank's restrictions credit to the personal and distribution sectors did not and will not increase.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is to substantiate the point that this Government at no time before or after the Election had anything to do with misleading the public of Barbados. We told the picture as it was.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 2.00 o'clock. Are you likely to continue your address or do we break and you continue when we resume?

Mr. A. TRUSS: I will continue after, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 today.
2.00 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was addressing the Chair. The said member may continue if he so desires.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, the question which I have been asked by the other side — by the Member for St. Michael South Central and the Member for St. Philip South — is why is it necessary to have a guarantee at this particular stage? My research has indicated that the Central Bank of Barbados has an agreement with the Barbados Development Bank, and presumably anything that goes over and above that agreement has to be taken into consideration by further guarantees. I understand that the Minister who introduced the Bill would be in a position to shed more light on this particular matter in his closing remarks.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of talk has been before the House about the inflation rate and the unemployment rate in Barbados. The unemployment rate as I understand, based on the recent statistics, is 11.4 per cent, so the honourable Members on the other side must appreciate that this Government's intention is not in any way to mislead the public of Barbados. We can only produce the information that is produced to us as a Government by the civil servants, and I daresay the same civil servants that produced the information for

the honourable Members on that side produce information for the honourable Members on this side.

In relation to the inflation in Barbados, I still think that Barbados has weathered the economic recession with better ability and more flexibility than many of the Caribbean territories. Trinidad, for example, suffered an inflation rate last year of 17 per cent, Jamaica, the inflation there was 18 per cent, in Mexico it was 27 per cent — this is 1981, Sir — in Britain it was 11.5 per cent, in Canada 12.5 per cent and in Barbados 14.6 per cent. When one takes into consideration the fact that Barbados has in real terms no natural resources, to have come out as well as we did, I still think in the light of anything that has been said, we have done well.

The Gross Domestic Product at factor cost in Barbados in 1981 was \$1.651 billion, and at market value it was \$1.891 billion. Almost \$2 billion is our Gross Domestic Product which puts our per capita income at over U.S. \$4 000. We are talking about approximately Bds. \$8 000 as the per capita income. Based on the first two months of this year it is expected to surpass that, if present trends continue. As a result of that, Sir, it makes it impossible for Barbados to borrow money from financial institutions, because the financial institutions, like the World Bank in particular, are saying that Barbados is weathering the economic storms so well indeed that it has no case to put forward to ask for soft loans, or to get funds for certain projects at low interest rates.

Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, though he gives the impression that we in some way were able to convince the people, the populace, prior to the election that nothing was wrong with the economy, he himself read the signs very well as Shadow Minister of Finance. He is a man for whom I have great respect. I believe that he is intelligent.

Mr. SPEAKER: He is an honourable Member.

Mr. A. TRUSS: He is an honourable Member, Sir, indeed he is. And as Shadow Minister of Finance, I can say that when I listen to his debates — apart from the fact sometimes that he tries to capture the Press headlines — basically he can sometimes come across with very sound arguments which indicate that he understands only too well what is going on in Barbados. Rather than pitching in and saying that he understands, he raises questions which would endeavour to embarrass the Government.

Sir, on Sunday, April 27, 1980 at Independence Square at a political meeting, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said.....(*Aside*).....in another place, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: That really has nothing to do with inside this Honourable House.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Fair enough, Sir. He simply said in another place on another occasion that he understands that Barbados is faced with an inflationary situation at present, and he told the people that if and when the Democratic Labour Party got back into power, it would take him as Minister of Finance 18 months to get the situation back to normal. He understood in 1980, Sir, he understood in 1981 and he understands now.

It was also reported at another meeting in another place that the honourable Member for St. Thomas knows only too well that in politics truth does not matter, facts do not matter, but impressions matter. That is a positive fact. It was taped, it was transcribed, it was recorded in another place, Sir, and it has nothing to do with this Honourable Chamber, but the fact is it is a clear policy enunciated by the Shadow Minister of Finance that facts are not important, the truth is not important — impressions are important.

Sir, the Barbados Labour Party proudly put before the people the facts on the performance based on this Government between 1976 and 1981 at the time of the General Elections, and we stated prior to the General Elections that the public of Barbados never had it so good. We were able to make that statement based on fact, we were able to make that statement based on the performance of this Government over the period 1976–1980, and we produced a document called *Promises and Performance* where we extracted all of the promises which we had made in the 1976 Manifesto, and next to it we had put all of the achievements, all of the accomplishments which we had made over that same period. This booklet was distributed through the length and breadth of Barbados. As a matter of fact, 38 000 copies were printed and distributed, and it was based on those facts that the people of Barbados put this Government back into power to serve their interests for another five years.

I still say that in spite of the fact that we are caught up in an international recession, in spite of the fact that countries all over the world are faced with economic bankruptcy in some cases, and large scale unemployment in others, and so on, Barbados is still doing better than most countries.

Mr. Speaker, it would interest you and this Honourable Chamber to know that last year, in spite of all the Opposition has been saying, that the people of Barbados imported for their own consumption \$15 million dollars in beef, \$3.5 million in mutton, \$6.3 million in chicken, \$2.5 million in pork, \$4.5 million in corned beef, \$5.2 million in powdered milk and sweet milk, \$2 million in butter, \$5 million in cheese, \$2.3 million in eggs for hatching, \$8.5 million in wheat, \$10 million in rice, \$8 million in maize, \$3 million in cereals and \$5 million in potatoes.

We have to be a country that is having it good. Where are the people getting the money? Orange juice, Sir, \$3.49 million, poultry feed \$2 million, tomato ketchup — just to show you, simple tomato ketchup — \$1.5 million. The list goes on and on and on. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Rastas do not eat those things). According to the honourable Member for St. James North, the Rastas do not eat this food. The Barbadians — you and I and Members on that side and the man in the street — are the people who are purchasing these items. The import bill of Barbados is too high.

The honourable Member for St. John said, in the Budget Speech of 1975 when he introduced 365 different items to be taxed that it was not the high cost of living that was humbugging Barbadians, it was the cost of high living. True enough, Sir, Barbadians are accustomed to high living, so whether it is a case of high living or living high, if you want to put it that way, it is really a point that Barbadians are very accustomed to having the better things in life.

3.00 p.m.

I have pointed out before — and for emphasis I must point out again — that in a small developing country such as we are, in a closed economy, when there is serious recession in North America, in Europe and Central and South America, there are three areas that affect a small developing country. You are either affected in the area of unemployment, you are affected in the area of Foreign Reserves or you are affected by inflation.

We have weathered well the inflationary storm by holding inflation down. Unemployment, we have heard, is holding its own at 11.4 per cent, but the only area of concern that this Government has been faced with is Foreign Reserves and the reason for high interest rates, and the honourable Member for St. Philip South and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central know that you cannot exist in a country like Barbados with interest rates at ten per cent when prevailing interest rates all over the world are 22 per cent and 23 per cent, and even today at 15 per cent and 16 per cent, it is still better than in Canada and the United States of America.

So if we are faced with a sudden decline in Foreign Reserves which is directly related to the fact that interest rates outside of Barbados are higher than interest rates in Barbados, local business and private enterprise would be forced to pay cash or pay by sight draft for the goods and services which they purchase, which means that there would be a sudden decline in foreign exchange and therefore Foreign Reserves will suffer.

Any Government worth its weight in salt must take into serious consideration our Foreign Reserves

position. Our Foreign Reserves position, as I understand it, is \$164 million or two and a half months supply. Jamaica and Guyana have not been in a plus situation in Foreign Reserves for more than eight years. They are in deficit when it comes to Foreign Reserves. Barbados has been consistently placed in a better Foreign Reserves position since 1976.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am in complete agreement and support of this Resolution because it assists the Barbados Development Bank by providing \$2.5 million immediately for their disposal so that they can go about the business of lending the money to the manufacturing sector and to the small business sector as bridging loan finance, and as the Minister introducing the Bill said, as soon as the money comes through, it will simply be a question of reimbursing the Central Bank.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael Central has made what I consider a most amazing speech in support of this Resolution which guarantees the Central Bank repayment of monies advanced.

In the course of that speech the honourable Member made some strange statements. He started by quoting from a statement by the Governor of the Central Bank early in 1981, in January, which indicated that Barbados was badly in need of a John Maynard Keynes, to quote his words. What one gathered from that — in fact the whole tenor of the quotation was that it was designed to show that in January 1981, things were extremely bad in Barbados because the Governor of the Central Bank — if we take what the honourable Member was saying — was at that point underscoring the point that in January, 1981, things were terribly bad in Barbados.

We had then after January and certainly coming up to the General Elections for 1981, statements from honourable Members on the other side that things were extremely rosy in Barbados — we have never had it so good. This was in fact the theme of the General Election campaign underscored by honourable Members on the other side — we have never had it so good.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the Central Bank, mind you, a couple of months before that was saying how bad things were in Barbados, and then when the honourable Member for Christ Church West said that politicians must get in the House and tell the truth, we wonder sometimes to whom the statements are being directed.

Now the honourable Member for St. Michael Central made one or two points which I suppose one need

not expand on too much. He talked about the Barbados economy in terms of an economy that was a closed economy, and I think that anybody, any economist, any non-economist in Barbados, would certainly be aware that the economy of Barbados is anything but a closed economy.

Indeed it is a small open economy which makes it so susceptible to all the problems and the changes which militate not necessarily from inside the Barbados economy itself, but also on external sources, and I believe that was a point which honourable Members on the other side were trying to make and which the honourable Member for St. Michael Central did not quite seem to understand.

But be that as it may, the central issue that we on this side have been making in the course of the debate on matters of this kind....

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall saying that Barbados was a closed economy. What I said was that Barbados is an open economy.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, I will proceed. I do not know what the honourable Member rose on, but he may have been intending to say "open", but in fact said it was a closed economy. And that is the basis of the argument which I was making — that the economy of Barbados is anything but a closed economy. I will proceed nevertheless.

The central point which we on this side are making in relation to the economic situation — and this is the point which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was trying to underscore — is that because of the serious mismanagement which took place in the economy of Barbados, we find ourselves in a situation where we had to be borrowing unusually high amounts of money in this day and age. And because of mismanagement, we are in the situation now where every additional sum of money which is borrowed or which the Government is being asked to guarantee is an additional burden which the economy is being asked to underwrite — and which in the final analysis the taxpayers of Barbados are going to have to pay for, because there is no point saying that our credit worthiness is good, it is excellent, therefore any bank will lend us money.

That is a good statement to make. But the whole point is that there can come a time when your credit worthiness can become impaired because of excessive borrowing. The point which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was essentially making was that if things go on at this rate and every additional borrowing or guarantee of loans can be an additional burden on the economy — if things go on that way — the

only way you are going to be able to finance the repayments is in the final analysis by increasing taxation on the people of Barbados.

3.10 p.m.

We think in terms of the methods of taxation which have been recently used by the Government where there is a tendency to move from direct taxation to indirect taxation, where there is a tendency to use levies — which, in our view, are retrogressive methods of taxation tending to affect those people at the lower end of the socio-economic end who are least able to bear the pressures of that type of taxation — we are saying that where you continue to increase the level of taxation which the people of Barbados have to pay, it is the people at the lower end of the socio-economic level who are going to be the persons most oppressed by taxation and consequently by the persistent rise in the borrowing of money from overseas or the persistent rise in the contingent liabilities which the Government of Barbados is being asked to underwrite.

Now the burden of the comments from honourable Members on the other side, Mr. Speaker, seem to have been to discredit everything that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has had to say on this cause. I do not wish to get up and defend the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central because I am sure he is capable of doing that himself but honourable Members on the other side must admit that there must be two sides to any case.

They have put their side. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central rises on this side to put the case for this side and they are going to accuse him of all sorts of hypocrisy and all sorts of....(Asides).....I am sorry — and making wild and irresponsible allegations about the nature of the economy — those are the words of the honourable Member for Christ Church East — what he said about the capacity of the Government to guarantee loans could do nothing but spread panic in the business community. I quote you correctly. It seems to me that what the honourable Member for Christ Church East is concerned about is indeed what all honourable Members on the other side seem to be concerned about: the fact that what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying may result in spreading panic in the community. (Asides)

You anticipate me well because the next point I was going to make is that you do not seem to be concerned about whether what you were saying was true or not and I think that when one analyses the whole economic situation in Barbados, you cannot help but come to the conclusion that there is a lot of truth and a lot of substance in what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is saying.

The honourable Member for St. Michael Central seems to disagree with you when he says that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central sometimes raises questions which seek to embarrass the Government, sometimes raises some points. The honourable Member for St. Michael Central is telling you that you have to listen to the Member for St. Michael South Central on occasions because he raises some points. So, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that Members on the other side are guilty of what they accuse the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central of when they accuse him of making wild and irresponsible allegations because they, too, in their criticisms of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central are themselves wild and sometimes more irresponsible in their criticisms which they make of him.

Now economists have different points of view. You can put ten economists in a room and they will all have a different point of view when they come to analyse a situation. I believe they say that Economics is not a pure science so that as many economists as they are, as many opinions you may have on an economic issue, if someone differs from honourable Members on the other side, it is not fair to accuse that person of being irresponsible in his comments. That would be, Mr. Speaker, to accuse all economists who differ from your own point of view of being irresponsible in their comments.

I am sure that there are economists in Barbados who, perhaps, have no political allegiance, no manifest political allegiance one way or another who would support the view taken by the Member for St. Michael South Central — that the interest rates in Barbados are too high. I am not an expert in economics and I do not myself pretend to be able to form a judgment on that, but the essential point I am making is that there are economists in Barbados who will say and express as their considered opinion that the interest rates in Barbados are too high.

So when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central makes the point in here that the interest rates are too high, it is unfair and irresponsible of honourable Members on the other side to accuse him of making an irresponsible statement in making that suggestion because he is entitled to his opinion. Honourable Members on this side are entitled to express their opinion as effectively as honourable Members on the other side express theirs so that there has been some measure of responsibility in comment.

Both sides have to be responsible in the comments which they make and in my submission what I am saying is that an analysis of the economy of Barbados must be open to comment.

I am sure if honourable Members on the other side were in the Opposition, they would be taking a completely different view from the point of view they are taking now. They have a duty to criticise the Government and if they criticise the Government the criticism should be taken for what it is worth.

So my final point, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to shear debate of all emotion and all rhetoric because the honourable Member for Christ Church West got up and began to accuse politicians of using a lot of rhetoric to make their point. In fact when he first began to make his statement, I thought he was addressing his remarks to the honourable Member for St. James North but as he went along I discovered that his remarks were directed to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. But he too fell guilty to the charge which he made of others because he waxed very warm in rhetoric and seemed to be carried away in emotionalism in the whole debate.

What we are saying in relation to the measure before us, is that we on this side are concerned about the persistence and what we consider to be the excessive borrowings of Government. The saying is that that last straw can break the camel's back and we are concerned that every persistent attempt or every persistent effort in borrowing more and more money is an additional burden on the Barbados taxpayers because it is they in the final analysis who are going to have to meet the commitments of the loans which are being taken.

I conclude by saying that our criticism should be taken in the right spirit and that one should not seek to try to discredit everything we say purely on the altar of political expediency.
3.20 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had a long.....

Mr. P. M. GREAVES rose. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am not winding up, I am speaking. I am not winding up. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to wind up because it is at this juncture that I am entitled, as an honourable Member of the Honourable House to speak. I rose before the honourable Member. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You spoke already.) I did not speak. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You introduced the Resolution.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get the matter clear. Is the honourable Member likely to be the person who will eventually wind up the debate for the Government? (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I may do it.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Somebody else here may do it, Sir. (*Asides*) A lot of statements have been made. I must be able to put forward the facts that they ask for. The Hon. Attorney-General can wind up, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. Just let us have it made clear.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Hon. Attorney-General can wind up, Sir.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am trying to get a point made clear by the Hon. Minister and until I get that point made perfectly clear, I cannot entertain any debate from anyone.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: All right, Sir, I always abide by your ruling but I would like to make a point.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not propose to wind it up, Sir. It is very important that we take out the..... (*Asides*) How do you mean, how I can speak twice.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order. Can I be heard at this point, Sir? The point is this, Sir. It was the honourable Member, Sir, who is now attempting to speak, who introduced the Resolution which indeed must be a speech. If he is not winding up, he is now making a second speech. But the honourable Member is only entitled to a second speech in winding up, Sir. He is not entitled, according to my interpretation of the ruling, to a second speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree. The honourable Member for St. Michael North. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I can handle him.)

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Thank you very much, Sir. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Five minutes.) (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: You do not last five minutes.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I followed the debate here today with considerable interest..... (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Is that a fact?)..... because my mind went back to..... (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: 1910.).....1973 when the then Government at the time removed the ceiling from the interest rates and put the interest rates to float in order

that the rates should find its own ceiling. And then, the Government at the time intended to and did in fact put back a restricted ceiling on the level of the interest rates.

At that time, Sir, we found the then Opposition Members criticizing the Government in terms in which they are now attempting to defend their own positions — pouring cold water at the time, on what we were attempting to do.

What we have found here, Sir, is that the wheel has now turned full circle. We found that the prevailing economic condition at the time warranted an increase of interest rates and rates at that time were not increased anywhere near what we have today. Not anywhere near.

We had similar situations. We had a situation at the time of those persons who had a line of credit to the commercial banks taking up the balance of their credit which they had not then used and sending them abroad to attract high interest rates. The Government could not permit this. But at the time, the Exchange Control at the Central Bank was not functioning and we found it difficult because we had not at the time fully pulled out of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, and we found it extremely difficult to be able to control the outflow of funds from this country.

But the situation today is far different. The situation today is that we have a fully operating Central Bank and if I may say so, Sir, in all humility and candour, it is my belief that the Central Bank is operating efficiently and effectively. That is my belief. So the situation at that time and now are indeed not at all on all fours.

But I am glad that the debate took the turn which it did today because it vindicated from the speeches of the honourable gentlemen the measures taken by the Government then, in order to correct the problems that were then existing.

We witnessed today what I consider to be some personal attacks, Sir, on the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. What do we find? What did he advocate? He advocated a lowering of interest rates. He wanted to know why it is that the Government is now coming for a guarantee of these Barbados Development Bank funds when, in fact, it was not done before. And he made certain comments on the state of the economy. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: In inflammatory terms.) I understand it now to be inflammatory.

It is the Government that boasts of open Government. I would like to know if they, on that side, would not like us on this side to be able to make commentaries on the economic situation as we see it and would not like a full disclosure. Mark you, one cannot always disclose everything. I am the first to admit this.

There are times for making certain statements, there are times not for making certain statements.

But I think the economic situation that we find ourselves in today can best be tackled if we are candid with each other. And when we on this side make certain statements about the economy of the country, it is not that we are running the country down. It is that we are passing comment as we see it on the state of the economy. That is pure and simple. And I do not accept that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was irresponsible in making disclosures to the Honourable House as he sees it on the state of the economy of this country.

I believe that Barbados has a reasonable credit rating on the international market. That is my belief. If that were not so, Barbados would not be able to borrow the money it has borrowed and now find itself in the kind of debt that it is in.

But what is amazing is that in 1976, and prior to 1976 when the National Debt then stood at a little over \$200 million — in 1976 and before — the honourable Members then of the Opposition criticized the size of the National Debt and they said that the country was bankrupt. That is what they said. But the evening of election after it was clear that the Barbados Labour Party had won a majority, the now Prime Minister went on Barbados television and said, "the National Debt is a bit low". Mark you, it was not more than a month before and less that the same Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the members of his Party were criticising the National Debt, he then went on television and said that "the National Debt is a bit low and we can do with some more borrowing."

3.30 p.m.

That was said at that time by the Prime Minister, which to my mind brings back to me something that was said today by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central. We say one thing today and we are prepared to unsay it tomorrow by making a completely different statement tomorrow.

Sir, today I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church West say that because of the capacity of the Government, we were given loans by the Orion Bank at the best rate available. I do not know if it is important that one should necessarily brag about borrowing money. They do it because they consider it to be an index or an indicator that the country is on a sound financial footing — because the lenders would not lend you if in their opinion it would not be repaid. But in fact we are saddling ourselves, we are saddling the taxpayers, we are saddling future generations with a financial commitment to repay this loan, and the loans are mounting, the debt is mounting. The debt stood before the end of last year,

at over \$700 million — \$500 million more than when the same Government here took office in 1976.

What are these best prevailing rates that we heard being boasted of today? It is my understanding that the rate of interest was somewhere in the area of 22.5 percent. That might be the best prevailing rate..... (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: That is not true). That is my understanding, I do not know if it is irresponsible to say that is my understanding, but that is my understanding, and I do not know if 22.5 percent is the best prevailing rate that Barbados can get a loan at today. If it is, God help the poor taxpayers of this country.

I was very surprised to hear the honourable Member for Christ Church East say that restraint on wages is a protection for Balance of Payments. I believe that is what he said — that it is a fact that wage restraint is protection for Balance of Payments. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Not by itself).

There are several ways in which one can protect Balance of Payments. We have a problem in this country. The appetites of the people in this country for sophisticated living have been whetted now for quite some time, so we have a problem. That occurred during our time, but we have a problem. It can lead to economic problems if it is not properly controlled, and we have the problem. The problem is how to control it, it has got to be controlled, and I do not believe that the way to control it is necessarily by wage restraint. I do not believe it. There are several other ways in which it can be done, and they know it too, but they are ways which they will find unpopular with those who support them. Let them tackle that problem and do not deprive the poor wage earner of what indeed should be a just due for the work they perform in this country.

Equally surprising was the statement of the Member for St. Michael Central that the Government at the time, that is, the Government of the Democratic Labour Party, had no credit rating. That was a reasonable interpretation of what he said, and he cited an example. In fact, he said that the Barbados Development Bank before 1976 was unable to borrow money. No self-respecting institution, he said, would lend the Barbados Development Bank any money.

Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to give the lie to that. I was a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, I attended a meeting of that bank in Quito, Ecuador in 1974, and along with me went the then Chairman of the Barbados Development Bank, Mr. Leon Bernstein. There in Quito, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leon Bernstein and myself signed a loan agreement for funds for the Barbados Development Bank for onlending to individuals for tourism development. That is a fact,

because I was one of the signatories — and so was Mr. Leon Bernstein — in Quito.

Let him check the records of the Barbados Development Bank. Do not come and tell me that the finances of the Barbados Development Bank were so bad that no self-respecting institution would lend it money, because that is simply not true.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The statement which I made is in fact true.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not risen on a point of order, you have risen to elucidate, but since you rose on a point of order, to attempt now to elucidate, I would have to say that you would be fraudulent.

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the honourable Member for St. Michael North is in any position to say what would have happened or what would have taken place after they lost power in September 1976. I am saying that after that date financial institutions refused to lend the Barbados Development Bank money.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point taken, but you are not now elucidating. Now you have risen to elucidate you are really not elucidating.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: The honourable Member is only confusing. Rather than elucidating, he is confusing. As a matter of fact, he has given me a further point. If — as I know — the Inter-American Development Bank lent the money to the Barbados Development Bank for tourism development, and if after 1976 they were not able to get money for the same Barbados Development Bank, it is very possible, it must be that they had no confidence in the then Government at that time. (*Aside*) I know you will not like that, maybe they had no confidence in the honourable Member's Government at that time.

Even if, Mr. Speaker — and it is not true — the Inter-American Development Bank or any institution would not lend the Barbados Development Bank money, how could that be a reflection on the credit worthiness of a Government? Because the Barbados Development Bank is a corporation, an autonomous corporation, how could that be a reflection on the Government?

Mr. Speaker, I just thought I should make some comments on matters that have gone before. I believe that the interest rates in Barbados are too high. That is my honest opinion, because the economy of this country is being stultified because of the high interest rates. A paralysis has set in in this country which is not only felt by the private sector — the public sector is also suffering.

Interest rates are not selective on whom they affect, they affect everybody — private sector, public sector, you, me, everybody else. The cost of living goes up, persons get laid off. The economy of this country was overheated over the past year and a half. It should not have been. Sufficient management was not brought to bear on the economy of this country, to the virtual overheating of this economy. 3.40 p.m.

Too many things were started or attempted at a certain time and left undone. Every day I look out of my window — I work in Spry Street — and I see hundreds of steel bars jutting up about four feet off the ground. Not one stroke has been driven there since June, 1981. That is the admission I am making. I see it every day as I look through my window.

So the fact is, Sir, that there was not sufficient management of the economy and proper management of this economy up to 1981, so we find ourselves today not saddled with high interest rates, and people down at Golden Mile, at Heywoods — over 100 of them — have been laid off over the past three weeks. I consider that to be the public sector. It is the taxpayers' money that is paying directly for that.

People in the private sector have been laid off as well, and people come to me every day who have been put out of employment. I have been embarrassed. I believe that they come to you and I believe that they go to every single Member of this Honourable Chamber, and there is hardly any way in which I for sure — and I assume the same might apply to Your Honour as well as to other honourable Members — can help and give assistance to these people.

I am advising the Government to have another look at the interest rates, because unless the interest rates come down we are in for a severe economic nightmare.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I promise the House that I am not going to reply to this matter in the vein in which the honourable member for St. Michael South Central spoke. I believe, Sir, that it is the duty of every Member of this House — both in the composition of their speeches as well as in the manner of delivery — to do everything possible without interfering with or whittling down the validity of the arguments that they put forward, to do everything in their power to ensure that they do not make wild, reckless, unprovable, irresponsible statements which can only be calculated to have the effect of undermining the confidence in the integrity of the dollar and in the economy of Barbados.

Now for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to say that the guarantee of the Government of Barbados is not worth as much as a

guarantee of an individual member is nothing but the height of total irresponsibility — and that is what he is being criticised for — is clearly portraying to the public at large that he as the Shadow Minister of Finance is in a position to know that the Government's financial situation is such that if it gives a guarantee it is worthless. Now if honourable Members on that side feel that that is a true and accurate situation and that is fair comment, then let them get up and say that we are not entitled on this side to castigate the honourable Member for such total irresponsibility.

There is a Prime Minister now in the Caribbean — Seaga, who spent years trying to damage the image of his own country purely because he was in Opposition, and up to now despite whatever efforts he is making, he still cannot undo the damage he did when he was in Opposition, and that is what we are talking about.

The democratic system of Government does not permit because you are in Opposition that you must use every privileged occasion to so falsify the facts. That is what I say it is — a falsification of the facts, falsifying the economic facts in order to gain a few headlines, because that is all the honourable Member can gain now, because the election is all over. He is just trying to gain a few headlines and of course establish himself within his own political party as being capable of leadership, because the style of leadership which he believes his own political party wants is one of an irresponsible leader.

The true facts surrounding the Resolution are simple. The Development Bank receives its money from equity capital. It receives its money from borrowing from international institutions and it receives its money from short term borrowing from the Central Bank and of course profits generated from its operations.

The Development Bank in view of its commitments, not longer than three to four months ago — knowing full well that it was dependent upon the signature of a second tranche under the new Lome Convention of \$8 million, required short term money in order to continue to disburse its commitments pending the legal formalities of the signature of the loan with the European Investment Bank. In addition it had applied to the Government for permission to issue National Development Bonds in the sum of \$10 million to deal with its commitments.

Now, Sir, having applied to the Central Bank, the Central Bank said it would not extend its line of credit any further because the Central Bank said that if Central Bank's policy was to reduce the amount of money available for lending in Barbados — having regard to the fact that in its opinion the Barbados economy was proceeding at so rapid a pace that with the international recession abroad, we too in Barbados would have to do some curtailing of our spending. It said though that it was

willing to lend it on a short term basis in anticipation of the loan which it knew it was negotiating.

In short if you know that Foreign Exchange is coming in from the European Investment Bank, if you lend them short term and as soon as you get it back in you will be able to repay it. There is no charge at all on the Balance of Payments in Barbados because it goes out one day and comes in the next day, and that is precisely what it is.

And they said that under the Central Bank Act a guarantee was required. I will read the letter from one Mr. Clarke who I believe is the Secretary of the Bank, and it is very simple:

"The Board of Directors of the Central Bank of Barbados declined to increase the facility but has undertaken to make short term advances to the BDB against committed Foreign Exchange receipts from international lending institutions. The BDB has been informed about this. We have received a request from the BDB for an advance of \$950 000.

Under the provisions of the Central Bank Act however, such advances must be secured. By copy of this letter we are hereby asking that a Ministry of Finance guarantee be sought for this advance."

It is as simple as that, Mr. Speaker, and the Addendum to the Resolution is very clear and sets out this. Now I also want to tell honourable Members of the House that the line of credit which is a general line of credit which comes out of the resources of the Central Bank is \$6 million outstanding, and the first Resolution for the approval of it was in 1977 and the second Resolution for \$4 million was passed in May 1980. 3.50 p.m.

So it is untrue to say that Resolutions have not come before. It is totally untrue to say that Resolutions have not come before so why found your arguments upon a premise which has no factual foundation. That is what we accuse the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central of repeatedly doing in here every day. That is what we are quarrelling with.

He is entitled to his opinions. What he is not entitled to do is to manufacture facts in order to give validity to his opinions. He is not entitled to do that so that for the record, the Resolutions were previously approved by the House of Assembly. The Central Bank Act — I am reading a letter from Mr. H. A. Clarke, Secretary and it is dated January 7, 1982 and I believe that Mr. Clarke is the Secretary of the Central Bank of Barbados.

Now, Sir, there are a few other points. Obviously on an occasion like this, having been effectively dealt

with in his criticism of the Development Bank only last week, the honourable Member now shifts his remarks and he is going to talk about interest rates. Now I want to say this: there has been no more better critic of the interest rates of Barbados than me. I have been criticising the interest rates policy in Barbados for many years and I say this: that I had to accede to two arguments that were put forward in the last six months not only by the Central Bank but by others in relation to interest rates in Barbados.

Despite the Central Bank having nominal control and legal control over the remittance of money from Barbados, there are still problems in controlling the total volume of export receipts, visible and invisible, coming back into Barbados — so that is the problem. If creditors abroad feel that they can hold payments due to Barbadians because the Barbadians interest rates are lower than theirs and they do not remit it abroad, what can the Central Bank do? What the Central Bank can do is to put pressure on the creditors here but the creditors here would have to bring legal proceedings against the debtors over there to try and get back their money.

Now we have done a tremendous amount of work in this area and it was a fact that because of the differential of interest rates in Barbados that some Barbadian firms — and when I used Barbadian, I do not necessarily mean Barbadian own — entities operating in Barbados were getting some charges abroad at a higher rate than our interest rate and the people abroad were willing to pay them because there were being financed at 12 percent when the going rate abroad was between 15 percent and 16 percent. So we became a creditor to that extent of the people abroad.

The other point is that we also have, in particular, the hotel industry, particularly from Europe. Now I can say from Europe because two things occurred last year. That is that between January 1981 and December 1981 most of the European currency dropped by over 30 percent in relation to the American dollar so that tour operators abroad not only had to get an additional amount of pounds, an additional amount of German francs to pay because they had contracted in the U.S., but also they themselves to pay the 30 percent had to go and borrow at 16 percent rate so we had a great job in the Ministry of Tourism trying to bully the hoteliers and others to try to get the remitters to come back.

This thing was so serious — not only in Barbados — it was so serious that they had a conference among the Caribbean Hotel Association in Jamaica because this phenomenon was something that happened not only here — it happened all abroad and we were monitoring and the Central Bank and all of us were aware of it.

We also had this pressure that the banks here were only giving six percent on the savings in one year and the ten percent the Trust Companies would have been giving on one year money but the arguments were that Barbadians could invest their money at 16 percent or 17 percent abroad and for the first time a number of companies who normally kept their profits in Barbados — for the first time in many years — began to make applications for remittance of their profits so that they could invest them abroad.

Now you are in a dilemma because part of the investment programme appeal of Barbados is that we guarantee repatriation of profits and of original capital. So taking all of these factors into account and the last factor which is equally as important — now why should Barbadian savers and this is important — I am talking about the Pension Fund, I am talking about the National Insurance Fund and all of that — why is it that if your own rate of inflation is greater than the deposit rate, that if I am good enough to deprive myself, save money and put it in the bank, why should I by saving it so that you can borrow it cheaply, give you an advantage when the value of my dollar that I save is going down all the time and you are making money on my dollar.

So there is a relationship between saving and lending. This is a fact and these are the matters that we had great debate and argument on. This was not an easy decision but the true position is this: only the United States of America can bring down interest rates in the world. You had better put that in your pipe and smoke it.

The Chancellor of West Germany, Belgium and the United Kingdom, had a meeting recently and they are beseeching the American Government to reduce their interest rates. Why? — because if you have high interest rates in the United States of America and the United States of America's dollar is also high, capital from all over Europe flies into the United States of America to take advantage of the high interest rates so if you want to retain it in your country, you have to follow suit. Remember that Europe has no exchange control now and these are big problems in the world and the only way the United States would be able to contain their interest rate, as I understand it, is if they reduced their Current Account deficits and reduced the borrowing requirements of the Government. So that is the position and that is why interest rates still remain high because the United States proposed budget shows a deficit of \$90 billion.
4.00 p.m.

So do not come in here and attack the Government on the basis of interest rates, when it is a matter in which we have devoted a considerable amount of time. What I am concerned with — and it is something that I will continue to pursue every day of my life — is that the

Barbadian savers get a realistic interest rate from the banks in Bridgetown. That is what I am concerned about. They must get a proper interest rate from the banks in Bridgetown.

I am not satisfied that the banks in Bridgetown are paying a sufficient interest rate, particularly on savings accounts. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: True) That is what I am not satisfied about and I have already indicated very clearly, my objection to that and the Government is pursuing that policy. We are pursuing that policy because they must give greater inducement to the savers here so that we can have more savings in the community so that we can generate more of our fund requirements locally. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That is it.) That is the context in which we must look at interest rates. But this is a worldwide phenomenon.

Now, Sir, I love to hear this talk about overheating. We have repeatedly told the other side — not only now, for a long period of time before the election — last year was an exceptional problem year for us. Alone on our export earnings of sugar, we lost \$43 million because of currency devaluation. It must not be forgotten Mr. Speaker, Sir — and I am sorry the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is not in his seat — that we never received payment for the last 17 000 tons of sugar which was produced last year but could not be sold on the world market because of the low price until January. We never received that. Normally, we receive our Foreign Exchange remittances from our sugar by the end of the year so it goes into that calendar year. So we did not receive it before January because it did not pay to sell it. If you sold it, the world price was so low. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: We mentioned that already.)

But the honourable Member is still quarrelling. He is still accusing the Government of being responsible for a matter that the Government could not possibly be responsible for because if the honourable Member were sitting over here — although it is very unlikely he will sit over here — probably over there — the honourable Member — I know with his love of money and his instinct for making a profit that the honourable Member — would not sell it at that stage — not the honourable Member, he loves and understands profit too much. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: This one?) The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

So let us get these facts clear. These are clear facts. We have also said, Mr. Speaker — and I believe by next week the honourable Members would be in a position to see — the honourable Member is not going to realize his great wish that the Barbados Current Account deficit in this year was \$40 million. The honourable Member is not going to realize that. He is not going to realize also that the Capital spending was \$200 million. He is not going to

realize that, either. The honourable Member is not going to realize that because we have taken steps not to borrow money to reduce the expenditure within the matching revenue. That is the big difference.

Now, Sir, I do not subscribe to the view which has been advanced by the honourable Member for St. Philip South — that if you borrow, you lose respect. I do not believe in that, Sir. That is an outmoded 14th century view of the economics.

No man, except he receives great gifts, if he is going to progress at some time or the other in life does not have to go and commit himself and borrow money for a worthwhile project. If the honourable Member had said that you do not borrow money to buy rum, I would agree with him. But if the honourable Member says that you must not borrow money to buy a house well then the honourable Member would not get a house unless some sweet girl gives him one. That is the whole point.

So you must not make statements like if you borrow money, you lose respect. There is nothing wrong in borrowing money. You must borrow money for productive purposes, not for consumption purposes — for productive purposes. That is what you must borrow money for. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: And for Current Account purposes.) And that is the position.

So we keep trying to point out — we must get a list of the projects — it was no overheating — no overheating. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Of course it was.)..... no overheating. It is a misguided word.

What has happened is that the magnitude and the complexities of the development programme was so stunning that the honourable Members on the other side could not conceptualise the realization of that programme. That is the problem. You could not believe that a Government in Barbados in five years could have done so much. But you missed one thing and this is the thing you missed: that between 1976 and 1981, the productive capacity of Barbados doubled, therefore its capacity to undertake a larger amount of product was greater. That is all you missed.

So when you look at the north of the island and you are going to talk — I am really ashamed of the honourable Member, I am really ashamed of the honourable Member who spoke last — he is going to come in here and say that down in Heywoods 100 people were being laid off. (*Aside*) But that is an inherent incident of construction because after you finish foundations, after you get up, you need a different type. At least two hotels have on the roof and the finishing is going along. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: One hundred people dug the foundation.) It is not only digging foundations, there are other things.

Every construction project has a peak employment period of time. The total number at peak was 500. Commonsense would tell you that. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I agree with that, not 100 laid off.) The honourable Member is not going to tell you that the Cement Plant just two miles below are now hiring there. So the essential characteristic of construction is mobility.

I will tell the honourable Member this: if he goes and sees Oistin, the polyclinic is finished, the Police Station is now plastering, but they have gone to the Court House. But some must be laid off from the polyclinic too because it is being handed over tomorrow. And if you look at the fish market.....(Aside).....You see this is our problem, Sir, we did not hold the other side and explain to them piece by piece the magnitude of the project. If we had done that, they would not talk about overheating.

Now as far as the Central Bank building is concerned, as I understand it, the real vagabonds in Barbados in the construction industry are the architects, the engineers and the quantity surveyors and they bid a ridiculous price. That is what they did, bid a ridiculous price and thank God, those who are in charge of the Central Bank had the courage to tell them, "No can do, go back out to bid". It happened with the CDB and thank God, it is happening with a larger number of projects in Barbados — that they have to go back and sharpen their pencils and come back in with better bids. That is sense, that is how you have to do it. Every now and again, all over the world, you have to tame the unreasonableness of the construction industry in relation to prices. That is what they do and that is the position.

We will get better prices now than we would have got 18 months ago. So Sir, I do not need to talk any more on this because I think I have answered all the things. I really feel very sorry, I feel hurt, Sir, that an honourable Member who is the Shadow spokesman on the other side for finance would feel that it is in the interest of Barbados now, at this stage, when the performance of the Barbadian economy in 1981 — I am going to deal with this — this question about the chaotic state of the tourist industry.

You know, we hear all of this talk. Do you know the final end of year figures for 1981 showed that the percentage decline in numbers was 4.7 percent — that is the chaos — 4.7 percent decline but the honourable Member is still going to get in here and say that the hotels are not paying back the Development Bank. I made it my business to check with the Development Bank in respect of defaults.....(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Spending.).....The spending was up, the Hotel Tax was up.
4.10 p.m.

The big point we have always been trying to make is that we were growing at 17 percent. If you only grow at five or six percent in your spending, the fact that you have less visitors does not mean that you have less spending. You look at the bed nights, because a significant thing has happened — something the Governor of the Central Bank himself when he was making those speeches did not understand — that the fact that the North American economy is in a recession does not necessarily mean that the British economy is not going to produce visitors.

We have been saying all along that we have been trying to diversify the source of our visitors particularly to get summer visitors, and thank God that policy paid off last year, because 72 000 came from the United Kingdom, nearly as much as were coming from Canada and America, when five years ago not more than 15 000 or 20 000 came. In the summer period of time, the United Kingdom visitors more than made up for what was lost in the traditional Canadian and American markets. That is a tradition, it is a remarkable thing, Barbados has a diversified tourism product.

I was also very pleased to note, Sir, that at the Export Promoters Conference, the statistics show that in 1981 we exported in domestic goods, including agricultural products, four percent more than the year before. That is what has happened. We had two areas of very great decline. One was our local oil production, and that has been explained, because we were going in for deep well drilling, and the second was the fall in the agricultural earnings. Do not let us get away with this idea that because there is a depression abroad that we in Barbados must fold our hands and say nothing can be done about it. Something can be done about it. You must have faith, you must have hope, and you must fight your way out — and we intend to fight our way out.

I am very glad to see that the farmers in Barbados, certainly at market gardening level, have already this year been producing food crops in Barbados at prices which I have not seen for many a year. That is a fact, Sir. There is also more fish around now than I have seen for many a year. That is the resilience of the Barbadian economy.
(Aside).

The honourable Member over there says that prices are high, he does not even know that if you buy four flying fish for a dollar — that is 25 cents each, and six flying fish unboned make a pound. If you are going to tell me that \$1.20 is high, go into a lawyer's office and see that even for him to look at you you have to pay \$25. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Flying fish are being sold at 80 cents each). You must have gone into St. George to buy them. I will invite the honourable Member to come anywhere along the coast, from Half Moon Bay right along the coast and he will be able to get them.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important. We all acknowledge that growth in the economy of Barbados is very difficult at this stage, because we are fighting in an international situation in which we have to watch our competitive position; because with the demand abroad shrinking, it means that the purchasers abroad are going to be very very careful about how they spend their money. They are looking for bargains.

I have had to tell the Hotel Association that when they look at Barbados they will look at Kenya, they will look at Seychelles, they will look at everybody else. When they are going to buy a shirt they will do the same thing, therefore we have to watch our competitive position, and it is in the context of your competitive position abroad that you must talk of the question, of your cost of production — and wages are an essential component of that.

That is all I can tell you, so there is no big mystery in this. There is no dislike for any particular class and all that foolishness. The question is that we have to export to survive and we have to look at the cost that we can sell abroad on all our goods and services.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

THE NATIONAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION ACT, 1982

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1970 the Parks and Beaches Act was passed and it provided for the setting up of a Commission which provided for the control and conservation, development and operations of places of environmental importance.

In 1975 the Caves Authority Act was also passed, which gave it similar functions to that of the Parks and Beaches Commission. It was discovered that the functions of these two bodies were somewhat similar, and at a very early stage Cabinet in 1977 decided that these two authorities should be amalgamated.

It was not possible to seek parliamentary approval of a Bill which would see the repealing of those two Acts, because Cabinet decided that until the caves were officially opened that it was not necessary to proceed with this amalgamation. But on November 20 last year, the Harrison's Cave in St. Thomas was officially opened, and Cabinet decided to effect its decision.

Between November and the period leading up to this decision to implement the amalgamation, there were some procedural matters which had to be dealt with, and the authority which would take over from these two existing authorities would have had to be given some time

to familiarise itself with the working of the functions of these two bodies.

4.20 p.m.

The Bill which is before this Chamber merely seeks among other things to repeal the two Acts and to incorporate in actual fact most of the sections of these two Acts into this particular Bill.

There are some additional sections through which the new Commission, which will be known as the National Conservation Commission, will have wider functions and duties. Their responsibilities will expand so that some of the problems and even some of the functions and responsibilities which are now undertaken by the Barbados National Trust will now be the responsibilities of this National Conservation Commission.

There are places of national interest — historic sites and other areas — which we feel should come under the ambit of this Commission. The two Acts that I have already mentioned do not make provision for this expanded responsibility. Therefore the concern of the conservationists and preservationists over the question of preserving sites or buildings of architectural interest, national monuments or areas which can be described as of national significance or historical interest will now be taken care of.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, is very much interested in the environment and the maintenance of the environment, and of its historic sites and monuments. To this end provision had been made under the Town Planning Act. In fact under the Town Planning Act the Town Planner already has power to insist that some buildings remain of historic importance. In other words, there are some regulations which forbid the destruction of some of these older buildings.

The Government last year passed a Trees Preservation Bill. That Bill is another step in the direction towards conserving the natural beauty of our country. I will not wish on this occasion to restate most of the points that were made during that debate, but suffice it to say that the Government has wherever possible provided an opportunity for the natural beauty or the importance of national monuments and historic beauty of Barbados to be preserved. Our history and our heritage ought to be regarded by all of us as something very near to our heart.

In St. Kitts the Government there is spending vast sums of money preserving what is known as Brimstone Hill, and Fort which is very dear to them, reflecting a point of history. In Antigua that Government has spent sums of money and thinks very highly about a place called Shirley Heights which they call a bastion. In Toronto, Canada, one notes that in Upper Canada Village

every effort is made to conserve and preserve at the same time elements or artifacts and everything that is historical, although the history of Canada is not very old. But one must be mindful of Governments and countries and the sort of importance which they attach to landmarks which they regard as of national interest.

This Government feels that it is indebted to the country at large to see that historic buildings, historic sites and monuments as well as places of importance are preserved, and this Bill empowers the Minister responsible for Lands to declare any building which in the Government's opinion is considered to be of national or historic importance to be such.

One of the remarkable features of the Bill is to put things in their proper perspective in respect of buildings over which preservationists and conservationists have from time to time expressed their concern about the wanton destruction of some of these historic buildings. The Bill provides not only for the protection of such buildings, but it goes a bit further.

The Bill also makes provision for the protection and maintenance of accesses to public beaches. This is one of the things that was missing from previous Acts where accesses to public beaches were not within the ambit or responsibility of the authorities that we established, and this Bill seeks to empower this Commission to be responsible for the maintenance of public accesses to and from beaches.

In addition to that, the Bill seeks to give the Commission responsibility and empowers it to clear from the access or the immediate vicinity of public parks and beaches and places of historic or national interest derelict things and objects. Ever so often we have complaints about derelict buildings or old cars — things that actually pollute the environment — and it is this that this Bill seeks to correct.

The new Commission will be responsible for maintaining many other things, all those parks and beaches that presently come under the aegis of the Parks and Beaches Commission, and the caves. Mr. Speaker, one must take time off to allude to the fact that one of the things that Barbadians must understand is that if tourism is to continue to thrive, then it becomes abundantly necessary and clear that we must preserve as much of our national heritage and historical buildings as possible, because experience has taught us that visitors to foreign countries usually like to visit places of historic importance. And while they like to see modern developments, they also like to take time out to see what is our history and to know something of our heritage.

4.30 p.m.

I will also like to point out that at the moment there is a feeling among some people that the organisation that is presently responsible for looking at, or preserving, or highlighting certain buildings that are of historical interest have so far preserved or declared certain well to do sort of houses, houses that housed certain people of a higher social strata. And I feel that we should not only be looking at a building because some eminent person lived or was associated with that particular building or site but also at some of the very villages that certainly have some sort of historical appeal.

I would like to see that this new Commission taking note of some of these points that are raised because we certainly have got districts. Week after week we see in one of the leading newspapers, pictures or some comment or stories about some districts and its people and that too, Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my opinion, constitute part of our history. I think that that sort of thing should be encouraged by the new Commission to preserve some of the districts.

I would say that one of the things that struck me about the Canada Village was that there was an history of the Canadian people who lived from the very early settlement over 100 years ago, even the Village Church that some people worshipped at, even the tavern, the pub at which people stopped for a drink, even the weaving that took place during that period of history — all of that is being relived at Upper Canada Village and I am sure that my colleague on the other side — the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that this Village — and certainly the honourable Member — has something remarkable because here is a village and it attracts a number of persons.

What I would also want to point out is to those people who are involved in tourism at this point and those who sometimes do not understand that what really causes some people not to visit countries is the fact that when you can create within your own country places of national importance or national interest, then you can get people to remain at home. The same way we are concerned about the shifting of money out of the country, we can think in terms of developing certain places of interest. Certainly the Harrison's Cave is one of those places that will cause lots of money to be spent right here in the country by our own locals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must look at the early preservation of these sites, and not only from our own national standpoint. There are of educational as well as recreational value and significance and we need to educate our youth in the light that they too should know about our natural history. If the young people are taught about buildings and what they mean, the significance of them and the history of our country more, I think that we in the end, in years to come, they will benefit from a better

society because I think sometimes the reason why vandalism steps in on some of our buildings of architectural significance is because the people who vandalised them are not aware of the significance of them in our society.

So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to continue to take up all of the debate because I know that there are honourable Members who would certainly like to make a contribution on this particular Bill but I would like to point out that the Bill has nothing revolutionary. It is simply to amalgamate the environmental Bills in order to further protect and preserve as well as to conserve the national beauty and certainly the topographic features of Barbados.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second it and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill before us seeks to establish a National Conservation Commission and in reality it is partly the amalgamation of the Parks and Beach Commission Act and the Cave Authority with the introduction of something from the Trust Division.

There are two things in the Bill which I wish to comment on, Mr. Speaker. The first I am in complete agreement with it — I am happy to see that it has been retained. The second one Mr. Speaker, saddens me to see that it has been retained in the Bill as drafted.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, which is on the plus side and I am very happy to see that it has been retained is that in the definition of beaches in Barbados is included that portion upwards to 33 metres to the landward shore of the foreshore. Also — and this is particularly important, Mr. Speaker — the provisions that have been made in this Bill for the control otherwise of this section from a local point of view.

Land, Mr. Speaker, is about the only natural resource we have in Barbados with the exception of a little oil we get now and again and we in Barbados because of our laws which allowed people to hold in fee simple, has lost sight of the fact that it is such a precious commodity, that its use should be open to as many people as possible and any great gains from such lands should go to as many people as possible.

Because of the fact that certain lands in Barbados due to the fortunate situation that there are on to the lovely beaches of Barbados and due to the fact that we over the years have been able to maximise the beautiful beaches in Barbados and the lovely sunshine and weather

by way of the tourist industry, have caused these lands to attract an artificial high price which have had the result that within recent times most of them — if not all of them — have suddenly passed out of the ownership of the hands of Barbadians. I was very happy to see that regulations have been retained in this to give the Parks and Beaches, the National Preservation Commission along with the Town and Country Planning Department, some little control over the use and the development of this section because we have here in Barbados the phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, based now on our local people being made to feel like strangers in their native land.

It is not any secret that some of the expatriate owners of this most cherished part of Barbados — particularly on the West Coast in time past — have made it very uncomfortable for the native Barbadian to enjoy the natural sea and the sun and the lovely beaches.

4.40 p.m.

And although the Laws of Barbados are very specific that the beaches are public property — and that is up to high water mark — sometimes — due to the lack of enough and sufficient public accesses, people had to traverse on private properties in order to enjoy what is quite naturally ours by nature and by birth. And on a few occasions they have been made to feel most unwanted and I remember an instance where there were complaints that there were some very vicious dogs on certain properties in Barbados that prevented the native Barbadian from enjoying what is rightly his.

So I am pleased with the provision in this Bill which gives the National Conservation Commission the rights — and most of them are contained in Section 5, 1 (c); Section 5, 1 (g) *et cetera* — to control the construction in public gardens, beach huts, *et cetera* of that foreshore. And this is very important because the Convention and the Law of Real Property in Barbados is such that ownership of land goes to high water mark and in the absence of these provisions, it would have meant that the privileged few owning those lots would be at will to develop in whatever way they see that portion of the land which is now under control — and has been under control — under the old Parks and Beaches Act and is now retained in this one.

I am also happy to see that provisions and authority has been given to this Commission to keep right of ways to the beach clean of all rubbish and if needs be, to provide additional ones.

The sections that saddens me, however, Mr. Speaker, are the sections relating to the licensing of people who want to sell on the beaches and these come under Section 16 of the proposed Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that this occasion would have been taken to remove from the Parks and Beaches Bill, a

section, a provision which in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is very obnoxious and that deals with the procedure for people obtaining licences to sell on the beaches.

Every one of us in this Honourable House, Sir, have at some time on a yearly basis to pay our fees in order to practise in our profession and calling. We might not call it a licence -- it might be a renewal of professional fees. The lawyers have to do it, Mr. Speaker, the Quantity Surveyors and the artisans, and not one of those persons have to produce a Police Certificate of Character to the Registrar -- in order for them to be licensed to carry out their profession or their work.

I am certain if a lawyer went to the Registrar tomorrow to pay his annual subscriptions to practise in Barbados and he were subjected to this by the Registrar asking him to produce a Certificate of Character he would feel very cut up, Mr. Speaker. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, if an Insurance Salesman went, he would similarly feel that way -- also a carpenter or a mason and I think it is unfair, Mr. Speaker, to have a situation where someone in order to earn an honest dollar in the calling of their choice has to be subjected to this type of situation. They have to do a lot more if they want to sell on the beaches of Barbados than the people who are making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year practising in their profession -- lawyers and doctors and Quantity Surveyors they must write to the Commissioner applying for a licence.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point you are making is a very good point, but it is for the Committee stage. Concentrate on the principles of the Bill. You will have an opportunity to deal with that, I am sure, in the Committee stage.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I will be guided by Your Honour. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: But it is a good point you are making.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you. As far as the other provisions of the Bill -- the inclusion of certain aspects of the National Trust under one Commission -- I think this is very desirable, because in this particular Commission what is being sought here is to give one set of persons -- who I am sure the Hon. Minister will see that they are properly selected because of their connections to the environment -- the right to control, protect, enhance and see about the future environment of Barbados, in order to make sure that it is kept in its very best shape for the residents of Barbados present and future.

I think that the Bill is a good one and it is one that would not pose a lot of problems for us on this side with those few exceptions which I will draw to the Minister's at-

tention in the Committee stage and I am glad to see that it was thought necessary and useful from a drafting point of view to bring all of those bits of legislation under one particular Bill and put it under one Commission.

Thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill.....

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just to reply to the honourable Member for St. Philip North. The point about the requirement for the Police Certificate.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter about which I just warned the honourable Member, it is all right for the Committee stage. The Hon. Minister will have an opportunity -- during the Committee stage, because I believe that the honourable Member for St. Philip North will ask him many more questions in respect of the same matter, and I would invite the Hon. Minister to deal with it in Committee.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, the honourable Member has made a rather interesting contribution. I have taken his points and I can give him the assurance that we will be looking at these matters to which he has addressed himself. As he said, it is a good Bill, a good one, and therefore I am very happy to know that on this occasion, there is consensus at least for the time being -- that the Bill is a very good piece of legislation.

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

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. Before we begin I wonder what is the wish of the Committee -- are we going to do this in Parts? (ASIDE: Clause by Clause.) Clause by Clause.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to move that Clause 2 stands part.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under Clause 2, because of the definition of beaches under this clause, it now gives the National Conservation Commission — as the Parks and Beaches Commission had — some authority over a section of land adjoining the fore-shore. It must also be noted that the Town Planner also has certain permission under this section.

I really seek under this clause to invite the Minister during the administration of this to make sure that there is some necessary co-operation and co-ordination between the two departments in administering the control of the particular section for the effective functioning, so that the owners because of the technical side of it would not be inconvenienced more than is necessary in the administration by these two departments.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the point is well taken and I want to give the honourable Member the comfort that on this Commission it is proposed to have someone with town planning experience so that this fear will be much alleviated.

The question that clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part. It should be noted that this clause includes a new section, that is, to conserve the natural beauty and the topographic feature. It also includes the preservation of historic and national monuments in Barbados.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Clause 5(4), Mr. Chairman, which gives the Minister the right to waive all or any part of the fees payable in pursuance of subsection (3). Subsection (3) applies to the Commission being able to clean, maintain or develop the lands comprising a cemetery or other burial place of a church, or in the possession of any person.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the Minister on this section to agree that specific instructions and procedures should be made, because if this is not properly applied one might think that the Commission might be carrying out their work with some type of partiality as far as the cleaning of cemeteries and churches are concerned. I would like to believe that there is a fixed policy by the Minister given to the Commission in which this clause could be applied to the cleaning of cemeteries, churches, etc. so that we can be sure that it is carried out

as far as possible, and the Commission would not be open to any charges of favouritism towards any particular organisation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have taken note of the point which the honourable Member has made. Far from putting it the way he is thinking about, I would like to see where the cemeteries and churches are concerned, that the churches take pride in keeping their cemeteries in good condition.

It is appalling when you go into some of the cemeteries to see "Here lies the body of our dear beloved brother" and all the love and so on added, but this is only for the first couple of hours after the person is deceased. When you go back a few months or years after you will see all the tombstones broken down, the cemeteries overrun by grass, people gambling inside the cemeteries, playing cricket inside them, and I would think that at least some respect should be given to those who have passed away.

I think it is incumbent upon the church, and for that matter the Sanitation Authority and the Parks and Beaches on this occasion, should be in a position to impose some fine on these places that have allowed their premises to run away and deteriorate into a state that Barbadians cannot be justly proud of.

You only have to travel overseas, Mr. Chairman, and you will see as you pass along — and sometimes you have to ask how it is done — the cemeteries are well kept, the lawns are nicely mowed, the graves are well attended. You only have to go into Westbury Cemetery down here, or even into St. George's church cemetery or St. James for that matter, and you will see how the cemeteries are all run down. It shows that we pay no respect to those who have passed away.

At this point in time I would like to commend the Committee who worked on the military cemetery here at Graves End for putting it back into a place where Barbadians can see those who gave their lives for their country. I do not know how the Minister would go about this, but I would like it put across to the churches to try and make sure that their cemeteries are very well kept. I think that the Minister would be in a position to speak to the National Conservation Commission and ask them to write these places so that they could pay some attention to the cemeteries.

That is my contribution. As a Barbadian I feel very very sad when I have to go to a funeral to see everything run down and derelict. It is very unsatisfactory, as far as I am concerned.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I take the point made by the Leader of the House. He can be assured that I too have some concern about the situation which he mentioned. However, on the point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North, I think what has happened here which needs to be explained is that the waiving of the fees, the power which the Minister has under this section, will be used only in cases where requests are made by churches or some other organisation to have work done by the Parks and Beaches Commission.

There are some areas where discretionary powers will be used, and that will involve looking at the nature of the circumstances involved. If this is the case, then I think there are some cases where some organisations would need some help, but wherever possible I will give this Chamber the assurance that this discretionary power will not be abused. I will do everything that rests in my power to see that it is not used willy nilly, so to speak.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this is really a drafting matter. The draughtsmen in an attempt to merge the two Acts have done a creditable job.
5.00 p.m.

In one respect I am referring to Clause 5 subsection (1) (i) "to control, conserve and develop caves". In fact what that is doing is repeating what indeed was said at (c) which is "to control, maintain and develop the public parks, public gardens, beaches and caves of Barbados". So in truth and in fact, this subsection is really a repetition and not necessary because it is already embodied in Clause 5 (1) (c).

I hope the Minister sees what I am referring to. Subsection 5 (1) (c) already mentions about controlling, maintaining and developing caves, and then (i) states the identical thing except it does not include public parks, public gardens, beaches and caves. What happened is that this section was taken completely out of the Caves Act and transplanted here, so it is not really necessary at all.

There is one further point I should like to make. Subsection (j) empowers the Commission to enter into written contracts for right of access to and control of caves. I think that we should also include in this the beaches as well, because there are some beaches that it is not easy to get to and it might be necessary to enter into some agreements with the adjoining owners to reach these beaches. If we are going to do it for caves, I think you might as well take the opportunity to also do it for beaches. It is no big thing at this point, but one never really knows, and while we are doing it for the caves, we might as well do it one time for the beaches. These are the two points I would like to draw to the Minister's attention.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I am right. Subsection (c) says "to control, maintain and

develop the public parks, public gardens, beaches and caves of Barbados" and then at (1) it says "to control, conserve and develop caves". One is to control, maintain and develop and the other is to control, conserve and develop. What you are saying is that this could be one.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this particular clause which sets out the functions of the Commission, in subsection (2) at the top of page 7 states that "notwithstanding subsection (1), the Commission may — upon a request being made to it in writing — clean, maintain or develop the lands, — (a) in the possession of any person; or (b) comprising a cemetery or other burial place of a church."

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of properties owned by the Government itself which are in need of regular maintenance, and I am wondering if the services of this National Conservation Commission will be used in order to maintain them, because if we are concerned about the beauty of this island and maintaining the historical buildings and all of the other facilities which will add to the rich heritage of this country, I think the Government has a very leading responsibility in this regard, and sometimes I am ashamed to see some Government buildings themselves without adequate maintenance of the premises.

I can just think of one off-hand right there on a main artery or highway on the Welches Road, the Welches Post Office. I am not certain which constituency that is in, but I know if it was in St. Michael East — I am calling any constituency — though very small grounds, they would be properly maintained. It is a bit of an eye-sore, and I do hope that this Commission which we are setting up would look at such matters including that particular Post Office. I stop there and do business sometimes. I have not had any recreation up on top of My Lords Hill yet, but we will get to that. I like these kinds of developments in that general area. and I mention it because I pass through this area; so I would like to draw this to attention.

I hope that this Commission gets going as far as those Government Departments and Government offices which now offend against the eye as far as beauty is concerned, and that something will be done positively in order to have them properly maintained.

I would like also to join the voices of those who have spoken in terms of ensuring somehow or another that church properties and burial grounds and so on are assisted as far as the maintenance of these properties is concerned. Sometimes when we go into places like the Westbury Cemetery and so on, it is a bit — I do not want to use the word "disgraceful" — but it is very unsightly and untidy. You go in for a very solemn occasion then to see the dilapidated nature, overgrown bush and so on inside what should really be a burial park, and I do hope

that some solution can be found to this particular problem and to those of the church burial grounds.

We know that the churches are not wealthy bodies. I am saying as a positive fact that the churches in Barbados are not very wealthy institutions, and they cannot afford the upkeep of the burial grounds and so on, and I believe that they constitute a part of the national heritage, and some major form of assistance to these institutions could be given in the form of services in the upkeep and maintenance of these grounds. I am not certain if this Commission will have the authority to waive fees in very deserving cases. I am wondering if the Minister could tell us this. I know the Commission can charge a fee, but it is not compulsory; it may be permissive, and so I do hope in some of these cases that we would not have very high fees being charged by the Commission. The Commission may say "Yes, we will come and do the work", but then the fee they may quote may be so high that it may be prohibitive and we may not advance very much further than where we are at present.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are other ways in which the Commission may seek to maintain the beauty of this country. It is very surprising that simply driving through an area and noting that the gutters and the sides of the roads are maintained in a reasonably clean condition can create a very good and favourable impression on those who observe, both nationals and non-nationals alike. I would also like to make an appeal for some improvement in this particular regard. We see now a lot of overgrowth in all places where it should not be.

I believe that also the planting of beautiful shrubs, flowering shrubs and other kinds of natural vegetation will also serve to improve the beauty of this small island of ours. A lot of persons who come here comment on the beauty of Barbados. Perhaps it is so close to us that we ourselves do not realise it and I believe that some time there were some oleanders — I believe an effort was made to plant some oleanders somewhere from the airport and I wonder if the Minister is aware of this. Are they still alive or have you allowed them to die? *(Asides)* They are very much alive and beautiful.

I would like to praise the former Minister now. At least he saw that one thing was done in that particular regard and I do hope that something will be done to maintain the beauty of this. The Minister says that he knows about the oleanders and he is going to ensure that they are maintained. *(Asides)* They have been stolen? The oleanders have gone?

I have a few other points to make but I think they will come a little later on in this particular clause.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Bill and I believe that all of us believe that the Parks and Beaches are doing a fine job but the only thing that struck me very much was to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South when he said that he hopes the Commission will take care of the churches.

Now we all agree and we all know that the churches in this island are way behind standard in the way they used to be kept years ago and we know the same honourable Member for St. Michael South was one of those people on the Democratic Labour Party benches who disendowed the churches.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of a particular church. I know for sure that the churches do not have money enough to take care of the cemeteries and to keep them clean. They do not even have money to take care of the buildings for the Ministers to live in and so on but I am glad to see here this afternoon that we have a Government with the understanding to try to come back to the assistance of the Anglican churches of this country.

Mr. Chairman, when you talk about cemeteries we do not have Pentecost churches with cemeteries or Adventist with cemeteries. The only people particularly with cemeteries in the island of Barbados is the Anglican Church, so I am very glad to see that we are coming back to the assistance of the rights which the Democratic Labour Party removed and the Barbados Labour Party now are bringing back.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Minister to know that as far as Parks and Beaches is concerned, that we will not only have it to a particular section because where I live, back there, it seems to me that the Parks and Beaches have stopped in St. Peter.

As for St. Lucy, I would say, we have the most seafront in the whole island and yet there is so little being done for that parish. You notice also that the famous River Bay and Archer's Bay are the most two famous excursion spots and nobody seems to come down there. They forget down there and everything has run to ruin.

This section here on page 5, the second part it says that "the Minister will maintain and assist in maintaining to such an extent the existing and future beach facilities, the construction of beach ancillary recreational facilities," and I am appealing to the Minister and this Commission. I do not think that there are many places in the island of Barbados which are in so desperate need of such facilities so I am appealing for the most lonely parish, the most neglected parish that the Minister in his office would make it a point of duty that he would come to St. Lucy and give the people over there a chance.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege to be at River Bay a few weeks ago and I saw some tourists over in that section and I was a bit ashamed to see people after they had had a bath and so on and they would like to have a move and they had to go all through the bushes and the trees. It was disrespectful to these people. I mean, when people come to the country for the first time to be confronted with such things like that it really does not encourage them so I am appealing, Mr. Chairman, to you and to the Hon. Minister, that he will do all that is in his power — that he will make sure that all the beaches over the island of Barbados will be treated and will be taken care of in the same instance. I thank you.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, first let me respond to the honourable Member for St. Lucy. I know the area to which he refers and under the very Act, the same Section 5, the new Commission in an advisory capacity — here it says to advise the Minister as to the construction of bath-houses and I think that the honourable Member is concerned about the lack of bath-houses in his constituency. I have noted his concern and on a previous occasion I assured that we will be looking at some of these matters which he has raised.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South alluded to sites that are not presently serviced by the Parks and Beaches — the existing authority, but this particular Bill makes provision which the honourable Member read in here. We would have a response to his query under sub-section 5 (e) "And such other sites as the Minister may designate", so if in my considered opinion an area needs some special attention then I can assure him that I will use that prerogative or that power to have the area properly cleaned as provided for in the Act.

The question that Clause 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part and while I am on this, I would just like to raise the point here that this section provides for the Land Acquisition Act to be invoked whenever lands are to be required for public purposes, also additional lands and there is a reason for that so that the question of disputes arising from trespassing on lands belonging to private owners under the Act is there taken care of.

The question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.20 p.m.

Clause 8 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 stands part.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, in this particular section, I note that in previous drafts or Acts, it was customary to put in a particular salary scale — provided in this section. I know there is a problem associated with that because as you get a new salaries revision, it would cause a problem in that.

I would like to suggest to the Hon. Minister that it might be considered that in this particular section, instead of putting a specific salary scale, that somewhere in the Bill, you can draft it to tie it on to the Administrative Assistant's level or something.

Although I am certain the Minister would exercise his authority in this one with due fairness, it is a wide clause which makes it possible for the Minister to fix it so low that he can have a say in the selection from messengers back up to the top. Although I know this particular Minister would not do this, I would like to see, if it is possible, that in clauses like these, you put in that to tie it on to the Administrative Assistant's salary grading *et cetera* — any salary grading above that of the Administrative Assistant, *et cetera* that the Minister would have a say in the allocation of the salaries and the selection of staff.

It would make it a little tighter than it presently is, because previously they set a particular salary into the former draft. This is a little bit clumsy, because as wages go up and up, you will find that that salary is becoming lower and lower down the salary scale. It is a bit clumsy, Sir.

I would suggest that he considers the possibility of tying it on to maybe the Administrative Assistant level in this particular section.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I take the point raised by the honourable Member. I am somewhat amused. But I think it is common practise, Sir, certainly among my colleagues and this present Government, Sir, that it is fixed around the AA Grade.

I do not think any Hon. Minister wants to concern himself — certainly, not me — with a monthly salary of less than \$1 000. I think it is to ensure to let the Minister or Cabinet know exactly, at that level — I am certain at that top level the Minister would like to know exactly what is going on top there, and to control the fixing of salaries because ever so often Boards do suggest or recommend some salaries way out and I think that this particular

clause governs any Board that seeks to fix a salary for a particular individual or holder of that office which is not compatible with the thinking of Cabinet.

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 9 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 9 stands part.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: In this particular section, Mr. Chairman, I would like to implore the Hon. Minister that he make available facilities under this Commission for parks like King George V Park, *et cetera*, Archer's Bay, at as reasonable a price as is practicable for the use and enjoyment of the people, and that he considers, when fixing these fees, that in times like these you should extend the facilities to as many people as possible; fix the fees as reasonable as possible, under these circumstances.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I must reply to that because I do not want it to be felt that because it is a Government property that we should rent it out or let it out at an uneconomical rent. After all, the public places cost money to be repaired and we have got to take on the maintenance cost into consideration and whatever fees is arrived at, is arrived at bearing in mind, the economic situation of the Commission. So, as far as possible, reason will prevail in fixing fees especially where the public is concerned or involved.

The question that Clause 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 10 to 12 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 13 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 13 stands part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, Clause 13 places a duty on the Commission to keep proper accounts and adequate financial and other records, in respect of its business. *(Aside)* You just came in, what happen, are you in a hurry?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is not a meeting between the two honourable Members. Please address the Chair.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not know — the lady Minister is looking so elegant today — I do not know why

she wants to put me off my tracks, Mr. Chairman. I am certain you will agree with me — she is very elegant today.

Mr. Chairman, I am making the point that I hope that this particular Commission will pay especial attention to this clause and ensure not only that it keeps proper accounts but that its reports and other records which it may be called upon or may be required from time to time to make public or to place before this Honourable Chamber are done in accordance with the Act.

In many cases, Mr. Chairman, we have Statutory Corporations which do not pay much attention to this particular aspect of it — I am not talking of the keeping of proper accounts — to the best of my knowledge, they do keep proper accounts — but in submitting those reports ensuring that they are — audited within the time specified and that any reports that are supposed to be made public or to come to this Honourable House come on time. And I do hope that this is a matter which the Hon. Minister will ensure that this body for which he will have responsibility, as far as policy is concerned, will be adequately staffed to carry out its responsibilities.

Sometimes, we place an onus on these Statutory Corporations to do certain things but they are not given the necessary staff with which to fulfil their responsibilities. I have heard about a Board called the Transport Board not being able to submit its reports and so on on time. *(Asides)*

You see, in this particular regard, the Central Bank of Barbados is an outstanding example. It publishes a wealth of information, in terms of monthly statistics, quarterly reports, annual reports, statements of financial statistics and other publications. But no doubt, it is staffed for this purpose and there are persons who have a specific responsibility.

There is no point requiring other Statutory Corporations to produce reports and other documents unless they are given the necessary resources or they themselves request the necessary staff, in order to carry out those responsibilities. It is very important that there should be a free flow of information so that the public can understand and follow, and monitor what is going on in these Statutory Corporations. I would just like to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Minister and hope that he will give the Board the necessary resources in order to ensure that it makes full disclosures to the public about its activities and about the problems and so on that it may be encountering.

The question that Clause 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.30 p.m.

Clauses 14 and 15 were called and passed.

Clause 16 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 16 stand part.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, this is the part of this Bill that worries me. As I said earlier, under the Registration of Professions and Trades Act almost every single working person in Barbados has to pay an annual fee to renew their right to work. This stretches from doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, surveyors, carpenters, masons, etc., and I would say about 98 percent of the working population in Barbados is roped into these regulations under that Act. Of that 98 percent not one single category of worker is required on an annual basis, or when he is applying to be so registered, to produce a certificate of character from the police to support his registration and his right to work.

I think it is unfair and undemocratic, and very degrading to ask people who might want to exercise their right to carry out the function of selling on the beaches in Barbados to be subjected to this type of procedural arrangement. The only other category of worker I know of, Mr. Chairman, which is required to produce a police certificate when applying are people in the security and defence area, and I could well see why this is so, because if you are working in security it is a very sensitive area and one would expect that the screening of people would be done after a very thorough investigation of their character, etc. and everything would be done to make sure that they are fit and proper persons to work in that area.

I realise the reason behind this, Mr. Chairman. We all know that one of the reasons for this stipulation is to try and cut down on the problems we are now facing on the beaches of Barbados. I agree that it is a problem that we should try to rid ourselves of, but on the other hand we cannot deny this section of workers in Barbados what I think is their right to function in a way they want to function and to expose them to this type of procedure in order to get around that.

Why should you have these special regulations requiring people to produce this type of certificate if they are selling to visitors when you do not apply that type of regulation when they are selling to local people? You could well ask why is this necessary because they are operating on the beaches of Barbados that are public properties, and not necessarily when they are operating on Broad Street or in their own stores, or in Swan Street.

One might be tempted to interpret this to mean that you are providing some type of preferential treatment to the visitors to our shores by making sure that they are orderly attended to or offered anything for sale by people who have been specially screened or interviewed, etc.

Let me say that I am in complete agreement with the Parks and Beaches Commission as it was then, and now the National Conservation Commission, to make sure that the procedure of people selling on the beaches is done as orderly as is possible. But I cannot agree to subjecting people to this type of screening. The National Conservation Commission would have to find some other means of making sure that they are fit and proper persons functioning, and possibly you could have a situation where they might arrange to have an objection type of arrangement where people who are applying for licences to sell on the beaches, like it is done when you are applying for a liquor licence for a shop — it is advertised and you invite anybody with specific objections against the person to make their objections known.

Although this would be some type of scrutiny, I would prefer this type of operation if it needs to be done, than having a person having to produce a certificate from the police and then they have to present themselves to be interviewed by the National Conservation Commission. After that then the National Conservation Commission will request such other information in writing from the applicant as it thinks necessary in order to get a licence. These arrangements are tighter arrangements than those for people who are working for \$100 000 a year and who do not have to go through this type of arrangement.

What I would suggest to the Minister is that this be removed. And I seriously thought this was a golden opportunity to remove from the Statute Book of Barbados this obnoxious clause that was in the Parks and Beaches Commission Act, but far from removing it, it has cropped up again, and it really does not go down well with me to think that we are singling out a very small sector of workers in this community for this type of treatment. I would suggest that it should be removed and the Commission should be charged with finding some other ways of making sure that the conduct on the beaches by people possessing licences is proper. This can easily be done by proper training of the guards who are working on the beaches. The regulations are there, they have the sufficient authority to administer the regulations, and I do not really think that this section of the Bill should be retained.

I would seriously invite the Minister to consider and think through the ramifications of this type of legislation in Barbados at this particular time against a very small sector of people who we can look at and see are being singled out for some unnecessarily harsh treatment in order to carry out the function they want to carry out to make a living in Barbados.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the points made by my colleague — the member for St. Philip North, and I would add these few words.

There are a number of vendors who live in my constituency of St. Michael South who have reported to me that they currently experience difficulty in trying to earn a living on the beaches. We know that there are requirements that the tourists who use the beaches should not be molested in any way, and at the same time that those who try to earn a living on the beaches should be entitled to do so — so long as they are not in breach of any law. It is how to draw the line between these two requirements that perhaps poses a dilemma for whatever body is responsible for administering the affairs on the beaches.

5.40 p.m.

I believe that in a country in which tourism is one of the main sources of revenue, in a country in which industrialisation is not yet at a level where it is the major employer of labour, persons who might otherwise be unemployed and who might otherwise be tempted to turn to other forms of earning income which may not be within the pail of the law should not be forced by an illiberal policy to look for ways of earning a living which may not be exactly legal.

In other words, what I am appealing for here, Mr. Chairman, is a very liberal approach on the part of the Commission to the issue of the licences, recognising the fact that this particular tourism industry may provide a source of income for persons who may otherwise not be able to earn such income. They travel around with their little attache cases and they have handicraft no doubt and other kinds of trinkets in these attache cases, all above board and all legal, and I think, Mr. Chairman, it is commendable that you have this group of entrepreneurs — let me call them — small business people that the Minister is interested in pursuing, a lot of them living in my constituency.

And I make a special plea that when this Commission gets going that it follows a liberal policy in terms of issuing licences so that those who are genuine itinerant vendors of handicraft would not have to dodge about and peep about because they cannot obtain a licence, but at the same time they have to earn money with which to look after themselves and their families. I say no more at this stage. I make representations on behalf not only of my constituents, but those who find themselves in a similar position in this country.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just briefly address the main points made by the honourable Member who just spoke, that is in relation to the qualification that applicants for licences to sell on beaches and public parks should have a Police Certificate of Character, there is no intention of the Government of Barbados to discriminate against one section of the community as against the other, but any Government has to balance the number of forces existing in the community.

Now we know — and the honourable Member for St. Philip North virtually admitted — that there is a high incidence of criminal activity on or about the beaches of Barbados, and it is therefore incumbent on a responsible Government to make such provisions as are necessary to reduce the incidence of crime in that area. That is not to say, Sir, that we are providing any special service for visitors to the island, because I feel very strongly that the people who live here, local Barbadians, are as entitled or more entitled to adequate police protection and security protection as anybody else. It is not as though we are providing any special protection for people who are on the beaches.

We have to attack crime where it is most apparent and the evidence is that there has been a lot of crime around the beaches and the amount is increasing. I will give the honourable Member an example. The police have had numerous cases of people who sell drugs on the beaches of Barbados, and indeed have found evidence of people who have been convicted, still selling on the beaches of Barbados. Is it unreasonable that the Commission should require a certificate to know whom they are dealing with before they grant licences? Now this is the only reason why this section is incorporated into this Act, and I hope that the honourable Member who on the one hand — the honourable member for St. Philip North — accepts the problem of crime and on the other hand dealing with something which he considers undemocratic, understands that there is nothing undemocratic about it.

The Commissioner of Police can determine who can get a driver's licence in Barbados. That was the law all the time. If you have police convictions for certain offences in Barbados, the Commissioner can say you cannot get a driver's licence.

If you have got convictions for house breaking for burglary or those offences, the Commissioner of Police does not approve the grant of a driver's licence. You cannot come and say that is discriminating against a small minority in Barbados, how come they give everybody else a driver's licence. You don't give the people who break into people's house at night a driver's licence because you have to protect the society, and the moment you give a convicted burglar a licence to drive a motor car, you are providing a facility for him to make an easy escape when he breaks into your house. Therefore the provision in this particular Bill is consistent with that provision and other similar provisions in the laws of Barbados.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, on this particular point I do not support this argument at all. It is quite illogical to accept that a person who wants to sell drugs on the beaches would do so under the umbrella of a licence to sell other drugs.

The beaches of Barbados are free for anyone to go to, therefore what I am saying is that if one is intent on selling drugs, Mr. Chairman, he has access to the beach, and he is committing a crime whether he carries a licence to sell other things or not. He does not carry a licence to sell drugs therefore he is committing a crime. So if he does not have that licence to sell other things on the beach and he wants to sell drugs, he would come on the beach and sell them, and if the Parks and Beaches people are not sharp enough to detect him or the police are not there, he would get away with it.

This screening of people who are peddling their clothing and their handicraft in my opinion is not in any way going to cut out that undesirable element that you would have, and I certainly cannot support it under that Head at all, because the undesirable element will peddle their dope anyhow with or without licence.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I support the Hon. Attorney General on his explanation for the inclusion of this particular section, but at the same time one would wish to point out that this certificate is not required for persons who peddle on the beaches. It says also in public parks, public gardens or in a cave.

The Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a very valid point with respect to the absence of sheltered accommodation. For instance in Jamaica, in Ocho Rios, I know for sure there is sheltered accommodation for people who ply, and very seldom do you see them on the beaches. As a matter of fact, they are rounded up; they are not allowed to peddle on the beaches, and it is the intention of this Government to provide sheltered accommodation for persons who ply. I refer to small businessmen.

For the time being in the absence of this sheltered accommodation, the Government has got to take certain measures which will help to reduce — because we cannot wipe out — all of the crime or the bad practices that we see prevalent, but this is a measure which we hope will not continue for long.
5.50 p.m.

As I said, I can understand the honourable Member in putting forward his case but I do not think that he feels so strongly on it. It is not a matter of violating anyone's democratic rights. I do not really see it as that. It is just that the Commission has a right to draft laws and regulations as to the issuance of any kind of permits to anybody at all and if this is the method and how they feel, note that they are charged with a responsibility. They have to come up with the solutions. If nothing is done we are going to hear all sorts of criticisms about the Commission and if they feel that this is the best policy

to adopt at the moment, well one can only hope that the results that we get will be good results from this measure.

As I said I do support the point but as we are unable to provide sheltered accommodation where we can have people and be able to identify people and those people can be identified as real genuine traders or small businessmen plying their craft, then I think that we should see this as a step in the right direction at least to protect our tourist industry which is vulnerable and we are hoping here to reduce the crime which we have so prevalent on the beaches.

The question that Clause 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 17 to 24 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 25 was called.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just a little clarification here on Clause 25. If I interpret this clause correctly, the Commission apparently will be given power to suspend or cancel a licence if someone has been convicted of a criminal offence involving moral turpitude.

I believe this carries or may carry some specific meaning but layman that I am, I am not certain what the moral turpitude would be. I am wondering if the Minister can give me some clarification because again this is affecting the capacity of an individual to earn a livelihood and if he is convicted on an offence involving moral turpitude, we on this side would like to have some idea of what exactly is this moral turpitude and if for instance this particular offence would prevent someone from, let us say, carrying on a business on Broad Street or anywhere else in Bridgetown and so on. I wonder if we can get some light on this moral turpitude.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question raised by the honourable Member is very closely allied to the question raised earlier under the clause relating to the grant of a licence, Clause 16.

Now I do not know myself precisely whether one should spell out in detail every crime under the Criminal Law of Barbados that would fall into the category of moral turpitude. What I do know however, is that provision is made in the law, in this Bill, for an appeal against any decision of the Commission to a Judge in the Supreme Court in Barbados. This indeed answers the two questions.

Now where there is evidence that there is blatant and unreasonable discrimination against a man in his effort to obtain a licence to carry out lawful work,

then he may appeal to a Judge of the Supreme Court in Barbados who can overrule the decisions of the Commission and I believe that even the Opposition, Sir, would have no quarrel with the ultimate words in these matters residing in the breast of the Supreme Court Judge in Barbados.

The question that Clause 25 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 26 and 27 were called and passed.

Clause 28 was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 28 stand part and I would take this opportunity to inform this Honourable Chamber that it is intended that this Act comes into force on the 1st April, this year.

The question that Clause 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 29 and 30 were called and passed.

Clause 31 was called.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I have a question which I guess should be directed to the Attorney General in this matter. Let me confess at the outset that I am not too much up on drafting and so perhaps he could enlighten me and perhaps the Honourable House as to the effects of the use in the Penalty Clause of the words "Any person who commits such an offence and is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of \$1 000 or to imprisonment for a term of 12 months or to both. (*Asides*). Clause 31. Let us start at Clause 31 (2) (c), just after (c). (*Asides*). Either one of the clauses would make the point. Take 31(c), after (c).

The usual phraseology in drafting of this kind would be "Is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$1 000." The question I am asking is this. The way in which it is drafted "Should be liable on summary conviction to a fine of \$1 000", whether that makes it mandatory for the Magistrate once there is a conviction — if he is going to fine, to fine \$1 000. 6.00 p.m.

If he is going to fine \$1 000. (Mr. CHAIRMAN: Liable.) Liable, yes, liable to a fine. I am just asking whether he can either fine nothing or \$1 000, just to give him a discretion to fine anywhere between nothing and \$1 000 in view of the wording of the Act. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: It is mandatory, according to the Act.)

Hon. L. R. TULL: Modern drafting practise, Sir, makes provision for the greater to include the lesser and a

number of Bills have come before this Parliament over the last five years in which this very point was raised. And I merely repeat it — that where the law says that the penalty is a fine of \$1 000 or to imprisonment for a term of 12 months or to both, inherent in that very sentence is a discretion. A magistrate may CRD, he may fine \$5, he may even reprimand and discharge, so the greater equals the lesser in respect of this. All the legislation coming before Parliament now with penalty clauses are drafted in this manner. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I hope the magistrate knows that.) I do not know if the magistrate knows that. I cannot do the magistrate's work. I can only pass laws.

The question that Clause 31 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 32 to 35 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Order No. 11.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order Number 11 is the instant Order of the day.

POLICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Order No. 11 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Police Act, Cap. 167.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, many areas of male domination have been falling over the past few years and this Government has always been interested in giving a very firm push to the collapse of some of those bastions, Sir.

What we are seeking to do here, Sir, is to continue a trend that has been started many years ago. Women were admitted into the Police Force of Barbados over 25 years ago. The Fire Department and the Defence Force now have women in them, Sir. I see there are female post women, they call them, Sir.

What we are doing here in this Bill, Sir, is to make provision by an amendment of the Police Act to include women in the Police Band — the band of the Royal Barbados Police Force — for the first time.

The Commissioner of Police has reported to me that there are a number of young female musicians, particularly at the Alleyne School, Sir, who have been under the training of one of the Sergeants of the Police Band and we have clear intimation from a number of young women that they would like to be members of the Police Band.

This Bill, Sir, is making the amendment to the existing legislation to make it possible for young women to be recruited as apprentices in the Police Band of Barbados, Sir.

I 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 Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to move that Clause 2 stands part.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, in this it says — Clause Two:

“Where the Commissioner of Police is satisfied that an applicant is willing to serve as an apprentice the Commissioner shall obtain the consent of

(a) the applicant's father” *et cetera, et cetera.*
6.10 p.m.

I would just like at this point in time to salute the Police Band for the outstanding work which they have been doing in the past, and in particular those young people where the Commissioner must be satisfied that the applicant is willing to serve, for the outstanding performances which I have seen by the Cadet Corps of the schools trained by the members of the Police Band and who serve us so well.

I would, however, even at this point like to say that I would still like to see a little beefing up in the Band, and I will tell you why I say that. I cannot play anything at all when it comes to musical instruments, but I can appreciate sweet music, lively music, and I would like to hear a little steel band, a little pan introduced into the Police Band. It would bring in a little of our West Indian character.

If I am not mistaken, I think it was at St. Mary's Church some years ago that there was a steel band concert when Rev. Hatch was there, and if I am not mistaken the Police Band was involved in that recital and I was particularly impressed that evening hearing the Police Band playing a little pan. I think it shows our West Indian culture, since the steel band is part of all of us in the West Indies, and I believe we could give it a little beefing up. I do not know how to get across what aspect of it needs beefing up, but I would like to see it a little more lively.

The “Tchaikosky”.....(*Aside*).....What is he? Tchaikovsky? I say Tchaikovsky because again I am used to the West Indian thing, I would get mixed up with the English work. What is the other man's name? Mozart and Beethoven. I cannot call the names the Minister of Education is telling me, I have to be very careful, I will call the names that I have heard before. I would be familiar with Sparrow, Kitch and Melody, I know about them. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Chamber is aware of what I am trying to get across. I cannot dance to Tchaikovsky, I cannot boogie down to that. I would have to sit down and prepare to cough, because the violins would have me confused. I like something to boogie down to.

I would implore the Hon. Minister, now he is having these ladies in the Band, that there could be a little something more in it. As I said before, I would like to salute all those persons who are employed in training the Cadet Corps and whoever they train. I think Sergeant Moore is in charge there, Sir, but I salute all of them for doing what I consider to be an outstanding job.

I sincerely hope that the ladies will bring to the Band a little more grace, which we know they are so capable of doing as they did to the Defence Force and the Barbados Police Force.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, about a month ago I had a discussion with one of the senior members of the Band, exploring the possibility of using the Police Band as the corps for a music school in Barbados.

There are a lot of youngsters who want to play music in Barbados now and there is very little formal training for them, as most of them play by ear. I am

wondering if it is not possible to have some scheme going where those who do not intend to become members of the Police Band can by some scheduling of practising sessions practise along with the Band, or whether there can be some special arrangement whereby they can be coached by members of the Police Band to play the saxophone, the trumpet and so on — in other words, to use the Police Band as the nucleus of a music school in Barbados in the absence of a more formal setting.

These officers assured me that as long as the administration was prepared to play ball and make one or two administrative arrangements possible, that it can be introduced in Barbados at very little additional cost to Barbadians, and I am certain that this would be a way that the Band would be able to make a very useful contribution or play a very useful role in the development of the musical talents of young Barbadians.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, 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 the separate motions of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, that brings us to the end of Government Business for today.
6.20 p.m.

Sir, I am just alerting honourable Members on the other side that I am going to do the Resolution for \$5 183 000 of which I gave notice today as well as the Civil Establishment Order on Friday. I know this one has already been circulated and I have no doubt you will have the other one in time. I am just alerting honourable Members that Friday morning we can come back and start to work so that we can get through as early as we can in the evening.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until Friday, March 12, 1982 at 10 o'clock a.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
6.24 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. I am to inform this Honourable House that during the course of this Sitting we have received a Message from the Other Place inviting concurrence in suggested amendments to the National Insurance Bill.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, arising out of your Message, Sir, I would seek the leave of the House during this Sitting to deal with these amendments. It has been reprinted and circulated, I am told by the Clerk of the House. I have no doubt that they would hardly be any objections. There are few amendments really. The Clerk has informed me that it has been circulated.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection in principle that the amendments be dealt with during this Sitting. We are however at some little disadvantage because not all of our Members have seen the amendments and we would wish to be assured by the Leader of the House that the amendments are not substantial. If there are not substantial, we can agree in principle.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am informed by the Clerk that it is relatively substantial. There is a whole new Clause 2 but I would still hope that later in the day we can deal with it and I have no doubt we can have consultation on both sides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand from the Hon. Leader of the House that the suggested amendments are of a substantial nature and he is suggesting that it would be better if we defer until a later hour in the day, the consideration of the matter to give both sides of the House an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the fulness and the extent of the amendments.

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 — To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of this island.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have no objection. Just for the sake of tidiness, I think I understand what is being done but Order No. 1 for this Sitting has already been completed so it would seem to me that we would have to move to recommit Order No. 1 or otherwise we would be doing Order No. 1 over again. I appreciate what is being done here. There are having Order No. 1(b). I have only raised the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: All supply orders, I am advised, fall under Order No. 1 and I believe if the honourable Member were to look at his Order Papers over the years, he

will see that has been the precedence followed. This is a suspended Sitting. We have had Order No. 1 commenced earlier during this Sitting and we have had items under this Order No. 1 — (a), (b) and (c) — as the case may be on Order No. 1 and we are merely continuing Order No. 1.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, Sir. I do not question the correctness of what has been said. The Order Paper which we have says "Supplement to Order Paper." All I am saying is that it appears to me that we have completed what is Order No. 1 in the same Sitting. We now have an addition to Order No. 1. I believe we should use the appropriate words so that the proceedings would have a sense of efficacy. That is all I am saying. I am not disputing. I appreciate the problems.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I think the honourable Member is saying that I should have said Order No. 1(b) and that probably would have helped him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I follow both honourable Members but what perhaps both honourable Members seem not to record is that we are still in the same Sitting referred to by the honourable Member for St. Michael West. We are still in the same Sitting dealing with Order No. 1. Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, 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 and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.
10.15 a.m.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1981-82, No. 24

Head 28 — Ministry of the Attorney General—was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Head makes provision for funds to pay the expenses of running the vehicles of the Court Processing Office. We are tidying up now towards the end of this financial year the whole set of Estimates in relation to the Ministry of the Attorney General and we find that there is a sum of \$2 417 that is required to meet the outstanding bills for the maintenance of those vehicles.

I beg to move that this Head for \$2 417 stand part.

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

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

Head 30 — Judiciary — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$93 600 was voted for this Item and under this Head to pay for jurors, witnesses for Assizes, legal aid, medical witnesses and things like preparing the cells for Assizes and so on. We have been spending a little bit more than we had expected, but it is difficult in the circumstances for anyone to know in advance exactly how much money we would need in a financial year, because the cost of overseas witnesses, for instance, is a matter that cannot be anticipated. Sometimes we have to bring back from overseas large numbers of witnesses to give evidence in cases in which they were involved. Therefore this Head has been exhausted because of this type of problem.

In preparing for this supplementary, Sir, I realised that the existing practice was for the Commissioner of Police to send for overseas witnesses only after the Registrar of the Supreme Court brought the need to his attention. In other words, there is a difference between the people who are responsible for the administration of the vote and the people who put the particular burden on the vote, and we are making provision in the new financial year to transfer both the responsibility for the vote and the responsibility for the summoning of overseas witnesses to put them together so that we can have a better overview of the state of the vote, and perhaps rendering it unnecessary for us at the late stage in March to be coming for a supplementary.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Head for \$30 610 stand part.

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

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

Head 31 — Police — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the need to supplement this vote for general police services, their operating expenses, is because of a substantial increase during the year in the police establishment. I do not know how many people are aware that we have increased the police establishment fairly substantially over the past two years, but the numbers are now well over 1 000, because we felt that we needed to have more men, better equipped men to meet the problems of increasing crime in certain areas of our community. We have therefore had to buy more equipment, more uniforms, more shoes, more of all the things that are necessary for new police officers.

We have also had to spend more money than we had envisaged because of the protracted crop of last year. We pay Fire Wardens from this vote, and the crop went on considerably longer than we had expected. And indeed, during the course of the year as we looked at the daily or hourly wages of the people who work as Cane Fire Wardens we realised that they were a little below what was reasonable, and we increased those too.

Those two factors are responsible for the fact that we are short in this vote and we are asking that this Head stand part of the general Resolution.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, under this Head for the general police services I wish to say just a couple of words and to raise a question for the Minister.

I should like, first of all, having on previous occasions taken note of certain shortcomings in the Police Department, I would like to go on record as saying that in the last few months the Commissioner of Police and his people have been indicating through their public image that they are seriously tackling their job, and I think it is proper that I should go on record as congratulating the Commissioner of Police and his people. I think it is good to see the police taking positions in the community without fear or favour.

I wish to raise, however, two questions, one I think should be of importance to the Minister. As you know, Sir, you get a chance every now and again to speak to junior officers in the Police Force, and I heard two constables talking the other day. I listened to the conversation because they roped me in, and I formed the impression that they were saying that there are over 12 vehicles sitting, or resting, or lying in Central Station — many of them for want of a simple part which may not be an expensive part.

In one instance, as one of the young men said, a part costing something like \$2 was stopping the vehicles from being available for police work, and the reason these vehicles could not be fixed was because the money was not available.

10.25 a.m.

I think the Minister should examine whether this is so. I am told that other people in the Government might be aware of it, but the Minister should examine if this is so and should try and have some kind of method by which in situations like that there is no need to wait for the long drawn out process which is attached to getting of a supplementary vote, because it is a waste of time and money for the Police Department to have one vehicle, furthermore 12 or more, lying around because they have not got the money to have them fixed.

I am not going to attempt here to criticise more than is necessary, but I think the Minister would wish to examine this. Whether it is a question of the methods used between the Central Government and the Police Department, whether in the Estimates process the police are being short-changed in an attempt to keep the Estimates within a certain range, then a greater sense of proportion would have to be brought to bear because we cannot have crime prevention on the one hand by word of mouth and at the same time the equipment and the material necessary for the police to carry out their responsibility not being available.

The other question I wish to raise is perhaps of more fundamental importance, Mr. Chairman. About three Sundays ago there was a report that a senior police official had indicated that the police were being thwarted in their attempt to deal with the question of hard drugs or drugs in any form, and that high people in the society — those were the words used in the report — were thwarting the police attempt to deal with this question of drugs.

Now I have waited, and the Democratic Labour Party has waited, to see whether the Government would have examined this statement alleged to have been made by a senior police official. I fail to understand how a senior police official can make such a statement and the Government does not (a) find out if it is true and (b) if it is true clarify the position or (c) instruct the police to do their duty as they are required to do.

I would like to know who are these senior people in the community of whom the police can say to the Press that they are being thwarted in the exercise of their duty, and if it is found that the Press has printed that and it is not true, it would be one of the more wicked examples of bad journalism found anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, we are not allowed to refer to articles in the newspaper and that is why I am not giving any details, but if the honourable Member checks three or four Sundays ago in the *Sun* he will see this statement, and it is a very serious indictment on the people of Barbados if it is true.

But worse, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party, because it is a responsible Party, decided to put out a statement about the particular issue. To this day that statement has not seen the light of day in any of the newspapers in this country.

Now that is what makes it suspicious to me, Sir. One newspaper claims that since the story originated in the other newspaper that they are not going to attract attention to that newspaper, and the other newspaper is saying that it got forced out by virtue of more important stories. It is still being forced out. If we have reached a

stage in this country where a revelation concerning attempts to thwart the police in their pursuit of criminals connected with organised crime and connected with drugs is not published then we are in a very bad state in this society.

It is our responsibility as a society to find that — wherever it is — and root it out, and we feel very strongly about the matter. We expect that if it had not been brought to the attention of the Minister that the Minister will take my making this statement in this Honourable House as an indication of its having been brought to him, that he would investigate it and that he would clarify the position for this Honourable House so that we can feel satisfied that either the story was malicious and wicked in which case we would help condemn the Press if that is what is necessary, or if the senior police officer was being malicious, then as I heard the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central saying, the senior police officer would have to go.

What we are saying is that this is a serious statement to go abegging in a community of this size, Mr. Chairman. We in the Democratic Labour Party are aware of a number of matters in which if we give vent to our views on them before all the information is in, we may in fact create confusion. So we seek information on certain sensitive matters before we go public. When we go public we like to believe that we are doing so in a responsible manner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It would be nice to have gone by way of parliamentary questions.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is only a method, but you cannot come in here and ask a parliamentary question on a report in a newspaper before you find out if the newspaper report is valid. I think we would be wasting the time of the Honourable House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not here to discuss newspaper reports.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not discussing the newspaper report. I am discussing what is alleged to have been said by a senior police official. That is the business of this House, not the newspaper report. If a senior police official has said that, it is a matter of grave and deep concern for the people of Barbados and we should investigate it, and I am not to be moved by any sense of *deja vu* in these questions.

I will wait patiently to hear what the position of the Government is before I take a further position, Mr. Chairman, but I reserve my right and the right of the Democratic Labour Party to take a further position on this issue when all the information is in.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, this supplementary concerns the payment of increased rates to the cane fire patrols. I am very glad to see that the cane fire patrols are being paid increased rates, because the whole matter of cane fires is causing a lot of us in the rural constituencies a considerable amount of concern.

As you may have read in yesterday's papers, the Chief Fire Officer is also very concerned about it, but my feeling on this matter, Mr. Chairman, goes a lot further than the fact that increased rates are being paid to cane fire patrols. I personally think that under the present circumstances, regardless of how many cane fires patrols you introduce in Barbados at the present moment, it is not going to make a lot of difference with the lessening of the fires being caused at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a personal theory about what is happening in Barbados this particular year in respect of these cane fires. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there is an acute shortage of grinding facilities in Barbados now. There are only four factories in operation. The one at Andrews is still to come on stream. Some time ago a lot of fuss was made by the sugar factories people about their putting Barbados first etc. and their patriotism.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that this situation with cane fires and cane fire patrols is a very deep-rooted one. What is happening at the moment is that it is a known fact that priority is given to burnt canes in the reaping process. It is also a known fact that in St. Philip there are lines of trucks as far as a mile and a half on certain occasions waiting at Carrington Factory to be taken in. It is a known fact that many factory workers in St. Philip some days only got in one load of canes and last week some workers drew some \$36 for the entire week.
10.35 a.m.

It is also a known fact that since there is a priority given to the reaping of burnt canes, there is a terrific stress being put on people to resist the burning of canes in order not to give them some type of priority in reaping, particularly when it is being felt that because of the shortage of reaping factories in Barbados, there is a strong possibility that up to 30 per cent of the canes will not be reaped this year again.

All of this, Mr. Chairman, leaves me to the fact that I think it is very irresponsible for the Sugar Factories Limited to have taken Porters and Lower Estate out of operation.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with the cane fire patrol.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman, but what I am saying is that in the circumstances surrounding the fires, that there is a strong connection between the necessity for increases in wages for

cane fire patrols and in the shortage of grinding facilities in Barbados. There is a very strong connection.

I am saying that the facilities available to the people for reaping of canes are very limited because priority is usually given to burnt canes. There is a distinct possibility that people who have an interest in canes might be tempted in order not to have the canes standing there and rotting — and therefore losing a substantial amount of income, to resort, unfortunately, to a situation of burning in order to be given priority. And I am saying that this is only due to the fact that the sugar producers have not seen fit to make available to the sugar industry in Barbados in this year, having benefiting from some \$6 million and Government funds for a sugar factory and telling us that it is coming on stream for this crop season when everyone knows that it would not be possible for the new sugar factory to come on stream and it was irresponsible for them to take those two factories out of operation and putting the strain on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is not dealing with the subject of the matter before us.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to say in winding up that I am glad to see that the increased rates are being paid for the fire patrols but I am afraid that this would not solve the problem we have. You can give them \$1 million and you can put a million cane fire patrols out there and you are going to continue to have fires in Barbados for the remainder of the seasons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Any other honourable Member? The Minister may wind up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I may just address a few replies to points raised by honourable Members. The honourable Member for St. Michael West raised the question of the police vehicles. I have had a report that a number of police vehicles have been sidelined because of damage — they were in a number of accidents. I think I heard there were 12 or 13. As far as I am concerned, the difficulty lies more in the fact that nearly all of them were Subarus — and the police drivers do not like the Subarus too much, I am told — but the reason why they are still sidelined is because we have not had the parts to replace them.

Now the honourable Member said that some need \$2 and \$5 parts or whatever it is he said and he wondered if it was a question of accounting. There is a direct line between the Commissioner of Police and myself and the Deputy Commissioner — a hot line — and if the Commissioner of Police wanted \$2 for a part for a vehicle and there was no money in the Estimates, I would give him \$2, Sir, and if he needed a little bit more than that.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not believe the Minister intends to stretch our credibility, but knowing what we do of his willingness ever to part with a dollar bill, his indication that he would give the Commissioner \$2 is a stretch of the credibility.

Hon. L. R. TULL: And further, Mr. Chairman, as the honourable Member well knows, the Minister has a Contingency Vote and really if the figures involved were so minimal and the parts were available, the Minister would use the Contingency Vote to put these things back in order — but it is a little bit more than that. We are aware of the problems and we are trying to meet it head on.

In respect of the question raised of about some mysterious report in the newspaper — which I must confess, I have never read or heard about until the honourable Member spoke — it is difficult for me in those circumstances to be able to give a definitive answer but the honourable Member must well know that there is no need for him to wax so formidable over hearsay and rumour. It is a society in which you hear daily about who got a stroke and who is in hospital when people are walking about as strong as a lion. You live in a society where you hear these things all the time.

The honourable Member must learn not to jump in before he has the facts. Now I do not know of any report to the effect that anybody in Barbados, high or low, is obstructing the police in carrying out their work in relation to drugs.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member may give way on a point of elucidation. It is obvious that the honourable Member must have missed the gravamen of my statement. It was not that rumour had been made. It was that it was reported that a senior police official had said so. It was reported. It was not a rumour or it could be a rumour, but it was reported and that is the point that we were making — that a senior police official reported so. That is all.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Now the honourable Member and I take different positions in respect of rumours. He obviously believes that if you are talking word of mouth, it is rumour; but if you print it in a newspaper, it is not rumour. I do not believe that something becomes true just because it is enshrined in the printed pages of the press. My experience and the experience of the honourable Member will well tell us that quite a few things appear in the newspaper of the ilk of which he mentioned in the *Sun* or whatever it is. Many things appear in that newspaper to my certain knowledge that are totally untrue — to my knowledge — not partly untrue but totally untrue, so I do not see why the

honourable Member should say well it is in the newspaper so therefore it is not rumour.

I do not know the report, Mr. Chairman, but I can give the honourable Member the assurance that as long as I am Minister responsible for Police, that we will move earth and Heaven to make sure that nobody stands in the way of the police carrying out their lawful duties.

The honourable Member mentioned something about the *deja vu* principle. Now that certainly is not malicious. I hope it is not, Sir. The honourable Member says leave it as it is and I will leave it as it is.

I will seek to get a copy of the report of the newspaper article. I have not seen it nor has it been brought to my attention and I would hope that the report would identify the "senior police official" who made the statement so that I can enquire from him through the normal channels what exactly he is talking about — give us the facts so that I personally can take what action is required in the circumstances.

When senior police officers are going to make statements and hide behind anonymity — statements that are damaging to the integrity of the whole Police Force and the society in which we live — then I have to say that police officer is not worthy of being a senior officer, whoever he is.
10.45 a.m.

I would not even go to the journalists, Sir. The journalists do not ever check sources, Sir, because if they get a report like that, they should really check the source. But I am not going to deal with the journalists today, I am going to deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael West because he knows if it is causing him and the Democratic Labour Party concern over such a report and is likely to have the untoward results that he has articulated, all he had to do was to get a telephone and call me and ask me about it, or write me a letter or meet me in the lobby of the Honourable House or the dining room and I would tell him what I know. He would tell me what information he has got and I would investigate it.

I have nothing to hide in my Ministry. I have nobody to protect in my Ministry, I only have the public of Barbados to look after. There are no skeletons, according to my friend, in my political cupboard — maybe another cupboard, Sir — not in my political cupboard.

Now, in respect of the honourable Member for St. Philip North, I share his anxiety about the high incidence of cane fires in the country. I represent a constituency that grows nothing but cane — the St. George Valley — and all the plantations around keep the people of my constituency living and indeed, I live almost in

a cane field itself because I cannot do better, and I have seen so much acreage of canes in St. George ravaged by fire this year that I am beginning to wonder what is going on and I certainly am not going to be arguing about it.

I would welcome suggestions and recommendations from anybody in the community as to how we can be better able to grapple with this perennial problem of damage to canes by fire. I agree with the honourable Member that it does not matter how much you pay your cane fire patrol people. That is not going to end the fires and what we need to do is to truly provide more grinding facilities — that may be part of the answer. But we also have to do a serious series of educational programmes and try to get through to people. We cannot give up. People have been stealing from the time there was man and you cannot say that they are still stealing so we should give up trying to stop them.....(*Asides*)

Hansard Reporter slumps.

Clerk speaks to Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Reporter escorted out of the House.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Sitting is suspended for five minutes.
10.50 a.m.

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

When the Sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. The Hon. Attorney General may continue his speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I have no idea at what point what I was saying was not recorded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are of the view that most of the points you made with respect to the cane fires have been missed, so you may go on from there in your winding up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: If I go a little further back, Sir, I have with me, in my head, a copy of the newspaper article to which the honourable Member for St. Michael

West referred, and the brunt of the statement that the senior police officer is alleged to have made was that things were working very well at the airport and the Customs were picking up people left, right and centre. So that contrary to what the honourable Member would have us believe, the police officer was actually pleased that things were functioning well and that they were hauling in a number of people who were in breach of the law.

You see, the honourable Member takes three weeks after the article to come, because he thinks it was not to hand, but he must not do that. He had me answering something that I should not have answered.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I specifically said in my statement that we had attempted to deal with the matter through the organs of the Press and it has not been published, and this is the first opportunity anything relating to the Police has come up during this sitting, which you recall has been going for some time. I do not believe it is fair for the honourable Member to suggest that I have waited three weeks and have brought it with some ulterior motive.

It is a simple, straightforward matter, and I wish the honourable Member would take it in the spirit in which it was offered. I think he should withdraw the part of his speech about waiting three weeks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, that is not a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: With regard to the cane fire business, Sir, I share the concern of the honourable Member for St. Philip North about the high incidence of cane fires in the country, and I give the House the assurance that the Cane Fire Prevention Panel—I think, that is the name given to it—whose Chairman is Mr. Ralph Boyce, meets regularly during the crop season, under the aegis of the Ministry of the Attorney General. We address our minds to all these problems and we take recommendations and suggestions from any sector of the community, because we believe it is a problem that concerns all of us. I can give the honourable Member the assurance that we will continue to use all our resources to see if we can bring, if not an end to cane fires, certainly a serious diminution of the incidence of cane fires.

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

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

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

Head 37 — Ministry of Transport and Works — was called.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, under this Head we seek to get the permission of this Honourable House to approve a supplementary of \$5 million which it has become necessary to seek in order to assist the Transport Board in defraying its expenses.

During the current financial year, \$10 million was voted by the Legislature as a subsidy from the Central Government to the Transport Board and it has now been found necessary to add another \$5 million to this subsidy which has proved inadequate to cover the cost of the Board's operations.

You will recall that some time last week when the House debated the Transport Levy Bill, I made reference to some of the internal structural changes that would have to be effected in order to ensure maximum cost efficiency within the operations of the Board. I do not propose to go over that ground today, but to address myself to some of the problems related to finance.

The internal structural problems of which I spoke may be described as the supply side of the Transport Board's operations. Today I proposed to deal mainly with the demand side of the Transport Board's operations.

There has been over the past few years, a steady erosion of the revenue of the Transport Board, and one of the principal causes of the erosion of this revenue is the existence of mini-buses plying routes within the urban centres. I will state categorically that it was a mistake by the Government to assign mini-buses to its most lucrative routes. The majority of mini-buses in operation ply on short haul routes which constitute about 30 per cent of the revenue that the Transport Board used to derive from its operations. What it means is that the Transport Board is now losing about \$6 million a year in revenue to the mini-buses.

11.05 a.m.

It is the intention of the Ministry of Transport to recapture those routes for the Transport Board. This can best be done without inconveniencing the travelling public in Barbados by building the Transport Board bus fleet up to adequate size. Once this is done, the full complement of buses may be assigned to short haul routes, and it is hoped that by restoring a regular and reliable service of superior quality within these areas, that the Transport Board can by effective competition recapture the routes now mainly plied by mini-buses.

The second factor, Mr. Chairman, is this: it has to do with the failure over many years to analyse carefully the demand for bus services and consequently this failure has led to no clear and definitive programme of providing such services. The Board had anticipated that once bus fares had been increased to 60 cents that revenue would be raised which would be about \$2 million more than the

revenue from bus fares which the Board will earn this year. There has been a short fall of \$2 million in revenue projections, just over ten per cent of the Board's revenue realised from bus fares, and what it indicates is a high elasticity in the demand for transportation. The Transport Board is now beginning an analysis of this development in order to determine what it implies for the provision of bus services in this country.

When we compare the event of the reduction of bus fares some six years ago to 25 cents which immediately triggered a substantial increase in the volume of passenger travel, it has led us to preliminary conclusions that a closer study of demand might enable us to determine what is the best service that the Transport Board can provide for Barbados. We now know that there is hard demand and that there is soft demand. We now are able to draw tentative conclusions based upon the substantial fall off in the volume of passenger travel which attended the increase of bus fares in September. It means that the Board is now in a position tentatively to assert that hard demand largely consists in a demand for bus services for people to travel to and from work. That is a demand that is likely to be substantially affected by any movement in the increase in bus fares.

We also believe in a preliminary way that the fall off in the volume of passenger traffic indicates a fairly high level of travelling by bus for recreational purposes, and that to the extent that bus fares increase, there will be an inverse relationship between the increase in bus fares and the demand for recreational travel by the Transport Board buses. We also are able to make other preliminary conclusions about the demand for services based upon what kind of services have been available to passengers in the past.

In the past the tendency has been to extend routes upon the demands of one or two influential persons within the community and no careful cost benefit analysis has been made in order to justify the extension of routes. The result has been that the Transport Board has been providing services which are not appropriate to the provision of bus services. In some parts of Barbados the Transport Board has in effect been providing taxi services or services which are equivalent to hired car services. One only has to look at the large number of buses running empty during off peak periods in certain parts of Barbados, or on Sundays and sometimes on Saturdays, in order to see the point that I am trying to make — that we have been providing services that are not appropriate to a bus company. Therefore, when we look for the reasons from the demand side of the Transport Board's operations for an increase in cost, we see several factors which I will repeat so that they can be better digested.

We see that there seems to be a high level of recreational travel. I do not believe that it is appropriate

for a bus company to come into existence to provide recreational travel on a daily basis and over a period of some 16 hours. The second factor, Mr. Chairman, is that the Transport Board has in effect in certain areas been operating a taxi service, and their consumption of fuel is too great. These buses are too big and too costly to maintain for a few people in some parts of Barbados to have the luxury of using a bus as a taxi or a hired car. It is therefore going to be necessary in order to determine the best kind of services which the travelling public would get, consistent with being fair to the taxpayers of Barbados who are asked to finance a deficit of \$15 million during this year, for us to begin to examine more scientifically the kind of service which we have.

Thirdly, but by no means least, the Transport Board must seek to service in an efficient manner those areas which for reasons of inadequacy of the size of its fleet it has been forced to abandon to the mini-buses.
11.15 a.m.

All of these factors, Mr. Chairman, from the demand side have contributed to the necessity for bringing such a Resolution today and the financial situation has been exacerbated by the fact that within the current financial year, there has been a 33 per cent wage increase for Transport Board Workers. In normal circumstances, wage increases are linked to increases in bus fares with a view to the latter carrying or underwriting the former. What has happened is that these increases were retroactive to April 1 whereas increased bus fares came into operation some five and a half months later. Consequently near \$1 million was lost to the Transport Board from the point of view of increasing the bus fare as an instrument for underwriting the increases of wages to the Transport Board workers.

Mr. Chairman, it has now become very clear — given our recent experience where an increase in the bus fares has brought in its train a decrease in the volume of passenger traffic — that we cannot automatically seek to increase bus fares as a way of containing rising cost and that is why the internal structuring of a drastic nature called for last week has to be carried out with a rationalisation of the services which I just mentioned in order to ensure that the most efficient kind of organisation of our transport system takes place.

Mr. Chairman, that is a synoptical account of the reasons for bringing this Resolution to the House and I hope that all Members would find it possible to support this Resolution in the confident knowledge that the public money voted will be in good hands within the Ministry of Transport and the Transport Board, that there will be frugal expenditure and that the Transport Board services of this country are being subjected to the kind of microscopic scrutiny which reports as early as the King Report of the 1960s called for, but which administrators and

policy makers for reasons best known to themselves found it necessary to postpone its execution.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Head now stand part of this Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I trust that the problems about which the Minister spoke in relation to the King Report being implemented, that he does not himself find that he has a similar problem in getting his proposals for a revision and a re-analysis and reorganisation of the transport system in Barbados. I hope he does not find that he has the same problems in having his ideas implemented.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, from what the Minister has said, that the problems of transport financing are closely related to the problems of the economy as a whole because in essence what has happened since September is that because of the increase in bus fares we have had a substantial fall-off in passenger traffic. I believe we on this side predicted that at the time, so that was to be expected.

The other conclusion which is drawn from his statement is that there is obviously an optimum fare which the Transport Board must charge if it has to reap the best benefits out of its fare structure and I myself am very happy to see that the Minister is taking the steps which he proposes, in doing a careful analysis of the transport system which has so long been necessary in Barbados. And it is obviously very evidently necessary today that I just cannot help repeating that I trust that in his efforts to get the Transport system working, he does not find that he is frustrated somewhere along the line by the problems of financing.

Now there is no question that the Government finances today are in a very chaotic state and you will recall, Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas — the Hon. Prime Minister — indicated results of a discussion he had with officials of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank which tended to indicate that those institutions were concerned about the level of subsidy which the Transport Board was receiving from the Government of Barbados and we had the indication then that if the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for sure had anything to do with the overall control on the decision making to subsidise the Transport Board, that that would have been an obvious area in which the Transport Board finances could benefit.

And we got the further impression from that statement that what the International Monetary Fund and the

World Bank would require would permit that bus fares in Barbados should be considerably raised and we heard talk about 90 cents and \$1 as being the level at which the fare structure should exist if the Transport Board were to run a profitable operation on fare structures.

Now having heard those two different approaches to the problem — and I have no reason to believe that the Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas disagreed too fundamentally with the recommendations of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund — and hearing the difference of approach to the problem with the Transport Board financing, I say that is the background against which I made the comment that I sincerely trust that the Minister of Transport and Works does not find that he is frustrated in his attempts to get the transport system functioning properly, because I must admit that if the fare structure were ever increased to the 90 cents and to the \$1 as predicated, that they would be a substantial fall-off in passenger traffic so that those people who would use the transport system would use it only out of sheer and absolute necessity.

11.25 a.m.

There are a number of things which the Minister has to address also in his dealing with the whole problem of the transportation system. I would like the Minister to inform this Honourable House what is the position as far as the members of the Transport Board are concerned. I think some weeks ago we heard that the members of the Transport Board had all been relieved of their duty. To date we have not heard any announcement of the appointment of a new Board, and I think the Honourable House would like to know if a new Board has been appointed, and if not, how soon could we expect a new Board to be appointed. Further, we would like to know if it is in the contemplation of the Minister to appoint a new Board, or whether he conceives of running the Transport Board as an extension of the Ministry of Transport and Works.

I have no doubt in my own mind that with the Minister's zeal for getting the Transport Board functioning properly, he might very well like to have a direct input in the day to day supervision and organisation of the affairs of the Transport Board. I would like the Minister to give some indication of the Government's policy in this direction, the Government's thinking on this matter — whether a new Board is likely to be appointed very soon or whether we are likely to have a Board drifting along as now, administered and organised by a Manager under the direction of the Minister for Transport and Works.

Maybe if that were so, you would find that the Board might be functioning much better, I do not know, but one of the things which we have to consider is that this whole concept of the relationship between the

Minister and the Board has to be rationalised. I have said that before in this House and I think it bears repetition. The whole process of the relations which exist between the Minister and his Statutory Corporation must be clearly defined, and I think the sooner we get to know what the position is on the matter of policy on the Government's part, the better off we will be.

Talking about policy, I think it will also be necessary for the Minister to indicate quite clearly what is the Government's view so far as its attitude to the Transport Board as a public service is concerned. Certainly from the statements made by the right honourable Member for St. Thomas about the need to provide an adequate fare structure for the Transport Board, it seems to me that there must be some kind of conflict between the views of the right honourable Member for St. Thomas and the views of the Hon. Minister for Transport and Works.

We have to weigh the question whether we regard the Transport Board as a profit making enterprise or whether we want to treat it in some kind of way as a social service which needs to be subsidised by the Government of this country.

It would seem to me that the position taken by the Minister of Transport and Works would require that there be some sort of subsidy to the Transport Board, and that would coincide with the view which I certainly have of the transport system, and which I believe is a view which we as a party over here hold as far as the transport system is concerned, because we believe that the transport commuters of this country should not be required to pay what we conceive to be unnecessarily high fares charged for transport services — especially at a time like this when the people in the lower social economic group in the community are being asked to bear so many other pressures in other aspects of their economic life.

It is going to be necessary for the Government, before any meaningful re-organisation and direction of the affairs of the Transport Board, to have a fairly clear picture in their own minds as to what they conceive the Transport Board to be as an enterprise in the country.

Mr. Chairman, another aspect of the Board's affairs to which we would invite some comment is in relation to the effect of the transport levies on Transport Board financing — I have done some quick calculations on the amount which the levy should have brought in to revenues, and they total some \$5.18 million since the levies were imposed — that would represent an employee contribution of some \$4.14 million and a Government contribution of approximately \$1.04 million — and you will recall that just a few weeks ago we in fact in this House had voted supplementary provisions for payment by Government Departments of the Transport Levy, so

by now, revenues which Government should have collected from that Transport Levy should be approximately \$5.18 million.

Some of it clearly, as has been identified, will go towards highway improvement and some for the transport services, but it seems to me that what we clearly need is some clear indication of what the total financial picture is like so far as the financing of the Transport Board is concerned. And it is worthwhile at this point to note that I do not see the Annual Reports of the Transport Board too frequently these days — the last one I believe was published some time in 1980 — the one which runs up to March 31, 1980 — so we in this Honourable House cannot have a clear picture of what the total financial position of the Transport Board is when we are being asked to subsidise the operation of the Board by this further \$5 million today.

I would urge the Minister in the effort to re-organise the Transport Board and get the Board functioning properly, to ensure that the Annual Reports are kept as up to date as possible, so that when we are being asked to provide funds to subsidise or in any way supplement the finances of the Transport Board, that we will have a clear and up to date picture of what is happening in the Transport Board, because only then can we in any meaningful and sensible way debate any provisions which come before this Honourable House for the financing of the Board.

11.35 a.m.

The final point I want to make before I sit, Mr. Chairman, is a very short one, and it is that it seemed a little strange to us that a Resolution for this supplement should be brought at this very late hour in the financial year, so to speak. One would imagine that the Estimates should be very shortly debated, and perhaps the Minister could explain why it was necessary at this very late stage to bring a Resolution for a supplementary of \$5 million, and whether the amount which is required by virtue of this supplement had not been contemplated earlier in the year, because it would seem to me that in the area of wages for instance, this is something which is not necessarily new but which could easily have been contemplated in the planning of the Board's operation, because the wages agreement run for a determined period and it would be known what is to be expected.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great degree of interest to the Minister's statement and I should like to say at the outset that I am very glad that an analysis of the Transport Board's problems has come from the Government side with a degree of calmness and a dispassionate approach in terms of the causes over the years for the Transport Board's problems.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in this Honourable Chamber from time to time and I have heard the honourable gentlemen from St. Thomas, I have heard the honourable Member for St. Andrew, I have heard the honourable Member for St. Joseph, all, while speaking on the problems of the Transport Board, seek to see these problems only in terms of arithmetic, and very poor arithmetic at that, when they always equated the size of the bus fare paid by the individual to the revenue which the Transport Board did or did not receive over a period of time, particularly the last six years or so.

I believe for the first time coming from the Government side we have had an indication that an attempt will be made to bear on the problems of transport, the economics of transport. Mr. Chairman, I recall that as Minister responsible for Public Utilities at the time, I played some role in suggesting to the then Cabinet that an attempt by the Public Utilities Board would have been forthcoming shortly in a decision to increase bus fares in the vicinity of 75 cents for those persons living in St. Lucy, and I was able to convince the Cabinet of the day together with the then Minister responsible for Communications and Works that it would be an unfair burden in a society, the size of which was less than a quarter of a million people, to have any one sector because of their geographic location pay substantial sums to go to work in the City centre where they received the same wages as those who lived in the so-called urban sector of the community.

It has been clear for a substantial amount of time among economists who deal specifically with transport, that the question of decision-making by a commuter is tempered by two things: (1) his need to arrive at the destination and (2) the cost of arriving at that destination, and if one should add a third one, the quality of service provided when he meets need No. 1 and need No. 2. It should have been obvious to any administration in Barbados that this question is not one for political humbug or football, but one for dispassionate analysis so that in the end both the commuter and the rest of the society could be satisfied.

It was at that time, Mr. Chairman, that we analysed the problem in specifically the same terms which the Minister now seems to be indicating is or will be done. We analysed the problem and sought to find what was the optimum fare for a transportation system of the kind which we have in this society which would allow the people from St. Lucy to feel equal to the people from St. Michael as they used the transportation system.

I am very glad to hear that the Minister can state now that there was a substantial increase in the passenger levels when the fares were reduced to 25 cents, and that there has been a substantial passenger decrease since the fares have recently been increased to 60 cents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may very well be that there is sufficient argument as to what is a proper optimum price, and it may very well be a proper argument that 25 cents was too low a figure at that time, but that was the best advice available to us from the economist who were supposed to have — and I have every reason to believe had expertise in the field. It does not fall well from the mouth of any Minister to suggest that he the Minister or any of his colleagues is in a better position to determine what is the best fare than what is suggested by those persons whose occupation and whose expertise require them to analyse such matters. And thus the 25 cents fare was not a political decision as to the quantum; it was a political decision as to the method. I stand by that method and we in fact have been vindicated today when we hear the differential in the response in the demand for the service based on the single factor of the fare imposed.

Mr. Chairman, I would never stand in this Honourable Chamber and suggest that the present fare is uneconomic from the passenger point of view, but what I would say is that perhaps enough care has not been taken to examine whether it is an optimum fare and to use the kinds of indices which are currently being used in transportation systems all over the world to determine by way of the frequency, by way of the distances travelled, by way of the needs expressed as to what would constitute an optimum fare. Mr. Chairman, a fare of 60 cents that has the buses one-third full is a stupid fare in economic terms as compared with a fare of 55 cents that has the buses two-thirds full, because the efficiency of the system should be clear to anyone who recognises that a bus service requires the buses to be full as often as possible.

I cannot say that and be innocent of the charge of intellectual dishonesty if I did not advert to the Minister's reference to recreational travel. Again, Sir, the question will have to be to what extent we as a community will recognise some aspect of recreational travel as part of the quality of life of the community.

I cannot argue from my position how much is too much, but what I can argue is that at the time when the 25 cents fare was introduced, there were persons in this community who planned excursions of six or four people to various parts of Barbados which they had not visited before and which relieved the Transport Board to a large extent of the phenomenon of what has been described as a taxi service. Especially on Saturdays and Sundays buses used to travel to the East Coast and to other areas of interest in this community full or nearly full because those persons who lived in the urban areas reversed the trend that was prevalent during the week, and they went out into the country. I say that that is a desirable thing and I say that in any planning which is done for transportation in this country — notwithstanding what the people from the IMF may say to the Prime Minister and Minister

of Finance — any planning which is done in this society has to be done by the people in this society for the people in this society, and therefore must take into account a number of factors which might not be taken into account in the city of Boston or the community of Washington.

Even so, Sir, in recent times in Washington, D.C., they have introduced a subway system which is now deemed to be the best subway system in the world, and it is being operated on the basis of subsidy by the United States Government.

11.45 a.m.

And I find it unacceptable, that we can have so called advisors who would wish to come into Barbados and allow the Prime Minister — and we have to believe him, Sir — we have to believe him when he speaks in this Honourable House — to suggest that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund would make public transport a major input of any cutting or any shearing of the financial body politics in this community. I say that is unwarranted intervention into the community affair but any Government, which ever Government is in power in this country, must have a philosophy concerning the development of the people of this country and that Government has to determine how it is going to share the load in this country.

I do not see transportation as something to be divorced from the rest of the economy. I am saying that the ability of people to move from point A to point B, whether it is by way of getting them to work or whether it is by way when they are away from work by providing them with the recreational facilities or the recreational content of their total life such that they will be ready in the next work week for productive work, I see both sectors as being important in the economic development of this country and therefore any subsidy which a Government gives towards public transportation cannot be seen as a waste of taxpayers money.

Mr. Chairman, in that regard I have had on behalf of my constituency, to have discussions recently with the General Manager of the Transport Board to seek to find out from him whether the Transport Board would give consideration to a reduction in the public rate for rental of a bus for an excursion. Now rentals for a bus for an excursion has been outlined in terms of cost to be in excess of \$300 per bus — plus a mileage charge. What that would mean for people who are attempting to go from the St. Michael area either to St. Philip or say to Archer's Bay in St. Lucy — a very desirable thing, I think we have all agreed — is that those persons in order to meet the cost would have to pay something for children in excess of \$5 and for adults in excess of \$15 for the day.

Now, Sir, I believe that if one examines the economics of that, one could see that while on the face of it if the cost of the bus is spread over the operations of the total fleet for the whole year that those figures might be reasonable, if one relates those figures to moving people from the Pine to the East Coast Road, one would see that it is an unnecessary imposition on people in the Pine who have every reason to feel that there should be able to go to the East Coast Road in a particular period, a bank holiday or a weekend.

I am not quarrelling with the information which has been determined by the Transport Board and I am not quarrelling with the decisions which they have made. I am saying that those decisions need to have brought to them the force of the economic analysis which the Minister now says to us the Transport Board is about to embark on at his direction. I have to share the position taken by my colleague that we hope that this Minister will not fall subject to the pressures which previous Ministers have fallen subject to, and that he too would be able to implement the King Report where it is relevant.

I have one question which I would like to ask the Minister before I sit down on this occasion. I would like to ask the Minister how much revenue, if he can tell us today, has been collected from the disbursement of the unserviceable units — buses — those unserviceable buses. I should like the Minister to indicate, if he can tell us how much revenue we get from the buses which should normally be sold at auction and if he can tell us whether he has located the ten buses which are indicated as missing. (*Asides*). I can only go on the information that has been brought to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am finishing, Sir. They had some arithmetic like the Eric Williams arithmetic. There were 17, Sir, and one from 17 leaves 7. I would like the Minister to indicate whatever they are, if he has found them.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, at this particular point I am very glad to see that my colleague from St. Michael West has brought home most of the points I wanted to make but I just want to re-enforce this and a few others.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we in the rural districts are getting the worst of the transport system at the moment and seem to be likely to get the worst in the future. At the moment, Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that we are some distance from Bridgetown and it is not the most economical route for the mini-buses, we are without the use of any mini-buses at all in my part

of St. Philip and knowing that, we are completely at the mercies of the Transport Board.

Being at the mercy of the Transport Board, Mr. Chairman, it also means that most of our workers have been very inconvenienced and there has been a considerable amount of lost days due to the non-availability of transport at the appropriate time. There have been a considerable amount of dismissals in some places because of the fact that they could not report to work in time due to the Transport Board and I sincerely hope that the Minister would have a very serious look at this section and reconsider the bus situation in that part of the country.

Part of the Minister's analysis that caught my ear very readily and which was dealt with a little bit by my colleague from St. Michael West, is part that quite rightly seems to have analysed the problem for recreational purposes, the one that has the more elasticity. Naturally the people who have to travel to and from work will travel. Those who have to travel for recreational purposes if buses are not available might not if there are no facilities to travel but I invite the Minister to have a very serious look at what the withdrawal of transport to the country folk for recreational purposes will mean to the community as a whole. If he has observed — and I am certain he has observed — the developmental patterns in Barbados over the last few years, he would notice that in the parish of St. Philip there has developed a very big residential area in and around the Ruby — Union — Belair district.
11.55 a.m.

The development of this new middle income and lower income residential district where we have the movement of people from the crowded suburbs of Bridgetown out to the country which had two advantages; (1), it allowed them to improve their housing; (2), it removed the pressures on the suburbs for residential use, has been due mainly to the fact that most of the people had their own available transport, but secondly, what was very important was that within recent times, travel for recreational purposes was made available to the people in the rural districts.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the Minister responsible is very well aware that because of the concentration in population and the population pattern, that certain recreational facilities that would be feasible and possible in the Bridgetown area and its suburbs would not be possible and feasible in the country, and I am certain that he would be the last in any way to bring about any system of fare structure or routing or timing of routes to remove from the people living in the rural districts — like myself who has been a rural man all my life — who are without private transport, the facilities to enjoy some of the recreational facilities of Barbados.

The removal of these rights to enjoy some of the recreational facilities can have a very serious effect, and I am certain that if a cost analysis was done, it would show that it would be cheaper for the Government of the day, if need be by some subsidy, to continue to provide adequate recreational travel facilities than to remove it. If it is removed, Mr. Chairman, a few things would have to happen.

More facilities would have to be made available for people in the rural districts to make use of the time for recreation that is now available to them. It is no point in your having a five day week and giving people more time for recreation if the facilities are not available within walking distance, or the transportation is not available to go to those facilities. My contention is that if both are absent, this is likely to result in two things. First, there would have to be more in-house recreational facilities provided for the houses in the rural areas, which would mean people would have to expense themselves in things like television and video, that type of stuff, and secondly, it would mean that there would be a lot more time that might not be usefully used.

I agree that those with a better trained mind, if they have time on their hands would use it properly, but on the other hand you could find that those whose chances of enjoying recreational facilities in town had been removed, that this time might be put to very ill use and subsequently an increase in crime could result. If you do a costing of the result in an increase in crime in terms of dollars and cents, I am certain that it would be far more expensive than any subsidy that would be provided by way of the taxpayers to provide fairly adequate recreational travel for the people in the area.

I would also like to signal to the Minister that I sincerely hope that they realise that in any increase in bus fares, that if any fare differential is made due to distances from Bridgetown, it is going to be an unfair imposition on the people who are further from town, because there are advantages in having your population spread and not concentrated, as any sociologist will tell you, and therefore you cannot discourage that population spread by putting an unfair burden on the pockets of people who have to move further in. After all, their tax structure is the same, they have to pay the same levy, and I am saying that by keeping a single fare you could well help to develop healthy habits in some of the people living near to town, because it is ridiculous to see coming down to town on mornings people waiting on Tweedside Road for buses — on a bright sunny morning, when they could take a quiet stroll into town, thereby improving not only their physical health but enjoying the surroundings.

Because it was easier before, you find that when the differential in the fare structure was cheaper to travel near rather far, you would find them crowding the buses from areas like Carrington Village and so on, but I am

not interested in the City and that area, I am interested in the rural areas where the air is fresh and nice, where we can still look around and see a few sheep and cows, and the children can still go out on afternoons to play ball on the pasture. I was still able, and bothered myself, to get a pavilion at Gaskins, but I got that from a private source, I was not so privileged to have an inside track.

Getting back to the more serious point, Mr. Chairman, I am certain the Minister is well aware of these disadvantages and would not further disadvantage the people from the rural areas by any removal of adequate recreational travel facilities. I am not saying that you must go to the other length, but certainly sometimes on afternoons around 6.00 to 6.30 you can see droves of youngsters waiting at bus stops to come to town either to go to the skating rinks, or to the 8.30 show, or they are going to take in a band concert around town, and it is extremely healthy, because you remove the temptation of getting under the street lights from these fellows. Some of them get under the street lights to play dominoes, others do not employ themselves so worthwhile — they get under the street lights and interfere with people and make themselves general nuisances.

I sincerely hope that the Minister in considering his transport policy would bear in mind those two particular things: please allow the rural people an adequate amount of recreational travel and do not penalise them by any fare structure that would make it much more expensive for them to travel in and get to their jobs, because in most cases they have to pay two bus fares and it would make it more difficult for them. Allow us to continue to want to come out into the rural areas, removing the pressure from town and developing a healthier population and better disposal of your human facilities, and better development of your country as a whole instead of having them all congregating in the same place.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the Schedule to this Resolution shows that the sum of \$10 million was appropriated for subsidies to the Transport Board at the beginning of this financial year. The amount now sought to be appropriated is half of that sum, or the sum of \$5 million. To me, Sir, this indicates that a substantial amount of money in excess of \$10 million has already been spent, or indeed committed, because I do not believe that in the dying days of this financial year that the Transport Board can spend this \$5 million between March 12 and March 31.

We have been told by the Minister that there has been a steady erosion of revenues at the Transport Board. I believe that that probably is one of the reasons that the bus fares indeed were raised about six months ago from 45 cents to the present level of 60 cents. In spite I

assume of the increased revenues collected by virtue of this increase in fares, we are now seeking some \$5 million. 12.05 p.m.

Now we are also told that the erosion of those revenues has been caused by the presence on the roads of these mini-buses. The mini-bus as I see it, is a very important factor in travel in this country. Without the mini-bus in this country, the economy, I daresay, would be seriously affected and almost grind to a complete halt.

The mini-bus has come about because of the inefficiencies not only of the Transport Board but also of the bus concessionaires that existed at the time when the mini-buses started plying these routes. The Transport Board was not the only concessionaire in Barbados a few years ago. As a matter of fact, it is now the single mover apart from mini-buses of travelling persons who use public transport, and I consider the mini-buses the public transport.

This came about, maybe in 1979 or thereabouts, and it is my belief that the problems that the Transport Board has found itself in today is because of the fact that when it took over total responsibility for public transport in this country — and again I am taking into account that the mini-buses do transport people and they do so efficiently because they have licences to do so — there was not a sufficiently planned operation for the Transport Board. I think what the Transport Board needs to do, is to have what I would like to call a master plan showing the number of buses that the Transport Board requires in order to efficiently and effectively move persons from point A to point B in this island. It also needs a plan to show the amount of monies collected, and I would say it needs a projection of not less than five years. I honestly feel that the Minister feels this way about the Transport Board.

Mr. Chairman, we need a plan of not less than five years showing the amount of buses required over a five-year period or even a longer period, showing the amount of fares to be collected over that period, showing the expenditures to be made over that period, and I think that such a plan should be unfolded before us here in this Chamber.

I say this because from time to time we have been called upon to finance the Transport Board, and for the substantial amount of money that we are now required to provide to make the Transport Board viable, I think we as a body in this Honourable Chamber ought to be aware of the total plans for transport in this country over a long period. I think when we have seen all this, when the plan has taken into account projections in terms of increased cost — and there can only be assessments — increased cost of parts, increased cost of fuel, increased costs in terms of salaries and wages, when the Transport Board has taken

these projections into account and then we can see the short fall between expected revenue and expected expenditure, I think then we will know for sure and be happier as to the amount of subsidy that would be required for the Transport Board.

I am not a person — and I want to make this quite clear and I am speaking also for the rest of members on this side — who is at all opposed to subsidising the Transport Board, but we want to be subsidising an efficient system. We would not want to be subsidising an inefficient system. We would also want to be sure that we are subsidising a system that is efficient in terms of cost control, in terms of controlling the fleet, in terms of controlling disposition of your assets, whether they be old buses or new buses. These are all important aspects. We want to know that these things are controlled. We do not want you to accumulate them at your headquarters, wherever that happens to be at this time — the old Combermere School compound. You will have from time to time to dispose of them and they must be properly disposed of and properly accounted for.

We are not opposed to subsidies because I believe that people have got to travel and I do not share what appears to have been the view of the Hon. Prime Minister. This is where I differ fundamentally with him on this point, that if we want to get the benefit of loans and what have you, we have got to reduce or cut out subsidies to transport. I do not believe that at all because I believe it is important to the economy of this country that people must move from where they live to the point of work, and if people cannot move from where they live to the point of work, then the economy of this country is going to collapse. It is as simple as that.

So transport is as important and vital and essential to the economy of this country as indeed any other economic activity that takes place, so let us view it in this way. Do not let us view it as a drain on the economy. It can be if it is not efficiently run. Let us view it as important to the economy, as an adjunct to the economy, and if we were to do this, Mr. Chairman, I believe that none of us in this Honourable Chamber would at all be unhappy about providing subsidies in order to keep transport in this country going, because by keeping transport going we keep the economy going.

Mr. Chairman, if people are not using the public transport as it should be used, it is my belief that it is because it is not as efficiently run as it should be. While I am on this, I want the Hon. Minister to look at the buses in terms of maintenance, not in terms of engine tuning but in terms of maintaining the interior of the buses where people actually sit, because there are far too many claims coming in from the general public for damage to clothing and so on. I think that there should

be a maintenance team. I believe in fact there is a maintenance team taking special care not only of the engine of the bus but also of the total machine, whether it be the engine or the interior where passengers are supposed to ride. I believe, Sir, that if we were to get this kind of service, the public would be fully satisfied and it might very well be reflected in the revenues of the Transport Board.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution before this Chamber to assist the Transport Board in carrying out its functions and to make sure that it can be as efficient as possible. I think, Sir, that transport all over the world, whether you want to call it nationalised or regularised, all over the world, has always been problematic as long as Government has anything to do with it.

In the United States of America they close down the City in a flash. Subways just decide not to run, buses stop running and there is turmoil in the City of New York whenever there are problems with the unions or some differences with the State of New York or the transit company which they have in New York City.
12.15 p.m.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those people who feel very, very proud of the Barbados transport system, very proud. I say proud because any Barbadian who had the opportunity to go to any of our sister islands would know as a fact of life that we can be very, very proud of our services. I would not like to go into any great detail as to describe what I see called buses in some of our sister territories because that would be more or less tending to run them down. I would not do that but I think Barbadians today in all aspects of life in this society, have reached to such heights in their way of life that if we do not get a bus every 15 minutes running in front of your door, Mr. Chairman, people make complaints about these things.

I just came out of Antigua, Sir, only a couple of years ago and they still operate the donkeys coming from — in Antigua, Sir — they still operate two donkeys coming down — a man sitting down on one's back and the other one is to bring up the stuff from St. Johns. They still operate that way but I think, Mr. Chairman, as the honourable Member for St. Michael North quite rightly said that it needs a master plan.

With the examination of the Transport Board, even its physical surrounding in 1982, it is almost just as it was when they had taken over the buses from Percy Stewart. A few more buildings, for example but the security alone — you can walk off Police grounds and walk inside to a cashier. There is no security you know and you are talking about spending \$40 or \$50

million. You can walk from off Roebuck Street, from Tweedside Road, come across Police grounds and walk inside to the Transport Board and kiss a cashier.

You may have Security Officers but the actual physical security is not there so when you hear about the buses getting carried away, you are lucky that they did not carry away all the offices and you had 15 years to rectify it, 15 years. I am not leaving you out of this. We are in our sixth year battling with it. We inherited a deficit. You used it as a political playground. In the election of 1976 you had some 18 people cleaning one bus.

Sleepy Smith the then Minister of Cabinet had 18 people cleaning one bus from around the Ivy and Tweedside Road so when we come today for money, this is not anything that we have incurred overnight. This is not anything that we have inherited overnight, Sir, this is something that you had for 15 years been using as a political playground. A little note at the Transport Board — you will get fix up, vote for me. That was it, Sir, so when you talked about the inefficiency we are now battling with, put it in its right perspective.

Imagine for example I really do not know if they ever had a General Manager of the Transport Board as qualified, look carefully, as qualified and which the Board recommended as the present one. He may probably be a failure, I do not know, because there are some lawyers with a lot of qualifications and they could not even represent me against a centipede — like the Member for St. Michael North. Now what would I do with him in a Court representing me? Really, tell me. If I had an accident with a centipede I could not call him so although you are qualified, it does not necessarily mean that you can do the job well. I wish that gentleman well in his office for the sake of the entire country.

There is no official controller at the Transport Board — you are dealing with very nearly \$40 million or \$50 million and that is a specialist post. The Personnel Manager — well I believe I know him. He is a Christian too. He is a big Priest in a church. I believe I know him, he is a Holmes Williams boy. That is the Personnel Manager but he is all politician and when you get these problems all put together.....(*Asides*). I am told they have a new Personnel Manager but I knew that Mr. Daniel was Acting Personnel Manager on one occasion for a very long time but when you have all of these problems and you are dealing with some \$40 to \$50 million, I think we should be in here this morning supporting the Minister in his attempt to get the Transport Board really going the way it should be going. (*Asides*).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

That is what you all say but the big chief has now come in. He may bring a different ball game. The information person has now come in. Now you will know who is supporting what. That is the light weight team. The second division has now come in. The first is out on vacation

Sir, I just want to be very brief. I just want to express my views on the transport system in Barbados in the light of the problems which we are confronted with and to say primarily that I feel proud as a Barbadian to see that we have a transport system second to none in the Caribbean. I say that, second to none in the Caribbean. Trinidad — now don't talk about that set up down there — Jamaica, all of them cannot touch the system we have in Barbados and whenever you have, Sir, something that the entire country is depending on such as transport as one of the social services, if you can call it that, the taxpayers of Barbados would have to expect to help those who cannot help themselves. We have to put it that way, that is how I want to put it — help those who cannot help themselves.

I want to wish the Minister well in his overall plans. I know what his overall plans are — that he, like his predecessors in office, try to put it on a footing that we can feel much happier with but I also would like to draw to the Minister's attention that one of the most important things I feel about in the Transport Board is the personnel — the drivers and the conductors.

I believe they should be polite. They should be courteous to women and old people, Sir. Sometimes it hurts my heart when I see a bus coming up the road and an old woman or an old man fighting just a matter of yards away to get to the bus stop and pushing her hand or his hand out and seeing the driver by-pass them.
12.25 p.m.

That is something which burns me deep inside, and that is why I believe the mini-bus, as the Minister did say, may cause some erosion into the Transport Board, because it is a kind of personalised service which the minibus operates. They put you down almost in front of your door, and there is a good rapport going between the driver/owner or the driver of the mini-bus and the people as against those of the Transport Board buses, and I believe that rapport can be brought about.

I recall a number of old bus drivers, when I used to travel on the bus, who knew you almost by first name. The drivers and conductors had something going between them and the public, there was a good relationship. My colleague said that was when it was a single bus, but I believe if I were a bus driver or conductor today, that my personality would demand a good relationship

between commuter and driver. I feel so. The only person I find it difficult to get on with is the Member for St. Michael South Central. Apart from that, I believe I would be able to make a good bus driver, because I would have a good rapport with the people. I feel so. I sincerely hope that this is one of the things that the Transport Board will set out to do, to bring a good relationship between commuter and personnel.

I sincerely wish the Minister of Transport and Works success in his overall plans. I have no doubt in my mind that he is going to succeed, never mind the three or four old bus bodies that got sold to somebody before the auctioneer got them — but a bus is not anything to put into your hip pocket, it is not a calculator.

The way it was put across you would think that ten buses have gone. Do you think they were ten Leylands just out of the Port? Of course, if I had to handle it on that side, I would know what to say and how to do it. These were old buses full of termites eating down all the Transport Board's place that somebody probably bought to carry to the East Coast Road to make a little "fassy" or to put fowls in. (*Aside*). I do not know why you do not buy a couple. You have horses and you could cut out the sides and put horses in them so you could take the horses to the Garrison.

I believe, Sir, that he must have a massive change in personnel. He has already started at the top with a General Manager. I sincerely hope they can soon find a Financial Controller. He has a Personnel Officer, I am told, and all the top flight people that can make the Transport Board work in a manner which all of us can be justly proud of.

Mr. Chairman, with those few comments, I am in support of the Resolution.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a great misunderstanding on the other side in respect of the Prime Minister's speech with respect to the question of subsidies. I believe that I know and participate in as much discussions on Estimates and public expenditure policy in Barbados as any Member on the other side, or as any Member on this side. I have never heard it said that the Government as a matter of policy has taken any decision that the subsidy for the Transport Board would be cut. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: You were not in here last week Tuesday when the Prime Minister spoke). Do not mind whether I was in here or not, I am telling you as a fact that there has never been any decision or any talk of eliminating the subsidy of the Transport Board. I have never heard that.

I have heard this, which is a fact — and you had better put it in your pipe and smoke it — that no com-

munity can afford an unreasonable level of subsidy in any department in these days.

I know that the Ministry of Finance, indeed the Cabinet as a whole, is seriously concerned about the escalating levels of subsidy necessary to run our transport system. That is a different thing from saying that the Ministry of Finance said that there should be no subsidy at all.

I believe the policy of the Government was very clear from the very beginning when we came into office. We repeated very many times that we would look at our public sector corporations, and our aim is to bring the level of management of the public sector corporations up to such a level that those who can operate without a subsidy, with good management should reach that point of operational efficiency.

We know that if you are to have a bus fare of the level that we have in Barbados now, that it is impossible for the Transport Board to operate without a level of subsidy. If you look in the Estimates every year, you will see the level of subsidy, and my understanding of the position is that what we would like to see is that that level of subsidy do not escalate, because we cannot afford to have it escalating. That is the simple reason. You cannot afford in any community in the world today, given the level of interest rates, to have a public sector borrowing requirement which exceeds a given percentage of your national income, and if you pay out in one service an extraordinary amount of subsidy in that service, it means that other services will have to bear the brunt of that. It is as simple as that, so this idea of projection from the other side that the Government of Barbados says it is going to cut out all subsidy to the Transport Board is not correct.

As Minister of Industry for the last five years, I have been encouraging the concept of greater decentralisation of work opportunities in Barbados. In particular, we in this Government have been trying to encourage the operation of the shift system because we want to make greater use of the capital invested in machinery and equipment over a long period of time, because we feel that if we are to operate at our maximum efficiency we cannot afford to have capital and equipment tied up for 16 hours of the day when in our competitive countries — the countries that compete with us abroad — the equipment is utilised for a longer period of the day.

It is a condition of a permit from the Department of Labour for a shift system that adequate transportation is provided for the second shift. That is a condition of employment, that is a condition of their permit, so that part of the expansion of the services of the Transport

Board later in the night was designed to create the conditions that the shift system could operate. Obviously, the Minister has analysed areas of operation of the Transport Board where the Minister himself has conceded that there is scope for increased efficiency. What we are interested in seeing is that they are implemented, because to the extent that they have an impact in reducing the level of appropriation by this House, it means that there are other areas of transfer payments in Barbados that can be specified. That is the aim and objective.
12.35 p.m.

So there is no scope for any distortion of the position. The level of subsidy has gone from \$6 million to \$10 million to \$15 million. It is \$15 million this year, nothing to do with capital account at all. This is only on the current budget. We hope that the Transport Levy, from a financial point of view, will take care of the capital account or part of the capital account, and we hope that the measures which the Minister has spoken of will help to reduce the level of subsidies to the Transport Board on current account.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the more I listen to the contributions by honourable Members on the other side, the more concerned I have become over the fact that only the Minister of Transport seems to be seized by, and fully aware of the problems facing transport in Barbados and has any idea of the solutions which are necessary to bring to bear on these problems.

Sir, I will make a few comments later on the financial implications of public transport in Barbados, but I must say that I was very concerned when I heard the Hon. Leader of the House, the honourable Member for St. James North, make light of the fact that a large number of buses had disappeared from the Transport Board at a time when we are considering a subsidy of some \$15 million to that Board.

As I understand it, Sir, the Minister by directive had followed the correct procedure and ordered that those buses should be disposed of in accordance with the usual practice, namely, by means of the Government Auctioneer. It would appear to me that several persons bypassed that procedure and removed those buses from the Transport Board — and if the Minister of Transport is serious about the investigation which he said he would undertake or order the Manager to undertake, then I would suggest to him that he starts at a certain plantation in the parish of St. Lucy where two of those buses are. They are not things that can be hidden in the pocket. They are large objects and I am giving this Honourable House some information. I am giving the Minister some information so that he can communicate that to his Manager who will probably call in the police to see whether or not he can have any assistance in locating two buses that are in St. Lucy.

When it comes to public finance, Mr. Chairman, we must be serious and we must follow the rules in every detail. We cannot just simply say that they are rotten buses, we do not know, we cannot just say that they have no particular value. The Government Auctioneer would be in a position to get the best market price for those buses, and that is the principle that we must be concerned about, because if it happens in relation to the buses at the Transport Board, then you will find it happening in relation to other Government property in other areas of Government, and as parliamentarians we must all give our support to the Minister in his efforts to investigate this matter as a matter of principle.

Now, Sir, the financial dimensions of what has been happening at the Transport Board is one that must cause concern to all of us. The basic problem, Mr. Chairman, had absolutely nothing to do with a reduction in bus fares in 1976. The basic problem was that this Government took over and they had no concept of the principles that they should pursue in trying to develop a transport policy, so that by 1978 we heard that they had revolutionised public transport in Barbados. That is a mere three and a half years ago.

They were saying how they had taken over the buses from the private concessionaires, how they had increased the number of buses on the road run by the Transport Board and how they were able to meet the increased demands of the travelling public whilst at the same time containing subsidies within reasonable levels in 1978. Remember the boast when we warned them from this side that if they expanded the fleet owned by the Transport Board and they did not set up adequate management, adequate maintenance policies, if they did not set up a situation where they would be able to cope with the increased fleet in its entirety and at the most economic level, then they would reach a point when there must be a crisis in that Transport Board.

On at least two occasions we have drawn the attention of honourable Members on the other side to the need to approach the financing of the Transport Board with more diligence and to have some kind of overall policy in respect of transport. Now, Sir, there are many ways in which this matter can be approached. Some countries out of revenues in given areas, for example, road taxes, revenue out of fuel consumption within the country and areas relating to transport, find that by funding these revenues they are able to finance not only the transport costs on current and capital account, but they are also able to maintain a given level of constant maintenance of the roads of those countries.

This particular Administration seems to me to have no concept whatsoever of the relationship between the cost of running that transport service and the state of the roads. An intimate linkage has been clearly defined by

every single authority who has ever produced anything on the question of transport so, Sir, what are they doing now? On the one hand they are setting up a special fund, the Transport Levy, and on the other hand they are providing a subsidy out of the Consolidated Fund.

12.45 p.m.

It would seem to me that if you are getting into the area of funding transport and road maintenance via the establishment of special funding arrangements, then the whole lot of money should go into that area so that there can be some well organised money brought to bear on how the entire operation should go, because all that is going to happen here is that you are going to have a levy on the one hand financing capital expenditure in respect to the Transport Board and you are going to have on the other hand money coming out of the Consolidated Fund. And I rather suspect that no single person will be able to sit down and try and harmonise those two sources in funding in such a manner as to make sure that the people of Barbados get the best returns for the money spent in that area.

Another cardinal principle, Sir, has been seriously breached by this Administration in respect of road management and in respect of the transport service and that principle is that there must be at all times a continuous growth of funding maintenance because the moment that your maintenance programmes are stopped, in a short period of time you are going to be faced with two major problems: (1) the problems of rehabilitation and (2) the problem of maintenance.

Now, Sir, I have tried to bring to mind to bear on the very roots of the problems in public transport and in respect of road maintenance in Barbados. The crisis has been created by financial mismanagement in respect of the Transport Board at policy level and that mismanagement has been compounded by gross inefficiency at the level of the operation of the Transport Board.

You can only correct that, Mr. Chairman, by ensuring that the kind of thinking — although I do not support it in its entirety — that the Minister has tried to bring to bear on transport should be translated into effective action. But I think that he has many difficult obstacles in his way when I listened to the other Members on the other side because they clearly do not understand how it is that the Transport Board for the first time in its history, has become — what was it called, “a bottomless pit” or something like that.

Why is it that in 1982 this has happened and why is it that it did not happen before is because the seeds were being sown over the years and you are now reaping the harvest. And the tragedy of it also, Sir, is that when you try to point out to a Government where there are making errors in their financial management, whether it be of the overall economy or sub-sectors of that economy, they

never listen to you. What you will be faced with is a torrent of abuse but no one would stand up and address himself to the basic issues which you raised during debate on the Floor of this Parliament and I will hope to see a departure from that type of approach by honourable Members of this House, one of whom is the Hon. Minister of Transport.

I too am concerned, Sir, that there is no proper harmonisation between the various departments and Government and between the various financial institutions under Government control on the matter of the mini-buses. How does the Government see the future of mini-buses in Barbados? The general thrust of argument that I hear in Parliament would suggest to me that the day that it is foreseen that an effective public transport system is coming that the mini-buses would no longer play a major role in the transport system.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is the general thrust of argument that I hear from the other side. On the other hand, Sir, when you look at the small business loans by the Barbados Development Bank, you will see that mini-bus operators are getting a constant stream of loans from that source. Now what is the policy of the Government? You cannot be saying one thing — that you intend to develop your fleet in such a way as to have buses of different sizes, large buses and smaller buses, to make sure that you standardise your fleet, to make sure you provide service for the entire country through the Transport Board buses, and at the same time you have one of the major lending institutions in the country in terms of the development financing pursuing a completely different policy.

Now I am just bringing this as an example to show how you can develop a situation of chaos, because, let us say, the Government through the funds raised by the Transport Levy were able to bring in 150 or 170 buses in a matter of 18 months or two years or something like that, and were really able to meet their objectives of providing a comprehensive service for the entire country by means of buses, what then would happen to the mini-buses? How then would they repay the loans that they have got from the Barbados Development Bank?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The time is up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The problem is that there has not been thorough thinking going into the whole area of transport and on a suitable occasion, and not in the too distant future, I will spell out in no uncertain terms what I think should be the financial dimension for the provision of public transport in Barbados. Thank you very much.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the Hon. Minister begins his address, I want to point out that this debate would end at 11.30 a.m. and the Minister has the right to reply to the questions raised but he must not exceed 30 minutes. So after 15 minutes I will be calling on the Minister to reply provided that there is no other honourable Member wishing to speak.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be relatively brief in my intervention in this debate. The Transport Board has always been the centre of some constant discussion and I have made contributions in this Chamber in the past calling for a rationalisation of the transport services. We have a situation where the Board has been spending over \$40 million in revenue in a year. We have a situation where a proper management structure is essential to the effective utilisation of this resource is not in place. The honourable Member for St. Michael East has demonstrated his understanding of the problems in taking off in the right direction and tackling the problem of management.

12.55 p.m.

I have seen the need for buses not altogether like the buses we are using now to provide the kind of service that we are offering, but I am talking about buses small enough to accommodate smaller numbers of people and to operate more efficiently in certain types and circumstances. I have spoken of the fact that the large buses break up the road in Grazettes, the part of Grazettes for which I am have responsibility — Grazettes and Seclusion Road — they were breaking up the roads because they were not designed to carry that heavy kind of machinery, and I have already talked myself hoarse calling for a bus serving those types of St. Michael areas that would be able to operate effectively on the narrow roads and at the same time not call for the tremendous outlay in road maintenance.

If you go to the corner of Wavell Avenue, down by the well, you will see that they have a ridge at that intersection caused by the Transport Board buses. It is always in a constant state of disrepair, because these heavy 45 passenger buses go through there day in and day out.

A more effective solution to the problem would be a smaller coach that would be able to travel full — I heard the Minister remark about the fact that a large number of the buses are travelling empty — a smaller coach would travel full, would travel more efficiently and would at the same time keep the roads in a good state of repair.

I do not intend to be long, Sir, but I do have to answer what I hear are allegations to the effect that buses are disappearing from the Transport Board yard, and I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South

Central make an oblique pass at a plantation in St. Lucy just a minute ago, so I have to set it right. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You know about that?)

I do not know of any buses that disappeared, I know that the Transport Board sold me two Rocklyn chassis in November. I paid \$1 620 for those two bus frames by a cheque that has my name emblazoned across the top, so there can be no question of hiding. I conducted a legitimate transaction, paid for two bus bodies.....(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Two buses?) They used to give them away. As a matter of fact, a couple of months before I got stuck with those two they used to be \$50 apiece. I came in too late and I had to pay the full price, but they were selling them for \$50 each. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Who got them?) I do not know who got what, I am telling you about the buses that I have which I made into two cane trailers. Two bus bodies. As the Member says, I have taken off the chassis, and if the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central wants the bodies to set fowls in, he can come and get them, but I have the chassis working hauling canes already. I paid for them with my personal cheque, with my name on it back in November last year.

I do not understand why it is that when a politician engages in a normal transaction that any other ordinary citizen engages in, that he has to be subjected to this kind of foolishness, and has to be subjected to this kind of nonsense about two musty old buses, talking about people carrying away something. You would think that they could go down by the East Coast Road or something like this. They even tore off the canvass. These were the old buses that you used to have to roll down the canvass to stop yourself from getting wet. They did not even let me keep the canvass, they tore off that too, so I just got the empty raw frame with flat tyres, and I can hear honourable Members who should be expected to bring a more responsible level of debate talking about buses disappearing.

I am prepared to let anybody at all see the cheque that I wrote marked "Cancelled, paid over to the Transport Board" not to me, not to the Traffic Manager, but to the Transport Board, and I think that that should be the end of the matter. I do not see why we have to come in here day after day on public business talking foolishness and dropping nasty insinuations.

Why doesn't the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talk about the fact that he bought his plantation for \$2 000 an acre and sold it for \$10 000? Is not that worthy of examination too? (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: A willing seller to a willing buyer). A willing seller to a willing buyer? Well, the Transport Board was a willing seller of old buses and I was a willing buyer, so why must I undergo all of this kind.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Why did he not know about it?) He knows

about it, the Transport Board knows about it, there is no secret about it. The Cabinet of Barbados knows about it, everybody who was supposed to know, knows.

I am going to talk about the Transport Board at greater length when I have a longer opportunity, but I just wanted to let the honourable Member for St. Michael West and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central know that if he is looking for thieves, he will not find them on this side over here, he will have to start right on that side if he wants to find people who carry away things.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I heard the honourable Member say that if one is looking for thieves and people who carry away things, they should look on the other side. I think the honourable Member will have to withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Withdraw the words.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remark, but we will expect a higher level of responsibility to come from Members on that side over there.

With that, Sir, I would like to indicate my support for the Resolution.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked leave to sit again, 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 now suspended until 2 o'clock today.

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

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

On Resumption:

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to stand here to support this Resolution. I think it is a Resolution with substance and I believe all of us will agree that since 1976 until now, the transport system in the island has improved by leaps and bounds. In 1975-76 the last bus left St. Michael for St. Lucy at 6.30 in the afternoon, but now at night you can have a bus as late as 1 o'clock, so you can see how well we are doing as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Michael West spoke about the bus fare of 25 cents and said that the buses used to carry more people. I disagree with that wholeheartedly because Mr. Chairman, as you know, the report that we got from the Transport Board is that the most people that have ever travelled in Barbados are travelling now. From 5.30 on mornings until 9 o'clock at night in the parish of St. Lucy where I live, you did not have buses enough to carry people because several people were going to work and were moving all the time, so when they talk about the fare of 60 cents I think my people are quite satisfied to pay 60 cents once they are getting a unique bus service. We all realise that there are some days when you might have a bus accident, or something may go wrong that would cause a bus to be delayed, but we also realise that some days in our very cars we get delays and we have to bear with that.

Mr. Chairman, in 1975 a bus driver was working for \$105.

Today a bus driver is drawing \$239 a week which is more than twice as much as he was working for in 1976. A conductor was working for \$95 a week and now today that same conductor is working for \$192 a week, so you can see the progress. We all know the fuel charges, we know the price of tyres, and I believe the whole public realises that with the cost of things, 60 cents is quite reasonable a fare.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the last Board did a good job. Although some people might not agree with me, I have to commend the Board for the work they have done over the last three years or so.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West spoke about the Board and said he was not sorry that some members were dismissed and things of that nature, and I will tell you why.

We know that the honourable Member has one of the biggest excursions you can think of in this island, and when he had an excursion in those days he used to pay \$100 per bus for the day, and a mini-bus was the same \$100 a day. That Board was the one that saw fit to move the price from \$100 a day to \$300 a day which I say was very reasonable. At the same time you all know that each bus on an excursion trip should not carry 100 passengers, but sometimes with children and grown-ups it carried practically 100 people, and at least 90 people at \$5.00 each is \$450 while they were paying the Transport Board \$100.

You will understand therefore, why he would not like that last Board at all. I say it was a Board of substance, it knew figures and somebody of that quality would like to hear something wrong with the Board.

Mr. Chairman, there is one question I would like to ask the Hon. Minister and I believe he will be able to answer it for me. Why is it that the people of St. Lucy and St. Peter have to pay two bus fares to get into town? They have to pay 60 cents to Speightstown and then they have to pay 60 cents from Speightstown to Bridgetown. I do not think that is fair to the people in the north. The honourable Member for St. Michael West said that the people up there are far, and I believe he meant they should pay more. I want to let the Minister know that this is going on right now, and I should like someone to make it clear why the people in the north have to be treated this way.

On this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that there are places like Boscobelle where we have a unique bus service, but the bridge was damaged for the last six months or so and we have no one to see to it, and the people in Boscobelle are suffering severely for a bus service.

We all know, Mr. Chairman, that from 1971 to 1975 the people in St. Andrew, St. George and St. Thomas never had an adequate bus service. You know they had private concessionaires, the Rocklyn and such like, and I do not think it was fair that the people in the other parishes who used to have the general transport should be treated in such a nice manner, so I think it was very good sense in the Barbados Labour Party Government since it came to power taking over all the bus services, which meant that everybody would have the same treatment. We realise that Rome was not built in a day; it took a little time, and I believe that with the present trend we can be very happy.

I would also like to let you know, Mr. Chairman, that there are many visitors whom I meet week after week and they tell me that the bus fares in Barbados are cheaper than in New York. I do a fair amount of travelling and I have not seen bus fares anywhere in the world that

could compare with the cheap rate in Barbados. I would like to commend the Government on its stand, and I feel that the Resolution is a very good one, and I believe that the Minister we have in charge is competent enough that he will solve these issues and this Board to go from strength to strength.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have listened closely to many of the comments made in this debate, and I think that I should deal with them in order of logical priorities. The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central wanted some clarification as to what Government's policy is concerning the Transport Board as a public service.

You will recall that some weeks ago I did summarize the philosophy of the Government with respect to transport. I started off by saying that the Transport Board operates a service that generally reaches the poorest segments of the community. From time to time one sees the children of the middle class riding on school buses, but by and large the majority of passengers who travel on Transport Board buses are working people, and it is because of this that the Government of Barbados is committed to a bus fare that is within the financial competence of the majority of passengers to handle.

There can be no question of this Government ever charging what is called an economic bus fare, for to do so would be to push up the bus fare to a level that is astronomical and well beyond the reach of people from the socio-economic strata that travel in such large numbers on our buses. It therefore follows as a corollary to that apposition, Mr. Chairman, that this Government, consistent with all Governments that operate bus services, is committed to subsidising such services, and indeed nowhere on the planet earth can be identified a public authority that operates bus transportation at a profit. 2.15 p.m.

It is fairly obvious that Government is committed to subsidisation of the public transport in this country by the very fact that it is this Government that made it possible for all persons over the age of 65 to travel free on the buses — all persons over the age of 65 as distinct from old age pensioners. Old age pensioners do not exhaust the category of all persons over age 65. It is constantly mis-stated from that direction, that they introduced legislation which made it possible for old age pensioners or all persons who are the age of 65 to travel on buses and this error emanates from the fact that they declared that every 65 year old is an old age pensioner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt to say that there are voices other than that of the honourable Member who is speaking. It is annoying to the reporters. I would ask those honourable Members who are responsible to keep less noise.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that these offending voices are within this Chamber so the services of the Marshal might be invoked to restore some tranquility in the areas in which these voices are heard.

So the Government which extended the privilege of free travel to all persons over the age of 65 *ipso facto* is committed to using public transportation as operated by the Transport Board as a public service and again the case for the Government's commitment to subsidy is supported by the differential of fares charged to school children and adults. School children are currently charged two-thirds of the fare of adults and that, once more, is an indication of Government's recognition that certain groups might suffer hardships within the community and this is further evidence of subsidisation.

Moreover, some school children are already receiving free transfers. Again these free transfers represent an extension of the Government's subsidy to transport. There can be no doubt, therefore, that transport as operated by the Transport Board is perceived as a public service.

Having established the principle that bus transportation in Barbados is a public service and having committed itself inexplicably to a subsidy, the responsibility of the Government of Barbados then becomes this: to ensure that the subsidy paid out of the Consolidated Fund is at a level which does not unnecessarily gouge the taxpayers of this country. It is my belief that a subsidy of \$15 million is too much for the taxpayers to pay for public transportation and that is why immediate steps have been taken to reorganise the Transport Board, to put that corporation on an efficient footing with a view of reducing the subsidy.

There is no man, unless he tries to play God, can at this moment state with any precision what figure a reasonable subsidy would be, and the reason why this cannot be done is because we do not know the extent of cost reduction at this point in time which will be occasioned by the reorganisation of which I have spoken on several occasions within this House. So the policy is very clear: Government is committed to the maintenance of a bus fare that is within the reach of the people who occupy the lowest stratum of this society. These people who constitute an overwhelming majority of the users of public transport but at the same time Government has an inalienable responsibility to taxpayers, to ensure that subsidies used are used in the most productive manner possible and are not wasted as has been the lamentable history of the Transport Board in the past.

Now, moving on to another point made by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central,

he enquired about the composition of the new Board. The Minister, Mr. Chairman, is taking his time in constructing a new Board, I am spending a great deal of time talking to potential new members of the Board because I do not want any misunderstanding to develop in my relations towards members of the Board, which brings me to the point of the relationship of a Minister to a Board.

It has been often stated with overwhelming simplicity, that the Minister should be responsible for policy directions and the Board and management be responsible for what people choose to describe as day to day operations. These two things, day to day operations and policy directions, are categories that can be compartmentalise in an hermetically sealed area and only exist in the thoughts of human beings. These things can only be separated in the thoughts of human beings because the object of giving policy directions is for policy to be executed in acts that occur during the course of a day's work and therefore in practice or praxis, if you like, because when I talk about action I cannot separate thought.

I cannot separate the conceptualisation of a programme from the execution of the programme. The automata or robots act in a way in which action is totally separate and segregated from thought, so consistent with my view that any human being ought to think like a man of action and acts as a man of thought, I reject as metaphysical rubbish, the notion that policy directives can be separated from individual actions because individual actions constitute the vehicle through which policy directions must be executed.

Now where individual actions are wrong in error or individual action represents obstruction, no Minister with a commitment to seeing that his policies are implemented can remain aloof and wring his hand in impotence. At least I will not be that kind of Minister. Here, Mr. Chairman, I must state quite emphatically that it is a nonsense proposition to hold that a Minister can interfere in anything for which he is answerable. The proper word is "intervene" and the frequency of intervention will be determined by the competence of the people who are charged and paid to execute the policy directives of the Minister. Where you do not have a competent Board or a competent management, then the Minister in order to ensure that his policy directives are executed must intervene more frequently than is the case.

2.25 p.m.

I work with other Statutory Boards, I work with the Water Authority, and during the course of my sojourn as Minister of Transport and Works I have had occasion to speak to the General Manager of the Water Authority once in eight months, and this is because the Water Authority is an efficiently run Statutory Board. I also

had the Child Care Board operating under my Ministry, I have been working with the Child Care Board for the past four years, and I rarely talk to the Child Care Board's Chairman — probably about six times during the period of four years, and I have talked to the Principal Administrative Officer there about the same number of times. It is a properly run Statutory Board. The Port Authority, another Board under my jurisdiction, rarely do I have to intervene there, but where we have poorly administered Boards like the Transport Board, then the question of more frequent intervention becomes a *sine qua non*.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that the public should be misled by the view that the Minister sits in splendid isolation in his office, delivers edicts to Chairmen who may either choose to carry out these edicts or to ignore them if they are of a mind to do so, and then once the Minister has given his edict his business as a Minister is finished. That would be a serious betrayal of the people whose interests the Minister must represent for him to take that approach to the administration of a Statutory Corporation for which he is answerable.

The fact of the matter is this, Mr. Chairman. When I came to the Transport Board, a Board totally devoid of professional technical staff, or professional administrative staff, a Board whose Directors had no special expertise in transport, either I was going to remain passive and allow a bad situation to deteriorate or intervene, and I make no apologies for interventions. It is my public responsibility to intervene and check abuses. It is my public responsibility to intervene in order to put right what is wrong as a result of ignorance and incompetence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Only five minutes, Sir? I shall travel more quickly, Mr. Chairman.

Another point raised was the question of the use of the Transport Levy funds. I am sorry the Member for Christ Church West Central was not in his seat last Wednesday when I gave an exposition on the use of the Transport Levy Fund, otherwise he would have been aware of the fact that the Transport Levy fund would be used in such a way as to get around the problem of insufficient financing. I indicated, Mr. Chairman, at that time, that the Transport Levy Fund would give the Board the leverage with which to obtain suppliers' credit and therefore capitalise the operations of the Transport Board at a far more rapid rate than would be possible, given the quantum of money available for capital financing to the Board.

Another point mentioned, Mr. Chairman, is with respect to the linkage between roads and transport in the

conceptualisation of our activities. I think the lie is given to this when one recognises that the Transport Levy Fund is set up for the dual purpose of up-grading the standard of our roads as well as upgrading the standard of transport equipment. There is an inescapable logical nexus between transport and roads, and this was recognised at the time that the Transport Levy was conceived, and this is precisely why a fund has been constructed to deal with both problems simultaneously.

Now, on the question of disappearing buses, I said last week that I have ordered an investigation, and I want to make it plain, Mr. Chairman, that it is not my intention to witch hunt, it is not my intention to sensationalise anything, nor is it my intention to white-wash. The issues and the facts will be presented as they are after the investigation has run its course. I am not gunning for anybody, Mr. Chairman, nor am I out to protect anybody, the facts will speak for themselves when the investigation has been completed.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Philip North referred to problems related to transportation in St. Philip, and he made the sweeping and inaccurate statement that the districts in the rural areas are poorly served by buses. I believe the honourable Member for St. Lucy can attest to the opposite, because during a site visit with him in St. Lucy, I had occasion to refer to the frequency with which buses were running in St. Lucy.

On the question of transportation for St. Lucy, it has come to me as a surprise that people in St. Lucy are required to pay two fares in order to get to Bridgetown. I am not aware that we have any stages, I am not aware that people in the rural areas are discriminated against in this and I will have to investigate this allegation made by the Member for St. Lucy.

2.35 p.m.

Coming back to the honourable Member for St. Philip North, the honourable Member made a very powerful case for transportation to be used in the promotion of recreation. What I did say and what I now repeat, is that it is no business of a bus company to primarily concern itself with transportation for recreation. I believe that as long as the buses run, people will be able to use them for recreational purposes. That is an incident of having a public transportation programme, but we cannot cater to a situation where 20 people during the course of a five hour period believe that they have a right to have a bus or buses at their disposal. That is what I mean by providing a taxi service for people in certain parts of the country.

We believe that once the transport services have been rationalised, Mr. Chairman, it would be incumbent on all those persons who seek recreation to organise their recreation in a manner that is consistent with available

transportation, but it is too expensive a proposition to provide these huge taxis for a handful of people during off peak periods.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to all those concerned to examine the programme, a programme which I believe, outlined on about four or five different occasions in this House has had the effect of raising the level of debate on transportation in this Honourable Chamber. When I read debates over the past years, I am happy that I have contributed towards bringing into this forum serious discussion on the burning issues that touch and concern transportation in this country.

Policies have been outlined, but in outlining the policies what I have uttered in this Chamber are words and they are not the words of a magician. To say that one will do certain things in the Transport Board is not akin to uttering the words "open sesame" and doors opened. It is no magic. I have not outlined a programme of witchcraft or obeah to this Honourable House.

These policies need a little time to work, and I believe that all criticism within the next 12 months of the Transport Board, and that is a period when I believe we will be able to sit back and assess the impact of the new programmes, Mr. Chairman, would be previous. At this time, we will be able to examine whether there has been a reduction in the subsidy, at this time we will be able to examine whether there are improved services; so all criticisms during the interim would be previous.

So I appeal to honourable Members to wait and watch, and if at the end of that time there are not significant improvements such as I have spelt out here, then all criticisms would be justified. I would stand excoriated by the House.

The question that Head 37 – Ministry of Communications and Works – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1982

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 13 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, periodically, amendments to the Civil Establishments Orders are laid in the House of Assembly, and this House has been in the habit of having a comprehensive Order to cover the various amendments so that it would be possible for one to be able to look within one document at the various gradings within the Civil Service.

As honourable Members would be aware, in addition to the salary increases which were granted two years ago, there has been a comprehensive regrading of a number of posts. It is therefore necessary to embody the results of this exercise into a single Civil Establishment Order. This is what this Order attempts to do. We have had individual debate on various aspects of this before, and I hope that this will not engage the House.

We are just checking to see whether there are any typographical errors in the printing of it, it happens. Anyway, Sir, we beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment General Order do now pass.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In seconding the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would concur in what the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central has said about most of the matters recited therein, having already excited the attention of the House.
2.45 p.m.

But there are one or two matters of policy contained therein which are going to be subject to review. Those are the ones relating to the Traffic Wardens Scheme. I am by no means convinced that Traffic Wardens should be introduced in a Civil Establishment Order, I think they should be dealt with on a temporary basis and secondly, I understand there has been some rethinking on the Ambulance Service – the proposal to combine it with the Fire Department.

The Ambulance Service in one way or another is a very unsatisfactory managed service because it makes personnel difficulties exist in the present service and we doubt that the public gets as good a service as it can based on the establishment of a number of vehicles. But one of the Departments concerned is questioning the policy.

I merely mentioned this so that honourable Members will not find themselves asking when is it proposed to appoint Traffic Wardens or when is it proposed to appoint a new ambulance post in the Fire Service. These matters have gone on for a couple of years and they come to the House, Sir, at a point when their utility has been questioned more now than was at the start. But there are really a great number of matters to deal with in the Resolution and I do not believe, Sir, that honourable Members are expected to go over every single section of it any more than they are

expecting the Deputy Prime Minister to do so, and I beg to second the Resolution.

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

Hon L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you can direct me at this point. Earlier in the day I indicated by way of a Message from you that there were some amendments to the National Insurance and Social Security Act. I do seek the leave of the House, if it is all right and agreeable on the other side, to have this dealt with now.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I shall indicate at this time that I have a number of items here to give notice of, Sir, and I shall be seeking the leave of the House at the appropriate time to give such notice, if it is the pleasure of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is desirous of proceeding with the request from the Other Place to deal with certain amendments which were brought to the notice of this Honourable House during the course of the day respecting the National Insurance and Social Security Act. Does the Honourable House concur in these amendments?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that the House do now concur in the amendments which have been sent down from the Other Place on the National Insurance and Social Security Act, Cap. 47. They had been circulated, as was said, but there was an oversight by the Hon. Minister of Labour to put the amendments at that time. I have my doubts that you would hear about the sloppiness.

I beg to move, Sir, that the amendments be now inserted, Sir.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, on the occasion when they were amending the National Insurance and Social Security Act to give the National Insurance Department the authority to collect the levy, the intention was to move an amendment on the Floor of the House to the Act so as to exempt those public servants who would not ordinarily be liable to this levy in the same way as we did for the Unemployment Insurance Levy, but, Sir, as the Leader of the House indicated, it slipped my memory at the time that we had this before us, and I just moved the amendment.

I suppose this reflects on the newness of my experience on the front bench and the procedural policy with respect to the amendment on the Floor were not altogether clear to me at the time, so it slipped out. But I would like now, Sir, to invite the House, and in seconding the motion by the Leader of the House, I

would like to second his motion to the effect that we amend the National Insurance and Social Security Act so as to exempt public servants from that levy.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a number of occasions I have heard Your Honour ruling from the Chair that there are certain matters which ought to be done during homework time. Time and time again, Sir, we are observing a number of what may, on the face of it, be tiny matters but which accumulatively, are indicative of an attitude which this Honourable House cannot condone as a matter of form. And I believe the records will show that a Minister whose tasks, as we have seen it unfold in the last eight to ten months, Sir, cannot be described as an over burdening task, and whose responsibilities on the front bench as we have observed them cannot be said to be so heavy as to allow for the kind of cost which his claim of oversight has resulted in for this Honourable Chamber and indeed this country. 2.55 p.m.

We are saying to the Ministers on that side that they have a duty and a responsibility to do their homework.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you are speaking to the amendment.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well then, begin to do this.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The cost of this amendment having to go up to the Other Place when in fact all that was required of the Minister down here, as he said, in a matter which they have had to insert a clause for retroactive — if you will recall, Sir, there is a clause in this matter for retroactive approval to October 1981 — this is a matter that should have engaged a certain meticulousness on the part of any Minister whose responsibility it was to bring it down here, and we just wish to record that this is the last time that we are going to agree that such amendments as they come would be accepted with the grace with which we are going to accept this one.

We recognise that the Minister does not have a great deal of experience in these matters. We accept his explanation that it is taking him a very long time to understand the intricacies of front bench operations, Sir, but he has been in this Honourable House long enough that he should have at least been picking up something from his colleagues who sat on the front bench before him. Furthermore, Sir, the Leader of the House has a duty in these matters. We recognise that the Leader of the House has not always found it easy to teach his more junior colleagues on the front bench, we have seen that from time to time, when he wishes to talk about bus bodies they wish to talk about chassis.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the amendment.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But, Sir, we will agree with the amendment, except that we would like to record that our position with regard to the retroactivity of the collection of these levies still holds good. We will not any further detain this Honourable House, we believe the message as sent has been received. At least we hope so.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I can appreciate all the honourable Member has said in relation to the amendments. He also mentioned something which you, Mr. Speaker, have been counselling all of us in here, even the Leader of the Opposition — that is, to do our homework before we come in here. We are all here subject to error, Sir. People spent millions of dollars to send men to the moon and space labs, and they came down — what is a simple little thing that is forgotten? I believe if the honourable Member for St. Michael West had been guided by me and had taken my advice over the past 15 years he would have been in this great Party. He used to ask me what I think and I always told him to come up, be on the right side, a Party of repute, but then fortune sometimes favour the brave. He wanted to be in the bright lights of New York so he joined the Dems, not that he was really in it, his heart was really in this Party. We know each other from Cable and Wireless days.

I beg to move that the amendments as sent back to the House be accepted in this august Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that it is the pleasure of the House that the amendments of the Other Place be concurred in. The amendments have been concurred in.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If it is Your Honour's pleasure, I would like to proceed to give Notices at this point, with the leave of the House.

I beg to move that the Item, *Government Notices* be the instant Order of the day. I had indicated earlier that I would be seeking the leave of the House to do it at some point today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is seeking the re-committal of Standing Order 10, Item (g), *Government Notices*, for the purpose of laying some *Government Notices*. If there is no objection, the Minister may proceed.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following document showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders for the months January to December, 1981.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act.

I think also that I will have to seek the leave of the House to deal with Item (k) — *First Readings of Bills*. One will appreciate that this is probably the longest Sitting in the history of Parliament. When we were on the other side we used to dispose of Government Business, eat the Government up, Sir, and that is why we used to get through with it so quickly, but this is the first time a Sitting has been this long, and because of that there are a number of little procedural matters which surely need tidying up as we go along the way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does that not include the Chair? I know my Rules.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am not saying I would include the Chair. You can rest assured I would not include the Chair, we have been in here together, so we know each other.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a question of a Bill being read a first time, and I cannot get down from the Chair and initiate this. That is what is holding up the people's business.
3.05 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, you have not got to come down from the Chair. I will stand up to the Chair. I therefore beg to move, with your guidance, that we now revert to Item (k) under Standing Order No. 10 in order to have the Bill read a first time also. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, I may add, that it is the Clerk's duty to help advise Members in here also.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act, be read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until Tuesday March 16, 1982 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on the motion — I do not stand to oppose the motion for suspension — but

I believe it is the duty of this side to draw to the attention of this Honourable House that during the course of this sitting we have had a situation where we have seen the pressures — perhaps, I do not know of my own knowledge — which have been brought to bear on the Reporters during the sitting.

Bearing in mind that we have Estimates around the corner, I think it is very important that this Honourable Chamber take note of the fact that the complement of Reporters to which we are accustomed, does not appear to be the norm with which we have been functioning during the last two months.

We saw what could possibly happen, and I believe it may be worthwhile for those concerned to take steps to make temporary arrangements in the event that when we come to the end of this Sitting and we meet again for the Estimates we do not have the kind of problem which we saw today, Mr. Speaker. I say no more. I do not wish to oppose the Suspension. I merely wanted to draw that to the attention of this Honourable House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I only entertained the honourable Member for St. Michael West because of the importance to the existence of this House of the point that he raised. It is only, and I repeat, only on that score that I entertained what the honourable Member had to say. I am not going to invite any discussion of this kind of motion without prior notice in the future, but it is due to the fact that I considered the matter that he raised of very considerable importance, and it is on that score and on that score alone that I entertain it on this occasion, and I thank the honourable Member for raising it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know that you can guide me with the Rules very well, but do I have to give notice when I want to speak on a motion for adjournment or suspension? I am just seeking Your Honour guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the motion for adjournment certainly.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And on suspension also, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Notice of suspension in place of notice of adjournment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there is a motion before the House on this occasion. I say no more.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question that affects me and it relates to Questions. We have on this side been very accommodating to the Government. They have introduced a number of

new methods and we have not objected to the laying of new matters, so that the Government may proceed with its business.

Now I myself have handed in a number of questions, but I have had no opportunity so far for asking those questions, and I am merely intimating that I would certainly hope that I would get an opportunity when the House resumes its sitting to ask those questions. I believe that the matter I am raising may be familiar to honourable Members. The Government recommitted certain items like giving of Notices and so on and we raised no objection. I hope that the Government will be equally accommodating if and when I ask for a recommitment of the item "Notice of Questions" so that I may ask the questions which I have submitted.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, as long as I am Leader of the House, honourable Members know that I will do everything in my power to accommodate them as far as Private Members' Business is concerned. As far as the answering of Questions is concerned, we have done that expeditiously. I know there are still questions on the Order Paper for 1967 asked by you, Mr. Speaker which have not yet been answered by them when they were in power. They can rest assured that we will accommodate them.

Mr. SPEAKER: As regards the point raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South, I am just advising that I will not sit here and allow a motion for the suspension of this House to give the appearance that we are allowed to make a mockery of the proceedings of this House. I will advise the honourable Member however that if he handed his questions to the Clerk, Erskine May advises in the clearest of terms for little children to understand that he must ask the Clerk firstly about his questions.

The question that this sitting be now suspended until Tuesday, 16th March, 1982 at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.14 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of Government Items to give notice of today, Sir, and I am therefore seeking the leave of the Honourable House,

Sir, and with your pleasure, to give notice of them. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I will have to revert under the Standing Orders to Business of the Day, Item (g).

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, please, I wish to draw your attention to the noise that is coming from the adjoining Rickett Street. I do not see that we can conduct business under the circumstances. I am thinking particularly in terms of our Hansard Reporters. *(Aside)* It is not what you can hear or what I can hear, it is a question of how confused our Hansard Reporter must be under these circumstances.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am in full support of what you have to say. But, I know this is a very ticklish situation. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to proceed with the business. If the noise continues to interrupt, I may have to suspend the Honourable House for a few minutes, Sir, so as to see if such a matter can be rectified.

I have no doubt that there may be persons trying to force the Government into playing into their hands where the police must take the appropriate action, because, as I understand it quite clearly, Sir, the precincts of Parliament are defined and Parliament should not be obstructed in its business during the course of the day. That is a matter however, Mr. Speaker, that is in your jurisdiction.

I seek the leave of the Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, to give the appropriate notice under Orders of Business, Item (g) which is Government Notices, Mr. Speaker, as well as (k) First Reading of Bills. With the leave of the Honourable House, Sir, I would also like to indicate that there is a Resolution which I am giving notice of — I am hoping to do it in all of its stages today. I have discussed the matter already with the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he has indicated that their side has absolutely no objection, Sir.

Therefore, Sir, I beg to move, that we now revert to Orders of the Day, under items (g) and (k), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is seeking the recommittal of Standing Order No. 10 Items (g) and (k). If there is no objection, the honourable Member may proceed. *(Pause)* There being no objection, the Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am trying to get my papers sorted out, Sir. Leave is granted, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the: Rules of the Supreme Court, 1982.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay: The Annual Report of the Child Care Board for the period April 1980 to March 1981.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on behalf of the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay:

The Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ending December 31, 1981.

I am also commanded to lay:

The Estimates for 1982–83.

I beg to give notice, Mr. Speaker, of:

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$299 303 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government and to supplement the Estimates 1981–82 Part I Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1981–82, No. 2 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

And also, Mr. Speaker:

A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to make the same available for the services of Barbados for the year ended March, 31, 1983.

I have indicated already, Sir, that I am going to proceed a little later in the day with the Resolution for the supplementary for the \$299 303 at the Honourable House's pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the services of Barbados for the year ended March 31, 1983 be now read a first time.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 14.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982.

Order No. 14 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill would correct a typographical error. The article that should have been referred to in Section 5 of Cap. 323 B was Article XI and it was printed as Article 11. The Roman numbers should have been used instead of the ordinary numbers. So that is the short purpose of the

Bill (*Aside*) No. The main Act had annexed the Agreement to it.....(*Aside*) Pardon me?
12.10 p.m.

Instead of Article 11 as printed, it should be Article XI, because that is the provision of the Agreement in which Barbados undertakes to give certain immunities and privileges to the bank through its representative in Barbados. It was a wrong reference to the Agreement, that is all.

I will tell you how it arose. This arose because of the fact that the Inter-American Development Bank has now bought a building in Barbados. Hitherto, they were only renting premises, and now they have bought Maple Manor — I think is the name of the place in question. The question of having to pay land tax and other things which are not payable by international organisations who have immunities and privileges arose as well.

It was discovered that Article 11 was in Section 5 of the Act instead of Article XI. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. 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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just have a very brief question to ask the Minister responsible. I note that a number of these international agencies are establishing branches or parts of their operations in various territories, and that as the Deputy Prime Minister indicated, the Inter-American Development Bank now has a building in Barbados.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us about the promotion or advancement of Barbadians in these institutions. I note that a number of nationals of other countries, including CARICOM countries, are appointed

to positions in Barbados, and I am wondering if any progress is being made in relation to the advancement, promotion or appointment of Barbadians on such bodies.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I know that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Barbados certainly within the last five or six years has been vigorously advocating in all the international institutions the advancement of Barbados with some success. At the Inter-American Development Bank we have a number of Barbadians who are working at the technical level. I know of no Barbadian at the Inter-American Development Bank who has reached the level of being the Manager or the Country Representative on the Inter-American Development Bank.

I am sure that the honourable Member will be aware of the remarkable coincidence of the number of those country representatives being people who have retired from politics, and I am sure there is hope for the honourable Member. I think that we have not had that sufficiency in number of retirements to be able to advance our claim, having regard to the fact that it seems to be the appointing pattern to choose from among that band — but by next year or the year after if the honourable Member indicates his interest, he can rest assured that the Government would advance his interest to the hilt.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just add to what the Deputy Prime Minister said, the honourable Member for St. Michael South will well recall that Barbados had a Director at the Inter-American Development Bank for a period of three years, and in case he does not know, has made a very significant contribution to that institution over a period of time.

Generally speaking, in respect of the appointment of Barbadians to top posts in international organisations, the Government has put up a very vigorous fight in the election of the Assistant Secretary General to the OAS, Mr. Val McComie as you are well aware. And we have had the appointment of Mr. Freddie Forde to the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations. We have also had a number of top level appointments in the P. 5 range both at the United Nations and UNESCO. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: IADB?) The honourable Member has had the answer in respect of the IADB.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part. I would just say that the original Act was passed in 1969 and it is fairly clear that it would have continued on the Statute Book had it not been for the issue arising.

I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

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

12.20 p.m.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is at this point that I propose to deal with the Resolution which I indicated I would do earlier in the day.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1981-82 No. 25

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the item under which this supplementary is sought relates to National Assistance. A sum of \$22.48 million was voted during the current financial year for National Assistance.

National Assistance is divided into several categories. About \$18.4 million of those dollars went to old age pensioners, and old age pensioners, Mr. Chairman, as you know, are drawn from all over the island. There are some 18,000 old age pensioners who receive pensions and who altogether are more than three times the number of people registered to vote in St. Michael East. So \$18.4 million of this sum of \$22 million was allocated for the payment of old age pensioners.

The remaining \$3.5 million went to other National Assistance payments as well as National Assistance in kind, and I shall indicate the categories of National Assistance payments other than old age pensions as well as National Assistance in kind.

Children whose parents are incapable of supporting them normally receive transfer payment from the Welfare Department, and the payments per child are fixed at \$4.00 per week. At the time of the Estimates last year it was anticipated that some 6 600 children would apply to the Welfare Department for National Assistance. In fact 6 915 children applied for welfare payments during this period.

The second category of cash grant relates to able-bodied adults who are unemployed. An individual who is able-bodied and unemployed receives \$5.00 per week. We are now paying 444 such adults.

The third category relates to disabled persons in receipt of allowances of \$8.00 per week. There are three kinds of payments for disabled persons. A disabled person is a person who is able to present a medical certificate to the Welfare Department stating that such person is unable to work. To receive a payment of \$8.00 per week, it must be established that such a person is under 55 years of age and that the illness is of a kind that it can be reasonably expected that that person would be off the welfare rolls in a very short time.

The second kind of disabled person is a person under the age of 55 who has a more chronic ailment and the nature of whose disease is relatively long term. Such people get \$12 per week and this year the Welfare Department is paying this allowance to 1 047 such persons.
12.30 p.m.

The third category of disabled persons relates to people between the ages of 55 and 64 — people who are passed their working age but do not yet qualify for pensions, and whose health is considered to be such that they are deemed incapable of working. Some 898 persons in this category are receiving transfer payments this year from the Welfare Department.

The other part of this Resolution deals with assistance in kind. Assistance in kind involves giving non pension benefits to people who seek the assistance of the Welfare Department. Such persons depending on their needs may receive food vouchers, they may receive spectacles, dentures or the Welfare Department may pay their light and water bills. The largest number of people this Resolution seeks to cover relates to those persons seeking to have their light and water bills paid, and out of the amount requested, some \$121,300 will go towards the payment of the light and water bills of pensioners.

During the current financial year, there has been a substantial increase in the number of people who are seeking to have their light and water bills paid. To give you some idea of the increases in this category of National Assistance, I will give you the figures from the

period 1979 – 80 when 369 persons had their light bills paid and 1 138 had their water bills paid. For the year 1980 – 81, 807 people had their light bills paid and 1 569 their water bills paid and during the current financial year, 1 883 had their light bills paid and 2 287 had their water bills paid. So as we can see, over a period of time there has been a substantial increase in the number of pensioners seeking relief for the payment of their light and water bills.

Mr. Chairman, I now move that this Resolution do now pass.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution that we are dealing with is one of those measures which the Opposition had very little notice of if any.

While we were coming into the Chamber today, the Leader of the House approached myself and my colleague – the Member for St. Michael West – and said that they had this Resolution for \$299 333 to be dealt with and that they wanted to deal with it in all of its stages or that they were going to deal with it in all of its stages and would be seeking our concurrence.

We have no difficulty in saying that we would accommodate the Government on this particular occasion as we have been doing on a number of occasions, because we recognise that the level of management within the Government has fallen – that there is a substantial deterioration in the quality of management both at the political and I believe at the administrative level. In here we talk about the political level and so the Ministers, collectively and individually, must carry responsibility for that. But there is no doubt at all that from the number of measures that have been brought in here with little or no notice to the Opposition so that we may study and consult and formulate our positions on these matters, that a lot is left to be desired as far as the political management of the public affairs of this country may be concerned.

Now as far as this Resolution is concerned, we have absolutely no problems with the principle involved of providing assistance, payments, transfers, grants – call it whatever you will, to persons in our society who for one reason or another may be unable to cope with the problems of living.

We are, of course, not surprised from the statistics given that there is an increase in the number of persons seeking assistance. That coincides with the pressures exerted upon individuals to make ends meet. It coincides with the request and urgings of the Government for us tighten our belts – Mr. Chairman, you are hearing these noises coming into the Chamber? These noises coming into the Chamber, Mr. Chairman, I think may

be a back-drop against the debate that is going on because they also reflect the pressures out there in the society as well and it directly affects this particular Resolution.

We of course in the Opposition are not against Barbadians demonstrating their particular grievances and we are not objecting to the demonstrations. A little earlier the Leader, I think the Speaker himself, drew the matter to the attention of the House. We are not objecting on this side to the demonstrations.

I recall on some occasions a few years ago, the present Government permitting some massive American planes to swoop down over Bridgetown, their jets at full blast affecting.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What has this to do with..... Order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I protested.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. There is a point of order.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Oh I am sorry, I did not realise there was a point of order. In fact I did not realise that you were on your feet. I heard you were not well enough.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member please take his seat.
12.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is really two points of order, Sir, and they are made from the Honourable House of Assembly, not from the St. Joseph Hospital.

The second point of order I had better take first – the American jets cannot possibly be relevant to this debate and I would move that they be struck from the Record.

The more substantial point of order relates to the honourable Member having taken notice – as all of us will have to take notice – of noises. The taking notice of noises is like the taking notice of strangers and normally, I respectfully submit, the Chair will be obliged to take such steps as are laid down in the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act to deal with them.

The Act is very strict that the proceedings of Parliament must not be interrupted, honourable Members must not be molested or whatever to and from their way

to Parliament. While I myself have no quarrel, one way or the other with the demonstrations, we must recall that not every demonstration may be so benign and once you allow precedents to establish themselves — in this case the precedent of ignoring the 1963 Act which governs the precincts of Parliament — you will allow a wedge to come through the door that will redound to the discomfort of all of us in future.

The combination of the 1963 Act which was passed by honourable Members opposite and the 1968 Public Order Act undoubtedly are intended to deal with demonstrations near Parliament by forbidding them. There is no doubt whatsoever on the law and we should not for the sake of — I do not know if it could be thought an embarrassment to the Government or an embarrassment to an unpopular employer or whatever — allow the proceedings of Parliament to be compromised by a demonstration which although harmless in itself, is pregnant with trouble for the future.

Trade Unions have an exemption from the operation of the Public Order Act. It is an exemption which can be taken away by Order or whatever, as long as they are proceeding in the course of an industrial dispute. I would draw to honourable Members' attention that it is open to any seven citizens of Barbados to put their names down and form a trade union. They can then apply to any employer in Barbados, if they can find one employer, and ask for recognition and if that recognition is refused they can drive a coach and horse — it is a long point of order, Sir, but I must make my submission — through the Public Order Act. Any seven people, ultimately by taking the right steps, will be able to demonstrate in the Public Buildings yard and shout us down if we do not administer the law.

I am sorry really that this has come up — I mean, it was raised by the honourable Member and this is why I pursue it. (*Aside*) The point was raised by the Speaker, but the honourable Member took note of the disturbance. We may not for the sake of grasping at what we think may be a temporary advantage want to enforce the law, but the law is there, and I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Chairman, must be enforced.

Parliament must not be interrupted, honourable Members of Parliament must not be solicited on their way to and from Parliament. We are not to be in here and hear people outside holding their own meeting.

When I was first in Parliament, that street used to be closed and traffic could not drive down there and the Public Buildings yard itself was restricted. There is a little more law to it, Sir, — a policeman when he attends Parliament on the days that it is sitting becomes

a member of the staff of Parliament and is subject to the authority of the Speaker and he must do what the Speaker says, carry out the duties of the Act. And I submit that once it reaches the point that a demonstration aimed at Parliament begins to make a noise and have itself heard in Parliament, that whatever our sympathies, we must stop it.

Someday, honourable Members opposite will be in the Government. They know that if this continues, the day that they are in the Government, it will be open to the Barbados Labour Party to form a trade union and demonstrate every day in Rickett Street and shout down Parliament. You know that, and if we do not stop it this is what will happen.

That is my point of order. I submit that Your Honour should take whatever steps are necessary under the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act to enforce the law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that both sides of the Honourable House are in agreement. (*Asides*) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You brought Eric Sealy and put him in here.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: When did I bring Eric Sealy and put him in here? You were not even in the Honourable House to know what was going on.

Mr. TAITT rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Please take your seat. Will honourable Members take your seats.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will honourable Members take their seats. (*Asides*) Honourable Members please take your seats! I find it very much out of order on both honourable Members who have been on their feet while the Chair was speaking. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is right. The Chair was on its feet.) The Chair has taken notice of the matter on which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister stood on a point of order and it will be reported to His Honour the Speaker whom I am informed has already taken steps to have the situation corrected. I will now entertain the honourable Member for St. Michael South. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Cowards, that is what you all are.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman,..... (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. (*Asides*) Please, we cannot have this behaviour in here. (*Asides*) Order, please. These

asides, please leave them out. The honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have referred to the fact that this Resolution, as far as I have been able to analyse it, is part of the sloppiness in the management of the affairs of this country to which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister made reference sometime ago and acknowledged that there was some sloppiness.

We have been concerned that a number of persons have been put to considerable anxiety in respect of their light and water bills being paid. A number of them have been very concerned by reports that the Government had no money with which to make payments and hence to obviate the very real possibility of their utilities, namely light and water, being cut off, we are saying that this rushed and hurried Resolution that is before us should really have been brought down quite some time ago when once the Government or the appropriate Minister had recognised that the amount of money provided to meet this particular need would fall short of budgeted amounts.

12.50 p.m.

Now, I do not know who is short-sighted in this matter. It could very well be, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister had done his homework, as we say, that he had foreseen that the amount provided in the current Estimates would fall short of that actually provided and that in good time he may have made a request through the appropriate governmental channels to have a supplementary brought down to this Honourable Chamber. That is a possibility.

It is also a possibility that the Minister might have been inefficient, and in fact not have anticipated the shortfall and might have only in very late times made a request through the appropriate Ministry, which is the Ministry of Finance. I have no means of knowing which of those alternatives actually obtained in the present circumstances, but I am certain that no Minister would allow himself to be charged with inefficiency in such matters without getting up and setting the record straight as to whether he was at fault or whether it was some other agency of Government over which he may not have had enough control in order to ensure that this very deserving need was met.

We are not quarrelling about the supplementary provision to provide additional funds so that those persons who obtain grants of one kind or another, whether they are handicapped, whether they are old age pensioners, whether they are children whose parents cannot make the necessary provision for them, we are not against these payments. We are saying that it is clear that there is a level of political mismanagement in the Government

which is alarming, and too many issues are surfacing which are indicative of such mismanagement.

Only recently there were some reports circulating in the Press that there was an insufficiency of funds, and old age pensioners and others would have to wait until the start of the new financial year. Now, when I saw that report my immediate reaction was, here it is in Parliament from November last year, and earlier in fact, routinely supplementary estimates were brought down to the House of Assembly in order to provide additional funds in those areas where there is a definite need for additional funds to be provided to meet the commitments of the Government, and I wondered how is it that a Government which says that it is a socialist Government, how is it that a Government which claims to have the interest and welfare of the poor at heart, how can a Government which proclaimed that it would pay utility bills could be so remiss as not to ensure that adequate funds may be in the vote at all times in order to meet the legitimate demands on those votes. So here we are today.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am having difficulty hearing the honourable Member because there are noises which I am hearing that are causing some difficulties in hearing his speech.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I can hear you quite all right.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You are not so near to the noises, and your ears might be better than mine. You are always hearing rumours anyhow.

I will draw to Your Honour's attention the specific provisions of section 24 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act, Cap. 9 of the Laws of Barbados passed in 1963:

"Any stranger who —

- (c) creates or joins in any disturbance which interrupts or is liable to interrupt the proceedings of either House while it is sitting,

is guilty of an offence and liable on conviction thereof by a magistrate's court to a fine of two hundred and fifty dollars or to imprisonment for six months or to both such fine and imprisonment."

Section 25, Sir: "An officer of either House may, without an order from a court and without a warrant, arrest any person who commits, in relation to the House of which he is an officer, an offence contrary to section 23 or section 24 in his presence."

This Act commenced on the 9th April, 1964 and it was passed in 1963. An officer of the House means

any person who may from time to time be appointed to the staff of the House, whether permanently or temporarily, and includes the Clerk and any police officer on duty.

I draw that to your attention, Sir. Those poor people outside are making themselves liable to a fine of \$250 for marching up and down Rickett Street and shouting, and it does nobody any good to continue to encourage it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do I hear from the Leader of the House a motion for the suspension? I will report progress and ask for leave to.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, before you report progress, the Prime Minister himself just read out the Act which was passed in 1963 when the now present Opposition had brought that Act into Parliament and had it passed through this Assembly. You came into power in 1961 and it was passed in 1963, and now today you are saying you are not supporting it.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
1.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me that this Honourable House has had its proceedings interrupted by noises coming from Rickett Street to the extent that the House could not hear itself. That is the extent to which the proceedings were interrupted. It is clear therefore that we cannot continue our debate under those circumstances, and it is for me as Speaker of this Honourable House to take such action as lies within my power to order that the march or demonstration of whatever from which the noise is emanating should be brought to a halt forthwith by the police who are officers of this Parliament whilst they are attached here.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I hope you will guide me on this. What we are complaining about is the noise. Don't "juck" him! I am big enough to say what I have to say, you clown!

Sir, it is the noises which we are complaining about, Mr. Speaker. It is the noises which this side has complained about, not the Opposition. They are not complaining. We on this side are complaining as the Government that there are noises coming from Rickett Street that are disturbing the proceedings of Parliament. I take responsibility for saying that now. It is not the House, it is the Government that complains, not the Opposition that passed the Law for us to complain.

Now, Sir, you are the head of the proceedings. It is not the marching around Rickett Street that I think we are complaining about. I have no objection to people demonstrating. It is the actual shouting, and maybe if the police can warn them that they should not shout — they can demonstrate. I have no objection personally. On the other hand, I leave this to your better judgment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought my information was that the honourable Member for St. Michael South was the first person who was addressing the Chair when he drew to the attention of this Honourable House the noise that was disturbing the proceedings of this Honourable House.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 1.30 p.m.

I think this would give enough time to bring this matter under control.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: May I speak on the motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: On the motion?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: For suspension. There is a motion made. Do you prevent me from speaking?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not preventing the honourable Member from speaking, but I am not hearing any honourable Member on such a motion.

The question that the Sitting be now suspended until 1.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

A VOICE: Divide!

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no cross talking in this Honourable House. I rule that there has been no proper call for a division, and I declare that the "AYES" have it.
1.10 p.m.

On Resumption —

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. The honourable Member for St. Michael South please continue. Head 44.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a situation in which the Government has promised to pay these utility bills, the water and light bills for persons in need.

As I have said already, there is absolutely no quarrel with the principles involved here. What we are talking about and what we are deeply concerned about over here is the capacity of the Government both from an administrative point of view as well as from a procedural point of view, to implement their promises smoothly and without bringing undue pressures or concern on to needy persons in this society.

The whole objective of the programme is to lighten the burden on the part of those who have problems. But instead of that, we have the reverse that problems have mounted up — that when some of these pensioners believe that their light bills and water bills have been paid, on the contrary what has been happening is that the light or the water is being turned off. Now something has to be wrong somewhere. Is that not a fact? *(Asides)*. I do not worry about licks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk. Please address the Chair.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is the situation. If you want to deny it, deny it. I am saying that some of my own constituents have been calling me and I have visited some of them with these problems. *(Asides)* I am not talking about 1976. We are talking about 1982.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Talk, talk. Will the honourable Member please address the Chair. Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: We are talking about the current situation and if you want to go back to that, if you want to go back to 1976 or 1974 or 1972, you can do that. I am talking about the current situation and something has to be wrong somewhere that we have this at the 11th hour — we do not even know if when we pass this particular supplementary here today whether the appropriate Department of Government will be able to process the matter so that the bills will be paid in time before the end of the financial year. We are only talking about days, Sir, this is what we are talking about and we are raising a legitimate question. What went wrong within Government that they were unable to handle these matters in an administratively efficient manner? *(Asides)*. What went right? More people getting money? That is right?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What we have is a situation where I do not know if it is overload — if the particular Ministry is unable to handle the matters efficiently through lack of staff when the temporary staff or whatever it is has been laid off, or if the Minister in fact has been doing his job and that for other reasons — maybe financial reasons — the supplementary could not be brought down before. But I do not believe that it is that one, I do not believe that it is that.

I believe that the problem is within the Ministry itself. I do not believe that it is that the Minister asked for these additional funds and could not get them. We would like to know the facts. It might be good to find out how many Ministries requested supplementaries and they were then piled up inside the Ministry of Finance, but I do not believe that is the particular case here. There must be a problem because we know that when persons write the Welfare Department that the Welfare Department send out replies promptly to the people that when the bills go into the Welfare Department that — it is in fact one of the more efficient Government Departments. I do not know if the Minister would agree with me because I believe that he had some problems. *(Asides)*.

He does not believe in welfare, he believes in a maintenance programme. Let us call it that. We are not calling it social welfare but it is clear to everybody, including persons who are supposed to be the beneficiaries under this programme, that something has gone wrong in this programme. We are calling upon the Minister to try to ensure that there is an efficient system put in place in order to administer the programme. *(Asides)*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member addressing the Chair?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Do you expect to get better than that? Anyhow, Mr. Chairman — I have increased my majority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, no cross talk.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: So, Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no quarrel with the principle involved here about the deficiency and we are wondering if it was within the Ministry itself or at the level of the Ministry of Finance.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Resolution. I would like to correct the misinformation of the last speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South. On page 24 of the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, General Elections 1981, under National Assistance, this is what he said "The re-elected

BLP Government will therefore implement a recreational programme," etc., etc. It said that, "the BLP Government will, in future, increase National Assistance payments to such person whenever Old Age Pensions are increased."

We never said that we would pay all the Waterworks bills or the Electric bills for the pensioners. This is the policy upon which we were elected to run the Government for the next five years. This is the policy of the Barbados Labour Party.

We have from time to time, as the Minister, — the honourable Member for St. Michael South East in particular has expressed, said that we as a Government shall try to pay as many of these bills as is possible, as many, Sir. We have never ever said on any public platform or in any written document — and I believe this document is already a document of this Honourable House — that we intend to pay all, so let me make it perfectly clear. The honourable Member for St. Michael South is misleading the House, Sir, — unintentionally.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am being accused of misleading the House and secondly I am being corrected. I have said that the Barbados Labour Party Government said that it would pay the light and water bills of old age pensioners and those in need. The honourable Member has not denied that. How am I misleading the House?
1.45 p.m.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, the impression he is giving is that we said on this side that we would pay every old age pensioner's water bill and electricity bill. That is the point. We never said that, Sir. As a matter of fact, no reference was made to it at all in the BLP Manifesto of 1981. Sir, one must remember that everything is relative. In 1981, Sir, 18 000 people were granted tax relief to the cost of \$18.7 million — unprecedented in the history of Barbados, 18 000 people in 1981 received tax relief to the tune of \$18.7 million. Sir, in 1976 when you earned \$25 a week, you paid tax. Today, you do not pay tax until you reach \$115 a week. So all those people who earn less than \$115 a week pay no tax. (Asides) In 1976, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: the very same old age pensioners.....(Asides).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, order.

Mr. A. TRUSS:.....The very same old age pensioners earned \$13 a week and had to pay five percent Sales Tax on everything that they bought. We abolished the five percent Sales Tax, Sir. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The five percent Sales Tax at the retail end is a regressive tax. It hurts those at the bottom more than it helps those at the top. So, we abolished it, we removed it and today, Sir, old age pensioners receive \$28 a week. Between 1961 and 1976, the Democratic Labour Party through 15 years of Government raised the old age pensions from \$2 a week to \$13. They increased it by \$11, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before I entertain the honourable Member, please let me ask the indulgence of all honourable Members on both sides of the Honourable House to consider the Reporters who are taking their records. Order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House, Sir. The honourable Member is making statements concerning the Democratic Labour Party between 1961 and 1976.....yes, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: and the statements he is making are not accurate, Sir. Furthermore, he is neglecting to point out that people could buy food during that time and nobody can buy food now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. (Asides) Order.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I may continue — that is no point of order, Sir, as you have probably ruled.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. The Chair has already ruled.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Between 1961 and 1976, the facts dictate, Sir, that the old age pensioners in 1961 received \$2 a week and by 1976 they were receiving \$13 a week and between 1976 and 1981 they were increased to \$15 and to \$28 a week. Those are the facts, Sir. Mr. Chairman, for all those persons over 65 years old.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An honourable Member.... (Asides) Order, please. An honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The honourable Member has accused me of misleading this Honourable Chamber and I want to refer to the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for 1976 which reads on page 12:

"ensure full implementation of the proposal to pay the water rates and electricity bills for old age pensioners".

(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: No point of order.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: How am I misleading the Honourable House?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. (*Asides*) The honourable Member is out of order. (*Asides*) I must have order in here. Please honourable Members, contain yourselves.

Mr. A. TRUSS: But, we never said all, Sir, and besides the people voted for us on June 18, 1981, based on the Manifesto of 1981 — not on what we promised in 1976.

You know, the Democratic Labour Party promised a cement plant in 1961, they promised a shoe factory, a flour mill and we implemented it. We have not seen a shoe factory yet because it is not part of our policy, Sir. There is a big difference between expressed policy and implementation of policy as the honourable Member for St. Michael South knows very well.

Sir, all of those people over 65 years are entitled to a special tax allowance, if not married, of \$4 000 a year and if married and the spouse is not working of \$5 000 a year. That is what this Government has done for old people. The chattel house owners can now claim repairs up to \$1 000 a year off their income taxes. And if they borrow from the bank to buy a chattel house, all the interest charges are also tax deductible. This Government introduced that, Sir.

We also introduced, Sir, a Home Help Service for the aged. The honourable Member for St. Michael East, I think it was, spearheaded many of these things and before him, the honourable Member for St. James — it is not St. James North — have been fighting for the cause of old people for more than 20 years, Sir... (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Old and needy)... and, the needy people. From the years that we were in Opposition we were fighting for them, Sir, and after 15 years in power, I do not believe that the honourable Members on that side have the right to come in here and dictate to us because we have out-performed them in five years — com-

paring their 15 years to our five years, Sir, we have out-performed them.

Sir, pensions for the blind. People who were 40 years could not get a pension if they were blind. We are reducing it to 15 years, Sir. You had to wait until you were 40 if you were blind. We reduced it to 25. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That is not true. That is not true.) If you were deaf and dumb in this country, you got no National Assistance until you were 40 years old. Today, you get it when you are 25, Sir.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the situation with respect to blind people and deaf and dumb is as follows. Persons.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must tell the honourable Member, you will have ample time to do this when you wind up. You have the last say. The honourable Member has the last say and I am sure you will clear.... (*Asides*).... Order, please. No honourable Member can put words in the mouth of another honourable Member. How does any honourable Member on any side know what an honourable Member is going to say?

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to help the Committee and to save time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept that very much, but it is not really a point of order. I am sure you will make a note of it anyhow. Please continue.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Everything is relative, Mr. Chairman, and we have increased the aid to all welfare institutions for the five years that we have been in power — the Thelma Vaughan Home, the Salvation Army, you name them. The subventions have been quadrupled in many cases. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Name one.) I just named two, Sir. We spent over \$29 million in National Assistance in 1981 Sir, — \$29 million compared to what the Dems — the DLP, the Honourable Members on the other side, Sir, their Party — spent in the 15 years that they were in power.

In addition to all of that, when you reach the age of 65, Sir, not only do you qualify for a pension, you can ride on all buses free. (*Aside*) The qualifying age to receive a pension when the Democratic Labour Party was in power was 68. We reduced it to 65, Sir, and if you are a widow, an old lady, you had to wait until you were 55 to get a pension. We reduced it to 50. Those are the facts, Sir. We can stand on this side and quote the facts, the facts of the last five years. The Labour Party has revolutionised welfarism. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: "Welfarism"?)

1.55 p.m.

Sir, I do not mean to trespass on the honourable Member's territory, that is the Minister who introduced

the Bill, but he is quite capable of adding to the few points which I have already made. I could not in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, sit here and listen to the honourable Member for St. Michael South getting away with the sort of insinuations and innuendo by stating that we on this side claimed that we would have given benefits in terms of paying water rates and electricity rates for all old age pensioners. That has never been the stated or written policy.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order again, Mr. Chairman. I never said in my speech that they had said all old age pensioners.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, the time is now 2 o'clock and I ask that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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 now suspended until 2.45 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.
2.00 p.m.

On resumption:-

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee. The honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, as I was saying, the Home Help Service cost the Government over \$380,000 last year. This service is primarily for the old age pensioners, those people who cannot help themselves, and the Government employs people to go around to their homes to clean the House, to change them, to bathe them, to cook their meals. This is what this Government has done, Sir. This Government has a social conscience.

As I have mentioned before, Sir, the qualifying age was 68 and this Government reduced it to 65 and

brought almost 2 000 old age pensioners into the mainstream of the welfare of \$28 a week. Before, if there was a husband and a wife, and the husband received an old age pension, and the wife was older than age 65, the wife was not entitled to the same pension. The wife was disqualified because her husband received a pension, but we have done away with that. Now, regardless of who receives a pension in the same household, once you reach the age of 65 you are entitled to your pension. If you are married and your husband is over age 65 he gets a pension, and if you are over age 65 you also get a pension.

There are 11 000 people registered with the Welfare Department, and this is a tremendous strain on the resources of a Government. At the Welfare Department you will find food stamps being given out, cash grants, clothing, gifts in kind, many other things, as well of course as paying electricity and water bills. Remember, Sir, when the Democratic Labour Party was in power in 1976, approximately 750 old age pensioners received help not on an annual basis, but those are the last figures available because it was an election year, and of course the Democratic Labour Party did all that was necessary to increase that facility. Prior to that they assisted 300 or 400 people on an annual basis, we now assist over 2 000 old people a year by paying their water and electricity bills.

This Government wishes that any old age pensioner would be entitled at some stage to have their water and electricity bills paid, but things take time, and slowly we will develop into that, hopefully.

Before I close, Sir, I would like to congratulate the Minister who introduced this Resolution. I think that he has brought to bear a great asset in dealing with these particular matters. His policy clearly is for the development of the masses, the people, and you can see clearly from the policy which he has embarked upon that he is genuinely interested in helping the needy and the old people.

I would like to say that I am very proud to be part and parcel of a Government and a party of which the honourable Member for St. Michael East is a member, and before him, Sir, let me re-emphasise the work which was done in this particular area by the honourable Member for St. James North. He has been fighting the cause for underprivileged since 1966 in this Honourable House, and it is based on the impetus which he gave this Government that we were able to act, and the honourable Member for St. Michael East was able to carry on the programme which the honourable Member for St. James North initiated.

Thank you, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I think that we have heard a number of speeches which all reflect hon-

ourable Members' concern for the welfare of the indigent and the aged in our society, and I would like to join in that concern. I would also like on behalf of the Government to express what really should be regret that the old age pension utility scheme should have got so out of hand as to exhaust the funds available for it. But welfare votes have a way of escalating, they have a way of carrying themselves far beyond what the original intention was.

I believe that the payment of utility bills for old age pensioners started many years ago. I really am not sure if 1969 is the date, you might very well find that it goes back to Local Government days and that there was some payment of utility bills for city pensioners by the St. Michael Vestry and the Bridgetown City Council, but at that time only cases of the most extreme need used to be considered, and although objective criteria are in general desirable, it seems that the subjective criteria that were used up until virtually last year worked better for 20 or 30 years perhaps than the objective criteria which we introduced.

2.55 p.m.

The objective criteria which we introduced turned out probably not to be objective enough. The rules, broadly speaking, were — and this was meant more to be an exclusionary than an inclusionary rule but it came to be considered inclusionary — that no old age pensioner could be eligible for the payment of utilities unless he or she lived alone or with another old age pensioner. This was to rule out all those old age pensioners who lived with their children, live in their children's houses and so on. But the rule came to be inclusionary so that all old age pensioners who lived alone began to consider that irrespective of other sources of income, they were fortified for payment of the utilities, and then the definition of "alone" came to be somewhat extended.

All of us are familiar with the concept of what is more or less a family compound particularly in the country. There is a piece of land, it belongs to the family, there is one house and the house gets added to. A young couple becomes middle-aged, and old parent then lives in a smaller house, all on the same land. Perhaps when the front house is made stone, the old wooden house that was there is salvaged and an old mother lives in it a few yards away. People in this position began to be regarded as living alone, and no attention was paid to the income desiderata and no limit was officially made as to the amount of utility bill which should be paid.

I have received two letters at my office from an old age pensioner very bitter because, I think, two electric bills were not paid — monthly bills. One was for \$78 and another was for over \$84.

Now to have a monthly electric bill of \$84, you have to have more than ordinary house lighting, an or-

inary refrigerator and a television set. You have to have a very big two-door fridge or a frost-free fridge, you have to have a colour television and you have to have some other appliance with a motor in it. In other words perhaps not just an iron.

And we begin to come face to face with the fact that there are many, many, and I think, Mr. Chairman, we are actually talking about thousands, not hundreds, of old age pensioners who each have at least a relative abroad who not only heartily supplements their income, but perhaps buys a nice fridge or some other nice appliance in the States and sends it down.

Now this is good and I welcome it and appreciate it, but I do not think that anyone considers that the Government can give an open-ended commitment to pay utility bills for persons in that position when there are so many more needy persons in this society. We have to remember that utility bills are not being paid only for the non-contributory old age pensioners. They are also being paid for National Insurance pensioners who get the minimum income. That number the Minister is reminding me, runs into hundreds.

The Government has therefore while introducing this Resolution to pay the past bills, got to look at the situation for the future. Counting the National Insurance minimum pensioners, there are over 25 000 old age pensioners in this country. I think it would be reasonable to assume that over 15 000 perhaps as many as 18 000 of them have, broadly speaking, their own household.

This is a country where many, many people live alone. It is not by international standards an overcrowded country, and at the same time the extended family concept does not necessarily extend to the same roof coverage. The phenomenon I mentioned earlier gives some indication of the circumstances where families live collected together, but very often in their own separate dwellings. It would in fact, Mr. Chairman, be impossible for the Government to think in terms of paying the utility bills for nearly a quarter of the households of Barbados, because old age pensioners do constitute a quarter of the households in Barbados.

We are getting to be an older and older country. There are many people who have emigrated, but the demographic structure of the population is indicating that every year there are going to be more and more old people. I do not think that the most relentless Opposition would really press on a Government the concept that you give a blank cheque to a quarter of the houses in Barbados in respect of water and electric bills. I do not think so. The correct way to deal with it is to put up the old age pensions and to make sure that National

Assistance of the sort spoken of by the Minister in his able introduction of this measure be given and monitored.

The Government will therefore have to impose much more restrictive criteria on the payment of utility bills in the future, and those who have had their utility bills paid in the past may expect that their cases will be reviewed to see if their need is really as great as would warrant the quite substantial sum of money involved in paying the bill.

Even if you put a minimum rate on utility bills, Mr. Chairman, you will find that a month's water, one-third of a quarter or a metered supply plus a month's electricity is going to come to more than a week's old age pension. It may come to two weeks' old age pension, and the Government has found itself effectively increasing the old age pension through the back door.

I venture to say that here in the House of Assembly it is very unlikely that anybody in going to tell us to double the old age pensions. It might be said in the heat of a moment of making a campaign point, but at a serious level no matter how much we may wish to do the best we can for the aged, we know that there are financial limits beyond which we cannot go, and I am hoping that when the Welfare Department introduces tougher criteria to ensure that only really needy old age pensioners have their bills paid and that the criteria used up to three years ago be re-introduced, that there will be general understanding that the Government and the Welfare Department found themselves in an open-ended situation which on any reckoning would be intolerable.

Mr. Chairman, the richest country in the world, the United States, has a minimum old age pension of \$US127 per month. That is the basic rate of non-contributory old age pensions in the United States. There is no rule in that richest country in the world that old age pensioners have their electric and water bill and heating bills paid. Needy old age pensioners receive welfare grants, heating grants, food grants, a whole range of grants which keep them above the poverty line, but not even the richest country in the world can afford to say there is a class of our population for which we are going to meet utility bills. Not in communist countries, not in the most highly developed communist welfare state is there any class of the population which has its utility bills paid.

3.05 p.m.

The payment of utility bills is fundamental. It is one of the fundamental things. It is more certain that you have to pay them than you have to pay taxes in every country of the world and Barbados cannot afford to be an exception.

We will put money in the hands of the pensioners — it would surely be an open secret by now that from April 1, the pensions will go up and provide adequate welfare programmes to take care of their needy but there will be no open-ended programmes which if carried to their logical extremities will ruin any Government, anywhere in the world.

The very fact that we stand before you today with this Resolution is an example of the danger of an open-ended commitment in respect of utilities. Were it not that the criteria had become somewhat relaxed and that the needy were being insufficiently taken into account in the decisions on the utility payments, we would not now need a Resolution on March 16 to supplement the Estimates that are now 51 weeks old, because that is really what it comes down to.

The very fact that the Government is put in this absurd position of running out of money in the Welfare Vote — I do not think that the Minister gave the figure but I think there is only a few thousand dollars left in that vote, is that right? A small amount of money is left in the vote and we would not be in this position had we not allowed our generosity and good thoughts for the aged out-run our financial discretion and out-run the canons of financial prudence.

The numbers whose bills will be paid now will have to be reduced. The Welfare Officer will have to make a review. The Government itself does not intend either, Mr. Chairman, to give any list of persons to the Waterworks or the Electric Company for whose bills it will be responsible. People's circumstances can change and those open-ended commitments are really quite impossible.

All of us can think of means of handling a situation where you have an old friend and the Government will pay his electricity bill willy-nilly. All of us can think of abuses of such a system that can ensue, and those who have the financial interest of our country at heart should all join with us in supporting a fresh look at this programme which will confine the payments for utility bills to those who are in real serious need and not those for whom it would be merely a convenience and afford the release of funds for some other, perhaps not absolutely necessary purpose. I think I seconded this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, and that is my contribution to the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think that the speech by the Hon. Prime Minister will come to this House as perhaps a further indication of the sobering of the Barbados Labour Party. Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Labour Party in 1976 was suffering, it appears to me, the problem of not having had responsibility for running a country for a considerable time and what we see here today is a sobering speech from the Prime Minister who is

recognising that a Government in power, a Government with responsibility for running the affairs of a country, is an entirely different kettle of fish from a group of persons who determine that they must become the Government in power at all costs, use hyperbole and andiose comments and statements to enhance their position and not pay attention to the final results which, should they come to power, is bound to haunt them when they come face to face with reality.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this document has been referred to before and I think it has to be referred to again. The Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party in 1976 was a document of superlatives. You must recall, Sir, "The Great Combination". It was a document of hyperbole. It was a document in which this kind of statement which I am now going to quote was the norm.

I do not wish to dwell on the free medical services which within weeks became not so free, but in this document on page 12, Sir, it said after listing a number of things which the Party would do, "the Party will also ensure full implementation of the proposals to pay the water rates and the electricity Bills for old age pensioners."

Mr. Chairman, any old age pensioner who read that document and read those words was bound to believe that the Government was promising to pay his or her electricity bills or water rates so long as he or she was an old age pensioner. And, Mr. Chairman, the tragedy of that problem today is not that the Government finds itself unable to meet that commitment, the tragedy is that the 25 000 pensioners which the Prime Minister now refer to have been misled through the words of the party in power into believing that their old age pensioner status would confer upon them the right to have their water bills and the electricity bills paid.

The untold harm which that promise now being rejected by the party in power has done, and must do to the old age pensioners in Barbados because they believed that they could anticipate such payments, will never be quantified. The harm which that has done and will do to those old people cannot be quantified and when it is considered that the Minister, the one responsible for Community and Welfare Services, stressed through visual and other aids, his commitment to old people, when you take all of this together and I have no doubt that it must have been genuine what we have is an expectancy.

Mr. Chairman, if it was only in the area of old age pensioners with water rates and utility payments it would perhaps merely be tragic. But mayhem has followed murder, Sir, and we find that this is applicable in a large number of spheres of activities of the citizens of this country. They have put their trust in princes and

they have believed what they were told and now, today becomes the beginning of the day of reckoning. The prince himself tells the people of the country we will have to review the criteria used. He calls upon the honourable Members of this Chamber to join with him in assisting the people of this country in the slow let-down.

The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that when you are dealing with persons, when you are dealing with ordinary people that kind of manipulation, that kind of movement upward and downward like yo yos by those who ought to know better, is more damaging and more dangerous than if those persons were taken out quietly and put away, because day after day they have to live the degradation, the lack of dignity which is inherent in the fact that a person who has lived in this country and who has contributed, who has been led to an assurance that if he or she merely sends the bill or post it to the Welfare Department, it would be paid — and not having heard anything for two or three months, they assume that it has been paid. Every honourable Member in this Honourable Chamber is aware of the plight of those old people now when the bills through inertia and through administrative inefficiency on the parts of Departments in the Government come back to them, three or four months later with arrears.

3.15 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political matter. This is more a sociological matter. This a question of how we as people who represent those people must feel as we come face to face with the pain and the shame, especially the shame, when those old people have to come furtively and suggest that they need assistance.

Mr. Chairman, we, on this side cannot take any solace in the plight in which the Government finds itself today. If it were merely going to affect them, Sir, we would take a lot of pride in damning them, but it has nothing to do with them. Each honourable Member on that side is able to pay his utilities and is able to pay his water so we are not concerned about them, and therefore we do not see their political party in those terms.

We are concerned that the ordinary people, the masses of this country, have been led to believe that a Daniel had come to judgment and now, we are discovering that it was nothing more than froth. That is not the only time that the Rt. Hon. gentleman would come to this.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I heard the word, "fraud".

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Froth, Sir. I would never accuse him of fraud, Sir, never. I leave that to others.

Mr. Chairman, the Rt. Hon. gentleman from St. Thomas will come back to this Honourable Chamber

again and again and again during the next four years and call upon honourable Members in this Honourable House to join with him and assist him. And, you know what, Sir? In the interest of this country and in the interest of the people in this country, we are going to assist him, not in the way he asks us, but we are going to assist him in the way he needs to be assisted.

We are going to explain to the people that they must bear their pain and their shame if they have it, and we are going to explain to them that better must come — in his own words, “better must come”. We are going to explain to them little by little, each single one of them, day by day, that they were taken to the river and they were shown the Promised Land. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: You got misled by your own men.) (Laughter) We will tell them, Sir. The honourable Members over there may be laughing, but I know they are not laughing because they are happy. I know they are laughing because, well, they might be slightly embarrassed by the ringing truth of what I am saying, Sir. They too are representatives, as Your Honour is.

I am not going to take this opportunity to berate the Government. The Government does not need any berating any more in this country. It is a Government without credibility. It is a Government that has lost the confidence of the people. It has lost the confidence of the people through its own actions.....(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: We have just won though and you have five years to go, and a week is a lot in Government.)..... and through its cynicism, Sir, — that Government's cynicism rings through its utterances inside and outside of this Honourable Chamber.

They say *sotto voce* or not so *sotto voce* that they have four years to go. (Aside) That is true. That is true, but — the Rt. Hon. Member, the Rt. Hon. gentleman from St. Thomas puts up his hand and shows me five years — let us hope that the people will wait five years. It is in the interest of this country that you pray that the people wait five years because, Sir, the honourable Member for St. Peter used to say that, “a hungry man is an angry man”. He said nothing about disappointed people, he said nothing about old people who have been led like lambs to the proverbial slaughter and who now hear that we cannot have an open-ended policy — that Government will have to impose much more stringent criteria.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know, Sir. I know the time will fly fast, Sir. Financial levels beyond which we cannot go, all of these are words which will come now from the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance — and the honourable gentleman who introduced this Resolution is probably the one who will have to bear the brunt out-

side. We on this side understand the situation. We on this side clearly understand that so long as that honourable gentleman has responsibility for Welfare Services that the rules are going to become even more stringent. But we shall say no more at this point.

I will merely say this in winding up, Sir, the appointment of the Public Assistance Committee has not indicated by policy, the words which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister uttered here today. On that Board, Sir, they have appointed nothing else but political rejects. They have appointed as Chairman, a political reject. They have appointed another political reject from St. Michael South and yet another political reject from North West and already the Chairman, the potential Chairman — I believe he is appointed — is going through the environs of Bridgetown indicating to people, all you have to do is come to me. Well, the Rt. Hon. gentleman had better speak to the Chairman of the Public Assistance Committee and stop him.....(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: He is worrying about Brath.)

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is the honourable Member speaking of the next honourable Member for St. Michael West?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I speak of cynicism, Sir, and you see it boldly. I am trying to suggest to him to stop a man from breaking the hearts of poor old people and he gets up and he makes light of it. That is the nature of that Government — uncaring. But in due course, that Government will also be uncared for.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe if it were possible, Sir, I would do everything in my power to get the Government to create a post in the Ministry of Culture, Sir, so that the honourable Member for St. Michael West would be the director of all the drama and theatrical stunts you think you can have in a Parliament, Sir. (Hon. Miss. B. A. MILLER: I will support that post.) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Are you coming Billie? On condition that you take Billie.) The honourable Member asked me. “How soon do you hope to finish?” I said, it depends on you on the other side.

Sir, well, I have nothing to say so we can go home early, only a few strangers in the gallery, Sir.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. What the honourable Member is saying is quite correct, but it was before the Honourable Prime Minister got up and made the speech he made, but if he believes that the Prime Minister can make that speech in here and we have

nothing to say about it, he must be out of his cotton picking mind.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is the point I am making, Sir. He had absolutely nothing to say. If tomorrow anyone looks at Hansard and reads what the honourable Member said, it was lacking in depth, no content, hands to the sky, I mean Jimmy Springer must be afraid of him in the church. Absolutely nothing.

The position, Sir, is this. A question was raised by the Acting Leader of the Opposition as to why we have returned here for a supplementary. I think that was the legitimate question raised. The reason why we came back for a supplementary was because there were a number of house fires last year, more than usual, where a number of old age pensioners as well as some welfare recipients were involved. The Government had to replace furniture, stoves, beds and things of that nature. Then there was an increase in pensions coming on, and the vote up to the end of 1981 was not enough to carry us through, and that is why we are here this evening seeking a supplementary.

There is no doubt, it is a fact that this Government has a good track record in Welfare in this country. I will say this for the Opposition. You have a track record that if I had to give you a plus you would get it in education. You introduced free secondary education, let us accept that. You cannot remove that, but when it comes to a track record for the senior citizens of this country, you are a G-Class horse, you are not in this. You should be ashamed to get up here this evening and talk about poor old people. What do you know about it? I will tell you what you did for them. You took them from \$2.40 and took 15 years to give them \$10.60. That is what you did, and gave them a free ride on the bus. That is your contribution to the welfare in this country over a period of 15 years, and when Mr. Reynold Weekes was in Parliament he introduced the paying of the old age pension by cheque.

Now, Sir, the Government had to return here to get additional funds to pay the water bills and the light bills for the senior citizens. But I would say this about that particular scheme, I was involved in it when I was Minister of Welfare. It is a scheme which has been abused. Let us get this very, very straight. It is an outstanding scheme conceived by this Government, but a scheme which can be abused, and which I am sure has been abused. I will go on to say how it has been abused, Sir.

You have a number of public officers who allow their political sentiments to overrule their better judgment. I will repeat it, some public officers who allow their political sentiments to overrule their judgment. I will keep quiet on that because you will say that I cursed the civil servants. Let me repeat. Some public

officers allow their political sentiments to overrule their judgment, and because of that, the scheme has been abused, and can be abused and therefore the scheme needs monitoring properly.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. James North were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw a reference to what I am talking about. People are well off and living in homes with sons and daughters presenting their home with an income when the months come, and yet they have the electric bill and the water bill in the name of the grandmother or the grandfather. That is where they abuse the scheme, and that is why the scheme must be monitored.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. James North were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

Now, Sir, my colleague has demonstrated here today what this party's Manifesto over the years has set out, and which was demonstrated in the last five years when we were in the Government. He read it out point by point.
3.35 p.m.

We reduced the age from 68 to 65 thereby bringing on more people to the programme. We increased the pension from \$13 to \$28; provided for them not only repairs to their homes by putting in a board or stopping a hole, but also putting in toilets and baths, and I would say without fear of contradiction that there is no party in the history of this country that built as many houses for the old age pensioners in any session as this party under its present Minister.

This is what you call caring for the aged, but today you are hearing in here some hurrah about a water bill not being paid and electricity being turned off from pensioners. The scheme has been abused and is still being abused. It should be monitored and properly monitored.

There has been an increase in fires over the years thereby putting additional strain on the Welfare Department. For that matter the Minister seeks a supplementary to the Estimates. The Opposition are in no position to talk about welfare in this country. They have a bad track record, and when the honourable Member for St. Michael West could make reference to what the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance said, we accept and it is accepted publicly that the present Barbados Labour Party Government as constituted is still the best governing party in the entire Caribbean, and I believe, Sir, that I could go beyond the region. I was going to say the Western Hemisphere.

If you support it, I am happy to see how patriotic you are that when you go overseas you can tell your friends not the Democratic Labour Party in Opposition but the Barbados Labour Party led by the present Minister is the best governing party in the western hemisphere. You have just said it. You feel proud saying that as a Barbadian. You did not feel proud on the last occasion. You had to hang your heads in shame for lack of caring for the people who made a contribution to the society.

I hope I have answered your question as to the reason why we are coming for this supplementary. There is an increase in expenditure due to a number of house fires thereby necessitating the replacement of furniture, crockery and cutlery, and many more people came on to the scheme, and therefore there was not enough money in the vote. That is why we have come here this evening seeking this supplementary, and I hope you will never get up in here again to talk about welfare. You can talk about education and I believe there is another area that you can talk about, but I do not hear you talk about it. You are so dumb as to what is going on around you. Do not tackle welfare. You have a bad track record.

Sir, I will say finally in winding up that I am supporting this Resolution and I sincerely hope that my words will not fall on deaf ears as far as the monitoring of this scheme is concerned. It is a scheme which can be abused. As long as Government funds are involved, people set out to abuse such schemes, and then when they are called upon to pay taxes to supplement, there is a cry of too many taxes. I can only call on the Minister whom I believe will do everything in his power to correct the situation.

Honourable Members on the other side have been singing praises of the Hon. Minister. We do not want you all to sing his praises. All of a sudden you are saying he is a nice fellow and he can talk good. He was born in the Barbados Labour Party many, many years before me, in fact since the Fifties, so these cheap phrases that you are singing about his being a good Minister are unnecessary. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was also born in the Barbados Labour Party, so he is only a renegade. You are a political rebel. You got bought with a Consul-Generalship in New York.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, it is offensive to any honourable Member and certainly offensive to the honourable Member for St. Michael West to say that he was bought with a Consul-Generalship.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw the remarks. He was offered a post of Consul-General in New York and he became a Dem as from then.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief intervention because the main thrust of this debate seems so far to have been missed by the spokesman from the Government side. The question that has been raised out here is not why the supplementary is here, but why it is here so late. Was there inefficiency inside the Ministry responsible for Welfare or was it held up in another Ministry? That is the argument, not why the Resolution is here. It is why the old people have been put to all the problems, concerns and worries, threatened with water being cut off and light being cut off. Why wasn't it foreseen that the amount of money provided would be inadequate to meet the projections? That is the question and I would welcome a reply from the Minister.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, before I respond to the question of the honourable Member for St. Michael South, it is necessary for me to indicate to this Honourable House what I have been trying to do within the area of social development. The first point that must be made is that the Ministry of Community Services have fashioned a new orientation and we have moved radically away from the poor law programme of welfarism. Now such a radical departure within this domain could not be achieved at one swoop because in addition to functional changes of a drastically different nature, it is necessary for it to be carried on within a different bureaucratic context.

A social development programme is predicated upon the assumption that the object of the social sector is to ensure a minimum level of material existence for all human beings consistent with an order which I should like to be described as civilised, which means that the Ministry set certain minimum standards with respect to housing. We insisted that all housing for the elderly and the indigent should be wind and water tight and as a consequence of this, a so-called housing welfare programme was accelerated.

3.45 p.m.

In 1978-79 \$400 000 was spent on the housing Programme for the repair and replacement of houses for the elderly and the indigent. In the following year, \$800 \$800 000 was spent. In the year before the last financial year, \$800 000 was spent on that programme and this year approximately \$800 000 will be spent and the increase in the number of houses repaired and replaced represent something like 5 000 per cent over what was done in the seven years between 1969 to 1976.

Mr. Chairman, having dealt with the problem of housing we then looked at the conditions within the homes. We felt that we could not tolerate a situation where many old people in this country were sleeping in rags on the floor and so our National Assistance Pro-

gramme in kind, for the proper furnishing of these houses, was considerably beefed up.

We also felt that the elderly within this society ought to move with a high degree of cleanliness and presentability within the society. We therefore instituted a Home Help Programme which would ensure that those old people who were weakened by reason of age but were not infirmed enough to be institutionalised could enjoy proper home care within their own homes and this also assured them of having clean clothes that they could wear on the street whenever they went on the streets.

The Home Care Programme started in the financial year 1980 to 1981 with \$100 000 and to date it is projected that we will spend in the coming financial year nearly half a million dollars on Home Care. And this must be made very clear, Mr. Chairman, there are many people who believe that all expenditure on social development programmes represents a wasteful and unproductive use of money. In order to meet this kind of objection, the Ministry of Community Service has been careful to examine the economic and social development and so we have a situation within the Home Help Programme where the National Assistance Board caters to 500 elderly persons and last year we spent \$380 000 in looking after 500 old people within their homes. When we compared this to the \$5 million which has been spent on the St. Michael Infirmary to maintain 428 persons, the point is made that these programmes of social development, if properly thought out, are cost effective programmes. And I want to make it crystal clear that there are people walking about creating the impression that whenever money is spent in the social development area, it is unproductive and wasteful and we have demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt through the development of the Home Help Programme that we have devised a much cheaper and more economical way in dealing with the problems of weakened old people than maintaining them in expensive institutions such as the District Hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, moving from that, when our old people go on the streets, we want to see them looking good and we have therefore increased the allocations for dentures, spectacles and things of that nature. That is the social development programme which seeks to ensure that valuable groups such as the elderly within the society maintain a minimum standard of material comfort. That is the purpose of a social development programme.

Now a social development programme is predicated on the assumption of a growing economy and when there are factors such as those that now exist which militate against economic expansion, then it has a deleterious effect upon the expansion of a social development programme. So in periods such as this, our social develop-

ment programmes have to be tailored to what is going on in the other sectors of the economy.

This is nothing new. There is nothing mysterious about this. In every society where social development programmes as distinct from welfare programmes are implemented, it is recognised that there is an inextricable relationship between the growth of the social development sector and the entire economy of the country. So if we are in a recessionary phase in our economic development, it is only to be expected that the growth within the social development sector would be affected. This is a slowing down, a temporary break on the development of this particular sector which seeks to ensure that the people of this community maintain minimum standards of material comfort.

There has been much talk in this debate about the payment of light and water bills, but it should be emphasised that more than half of the amount of money requested is allocated to other transfer payments. Over \$177 000 of this money sought will go towards other National Assistance payments in cash which brings me to the question raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South raised the question as to the delay in the presentation to the Honourable House of this Resolution, and like so many thinkers today, he drew the Pavlovian conclusion that to be late or not to foresee or not to be in a position to predict, is to be inefficient.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the assumptions that all proposals and recommendations must have a high predicted value to the indices of efficiency have been laid to rest by the prices in economic and other social science theory. It is long recognised that where you have perimeters that are not susceptible to quantification, it is not easy to predict and I shall be more specific having made that general point.

No Welfare Officer, no matter how experienced he is, can indicate with any degree of certainty the number of clients that will seek assistance from the Welfare Department in one month, one week or even as brief a period as one day. The multifarious reasons that force people to seek the assistance of the Welfare Department are such that they are not available to any man that was born of woman. Only God can tell you how many people would go to the Welfare Department any one day and in fact, the empirical evidence of the administration of the Welfare Department reveals that there is not one single year — and I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South once had responsibility for Welfare as distinct from Social Development — no one year passed when it was possible for the Welfare Department to

estimate with any degree of accuracy the number of people who would be seeking assistance in any single category.

3.55 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South well knows that in the grants of assistance in cash and kind other than old age pensions, there is a system of virement in existence where money allocated to one category of Cash Grant is freely applied to other categories of Cash Grant.

Faced with this situation and faced with a tight financial problem within the country.....(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is it).....the Welfare Department and the Ministry of Community Services proceeded with the utmost circumspection. We waited to see if there would be an adequate amount of money left over from any sub item so that it could be utilized for the payment of cash grants as well as — the payment in kind insofar as they relate to light and water bills and it was only at the very last moment when it was crystal clear that we would not have been able to save enough money given the quantum of demand made upon the Welfare Department by its clients that we brought this Resolution.

Indeed, had this Resolution been brought one month ago, we would have been asking for something like \$600 000. But in the light of the experience that we cannot predict the number of clients who will come to the Welfare Department, we decided to wait until the last minute and not tax the Consolidated Fund unnecessarily. That is exactly why there is the delay in bringing this and it has absolutely nothing to do with what the honourable Member for St. Michael South chose to describe as inefficiency.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I wonder if while the Hon. Minister is on that if he could answer the question as to why it has taken three to four months for persons who had referred their utility bills to the Department to have those bills referred back, and what steps he is taking, if any, to speed up that system? If the bills are not going to be paid, I think the people should know as early as possible.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the amount of money allocated for the payment of utility bills was exceeded, but it was felt in the light of what I have just been explaining that if we wait, we might be able to divert through savings from allocations to Cash Grants, some money which would go to the payment of utility bills.

This is precisely why there was this delay and I want to assure the honourable Member for St. Michael West, Mr. Chairman, that all of those persons whose utility bills are now within the custody of the Welfare Department will have these bills paid as soon as the pro-

per authorization is derived from this side. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What about the ones that are sent back?) Pardon me? People who come to the Welfare Department and present their bills will be assessed on the basis of demonstrated need.

I have already been careful to explain, Mr. Chairman, that a social development programme contracts and expands in consonance with the contraction and expansion of the wider economy.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member does not give way. Oh, he has.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some confusion here because some old age pensioners, some of them handicapped, in a number of cases both of them, both husband and wife suffer handicap and bills have been returned to persons on the grounds that there is no money in the vote to pay those bills and we are asking on this side what is to happen to those persons to whom bills have been returned.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if bills have been returned by any officer of the Welfare Department, that officer has been acting in a manner that is in violation with clear directives which were issued by me. *(Asides)* Pardon me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I made it unequivocally clear to the appropriate official in my Ministry to transmit to that department the directive that all bills are to be held until such time as the Welfare Department was in a position to pay them.

If actions other than those have been carried out, they were carried out in conflict with ministerial directives.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way, Sir. The honourable Member is giving way. I would like the Hon. Minister, in the light of the statement which he has just made to this Honourable House, to assure us that from the date of the transmission of his directive, all those bills which were obviously returned contrary to the directive, will be included in the assurance which he gave to this Honourable House about those in possession. I think that would be the only fair method of dealing with this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have about two minutes more.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, the situation would be handled in a manner that is reasonable and fair to all. I give that assurance. *(Laughter)* Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have about two minutes to wind up .
4.05 p.m.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it is necessary for me to go any further. As I understand it, the Acting Leader of the Opposition said that the only point with which his side was concerned was the timing of the presentation to this Honourable House, and I believe I have explained why this has been done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The question that Head 44 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. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this brings Government Business to a close. I think we can safely say this was one of the longest sittings ever in the history of Parliament. I would like to say thanks to the Reporters and the staff of Parliament who work under some very trying conditions.

I can also say in advance that we are going to come back on Monday at 10 o'clock to start the Estimates and I have no doubt that the honourable gentlemen on the other side will have enough time to prepare their work — almost a whole week and a weekend to go into retreat to get all the information the shadow Minister of Finance requires to deal with the country's economy, the Transport Levy, Health Levy and all these levies which he will talk about again. I will try to look at Hansard very carefully to make sure that you are not repeating yourself.

Sir, with those few words, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Monday, March 22, 1982 at 10.00 a.m.

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.
4.13 p.m.