

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 - 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 22nd March, 1982.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.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); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Q.C., M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A., (Econ.); Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Education); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Health); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A., (Minister of Labour and Social Security); Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M. A., LL.B. (Hons.); Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. P. M. GREAVES; 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.; Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN and Mr. A. TRUSS.

Prayers were read by Archdeacon Frank A. Cayless.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Hon. Del. O. BRADSHAW entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that there are no Minutes ready for confirmation at this time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received a Message from the Other Place respecting

amendments to a Bill. Such amendments seek to make the clauses of the Bill correspond to the long title of the Bill.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Message which you have received from the Other Place, I shall be seeking the leave of the House during this sitting to deal with this matter, if it be the pleasure of the House.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Drawback of Duties (Imported Tobacco used in the Manufacture of Blended Tobacco or Smoking Tobacco for Export) Regulations, 1982.

The Drawback of Duties (Locally Manufactured Cigarettes) Regulations, 1982.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Halls Road, St. Michael for the purpose of road improvement, and

A Resolution to approve the abandonment of the compulsory acquisition of land at Howells Cross Road and Two Mile Hill, St. Michael.
10.30 a.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central; his notice of motion in respect of the Barbados National Bank.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

"Whereas the 1980 Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados National Bank laid in Parliament, on the 2nd February, 1982 revealed an unsatisfactory performance by that Institution

And whereas the Barbados National Bank can play an important role in the recovery in this country,

Be it resolved that this House call upon the Government to take urgent steps to improve the efficiency of that Institution."

Thank you.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Philip South, his question about the Berlin Road.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:

To ask of the Minister of Transport and Works —

1. Is the Minister aware that Berlin Road, Woodbourne and Seaview Road towards Hareville in the constituency of St. Philip South are in a dire state of disrepair and that they become impassable whenever there is a downpour of rain?
2. Would the Minister indicate what steps he proposes to take to remedy the deficiencies and would he also state when he proposes to take such steps?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18 and 20 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the Instant Order of the day. Order No. 1 — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to grant the sum of money from out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1982.

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has had a very difficult financial year during the period 1981 — 1982. International recession sharpened very considerably during the first quarter of last year and reached Barbados effectively in the second quarter. This immediately began to make itself felt in a short-fall in tourists and also in a short-fall of investments caused partly by the recession and partly by other factors.

The Government has often been the first to feel the pinch of difficult economic times overseas, because imports tend not to go up and Customs revenues therefore tend to fall. Exports also, if they go up, do not necessarily go up as abundantly as in good years, and economic activity in the country is therefore affected. And if this comes at the time when the burden of taxation has been substantially relieved on the community, then, inevitably, the revenue will suffer — and the revenue has suffered during the year 1981—1982.

This time last year, we estimated that revenue would be \$483.7 million. It looks as if revenue will reach the figure of only \$463 million. The shortfall is due to a number of causes. Direct taxation, of course, is much less. We did reduce Income Tax in 1980 by approximately 28 per cent, by measures which would lead to approximately 28 per cent less tax being collected. But the other taxes have also been less buoyant and, of course, taxes which depend directly on tourist arrivals as one would readily understand has been least buoyant of all.

At the same time, Sir, expenditure has by no means been as modest in its growth as revenue. The Memorandum on the Estimates is therefore estimating that the total current expenditure for the year will be \$473.4 million and we are therefore projecting a Current Account deficit of \$10 million.

10.40 a.m.

This is necessarily vague because this week that we are actually in now, Sir, is the week when Corporation Tax payments are being realised, and we are unable to estimate with any accuracy what the Corporation Tax will bring until the returns are processed by the Department of Inland Revenue. That procedure goes on to the end of the month of March.

We are estimating Capital Expenditure at \$200.205 million. This at least follows very closely the estimate of Capital which was \$199.4 million this time a year ago.

I want to say something, Sir, about the many commentaries that we have been seeing on Government financing in Barbados and its effect on the Balance of Payments and on economic activity in the country. I have been very amused to see one or two economists who, instead of using scientific methods of analysing the facts and figures and coming to a conclusion on them, appear to come to a conclusion in advance and interpret the facts and figures according to either their ideological or their partisan political point of view and therefore, I would suggest, tend to introduce a bias into proper analysis of the figures.

There are some economists who take up a political position that there should be no wage restraint, and in contradiction of common sense, contrive to look at Barbados' economic statistics and say that when you give people more money, they do not spend it on imported goods — and therefore, wage increases have no effect on the Balance of Payments. This is obviously so ridiculous that I am astonished that people who can be employed by the university to teach our students, can put it forward as a serious point of view.

But more dangerous, perhaps, is the fact that one of these economists who has the ears of politicians, mainly represented in the Opposition, should be putting forward with some force monetarist views that would do no discredit to Professor Milton Friedman and his two principal practitioners on monetarism President Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher — and these monetarist views are put forward by an Opposition spokesman without his even understanding the nature of what he is saying. Just for the edification of the public, I would suggest that if you put down all of a country's economic woes to the expansion of the money supply, whether that expansion is achieved by straightforward printing of money or by Central Bank credit in one form or another, or by borrowing funds which are available in the private sector, you are in fact putting yourself in the camp of those who believe that unemployment is an acceptable economic policy to deal with the woes of a country — and who believe that there are instant solutions to economic problems, in this case monetarism which operate to the exclusion of a more balanced and all round policy.

I read a letter in the *Advocate* newspaper signed "R. C. Haynes" — I do not know if it refers to any Member of this Honourable House — in which there was a great deal of fulmination about the printing of money, the expansion of the money supply and its effect on Barbados. That letter would not be out of place over the signature of Margaret Thatcher, over the signature of Keith Joseph, over the signature of David Stockman or

others of the far economic right who believe that the best thing a Government can do to restore economic health to a country is to restrain transfers to poor people, restrain welfare systems by the monetarist tool. And, particularly I have to realise that even though the local practitioner of this economic point of view may not understand that what he is being told to put forward is a straightforward monetarist analysis — his training in economics, I think, is insufficient for him to grasp that — surely he, and all of us, can grasp that when you put the Government's economic problems down to spending too much on Capital, that you are striking directly at employment — and that any exhortation to spend less on Capital Works is an exhortation to make sure that unemployment will increase in our country.

It is therefore not the Government's intention — although in the current financial year we have marked time on Capital projects — to abandon in the forthcoming financial year, the useful and productive employment creating opportunities which the ongoing programme of public activity has created in Barbados. If we had not spent \$200 million in the current financial year on Capital works in the island, we would not have reduced unemployment to 10.1 per cent at the end of last year — and this is something to be made abundantly clear.

I observed that there is another critic, who I cannot accuse of any partisan, political bias, who writes in the newspapers and says that Capital works should be left to private enterprise. If private enterprise is going to build a magistrate's court at Oistins or a new headquarters for the Ministry of Agriculture — and do so at less cost to the Government than the cost which the Government has undertaken, I would be glad. But if you know of any company in Bridgetown that is going to carry on infrastructural Capital works out of its own resources to help the Government and the taxpayers of Barbados, I do not know of one. It is necessary for the Government to maintain productive investment on Capital works both from the point of view of unemployment and from the point of view of improving the infrastructure of the island.

For what it is worth, the international agencies — as anyone with acquaintance with them will confirm — tend to encourage spending productively on Capital works, and suggest that cuts fall wherever possible on current expenditure, especially transfer payments, other than on Capital works which go to build the economy as a whole. Barbadians will be very proud to hear, I am sure, when the Budget is delivered, that despite our economic problems during 1981, despite the continuing international recession and despite the difficulties of management which are confronting the Government, that gross capital formation in Barbados increased by a considerable amount last year, and that we are investing usefully and

productively even at a time when we are facing international winds buffeting us from side to side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned unemployment. I would want to deal with a few other economic indicators before I go into the statistics of the Estimates now before the Hon. House. I want to deal with these indicators because it is the Government's argument that the economic problems of Barbados, occasioned by the outside difficulties, are felt mainly in the area of the Balance of Payments that if they were an irresponsible Government, perhaps the Balance of Payments might have been allowed to decline to any new floor without the public being taken into the confidence of the Government, and that you might be in a real crisis before you knew where you were. In the United States, balance of payments problems are minimum since the American currency is the international medium of exchange, and it is open to any American to pay in his own currency for anything he brings from overseas, therefore their Balance of Payments problems do not show up in a shortage of foreign exchange — they show up in the effect on the economy itself.

10.50 a.m.

The monetarist theory is that printing money to pay for overseas services in the United States forces up inflation. To some extent indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is true, but it is inflation that America pays for balance of payments problems, not in foreign reserves. The measures to deal with inflation adopted at the present time in the United States feed into unemployment, and so the nature of the American economy managed as it is now, is that the American public is given the choice between unemployment and inflation. Very broadly the same is true of the United Kingdom — although ten years ago perhaps it was not true — and Balance of Payments problems were those which were addressed by the managers of the economy — and you got fluctuations of the pound and movements of the British reserves.

Now, in Barbados it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to manage the economy in such a way as to avoid excessive inflation, avoid excessive unemployment and deal with the balance of payments problem as your principal and main problem — and this is the formula which the Government is adopting. I say without undue modesty that despite our economic difficulties, it has not been an unsuccessful approach.

Inflation in Barbados is far nearer to international inflation than it has been perhaps at any time since the 1960s. It is virtually impossible to reduce the inflation rate in Barbados where over 60 per cent of our GDP is represented by imports below that of our principal trading partners. If prices go up in the United States by 10 per cent, inevitably they are going to go up in Barbados by 9, 10, 11 or 12 per cent — something close to 10. Under the previous regime when they went up in the United States by 13 per cent they went up in Bar-

bados by 40. Under our dispensation, inflation rates in the United States have been on the margin between single digits and double digits, between 9 and 10 per cent, and ours have been on a margin between 12 and 13.

But I do have some good news from the Statistical Department — the rate of inflation over the last few months in Barbados has fallen very drastically. Over three months it has risen by only 1 per cent, food prices have in fact fallen. These are things you can tell people, Sir, but we are well aware that nobody ever believe that prices fall, but the average price of food has fallen since November last year. In fact, it has only risen 3.5 per cent in the last six months.

The current 12 month inflation rate at the end of February was 9.9 per cent, at the end of January 11 per cent, and at the end of the year 12.8 per cent. So we can see that inflation is declining, and this is a blessing for which we should be glad, because I can certainly make no promise that prices in Barbados will stay the same or that food prices will fall when we reach difficult times in the middle of the year with no local food production, and so on.

Unemployment in Barbados has also been modest compared to our average. It has already been published that during the year 1981, again despite economic difficulties, that unemployment fell. The average level of unemployment during the past year is now being worked out, but the end of year level was between 10 and 11 per cent.

This sounds a lot, Mr. Speaker, but we have to set that against the fact that, perhaps for the first time in recorded history, unemployment is less in Barbados than it is in Britain, and not much more than it is in the United States. These are spectacular statistics because we have never been a country of full employment. No Government has ever been able to achieve full employment in this country, employment that is at the level where the number of people seeking jobs was less than the number of jobs available.

What it has to be compared with is the 22 per cent at the end of 1975 when the Government was awash with money, having had the most successful year for sugar cane ever known in our long history, and was still unable to get the boys off the street corners and the girls out of their homes into factories for useful employment — and away from the social pressures to which unemployment leads.

I am not satisfied that there should be 10 per cent unemployment. At the very least, I would like to see unemployment in single digits. I cannot promise you for this year, but with good fortune, good management, we will see it happen next year, 1983.

The only thing that I would say further about unemployment, because I have no doubt that we are going to hear about layoffs and so on in the Government Service, is this — the number of persons employed by the Government in 1980 was in the region of 22 500. That is a very large number. It was then out of a working population of less than 100 000, that is, the population actually at work. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that that was too high a percentage.

You cannot cure unemployment by employing people at the taxpayers' expense. Many countries have tried this, and all who tried it remained poor. You can cure it only by productive investment, following policies which create permanent jobs. It is better to spend a million dollars, put up a factory which will employ 100 people than to try to pay 100 people \$10 000 a year. At the end of the year you are still paying the hundred people, and you have no base for useful employment for them, except the burden of tax collection.

That figure of 22 500 includes not only the Public Service, properly called, but the Statutory Corporations, both those which receive subventions from the Treasury and those which are commercial and do not receive such subventions. Where one would put the BMC now, I do not know, Sir. That used to be one which you had to bail out so often at least now it is one which can run on its own without making any demands on the Exchequer.

The number of persons this week being employed by the Government is approximately 25 300, so there has been a fall of 200 people, that is all, in the last two years in Government employment. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the number of persons employed in the country has increased by several thousands and the unemployment rate itself has been reduced, and I think that this is a very reasonable, pragmatic argument supporting the theory that it is better for Government to create employment opportunities by a more skillful use of the taxpayers' money than it is to maintain a padded and overburdened Civil Service staff roll in the belief that you are contributing to over-all employment in the country.

11.00 a.m.

The process of dealing with an over-manned bureaucracy is continuing, Mr. Speaker, and we see no signs that it is creating the dire hardships that have been predicated for it. The artisans released from the National Housing Corporation, the artisans released from the Ministry of Transport and Works are finding no difficulty in getting employment in private construction activity.

Officers at a senior level, persons engaged in projects which are completed, people who have been taken on as temporary public officers in a project team, per-

viously used to stay on in Government — people would try to find posts for them in other departments of Government. We are trying our best to close down the projects and we are observing that the professional staff again has no difficulty being employed in management or in areas, particularly where the mechanical, engineering and architectural professions are concerned.

We have unemployment at its lowest point for over ten years at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and this is in the middle of an international recession.

No doubt we will be told something about the National Debt. I will give honourable Members opposite some accurate figures on which to base their speeches. The total debt at the end of December was \$683.4 million: domestic \$424 million, foreign \$259.4 million. The foreign debt showed a sharp increase over the year. It is being reduced a little at the present time, Mr. Speaker, because the six months' credits which the Government took up in order to support the balance of payments are now being repaid in this month of March and will also be repaid during the month of April, but they are the accurate debt figures.

Since the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is such a confirmed monetarist, whether he understands it or not, I will tell him that the M.I. money supply increased 5.6 per cent — that is all — during 1981 over 1980. As far as printing money is concerned, he said the Government has printed money in order to support its activities. There was \$117.5 million — cash dollars — in circulation in 1980, and there is 122.5 million cash dollars in circulation in 1981. If he tells the public that the Government is printing money, he will expect the public to be told the actual truth about the amount of money printed. If he wants to use a pejorative expression, he must expect to be answered in his own style.

Mr. Speaker, those are the economic indicators and now to the forthcoming Estimates. The outturn figures have been less favourable than the Government had anticipated, and therefore we have pruned our expenditure in order to bring it more into line with estimated revenue for the forthcoming year.

There will be a number of move-ins during the Estimates that will affect the figures, Mr. Speaker. Some of the expenditure on the Sewage Project has not materialised during the current financial year and we will have to move in a sum of \$2.6 million to Capital.

The vote for the Defence Force was cut somewhat too sharply. I think it is \$7 million or more, I cannot remember the amount in Capital and Current. We have applied the chopper a little too vigorously and did not

make allowance for the fact that the Defence Force now has a functioning Coast Guard and an aeroplane to maintain, and we will therefore have to provide \$2 million for the training of the Coast Guard. It is very necessary at the present time, because the Coast Guard is now being worked up to full standard. That will have to be added.

At the same time there will be further cuts made in expenditure and the figures for current expenditure, the deficit which we estimate of \$6.8 million, will in fact become about \$7 million.

The estimated expenditure will go to \$501.6 million. A couple of hundred thousand dollars extra are going to be added. Mr. Speaker, this does represent a very modest increase in the Government's current expenditure and we should not pretend that it has been easy to identify areas of spending cuts which are acceptable to the Ministries; to the Government and in conformity with the general policy of the Government.

Some services have necessarily had to be put off, some to be curtailed. The Public Service is very lavish in its provision for training and further education, so that in many ways we have a better educated public service than the public service of the United Kingdom. I am very amused to see that my contemporaries at Oxford and Cambridge who are now senior civil servants, are heads of departments with one degree while in Barbados, in my own Ministry, we insist on two degrees for comparable positions of Permanent Secretary, Planning and Director of Finance and Planning. Somebody told me that in fact we have more people with second degrees in the Ministry of Finance than the British Treasury has.

I am glad that we have such a well educated bureaucracy. The necessity however is a slightly different matter. So we have made some pruning on absences, such are necessitated by elaborate training and further education schemes. These schemes will be reactivated in full when the Government can afford it, but I think that the putting off of a course for a year or two years is not a matter which we should say, all right we will let them have these courses, but we will cut the Welfare vote to the disabled and the crippled.

We have also been forced to close down one or two uneconomic services of Government. They will be dealt with as we pass through the Estimates. We are making sure that the staff implications are minimal. We have avoided new programmes which are going to be an unreasonable burden on the Exchequer at a time like this.

Now Capital works, Mr. Speaker. It may seem that by presenting to the House a vote only of \$135.6 million for Capital that I am contradicting my own argument that

Capital Works have to be maintained if we wish to maintain employment and economic activity in the country.

I would point out that the two perhaps largest Capital Works ever carried out in Barbados are being carried out at present outside the Estimates and direct Government expenditure — but under the aegis of Government. These are the two hundred million dollar projects, the Cement Plant and the expansion of the Barbados Light and Power generating capacity at the Spring Garden site.

11.10 a.m.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there is the Cement Plant which is owned jointly by the Governments of Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, and the expenditure of \$200 million involves the transformation of a portion of St. Lucy. And the increase by something like 20 per cent or more of the generating capacity to the island is a major Government project however you look at it — even if it is not financed through taxpayers.

In the light of this, it would be unreasonable to expect capital expenditure directly financed by the taxpayers and by straightforward Government borrowing to continue at the same level. Let it not be forgotten that something like \$16 million of the Government's money has gone directly into the Cement Plant to provide equity.

As far as the Barbados Light and Power is concerned, none of the Government's money is directly involved. But the Government lent its support to the negotiations with the World Bank which itself led to the obtaining of the credit that is financing the construction of the facility. The World Bank's share is not large. I forgot the exact proportion, but perhaps in terms of percentages, it would be in single digits. The participation of the World Bank was essentially in order to get the money at all and the sponsorship by the Government was essential in order to get the participation of the World Bank. That is another project, probably the second largest ever conceived in Barbados.

With these two projects going on outside of the framework of the Government's financing, the Government does not see the need in 1982-83 to engage in other projects which are on our drawing boards merely for the purpose of maintaining productive investments. These investments have great rates of return which are predicted to be a saving both in Balance of Payments and in terms ultimately out of the costs to the users for services.

It does not seem to be generally known, Mr. Speaker, that the construction of the new electric genera-

tor works will save the country foreign exchange since the cost of servicing the loan is less than the saving on fuel which the new generators will effect. We will import \$9 million less oil and pay, I think, just under \$9 million for servicing the loan for the electric operation.

The Cement Plant also has a rate of return both in Balance of Payment terms and in financial terms which is highly favourable to the island. It is to be hoped that when the new Clay Block Plant as well as the Cement Plant come on stream, that all of the strictures that have been levelled against the cost in the construction industry — the bottlenecks of supplies, Balance of Payments costs of bringing in basic raw materials — will vanish, and the country will have an indigenous building industry not dependent on overseas supplies for its cement and building blocks for overseas supplies.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it can readily be understood that there may be some pause in the Capital Works programmes in Central Government in the light of these major infrastructural activities being carried on under Government's sponsorship. In any case, Mr. Speaker, the overall deficit of Government during the current financial year is projected in the Memorandum at around \$185 million.

I have not got before me the Gross Domestic Product for Barbados during 1981, it will be found to be something like \$1.6 billion. This estimate projects a deficit of something of the order of 12 per cent of GDP. This has been reached before. We inherited such a deficit when we took office, and on an earlier occasion, I think in the financial year 1973-74, it was perhaps higher.

The fact that it is not unprecedented does not mean that it is desirable. The Government, therefore, is moving in these Estimates to reduce the deficit to under ten per cent of projected GDP and reduce the amount of the deficit by some \$40 million during the forthcoming financial year. To this will, of course, be added the cost of Civil Service salary increases — but that is altogether another story. And naturally, it does not take into account the fact that there will be a Budget very soon in which I promised on many occasions that there will be increases in taxation.

But for the moment, our projected overall deficit will be \$141 million, a smaller deficit than the current financial year but nonetheless a deficit that we think is much too large for comfort — especially when we remember the call that the Public Service will have to put on the taxpayers for a wage increase. However modest it turns out to be, it is going to be positive since I do not think we have reached the stage in this country that the motor car companies in the United States have reached where we can ask Civil Servants to reduce their salaries.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Estimates show the intention of the Government, an intention to which we will hold very firmly to see to it that financial prudence is the watchword of the financial year 1982-83. This is not the year to be living above our means. This is not the year to be putting pressure on the Balance of Payments. This is the year for patriotism, for the good sense of Barbadians to come to our aid, for an understanding that you have ups but you also have downs.

This is the year, indeed, which I hope that the Opposition will continue with the good work, good from a purely political point of view, in that it has one argument which it repeats, but good also for the public point of view that shows a certain restraint in bad behaviour and style befitting the approach which the whole country should have towards dealing with the most severe economic recession that the World has known for a good number of years.

All of us want interest rates down. If honourable Members opposite, and in the Other Place, can tell me when we estimate that keeping a differential between our interest rate and that of the United States, as we did for two years, cost the country \$98 million, if you could tell me how to keep interest rates down when they are at the levels they are at in Western Europe and North America, I will be glad to do so. I will be glad to apply your advice.

When I was a little boy, there used to be a saying in Barbados — I do not know if it is current now — "Shakespeare tell you to get money but he did not tell you how to get it."

11.20 a.m.

If honourable Members can tell me how to keep down — they tell me to keep down interest rates — if they can tell me how sensibly to keep them down in the face of interest rates that are shaking the foundation of the rest of the world — the communist as well as the capitalist world, if they can tell me how to insulate Barbados from that without a drastic reduction in our standard of living, I will be glad to apply their advice. If honourable Members can tell me how to make Barbados prosperous when people in the United States cannot afford to take Caribbean holidays, I will be glad to take their advice. If you can tell me how to make the sugar industry prosperous, when in one year the Lord poured down record levels of rainfall in the months of March and April, and in the next year, the wicked poured down record levels of cane fires during the month of March, we will also take the advice from the Opposition. Advice is easy to give. Telling people that something should be done differently is easy, but telling people how to do it differently is not always so easy, Mr. Speaker.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a useful week of debate. I would like to say that I am sorry not

to see the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition present. I understand he is not in good health and I wish him a very speedy recovery. In the 16 Estimates that I have attended, the contributions of the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition have reached a greater height than any other of his political activities of which I am familiar. Undoubtedly, his contributions to debates in this Honourable House during the annual Estimates have been of a level that can educate all Barbadians — and have educated some on the Barbados Labour Party side of the Honourable House including myself, both in and out of Government. I would much regret if it proves impossible to have him here during these Estimates. Indeed, I would be glad to listen to what his many years of experience in public life might suggest to us in helping the Barbados economy sustain and face up to these difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Appropriation Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some degree of distress to the attempt by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to pour scorn on the contributions of distinguished economists in this country to the economic debate which is of concern to all Barbadians. However, Sir, after the polemics and his failure — and I regret this very much — to deal with the matters facing this country in greater depth so that the Estimates could be evaluated in a much wider perspective, he finally made a plea to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to assist him in telling him not only what should be done — but how it should be done. I wish to assure, Sir, the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance that we on this side will be making every effort during this debate to tell him where he has gone wrong, to tell him what needs to be done and when necessary, where we are satisfied that we have all the information, try to guide him as to how it should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I have given considerable thought as to the nature of the contribution which I should make in this debate, and I have come to the inescapable conclusion that this is a moment of national economic crisis in Barbados, a situation which is now accepted on both sides of the Honourable House, that it is not an occasion, Sir, for partisan, political considerations, but it is an occasion to try to look at the economy as a whole and see how these Estimates will improve on that economic situation one way or another. I therefore, Sir, intend to reject the kind of approach which I heard earlier, and try to get down to the meat of the matter —

and to do so in the most responsible manner without trying to draw a whole heap of smoke screens or red herrings across the trial.

Sir, much has been said about the impact of the international recession on the economic affairs of Barbados during the year 1981–82, the impact of external factors. Whereas, Sir, there is an element of truth in that statement, there can be no denying that by gross mismanagement domestically, that we have contributed considerably to the problems facing this country. Whereas, we are powerless to influence what is taking place in the outside world, we are certainly in a position to influence what takes place within Barbados.

Sir, there can be no doubt, Sir, that the Capital programme of Government has contributed considerably to the state of affairs of this country. Capital programmes were carried on in Barbados for generations. The principal has been accepted that Capital programmes by Government contribute to the relief of the unemployment situation in this country. That is not the issue, and this is where I find the argument of the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance so disappointing. It is not a question of the role of Capital development financed by Government in the reduction of unemployment in Barbados, temporarily or otherwise. The argument, Sir, relating to the Capital programmes pursued by Government in 1981–82, relates to the fact that those programmes were all clustered together, that they largely constitute programmes of a long term nature in terms of earnings of foreign exchange, that they were done at a time when the rates of inflation in the construction industry had been exceedingly high, that they made heavy demands on Government's current revenue and also further demands on the need for further borrowings even to the point of having to borrow money to meet counterpart funds. Therefore, Sir, it is not the principle of Capital Expenditure that we have pinned down as one of the major factors leading to the serious economic crisis in Barbados, what we are saying is that it is the mismanagement of its Capital programmes.....
11.30 a.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is the mismanagement of those Capital programmes and the impact that they have had on the foreign exchange earnings, the foreign reserves and the public debt of Barbados in one given year. That is what we have been complaining about.

The second point adverted to by the Hon. Minister of Finance reflects another area of naked, bare faced mismanagement on the part of the Government of Barbados. I make bold to say that there has been extensive printing of money in Barbados in 1981, and I was extremely disappointed after hearing the Minister of Finance admit on the floor of this House for the first

time that Government actually printed money in 1981, then hear him go on to try to minimise the impact of such printed money.

Sir, in the first instance, it is absolute foolishness to look at the number of coins and notes in circulation, or the increase in the coins and notes in circulation, and relate that to the printing of money. In the context of Barbados, printing of money is not reflected in the increase of the notes and coins, because most of the transactions in Barbados are done by cheque, and it represents entries, book entries in relation to the Central Bank and the Treasury of Barbados, whereby that money can be put into circulation by the writing of cheques. As a matter of fact, the Central Bank itself

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please. The honourable Member already today gave notice of a Resolution respecting the Barbados National Bank.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, the Central Bank, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please. The honourable Member gave notice of a Resolution respecting the Barbados National Bank. I was at pains to accommodate the honourable Member. The honourable Member starts off now with Central Bank to which he offered no objection, but I am going to warn the honourable Member, I am going to warn the honourable Member, I do not want to hold up this debate, I do not want to stop him at any point, but do not start off with the Central Bank and then drift on to the National Bank and then drift on to 23 other banks. I know exactly what I am saying. Please continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in the area of money creation, there is no question of ever reaching any institution other than the Central Bank, if my understanding of the Government's financing is correct.

The point I am making is that an evaluation of the extent of the printing of money in Barbados has little to do with the amount of notes and coins in circulation, and indeed, Sir, it was not a question of \$2 million, because this economy could easily absorb the printing of \$2 million without any noticeable effects, and a casual glance at the figures put out by the Central Bank would indicate a level of printing which must have created severe damage to our foreign reserves and to the Balance of Payments of Barbados. I believe that there is a connection between that clustering of Capital projects, the demands for current revenue in relation to those projects, and the need for Government to resort to excessive money creation. If the honourable Member for St. Thomas would prefer that term, money creation rather than the printing of money, or money expansion, or excessive accommodation of the Government; when that accommodation, or when that creation, or when that expansion is seen against the back-

ground of a falling foreign exchange holding position by the Central Bank, then it amounts to the printing of money. I can be quantitative, and will be quantitative on another occasion.

We will also be able to demonstrate the extent to which the foreign reserves and the balance of payments in Barbados have been damaged by that act.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the honourable Member, but I must elucidate. I rise on a point of elucidation, I really must elucidate. I did specifically say that notes in circulation increased by 5 per cent, and I went on to say that the money supply itself only increased by 6.5 per cent. I said M.1, if the honourable member knows what that means — obviously he does not. I have the figures here and I gave them in my speech, so it is not fair of him to say that I ignored things other than notes when I spoke about the printing of money.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there will be ample opportunity to quantify that, it is quite clear what happened on page 2 of the Central Bank Report.

Now, Sir, it was not only the maladministration of the Capital Projects Programme and also the misdirection of monetary policies in Barbados, it is only in those two areas where we can identify where the Government has contributed to the present situation which confronts Barbados, but there are many other areas.

There have been major defects in its policy in relation to tourism — if I may just advert to one — the pricing structure in tourism, the impact of energy on the cost of accommodation in Barbados, the high prices prevailing within the society as compared with those of the countries or origin of our tourists. There have been defects in the manufacturing sector, although I must say to a lesser extent than in other areas. There have been major defects in policy in relation to agriculture, not only from the financing of agriculture but many other areas such as marketing and so on.

11.40 a.m.

We can recognise serious misdirection of policy objectives in relation to welfare, we can recognise policy errors in relation to housing, particularly in relation to the cost of housing in Barbados — whether it be in the Government sector or the private sector.

It is now public knowledge that there has been a major problem in relation to Government policies in respect of transport and the roads in Barbados, and that the combination of these two factors must have a serious impact on our foreign exchange and our balance of payments. Many people do not realise the extent to which bad roads can damage your balance of payments in the

long run. In fact, Sir, it is estimated that for about every \$1 500 to \$2 000 that you spend per kilometre in the maintenance of paved roads, you save about \$6 000 in the cost of transport, and in the context of Barbados that means in foreign exchange cost.

Sir, there have been major defects in the policy thrust in relation to health and in relation to education and culture — I believe that the CARIFESTA events would be testimony to that. There have been major defects in relation to policies such as incomes and prices, major defects in our taxation policy, and we are now beginning to see the impact of a taxation policy which is closely allied to consumption patterns within the society.

Now, Sir, I believe that I have identified several areas where we have created problems for ourselves domestically, and indeed, Sir, when you take the whole picture and try to look at it in a composite manner, what we have successfully done is to increase the openness of this economy in a situation where there are recessionary trends in the external world, when in fact the acid test of good management in 1981–82 should be the extent to which we could have reduced that openness in the economy.

Now, Sir, what have been the effects of this mismanagement at the domestic level? Government finances, Sir are in a state of chaos. Government is rapidly reaching the point where it has exhausted its taxable capacity. The people of Barbados cannot bear any more taxation. There have been falling standards of living of the people of this country in every walk of life. For the first time you are seeing a movement where people who concern themselves in the upper income bracket find their standards are falling. The standards in the middle class are falling, and, even at the lower levels in the society, there are many people today walking the streets that only get two or three meals a week. These are harsh facts that we must face up to, and we cannot come in here on a major Bill like an Appropriation Bill in the present economic circumstances and try to gloss over these matters.

We have heard figures of reduction in unemployment and in the reduction in the rate of inflation. Mr. Speaker, I doubt there are few Barbadians who would not recognise that prices in this country have been rising from day to day, and that the rate of unemployment in Barbados continues to rise, and I have some very, very interesting figures which I will produce in due course on the appropriate occasion which would cast very serious doubts on the sources of the information made available to this Hon. House in respect of inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there is today a decline in private sector activity and I regret, Sir, that any suggestion can

be made in Barbados today that the private sector is taking up the slack for any job losses within the public sector of Barbados. The private sector, Sir, has been hit like every other citizen by the high regime of interest rates existing in Barbados and the wiping out of credit from the system. How can you expect an expansion to be in the private sector in the face of these two major factors, particularly when we bear in mind the low equity input of a large section of the private sector activity in Barbados and the heavy dependence on overdraft facilities and other accommodations by the commercial banks of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, that mismanagement is reflected in an intolerably high deficit. It is reflected in massive increases in the Public Debt. It is reflected, Sir, in the increasing demands for taxation and the repeated threats made by the Minister of Finance that there will be further taxation this year. It is reflected, Sir, in the precarious state of the foreign reserves and the balance of payments in this country. These global figures cannot fool me any longer. I have now had access to information relating to the functional aspects of these reserves and what is available to meet the goods and services required for this country. An analysis has been done. In fact, Sir, throughout this entire economy, there is a state of recession and depression, and this Appropriation Bill and these Estimates simply represent a stop-gap situation — an effort to correct past mistakes, and you cannot see a glimmer of hope of a way out by looking at either the Appropriation Bill or at the Estimates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some time ago I made a genuine call — and I meant it from the bottom of my heart — when I suggested that the Estimates debate this year probably should go on for a period of one month with appropriate suspensions of the Standing Orders. The reasons were very simple, Sir. I fully appreciate that in these Estimates you will find evidence as to whether we would be getting out of trouble or going deeper into trouble. It is also my belief, Sir, that the Members of this Parliament with different backgrounds of experience should be given an opportunity to scrutinise every single Head of the Estimates, every single item of expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! I just want to warn the honourable Member. This is the people's time that you are now wasting. Any honourable Member had an opportunity to rise in his place this morning.

11.50 a.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I am talking.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please! Hear the Chair.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You would like me to sit?

Mr. SPEAKER: Any honourable Member could have risen and moved that the Standing Orders be suspended. The opportunity was available to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. He took no advantage of such an opportunity, so he must now turn and blame himself for not doing his duty. Do not blame anybody else now. Please continue your debate, but not on that score.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The principle, Sir, of zero budgeting, I believe, could have been applied effectively to the Estimates of this year and indeed, Sir, the constitution of Barbados provides that these Estimates must be passed by March 31, and therefore, they have to be completed within that period.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the point the honourable Member has just made that there be a suspension of the Standing Orders so that they should have been debated. The Opposition ought to have been given a month's time to debate them. I warn the honourable Member from the Chair that he lost his chance to pursue the matter of getting this month to debate them. Do not let me hear him on that score at all. You lost your chance. Continue your debate on some other point. In other words, do not mislead the public anymore on that score. You cannot mislead the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Estimates, Sir, as they presently stand, represent, Sir, an irrelevant prescription for the problems facing Barbados today, and as I read the significance of the presentation of those Estimates, it would seem to me, Sir, that they represent a maximization of the tax effort in Barbados in order to close the obvious gaps on current revenue that will arise.

It seems, Sir, that there will be a constant pursuit of the very monetary policies which the honourable Member complains of, that is, a high interest regime, Sir, — a strangle hold on credit and allowing prices to rise as part of the process of reducing imports. It is quite clear that there would be a continuing demand for borrowing both at the domestic and at external levels. It is quite clear to me, Sir, that more human considerations should have gone into the areas in which there have reductions in the anticipated growth of expenditure, and it would seem, Sir, that there will be a significant cut-back on the social services which, in my view, represent one of the main props to the more disadvantaged in our society in times difficult as these.

Sir, I was not surprised to hear the honourable Member advert to the policy of wage restraint. Every single economist that I have ever known, Sir, in the context of an open economy such as ours, has always recognised the relationship between incomes and the levels of foreign exchange earnings in these societies, that it is your foreign exchange earnings that ultimately

determine the level of earnings which the society can afford.

Where, Sir, I think there has been a difference of opinion is that many persons feel that if you destroy your foreign reserves and your Balance of Payments situation by a reckless monetary policy and by a misguided Capital Programme, and then you run into a Balance of Payments problem, then you start screaming and passing the burden on to the wage earners in the society. Many of us feel that this is wrong.

Many of us feel, Sir, that it is also wrong to deal with a wages policy and a policy of wage restraint and not at the same time deal with matters relating to prices, profits, dividends and even professional fees. We feel there should be an all round wage restraint if there is going to be a wage restraint, plus control of prices and so on, if you are going to have some balance, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these Estimates, 1982/83 give us an opportunity to look and see where we are going. This, Sir, is the first Appropriation Bill in this new session of Parliament and the opportunity is here for us to look and see what is actually going on within the financial structure of Government and the country as a whole. Revenue, Sir, would have doubled over the 1976/77 levels according to these Estimates.

The public debt at the end of November 1981, — I would not have the figure to date, Sir, it is not yet published — was some \$702 million, an increase from \$213 million around this same time last year and what is absolutely shocking is that the debt service in 1976/77 which was some \$21.5 million or 10 per cent of total revenue has now reached the appalling level of \$99.5 million or 20 per cent of projected revenue. Out of every single \$5 paid in taxes this year, one dollar will be going to debt service. This is a tragic situation, Sir, and I think that it is our duty in the Opposition, Sir, to draw to the attention of Government certain aspects of their policies which need to be evaluated.

Now, Sir, if you were to take the six-year period, 1971—1977,.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. It is very misleading.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Prime Minister had risen on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I submit it is very misleading to quote the figure of one dollar in every five unless the honourable Member makes it clear that a good deal of the public debt is owed to the National Insurance. It is only a form of Government accounting and therefore that one dollar in every five is going to the National

Insurance to help it pay pensions and so on. The honourable Member should not speak as if there is overseas debt and a dollar is going out of the island or going into the hands of the banks. He knows that too.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I never said that. I am quoting exactly what appears in the Estimate and the comparisons are the same from one year to another. The composition has been roughly the same over the years.
12.00 noon.

Nevertheless, that is the position as it stands today, that is this year, Sir, \$99.5 million — one dollar out of every five dollars collected would be gone towards the service of debt. But there is a much more serious matter that I would like to bring to the attention of this Honourable House,...(Asides)

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you were to take the six year period 1971-77, one would see that the total revenue raised by Government was somewhere in the region of \$900 000 000. These figures, Sir, are approximate because the sources are slightly different, but the pattern and the trend is what I am trying to get across. The expenditure, Sir, was somewhere in the region of \$1.1 billion during that six year period given an average deficit of around or slightly under \$30 million.

That pattern has changed dramatically over the past six years and this must be a matter of serious concern to the Government. For the first time today I have heard the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance express some serious concern about the size of deficits being accumulated in Barbados on Capital and Current Account. The past six years, Sir, saw revenue somewhere in the region of \$2.3 billion, expenditures about \$2.9 billion and you get an average deficit situation approximated somewhere in the region of \$100 million.

Now, I do not want anybody to come and say that it is \$99.2 million and not \$100 million. I have sought to establish trends and that is a very serious trend in Government revenue because, Sir, in that area, you could see — and it is almost accurately reflected in the extent of the National Debt — the demands on Current Revenue to service that debt and the demands for further taxation. Do not forget that when we spend \$99.5 million to service debts, that \$99.5 million is being diverted from other essential services, and vital services, within this country. Mr. Speaker, it is also indicative of the current levels of borrowing, and with a projected deficit next year of some \$142 million, these Estimates are a perfect recipe for a continuation of the same pattern of financing in Barbados which is bringing intolerable hardships to each and every person in this country.

No wonder, Sir, Government finances are in disarray. You can try to gloss over it. You may talk of revenue expenditure deficiency. You can come, Sir, with a Memorandum of the Estimates which I will deal with in due course. You can talk, Sir, of trying to give the impression that prices are falling but the people know better. You can try to give the impression that there is a fall on unemployment but people know better. You can talk, Sir, about activity in the private sector, increased activity — but the businessmen out there know better. The people know better when they go into Bridgetown and they go through the banks in Barbados on a Friday afternoon or any time of the day, they know what is happening.

Every citizen in this country today, Sir, is faced with a situation where their standard of living is likely to decline, and I would say this, Sir, that the threat to the stability of the social, economic and political structure of Barbados does not rise from any ideological position taken by anybody in Barbados. But the day you create a situation where that upward social mobility in the society is brought to an end and then you start the downward slide, Sir, you begin to realise the full social impact of the policies which you have pursued.

These Estimates, Sir, are a recipe, I repeat, for increased taxation, decreased productivity, increased borrowings and indeed, Sir, there is an item in there which suggests to me that that policy of further money creation might well be extended into 1982/83, and above all, Sir, repeating another year where you are having deficits both on Capital and Current Account. That Current Account deficit must be closed. We in this country can no longer continue to pay civil servants out of overseas borrowings. We cannot continue to do that. We cannot continue to do it. And the gap is much wider than is reflected here in the official records of the Estimates, because this is a year in which there are going to be salary increases.

Now, Sir, it is my feeling that the deficit on Current Account will be much wider than \$9.9 million for the year 1981-82 and my reason is this. If you look, Sir, on the deficit on Current Account at January 31, 1982 you will see, Sir, that it is some \$28 million and the Government expects to close that gap and bring it down to approximately \$9.9 million by the end of March 31 by raising some \$109 million in those two months.

These are the reasons why I have my doubts. If you look, Sir, at February and March 1982, they are hoping to raise \$109 million. Now in the same months February and March 1981, they raised \$94 million only. In 1981, at that time, there was a 26 per cent growth in

Government's revenue at the end of January 1981. At the end of January 1982, there is a one per cent growth in Government revenue. Similarly, Sir, at the end of January 1981, there was a 26 per cent increase in Government expenditures so that the income was roughly balancing the expenditures in 1981. Now, you have an average revenue growth of 1 per cent and an expenditure growth of 12 per cent. How are you going to close that gap and bring it down to \$9.9 million? Perhaps, by not paying the millions of dollars owed to the citizens of this country in respect of CARIFESTA and many other goods and services supplied to the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, this Hon. House has already come to a conclusion on CARIFESTA.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Capital, Sir. Capital not Current, Capital. (Asides) Sir, anyhow, the point that I am trying to make it that there would probably be a substantial amount of money owed away by Government and I doubt very much on the basis of the performance of the economy — because do not forget that in 1981, we were in a state of artificial reflation of the economy for the purposes of an election, whereas in 1982, we are facing the consequences of that reflation and we are in a depth of a depression or recession, whichever word you choose to use.

Further doubt, Sir, in my mind would be cast on that assessment of narrowing the gap of current revenue down to a deficit of \$9.9 million by looking at the failure of Government to control the overall deficit. Intrinsic in that statement, Sir, is the evidence that tax measures do not necessarily solve these problems or bridge these gaps. When in September I pointed out that taxation is not the answer, and when some of the very economists who have been pilloried pointed out that taxation is not the answer, what do you find, Sir? When you go back to the mini-Budget, the House of Assembly Debates, Official Report, Sir, Tuesday, September 8, 1981, what do you find? You find, Sir, a clear statement, page 27, Sir:

"A deficit of \$187 million will clearly be intolerable and would have to be met by financial expedients which would only serve to undermine the long-term resilience of the economy."

12.10 p.m.

A series of tax measures and subsequent tax measures, Sir, but the deficit is still \$184.9 million. This mini-Budget has been a total failure and it has not met what was supposed to be one of its overall objectives, namely the reduction in the overall deficit as set out in that Budgetary Statement.

Now, Sir, we continue into 1982 — 83 in the same situation where you are budgeting for a deficit of some \$6.8 million on Current Account and \$135 million on

Capital Account, an overall deficit of over \$142 million, and that deficit is to be financed largely by external borrowings. For the second year this country will not be contributing one cent from Current Revenue to Capital costs and Capital development in Barbados; for the second year in succession, not one cent.

Now, Sir, when I have outlined the accumulated deficits, when I have outlined the anticipated deficit even in the absence of increases in personal emoluments, clearly there is a justification for my statement that this country will suffer considerably from increased taxation over the next year, and to my further statement that these Estimates do not in any way suggest that we are doing anything other than drifting on and that this is a stop gap exercise.

Now, Sir, the external borrowings in this country that I can identify — and I have to be very careful — were well over \$100 million in 1981–82, and at the moment it looks as though we are heading somewhere in the region of some \$62 million to start with, and I suspect that it might be much higher, and I will tell you why. Government's policies have succeeded in destroying — not destroying, probably in narrowing — its own revenue base and destroying its potential for raising revenues from the existing revenue base unless there are increases in those rates of taxation.

Some highlights of revenue that I would draw to the attention of this Hon. House have to do with the situation in relation to Corporation Tax, which I think is a pretty good index of contraction of private sector activity, and that if the projected amounts as set out in these Estimates are to be achieved, then there will probably need to be an increase in Corporation Tax.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I just have notes here, Sir, I am not reading from them. They can be a document of the House at any time when I am finished.

Income Tax, Sir, given a good level of growth in incomes in Barbados in 1982 — 83, would show some modest increase which indicates a determination of Government to impose a serious policy of wage restraint where they can do so by legislative means. It shows in revenue significant increases in property taxation, and I have already pointed out that our whole policy in relation to property taxes needs review in this country. I will not go into that today, but there will be ample opportunity in the not too distant future to demonstrate how the present policies, certainly in the private sector, militated against any increase in our housing stock and contributed considerably to a deterioration of the housing stock in Barbados.

I doubt, Sir, whether there will be any increase in revenue from transfer taxes, because I understand the lawyers in Bridgetown are rather upset over the limited number of property transfers taking place at the moment. No mortgage money, people cannot get any bridging finance, inability to save the deposits, and Government's revenue in respect of Transfer Tax would be seriously affected.

As predicted, Sir, one area in which you see a distinct erosion in Government's revenue base as presented in these Estimates, has been in the area of consumption taxes, and if Government is to achieve its objective of an increased yield in consumption taxes this year, then you can expect either a broadening of the base for consumption taxes, the inclusion of more items or an increase in the rates.

I have looked at the revenue coming from motor spirits and related activities, highway revenue which is very substantial, Sir, and it is my belief that there was no need in Barbados to impose a Transport Levy on the people of this country, because there was enough money coming from highway revenue, revenue from motor spirits and so on, that if Government wished because of its incompetence in managing its budget to create a special fund in respect of transport and roads, then that money should have come from that area of revenue and not from any new taxation in the form of a Transport Levy.

Sir, the hotels and sales tax decline is an indication of what we have been saying: that either fewer people are coming, or there is not the expected growth in arrivals, or they are spending less money when they get here. The Hon. Minister of Finance is right, that there has been a drop, but that is an indication of one of my earliest complaints that the present Administration has failed in its policies towards the development of the tourist plant, and failed to influence in any way the escalation of prices in the hotel industry. We wait now until Barbados is branded as one of the most expensive destinations in the world, and I see that at last the tourist people now are saying that it is being said. It is not to the help of Barbados. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: We only doubled it in five years). I will say that, but there have been serious errors where you should not be in this position today. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Have we done anything good in Barbados apart from raising the standard of living?).

12.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the revenue from gaming machines should be foregone because the \$2 million or so that you get from that, when you consider the foreign exchange losses and the impact of that operation on the domestic economy and on our balance of payments and our external position, it is not of any help whatsoever to this country, and that revenue we can well

do without because in the long run you are doing damage and it is much more costly to the country as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member has taken some time off to talk about the capital expansion of the Barbados Light and Power Company under the aegis of the World Bank, the loan portfolios under the aegis of the World Bank, the contribution which that capital expansion would be making to the economy and the consequential need for Government not to go in for that kind of expansion. I would have to respond, I believe, on behalf of the people of Barbados to those comments.

The very first point I would like to make is that much of that cost is in the form of capital equipment. Much of the cost will go into the purchase of equipment and not into job generation. The second point I would like to make is that it is high time that people realise that when you make external borrowings, whether it be the Government, a Statutory Board or private corporations, in the long term it makes no difference because it all has to be paid out of the same foreign exchange pool. But I will say that the Government has a duty to review and to look at the cost of that equipment. It has a duty to look — I cannot refer to any future electricity rates — but it has a duty to look at the impact of present rates on such persons as old age pensioners, domestic consumers, the hotel industry, the manufacturing sector, prices in the supermarkets, the effect on unemployment, the competitiveness of our exports and demand for greater revenue by taxation, because you will see that in these Estimates, that utilities, as you go right through, will be considerably increased. A large component of that cost would be existing rates of electricity in Barbados and the impact on water rates consequential on the present levels of electricity rates.

We are all very concerned, Sir, and as a private citizen, I certainly will be associating myself with the public utilities users group who shall be seeking to deal with matters relating to national expenses such as investment tax credit and deferred taxes which impose a serious burden on the people of Barbados, because these represent part of the cost of service, and therefore relate very substantially to the rates which one has to pay. In the appropriate forum, that activity will take place in the protection of the citizens of Barbados.

The contraction of Government revenue base, not only in respect of consumption taxes but also in respect of its import duties, is further indication of the seriousness of what is going on in Barbados. There is, Sir, a new form of taxation in the form of levies — taxation right off the top. We see that the Government has already taken steps to raise somewhere in the region of \$49 million through National Insurance collections or monies that will be collected by the National Insurance

Office. Some will be National Insurance collections and some will go to the various levies. There is a Health Levy which is estimated to yield \$4.5 million at one per cent or thereabouts. When you multiply that by 11 you reach a figure of about \$49 million, which means that about \$25 million would be coming off the top of the wages paid to the people of Barbados during the forth-coming year.

I just draw attention to those areas of income and to show the pattern that has been developing. That is why I feel that Government has to review its whole strategy in respect of raising revenue and to pay particular attention to what is happening in relation to the major swing from direct to indirect taxation since that latter swing has certainly tied this Government more to consumption patterns. In the long run, that might well be self-defeating, particularly when you have to cope with cyclical patterns of growth within the economy, unless within that cyclical pattern, you have steps which would regulate your flow and your demands on your foreign exchange in order to cope with those troughs of depression within the economy.

Now, Sir, I think that in such straitened circumstances, that these Estimates indicate on the expenditure side, a mislocation of the resources.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished physician, my colleague and friend for St. Michael South Central, would take his seat, I would like to move that this sitting be now suspended for lunch until 1.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable Member would have taken more than ten minutes to complete his address.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 1.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
12.30 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was addressing the Chair. The same honourable Member may continue if he so desires.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have sought during this debate, to respond with that element of responsibility which is incumbent on each and every Parliamentarian in a moment of national economic crisis. I propose, Sir, to continue my address in the same vein dealing with those issues which I perceive to be relevant in the context of this Appropriation Bill and the Estimates, and certainly, to ensure that at no time there is any diversion into personal attacks which I do not think to be in the interest of the nation at this stage.

I also sought, Sir, to pursue these matters with some degree of objectivity and with moderation whilst at the same time carrying out my duty as the official spokesman for the Opposition in the area of Finance and Planning.

Now, Sir, I was looking at the pattern of revenue, and indeed there is one particular area which I must advert to because of its impact on a major productive sector. I refer, Sir, to the expected increased yield in respect of landing fees for aircraft. It is my opinion, Sir, that apart from procedural matter, that the principle of so doing at this time was wrong and based on a wrong premise. The premise, Sir, was a comparison between such charges here in Barbados and charges in the metropolitan countries.

An analysis, Sir, of world tourism, would demonstrate that over 95 per cent of tourism took place in a North to North direction and the remaining 5 per cent takes place in a North-South and inter-South direction. It is quite clear then, Sir, that if we are to maintain our competitiveness, those charges for aircraft landing in Barbados should relate to those destinations in the South and it would be inappropriate to make comparisons with destinations elsewhere, particularly when those destinations provide qualities of service for aircraft far superior to those provided here in Barbados. I refer, Sir, to the comparison of the charges at Kennedy Airport.

I have taken the trouble, Sir, to look at a whole range of charges in countries that are our direct competitors such as The Turks and Caicos Islands, San Juan, Puerto Rico, St. Thomas and the U.S. Virgin Islands in general; Piarco, Trinidad when it competes with us to a lesser extent in respect of the tourist industry, and even, Sir, places like Miami.

I have looked at Honolulu and I have looked at other places farther afield, those areas which are now benefitting from the diversion of much of the traffic that normally would come to Barbados. The Bahamas I have looked at, Sir. I have looked at Jamaica. I have looked at St. Vincent. I have looked at Hawaii and I have looked, Sir, at comparable destinations and there is no question,

apart from the psychological impact of increases in the present state of decline in the tourist industry. I believe that the net gain which we will get in revenue will be offset by the adverse publicity in that area. My judgment, Sir, is that it is a mistake of policy.

Another area, though small, which I think we can look at is the monies which we are raising in respect of Character Certificates. This is a very human problem. There seems to be a tendency — I do not know why but this has suddenly developed in Barbados — where persons seeking jobs are often required to get Character Certificates which cost them money. They go to seek one job after another and they find themselves over a period of a year, or 18 months, in their search for a job probably spending money which they have to borrow from their relatives in order to get a job. I think that this whole thing needs to be looked at.

We are decent people and, generally speaking, references can be obtained from responsible people and when persons are asking poor, young girls to bring a Police Certificate if they apply for a job as a maid or something like that, a Character Certificate, it is an imposition that I think is unnecessary. I think the Government should recognise this particular area and see what can be done. It is a human request or a request for a more humane approach to this problem by the entire community.

Now, Sir, I turn to the expenditure side of the Estimates. Quite clearly, Sir, the projected gap of current revenue will be broadened considerably by the increases in personal emoluments. Provision is made, Sir, for an increase from \$197 million to \$204 million. Whereas I recognise that it would not be possible to put in the Estimates such statutory emoluments which might result from increases, it is important for us to recognise why that can be increased by as much as \$20 million purely by a 10 per cent across the board increase in wages. So if one expects wage restraint to contribute to narrowing the gap on current revenue, it would seem to me that Government could well be envisaging massive lay-offs in the public sector.

Another misallocation, Sir, of our resources, I think, is clearly reflected in the amount of money which we are spending on Defence and Security. It is one thing to say that you can get the money which you can borrow for Defence and Security easily, that you do not have to make the same kind of commitments which you will have to make in respect to borrowings for other sectors, but the point is that the money has to be repaid at some time and what is even more important, Sir, is that such capital outlays by borrowing have escalating current revenue implications.

This, Sir, is reflected in the massive increases in expenditure in this area. When you buy a warship, Sir, that warship has to be serviced. It has to be run. It has to be manned. When you set up an army, even if the capital cost of the equipment is given to you, not loaned to you, to keep it in a serviceable state and to keep that army in a state of preparedness, there are significant current expenditure costs involved.

Now, Sir, in 1976/77, our total expenditure on Defence and Security, as far as I can see — I was very surprised quite frankly — was about \$1.46 million, about \$1.4 million on Current Account and \$60 000 on Capital Account. I was very surprised at that figure. In this year, Sir, it looks as though we will be spending \$18.8 million on Capital and Current Account on Defence and Security and it is most important, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Just on a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member seems to be discussing — I heard him calling the amount of money to be spent on Defence and Security and I do not think at this stage, Sir, he should be discussing any details of the Bill before us, Sir. I am quite sure I heard a figure of \$90 million or something like that. We are dealing with the Appropriation Bill at this stage and not the details of it.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there is a Schedule to the Appropriation Bill and I am dealing with the question of allocation of expenditures and the principal behind that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I very much take the Minister's point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The trend, Sir, during the last three years in this area, if you compare, Sir, the increases, say, in Education, in Health, in Transport, allocations for roads, allocations for Housing, areas that bring significant gain to the majority of the population, you will find a very distinct difference in the trend in those areas, as compared, Sir, with the trend in the area of Defence and Security which, as far as I can see, is a sterile area and probably has a lot of concealed unemployment and unproductive unemployment involved in that exercise. 1.45 p.m.

The totality, Sir, of \$58 million in three years, if spent on Housing, if spent on Transport, if spent on roads, if spent in any other major area of social or economic activity in Barbados, it is my feeling, Sir, that that would be much to the benefit of the entire country. It is true, Sir, that some people feel, some people have stated that bullets make you strong, I think, whilst butter makes you fat, or words to that effect. But I certainly feel that as a small country, that this represents a misallocation of our resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again on the expenditure side, I had referred earlier to a Public Debt this year of \$99.5 million in the Estimates of 1982/83 by reference. Again, Sir, it is most incumbent on us to do a proper analysis and look and see what the trends in the debt service will be to this country and what has been happening over the past decade or so. We have now reached the point, Sir, where our debt service in one year is almost the same as it was during the years 1971-77, that is over a six year period. Now, Sir, this is a dangerous situation that we are getting into. We are walking inevitably into the debt trap unless, Sir, steps are taken to restore productivity in the various sectors of the economy of this country.

I, Sir, have taken the trouble to do an analysis of the amounts that we spent in debt service: 1971-77 about \$100 million and in 1977-83 we will be spending about \$377 million. But, Sir, within those figures, you would see the tremendous escalation in the last three years, Sir, corresponding, of course, with the main large deficits which we have been piling up on Capital Account three years ago. In the year ended 1981-82 on both Capital and Current Account and in this year that we are dealing with now, Sir, there is a deficit somewhere in the region of \$142 million on Capital and Current Account.

The question that we must ask ourselves when we see these massive increases in revenue, when we see these massive increases in borrowings, is, Sir, whether or not there has been a commensurate development of social and economic well-being of the people of Barbados, or whether there has been substantial wastage, substantial redirection of the receipts either from taxation or from borrowings over the past five years or so. My submission, Sir, is that when you see the deterioration of the standards of living of people of Barbados.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is merely repeating himself all around. (*Aside*)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: No, Sir, I.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is merely repeating himself all over and over.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will have no more of this. He is merely repeating himself and that is the last time. Find something new or take your seat. (*Aside*)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to do an analysis of the Public Debt expended.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Get on with the debate or take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: however, that is not possible. I wish, Sir, to draw attention to the question of interest rates. The Hon. Minister of Finance has stated that the present interest rates in Barbados are inevitably high because of external factors.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already heard the honourable Member.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not dealt with interest rates.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already heard the honourable Member on this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, can I speak on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already heard the honourable Member on this.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Capital flows, Mr. Speaker. Capital flows in and out of Barbados are determined by a multiplicity of factors. Among those factors, Sir, is the buoyancy of the economy and it is important for the Government to recognise that if it is to attract capital and prevent the flight of capital, then it is necessary to get the economy going again.

Now, Sir, there are other important factors which I would like to deal with, because it would seem to me that the statement by the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance relating to the losses of capital over a given period, which he attributed to the cost of money might, well relate to other factors. For example, one would not take up a large sum of money and invest some in a state of Ghana, because you will get a much higher return on it than you would invest say, in the United States, or even in Barbados even in today's situation.

The point I am trying to make is that apart from monetary considerations, there are a whole lot of other considerations which would affect the movement of capital. Up to the moment, it does not seem to me that the cost, Sir, of money has been a significant factor in influencing flows of capital in and out of Barbados and that therefore one's monetary policies should be directed to getting those strategic areas in the economy moving in order to attract capital, because capital will follow a situation where it can be usefully invested. That means it will follow a growing economy.
1.55 p.m.

I would also like to make the point that the growth of savings, whether they are domestically generated or whether they are the consequence of capital transfers as reflected in the commercial banks of Barbados, that that

does not necessarily reflect health in the economy. What it might reflect is a reluctance of persons to expand or invest within the economy with the consequential problems attendant on that situation.

I believe, Sir, that despite the difficulties, despite the problems in approaching areas of central importance in the economy, within the context of the reply to this Appropriation Bill I have tried within those constraints to do my very best to bring other dimensions to bear on the problems facing Barbados. The Government has an approach to these problems but I believe that these Estimates should show a different mix, because my assessment is that apart from holding a situation, I see nothing there to move us out of the trough in which we find ourselves.

Now, Sir, I believe that a restructuring of these expenditures to reflect more accurately the needs of the social and economic services in Barbados — and I will group them all together for the sake of convenience — such as transport, education, health and also the needs of the agricultural sector. I am convinced that if we were to start putting more money this year into Agriculture at each level, then we would make a substantial stride in reducing the openness of this economy, so that if we are faced with a similar situation in the future, we might be in a better position to cope with crises of this kind.

In winding up, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present as moderate and as balanced an approach as I possibly can to the problems facing this country, and to reflect somewhat on some of the commanding heights, shall I say, within the Estimates without going into any significant detail in any area. I have tried to do so with that dignity, with that objectivity, and also recognising that in times of crises like these, then you should address your mind to the issues involved. Through the process of dialogue on the floor of this Parliament, considerable insights can be given by each and every one of us who would have a substantial contribution to make, I am sure. I am to thank honourable Members for listening to me as I presented the case for the Opposition. Thank you very much.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use this occasion as an opportunity to indulge in other than what I regard as an important and constructive reply to the speech of the principal spokesman for the other side. I think that it is important for all of us to recognise that Barbados is part and parcel of the world economy. It is easy for honourable Members to state that the Government has made mistakes in a number of areas. The ability to state *ex post facto* that mistakes have been made does not advance us as to what we are to do in the future.

I have had the privilege of listening to the principal spokesman on Finance for the Opposition for a long period of time. He is a critic without being able to suggest alternatives.

The debate in Barbados today is not dissimilar to the debate that has taken place in the countries of the western world. Not so long ago I had the privilege of being in Canada on a promotion tour with the Board of Tourism when the Canadian First Ministers' Conference and Premiers' Conference took place on the Canadian economy. I had the privilege recently of reading the debate which took place in the United Kingdom Parliament on their budget. On each occasion, it is interesting to note the contrast in style between the principal spokesman on the part of the Government and the principal spokesman and other speakers on the part of the Opposition.

In the Canadian debate, the Opposition proposed specific alternate proposals to the Government, whereas in the United Kingdom, the Chancellor of the Exchequer defied them to reflate the economy given their unemployment rate at unprecedented levels, given their interest rates at very high levels — higher than Barbados, given their publication of expenditure proposals. The Opposition was able to put forward specific items of expenditure, global and subsectoral, as to what they would do.

I am yet, Mr. Speaker, to hear the honourable Member for the Democratic Labour Party in Opposition in this House say that the Government proposes to spend on expenditure \$501 million with each subhead delineated and outlined. What are the proposals of the Democratic Labour Party under each subhead in the Barbados Estimates? That is what I would call constructive opposition. Where are we in this House in a position to determine the differences under each subhead between the Government and the Opposition? Where are we? We have had a catalogue of delineation of the deficiencies in Government policy. It is easy to make those general statements. I will deal with them in so far as they are generalities.

2.05 p.m.

The honourable Member says that the Government in relation to its policy in 1982–83 has landed this country in a position in which there is a failing economy and that domestic policies are the causes of the National Debt. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the honourable Member's speech indicate very clearly to me, and to members on this side, that the honourable Member, if he was a Minister of Finance, would have introduced such a draconian policy in 1981 and 1982 that this country's unemployment rate would have been greater than during the period of time when the Democratic Labour Party was in power.

It was in 1960 through 1976 at 22 per cent and that is the essential distinction between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party.

We believe, and it is a fundamental belief of this Government, that in a society like Barbados in which the private sector is primarily a private sector and a traditional non-risk taker, the Government of Barbados must be the prime mover and initiator of economic activity in Barbados. That is the fundamental distinction between us and them. The private sector in Barbados is not an initiator it is a reactor: it is a distributive sector.

We, Mr. Speaker, have always had to dig, when we were in power, for decisions which lead us forward and we, in the course of our period of power 1976 and 1981, were bold enough to take those decisions — and Barbados leapt forward in that period of time.

I only wish to deal with the honourable Member's criticisms of a so-called bunching of projects, but let us not forget that it was the Democratic Labour Party which for years had the plan and the foresight to build the post office. They had the discussions to build a Cement Plant. They had, Mr. Speaker, the plans and projections to build Heywoods. Mr. Speaker, they had — and the honourable Member for St. Michael South, particularly, was the one responsible — the conceptualisation and the failure to realise the rebuilding of a polytechnic.

It was within the competence of the Democratic Labour Party to execute these projects in their 15 years of power. But because of their beliefs and their failure to recognize the economic impact of those projects, we were left to execute them and finance them. We were the ones who had to make the decisions, whether to say go or not to go, because we had the boldness, the faith to decide to say go. The honourable Member for St. Michael South now has the audacity to criticise us for their failure during their 15 years of ruling.

It is a fact of life that we came into power in 1976. We had the choice to say these were Democratic Labour Party projects, and because they were Democratic Labour Party projects we should chuck them out the door. We had that choice and we analysed them on their merits. For instance, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the Inter-American Development Bank bluntly refused to disburse one cent of money to the building of the polytechnic next to the hospital because the Democratic Labour Party wanted to sink millions of dollars in a foundation. We had to take the decision to look for a good site for the resiting of the polytechnic institute.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hear such stupidity — that the site was there already. Why is it, I ask the honourable Member for St. Michael South in particular, that if the

site was there, why is it that he did not build before? If the site was there, the honourable Member has shown a total indifference, and do not excuse him for the lack of incompetence to the young people who are in dying need of a technical education that you did not in 15 years complete the building of the polytechnic. The site was there already. Mr. Speaker, they have a lot more licks to take today. I am using the very words. We have to resite the polytechnic.

Now if we were not competent people, if we were not people who had courage — the essential distinction between this party and that party is that we have courage. We believe that where there is no vision among the leaders, the people will perish. We believe that we have sufficient confidence to believe that we are able honestly to tell our people that we have lifted you from a plateau of one level in 1976 to a plateau of another level in 1981, that even though we are at that plateau now, we will go to a higher plateau in the future. We have much confidence.

We had to move the polytechnic, we had to redesign it and it had to be executed. For years they were mucking around with the concept on the area.

When I went into power as Minister of Tourism there was an argument as to the pricing of the land at Heywoods. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we had to settle the pricing of land at Heywoods into a total Speightstown Development Plan, because one section of the Ministry — and it was the Ministry of Communications and Works at that time — who subsequently were proven correct — were insisting that we could not build the Heywoods development without making adequate provisions for a total by-pass road for the whole of Speightstown.

2.15 p.m.

They argue about that. I had to do the negotiations with the World Bank. That was supposed to be their project. We did not adopt the narrow partisan view on that project and say it was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party and therefore we would chuck it out through the window. We did not say that, because, Mr. Speaker, whether they like it or not, the Barbados Labour Party believes fundamentally that the national good of Barbados rises above and is more important than the partisan interest of any political party at any particular time in government. So we said that we would look at the project and that we would re-evaluate it. That takes time. The honourable Member does not know; he has had no experience of having to deal with international institutions, to comply with pre-qualifications, with feasibility studies, with pre-feasibility studies and of trying to meet pre-disbursement conditions.

It took us three years, Mr. Speaker, to fight them on that point. We had to have plenty of re-evaluation on it. That cost us time, and when I come to the Cement Plant — I am really very sorry that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who knows and understands these things was not in his place today. He would have cringed to hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talking about the bunching of projects, because he would have known of all people that the Cement Plant was held up in Barbados for a long period of time for two reasons.

One was that Barbados' partner was Guyana — no man on that side can deny that Barbados' partner was Guyana — and nobody would give the Government of Barbados credit as long as Guyana was the partner, because in those days, and more so today, there is a strong feeling that a note backed by the Government of Guyana together with the Government of Barbados was really a note backed for all practical purposes by the Government of Barbados alone. It took us time to interest the Government of Trinidad in that project.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we had then to do negotiations with the Austrian Government to take advantage of the most favourable external credit that we had available. But we were not so stupid as to try and throw away the expenditure on pre-feasibility studies that had been incurred by the Democratic Labour Party, for we made it our business to try to recapture that expenditure, and we re-hired Holderbank Engineering who were the advisers to the Government of Barbados during the Democratic Labour Party regime.

So that when I hear the honourable Member criticising us when we are executing and carrying out matters which they themselves for 15 years have tried to do — because of our ability to carry them out, I know that is a shallow and empty criticism. The honourable Member is missing a vital point. He is not educating the public of Barbados as to the reality and the seriousness of problems that confront all developing countries, and it is this: in 1978 the world oil prices took off, and any estimates, whoever estimated them between 1978 and 1980, were bound to be totally out of touch with reality because of the fact that there was well over a 200 per cent increase in the price of oil between 1978 and 1980.

Mr. Speaker, so profound has been the impact of that oil price on the world economic environment, that today those people who were responsible for increasing the price of such a fundamental commodity throughout the world have themselves induced a lack of demand for their own product, for all of them are now finding that there is a reduction in the demand for their own product and they are suffering because the foreign exchange earnings that they were accustomed to

getting are being reduced every day. I have absolutely no fear at all in answering the honourable Member's criticism.

I also want to point out, and I want this to sink in, that had it not been for the Capital Development Programme of the Government of Barbados, the levels of unemployment in Barbados would be far greater than what we have. Construction in Barbados is the fastest generator of employment. The Barbados Labour Party throughout its 15 years in Opposition has always held the view that the role of construction in the Barbados economy is similar to the role of the motor industry and the steel industry in the United States' economy. So when the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says in this House that we had mismanagement because we had too many Capital Development programmes in 1980–81 and 1981–82, I say to the public of Barbados that the honourable Member is only advocating that there should be less construction and hence less employment in Barbados. He cannot advocate the reduction in the Capital Programme in Barbados and at the same time say that the Democratic Labour Party believes you should have an employment retention programme.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Democratic Labour Party, in the interest of clarification in the minds of the people of Barbados as to the difference between the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party, to tell the public of Barbados how is the Democratic Labour Party going to have people employed in Barbados without a Government development programme of the magnitude of X, Y or Z dollars.

Now, Sir, he talked also on the question of taxation. It is very interesting for me to hear, of all people, criticism from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central on the tax policies of the Government of Barbados. Few of us can forget the persistence of the honourable Member, not only in this session but in the previous session, in his call for a reduction of income tax in Barbados. If there is one point that indicates to me clearly that the honourable Member is what would be called an arch 18th century Tory is that statement. He has been bitterly criticising this Government for years upon years since he entered this House of Assembly as to the high rates of personal income tax.

I well recall his words. He said it destroys initiative, it encourages evasion, it is not good for the public of Barbados. But yet, Sir, now that we have not only reduced the rates of income tax to the tune of \$30 million, now that we have also abolished estate duties in Barbados, he even has the audacity to now say that we were wrong, very wrong, to deal with the question of the transfer of property taxes.

2.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member said that the Government has to repeal property taxes in Barbados. The honourable Member says that. Property taxes can only consist of two things, Sir, — the transfer element and the rate in other countries that local Government have on assessment of property. The honourable Member does not know what he says. If he is worried about his saying that, it seems that he really speaks without his mind being attuned to what is coming out of his mouth.

The truth of the matter is this: that if you are to have a good rate of expenditure, rather on current level or on capital level, and you agree that you must make a contribution from your Current Account surplus to your capital contribution, the money must come from somewhere — and in the context of Barbados it is our philosophy. You can state yours. It is up to you to go to the public. You went to the public on your philosophy and the public agreed with us, so we have a right to implement our philosophy. You have five years to persuade them that your philosophy is right.

If, Mr. Speaker, you recognise because of the openness of the economy of Barbados that what we have to do is to have a taxation regime that encourages initiative and investment in Barbados but you have to look at the balance of payments impact of the.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister has one minute in which to wind up his debate.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Only one minute, Sir? Then these rules are not right, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: We will abide by them this time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. The point is, Sir, we have resources on this side to answer point by point. The reason for the shift in taxation for consumption is that we have to protect the balance of payments. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I recall that it was this Government that not only reduced income tax. It was this Government that granted tax concessions to house builders. It was this Government that granted rights to people in Barbados in successive Budgets to save money, gave them tax free incentives to invest in public companies to get share participation, wider property ownership.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave the Minister time to wind up his debate.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am winding up right now, Sir. We prefer housing to television sets. We prefer, Mr. Speaker, Sir, food on which there is very little tax in buying imports from abroad. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the taxation policy of this Government has been designed to discourage imports and to create more productivity in Barbados. *(Applause)*.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the policy of this Government has been geared towards maintaining employment levels in this country. We had a problem in 1976 where unemployment was extremely high and we made an effort. We took the initiative. We had the courage to create programmes and create employment.

In the last few months, Sir, we have had to be aware of the circumstances of international recession and as a result, this has affected the foreign reserves in Barbados. So both the fiscal and monetary policy implemented over the last seven or eight months have been done bearing in mind that one has to protect one's foreign reserves, and at the same time, bearing in mind the level of employment in Barbados.

The Agricultural sector, Mr. Speaker, is a very important sector to Barbados. This sector employs approximately 5 per cent of the work force, or permanently employs 4 500 people. It contributes approximately ten per cent to the GDP to our country. One must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the domestic export of sugar represents almost 20 per cent of all total domestic exports coming to this country. Manufacturing, Sir, is a very important aspect in employment of people in Barbados. Manufacturing contributes almost 14 per cent to the GDP and employs almost 15 per cent of the labour force, or some 17 000 people. Tourism, perhaps the highest earner of foreign exchange that the Government has had at its disposal, contributes almost 14 per cent of the GDP and employs approximately 17 per cent of the labour force or 20 000 people.

The Estimates, Sir, reflects that this Government is very mindful of the fact that these three areas contributes significantly to employment in Barbados. These Estimates reflects the policy and philosophy of this Government as separate and distinct from the policy and philosophy of the Opposition, as has been pointed out by the last speaker.

The public sector alone, Sir, because of the initiative which this Government has taken in its Capital Programme, today employs 24 per cent of the labour force or 27 000 people. As has been pointed out, Sir, construction is as important to Barbados as the car industry is to North America. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is very mindful of the level of employment, and as we understand it, the unemployment figure is now 10.1 percent, and hopefully by the end of this year or early next year we will see a single digit.

The difference between this Government and the former Administration, Mr. Speaker, is that though we can borrow money, we borrow money for Capital Projects. We do not borrow money for Current Accounts. When the Democratic Labour Party was in power, they borrowed money to pay civil servants' salary. Any business in

Bridgetown, even when you bring it down as simply as a business, any business that borrows money to pay wages at the end of the week has to become bankrupt eventually. The Government cannot borrow money for paying civil servants salaries.

If the other side was saying that we were borrowing too much money, or we were spending money in that way, Sir, I would say that they are correct, but the money which we are borrowing are for Capital projects.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, just quiet.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central talks about falling standards of living but there are a few economic indicators that I can offer, Sir, that will deal with these things so the people of Barbados can decide whether or not, in truth or in fact, the standard of living in Barbados has declined since 1976. Things might be harder now than last year but there are still better than 1976.

Food prices are falling and inflation, as we have heard is just in the double digit figure, 12.8 per cent if you deal on a point by point basis, but when the figures are published for the whole year I believe there would disclose an inflation rate last year of 14.6 per cent or 14.8 per cent — if my information is correct.
2.35 p.m.

Sir, the accumulative inflation rates for Barbados, in 1977 through 1981, was 60 percent. On the other hand, Sir, between 1979 and 1981 the accumulative wage bill was 83.3 per cent. In other words, Sir, though we have inflation ranging between 12 per cent and 14 per cent per annum, the sum total of wages for all sectors — the private sector, the public sector, the manufacturing sector, the sugar industry, the agricultural sector — on average have for the last six years been higher than the average of inflation. That is what one has to look at when one considers that unemployment in Barbados is 10.1 per cent. In Jamaica, Sir, last year unemployment was 26 per cent. In Guyana accurate figures are not produced, World Bank reports indicate that it is in excess of 20 per cent.

Sir, Barbados one island surrounded by sea does not stand alone. We are part and parcel of the whole world, and when a major industrialised country, Sir, like the United States of America is feeling the pinch of inflation, rising prices and international recession as well, who are we, in small Barbados, Sir, to stave it off by ourselves? And I am saying, that in spite of the fact of what is happening around us, we have still been able to maintain

a certain level, a certain standard of living, a certain quality of life better than most of our other Caribbean brothers.

One must look, Sir, when one is talking about whether we are better off or whether we are worse off at the per capita income of Barbadians. In 1975, Sir, the per capita income which is the Gross Domestic Product divided by the population — this is how one arrives at the per capita income of a country, Sir, was \$2 824, last year it was \$6 574 and for the first quarter in this year, it has already exceeded \$7 000. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Facts) We have in five years, Sir, more than tripled the per capita income of Barbadians. That is how you can tell if you are better off, Mr. Speaker, that is how you can tell. And you must relate this to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, the per capita income of Jamaicans last year was \$2 480, of Antiguans \$2 140, of Dominicans \$820 — I am giving in Barbados dollars, Sir — in St. Vincent, the per capita income was \$980, in Grenada \$1 260 and in St. Lucia \$1 560. I can go on to Central and South American countries. There is not a country in the whole of South America, the whole of Central America, and from Jamaica right back down to Guyana with the exception of Trinidad, that has done as well as Barbados. (*Applause*) The whole of Central America, Sir, the whole of South America and the entire Caribbean with the exception of Trinidad and Tobago has a higher per capita income, and the only reason is because Trinidad and Tobago has oil. The petro-dollar down there has forced their per capita income higher than that in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, that is how you can determine whether you are better off or not.

Another point which one must take into consideration, Sir, is the national savings. People are saying that things are tight, that is what I am hearing from the other side, but the gross national savings in 1976 represented less than five per cent of the GDP. Last year, Sir, national savings represented 19 per cent of the GDP. (ASIDE: Hear, hear.) More people are saving more money. Total savings in 1975, Mr. Speaker, were \$360.6 million and at the end of last year total savings were \$618.2 million (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: More to borrow.)

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with private individual savings, let us not mix them up with the savings of big business, with the savings of the show proprietorship to individuals, Sir, the man in the street. Individual savings in 1975 totalled \$205.4 million and in 1981 savings totalled \$449.6 million. (ASIDE: Do you see why he beat Trotman now?) One must take into consideration all of these things when one is looking at the quality of life.

One has to look, Sir, at the number of people that had electricity in 1976 and look at the number of people

that have electricity today. I am going to deal with water in a minute, I am going to deal with electricity now, Mr. Speaker.

In 1976, we are dealing strictly with people and their homes, not businesses — there were less than 54 000 domestic users of electricity, Sir. Today, there are in excess of 62 000 users of electricity, and what is even more important is that in 1976 the per capita consumption of electricity was approximately 520 kilowatt hours compared to almost 12 000 kilowatt hours today. So, not only do more people have access to electricity, Sir, people are using more electricity which means they have a television, a fridge, a freezer, a video tape, electric mixers, radiograms, cassettes. This is how one can reflect on the way of life and the quality of life in Barbados.

Sir, in dealing with water, 92 per cent of all homes in Barbados have running water, 92 per cent. There were less than 45 000 users in 1976 and they exceed 55 000 today. Ninety-two per cent of all homes in Barbados have running water, Mr. Speaker.

When one deals in terms of telephones, Sir, the quality of life is measured by telephones as well. There are certain basic things which are recognised internationally, basic economic indicators and telephones have to be one of them. In 1976, Sir, less than 44 000 telephones were in service. Today, in excess of 60 000 are in service. I am not dealing with commercial enterprises, Sir, they will show a growth of almost 300 per cent in six years. This is how you measure the quality of life in a country and the point which the honourable Deputy Prime Minister made; housing. And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, he made a very, very good speech. I am sorry he did not have another half hour because he was now getting warm, but he will get the opportunity during the course of this week to deal with the comments of Members on that side.

He mentioned housing, Sir, the Opposition spokesman for St. Michael South Central talked about housing and that what we need is to have more money spent on housing and so on. It would interest you to know, Mr. Speaker, that and in terms of long term lending for housing in 1975 when one included the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation, commercial banks, insurance companies and trust companies, the total amount of money loaned for housing programmes, house building and so on was \$52.2 million. As of last year, over \$185 million was loaned for housing — almost four times as much as was loaned in 1975.

Rome was not built in a day, Sir, even the Lord took six days to create the world. We have had five years. I do not belong to the front bench, but I am proud, Mr. Speaker proud to be associated with the people on the

front bench who have given of their best to this country. It is the sort of example which we on the back bench, Sir, will aspire to follow. Every one of the Members on the front bench, Sir, including those who are sitting in the Other Place, have contributed their best to this country, and even though we may have certain difficulties at this particular point in our history, we are not unrelated, Mr. Speaker to what is going on in the rest of the world. We are certainly not unrelated to that.

2.45 p.m.

When one thinks in terms of the quality of life, one must think in terms of the population in relation to how many doctors there are in Barbados. In 1970, for every doctor there were 1900 people, up until last year for every doctor there were 1300 people. The quality of life has improved. For every dentist in 1970 there were 18 300 people in Barbados, today there is one in every 14 000. The infant mortality rate has declined. This is how you measure the quality of life in the country.

Let me close off, Mr. Speaker, by dealing with the point raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central on the National Debt. I touched on it earlier, but the important thing in relation to the National Debt, as I have pointed out, firstly, is that we borrow money for Capital projects, and secondly and most importantly, one must take into consideration the debt service ratio. The rule of thumb of accepting international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, IADB, CIDA and so on, is that if a country's debt service ratio is between 18 and 20 per cent, that country is doing well. We may owe \$683.4 million with a domestic component of \$424 million and a foreign component of \$259.4 million, but, Sir, our debt service ratio is approximately 6 per cent. When you take other countries and deal with their external debt service ratio, you will find that in Jamaica their debt service ratio is 15.9 per cent; in Guyana, 20 per cent; Bolivia, 29.6 per cent; Brazil, 61.6 per cent; Chile, 39.2 per cent; Mexico, 64.1%; Barbados 6 per cent — and the Shadow Minister of Finance says that we are borrowing too much money.

Sir, one cannot pluck out \$684 million that we borrow and say we are borrowing too much money. We must deal with that situation in relation to what we are borrowing the money for, and also what relationship that has in terms of the debt service ratio — that is the point. If the international institutions did not have confidence in the Government of Barbados, they would not be lending us the money so we could borrow \$683.4 million.

He made the point that between 1971 and 1976 the sum total of the debt service ratio when added together was exceeded by the debt service ratio for this year. That is incorrect, Sir. If you added up the debt service ratio

from 1971 to 1976 it far exceeds the debt service ratio for 1981. I just wanted to put that record straight, Sir, because he said the debt service ratio of this year exceeded the debt service ratio of the six years they were in power, and I am stating categorically that that is not true. He has his mistakes mixed up. I cannot accuse him of telling a lie, Mr. Speaker, and you know I will not do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. At least, not in this Hon. House.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Not in this Hon. House. The last point I want to deal with, Sir, is taxation. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that the people of Barbados have been taxed by this Government, and overtaxed until they cannot bear any more tax. Mr. Speaker, the Personal Income Tax and total tax revenue dropped from 29 per cent in 1976-77 to 21 per cent in 1980-81. So contrary to what the honourable Member is saying, we have reduced taxes from 1977 to 1981. If you read the Central Bank Reports they will bear me out on this, that the total tax revenues have dropped from 29 per cent in 1976-77 to 21 per cent in 1980-81.

I close on that note, Sir, and hope to get the opportunity to speak again over the next few days.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Estimates now stand committed to this Hon. House.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, for two hours we have been held up, as it were, by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central who, in attempting to put the case for the Opposition, made a long speech in his usual vigorous and deflammatory style, and attacked the Government on every front — its cultural policy was deficient, its policy on tourism left much to be desired, its manufacturing policy was in shambles, its taxation policy was misguided. Everything was wrong, and we thought that at the end of the day we would have seen the issues that divided the Democratic Labour Party from the Barbados Labour Party. It is only implicitly, Sir, that we have been able to gather what are these issues that divide the Barbados Labour Party from the Democratic Labour Party.

Before I deal with some of these issues that divide us, Sir, I would like to answer the first specific allegation which he made in relation to the Barbados Labour Party Administration. Indeed, I may add that there have only been two or three specific allegations, for in most instances the principal spokesman for the Opposition made charges which were not substantiated and for which he provided this Hon. House with no particulars whatsoever.

He did say, however, quite specifically, that the problems we are having in relation to our Balance of Payments relate directly to the fact that the Central Bank of Barbados accommodated the Government with financing throughout the last year, and that it is as a result of that excessive financing of the Central Government by the Central Bank that we have the Balance of Payments problem. In short, Sir, he sees the Balance of Payments problem as essentially a monetary phenomenon. As far as he is concerned that is the principal and, indeed, the total cause of the problem in relation to the Balance of Payments.
2.55 p.m.

I think it ought to be said, Sir, that the Balance of Payments, as an issue, is too complexed and complicated Sir, to be treated to any unicausal explanation. That is the first mistake which he has made in his analysis, Sir. That is the first and most fatal clause, Sir.

It is a fact, Sir, that the money supply of a country is equal to the net foreign access of the banking system plus the net domestic access; that is a fact Sir. It is also a fact, Sir, that if you increase the money supply of your country without at the same time increasing your foreign earnings, and your reserves, that that tends to put some pressure on your Balance of Payments. But that is not the end of the story, Sir, because if you have a fall in the earnings of your production sectors, if the terms of trade go against you, for example if all of a sudden you have to pay a large amount of three or four foreign increases for energy, if you are getting £200 for your sugar and immediately your sugar attract only £100 per ton, that too, Sir, will reduce your foreign earnings and, as a result, interfere with your Balance of Payments.

Our contention on this side is, Sir, that the problems which we experienced, and are now experiencing in relation to our Balance of Payments, relate directly to the fact, Sir, that we have had a shortfall in our earnings in the principle economic sectors and I refer to sugar, tourism, and to manufacturing, Sir.

The second specific criticism, Sir, which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central made in relationship to the Government Sir, is that the excessive bunching of Capital projects in the last year or year and a half is directly responsible for the problems which we are now having in the economy. Indeed that is a re-statement, Sir, of a speech which he has made in here at least a dozen times, Sir, but it just happens to be our misfortune that we have got to just hear it over and over again. Already we have gone on record, Sir, I say that we on this side feel that we have no apologies to make for an invigorous Capital Programme which we carried out in the last six years in this country, and this really, Sir, is the point to divide us between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party.

In the period of 1971–1976, they did not understand in the Democratic Labour Party that not only is the fiscal policy to be used only for social engineering purposes, not only to redistribute income to the less well off in the community, but that it could be used to stabilize the economy, it could also be used to promote your exports and to improve your national income. That was not understood, Sir, and that is why in the period of 1971–1976, the Democratic Labour Party brought this economy to a virtual standstill. We had years of negative growth and that is why, Sir, thousands of young people in this country could not get work and had to be liming in the streets of this country.

When we came into office, Sir, we understood that we could use fiscal policy in order to stabilize the economy and the particular dimension that needed to be stabilized was the employment dimension. What we did, Sir, was use the construction sector which has been pointed out, Sir, as the lead sector in this stabilizing exercise. We sought concessionary funds from the international agencies to invest in our Capital projects and we expanded the productive base of the economy and at the same time we put thousands of young people to work in this country.

That is a major point of difference, Mr. Speaker, between the Barbados Labour Party Government and the Democratic Labour Party. They see fiscal policies in very narrow terms, Sir, and indeed as has been pointed out in 1974, they had the largest year we have ever had in money terms from a crop of this country. They had money in the Treasury and notwithstanding the fact that they had money in the Treasury which they could have invested in Capital projects, they failed to do so — with the results that things in this country came to a virtual stand still and everyone in Barbados suffered adversely as a result.

The second point that I have got to make in relation to the charge that we have been bunching projects is this, Sir, — as I have pointed out before in this Hon. Chamber, this economy seen over a long period of time has had its moments of prosperity — short for the most part, and long periods of adversity.

Put differently, Sir, the sun does not always shine here. Often we operate under a cloud, and when the sun is out, we have got to make haste and make hay too. The period of 1976 to 1981 we perceived as a good period. There were harsh winds in the world blowing against us. Nevertheless, Sir, we saw the opportunity and we ran as fast and as hard as we could. I think the country is better off for our having done so.

What would have been the alternative — that is the question that we have to pose, Sir, — if we did not invest as heavily as we did in Capital projects to stabilize this

economy and expand its base in the 1976–81 period? What would have been the alternative as has been pointed out by many spokesmen on this side? The alternative would have been, Sir, that the unemployment situation in this country which was threatening to divide this society and tear it apart would have been allowed to continue unchecked, Sir, and we would have had nothing but social disorder in this country had it not been for the Barbados Labour Party coming into office in 1976.

If indeed there was a crisis in the economy of this country in recent years, it was under the Democratic Labour Party during the period of 1974–1976 when the Democratic Labour Party was in office. This leads me, Sir, to the charge that the standard of living has fallen in this country and every class is worse off, that people are going to sleep at night without a meal and there are many who are only getting two or three meals a week. That is what the honourable Member of St. Michael South said Sir — that is a baseless charge. The facts are Sir, that the standard of living in this country has doubled within the past five years, all as a result of the initiative of the Barbados Labour Party. So there can be no question of any standard of living falling at this time, Sir.

The Balance of Payments, Sir, is not the only index as to whether a country's economy is performing well or otherwise; that is not the only index, Sir, of good economic performance.

It is interesting, Sir, that at a time when the West Indian economies are suffering from the most relentless recession they have had for the last forty years, that the employment rate in Barbados is higher than it has ever been in recorded history. We have more people employed in Barbados today when the world is experiencing the most relentless recession than we have ever had employed since we have been keeping employment statistics. It is interesting, Sir, that while our major trading partners, are experiencing in some instances runaway inflation, Sir, that we for the last year have only had an increase of 9.9 per cent.

The charge has been made, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party has made this more of an open economy, more vulnerable to adverse external forces within the last five years than it has ever been. Again, Sir, I reject that as a baseless charge. We can reject that specifically, Sir, by looking at one or two sectors, we can take manufacturing and construction. The investment in the Cement Plant and the investment in the Brick Factory, the latter of which the Government has underwritten the loan for, and in relationship to the first the Government has put in considerable equity, all of that is designed to make sure that we for the most part are self-sufficient in the basic building materials of bricks and cement.

3.05 p.m.

All of that is designed to make sure that we are for the most part self-sufficient in the basic building material, bricks and cement. In short, Sir, it is designed to reduce, if not wipe out completely, our dependence on external or imported building material. So that in relation to the building sector alone and the construction sector, it can be clearly demonstrated that the Government has moved in the direction of reducing the dependence of Barbados on the outside world rather than exposing and increasing Barbados' dependence on the outside world.

The same thing applies, Mr. Speaker, to manufacturing. When the Barbados Labour Party came into office in 1976 the manufacturing sector relied, perhaps as high as 90 per cent, on imported capital. We relied on manufacturers coming from the United States in particular, Mr. Speaker, from Canada and occasionally from countries in Western Europe to invest in manufacturing activities in Barbados. This statistic will demonstrate the trend and the extent to which we have lessened our dependence on the outside world as far as new capital in manufacturing is concerned: two years ago \$20 million was invested in manufacturing activities in Barbados and only \$1.6 million came from outside. That demonstrates the extent to which we in this country have moved towards financially fuelling our manufacturing activity. So that if we look at these two sectors, the construction sector and the manufacturing sector, you will see quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, that the Barbados Labour Party Administration has tried its best to reduce our dependence on the outside world rather than, as has been alleged, increase our dependence on the outside world.

This is not the first time in the history of this country, Mr. Speaker, that we have had difficulties in the economy. In the past we have triumphed over these difficulties, and I have no doubt that on this occasion we will again triumph over these difficulties. We in the Barbados Labour Party have absolutely no doubt about that.

The principal spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party has virtually used it as an occasion for rejoicing and making the wildest sorts of allegations about the Barbados Labour Party Administration, and indeed about the direction of the Government. In the course of the next few days we will have further opportunity to answer him point for point, but there are one or two additional points that must be made at this stage in order to set the stage for the detailed consideration of the Estimates.

One point is this: — and we ought to be frank about this if we are to discharge our public responsibility faithfully — in a situation where the major industrial countries in the world are settling for very modest pay increases, from 2 per cent to 5 per cent, at a time too, Sir, when the demand for the goods produced in the world is contracting, Barbados in that situation would be making a sad mistake indeed if we believed that we can

retain our competitive edge in the manufacturing arena and at the same time increase the cost of production. We cannot maintain our competitive position in manufacturing, or indeed in anything else, if we increase the cost of production at a time when our principal trading partners are themselves trying to reduce the cost of production.

Wages are an important component of the cost of production. If we were to have the sort of wage increases in this country that the Michael Manley Administration gave the Jamaicans in 1974, 1975 and after, we all will follow the road of Jamaica. That is the first argument in relation to moderation in wage claims at this time. If we were to do otherwise we would destroy the competitive position of the goods and services which we sell abroad.

The second point, Sir, relates to the foreign reserves. We can expand the money supply in two ways — either by an expansion of credit, or by an expansion of incomes. If there is an argument for control of credit at this time, the argument for the control of incomes is equally valid, because there are two taps that flow into the increase of money, and if there is a case for turning down one tap, there is an equally powerful case for turning down the second tap.

The big flaw in the argument as put forward by the principal spokesman for the Opposition in relation to wage restraint is firstly, Mr. Speaker, that an increase in wages — an increase in income — is not reflected in any increase in the buying of goods from overseas, and secondly that credit has no place in determining whether or not individuals in Barbados purchase consumer goods.

Now there are obvious flaws in that position. In Barbados, Mr. Speaker, you cannot take advantage of hire purchase facilities unless you have a downpayment in some cases equal to 50 per cent of the cost of the goods. It follows, therefore, that the purchasing of consumer durables on hire purchase terms is as much a function of the existence of the hire purchase terms as the availability of income. It follows from that, Mr. Speaker, that an increase in income is bound to feed into the foreign reserves and put pressure on it at a time when your foreign receipts from exports are not expected to rise dramatically, and that is the case for turning down the two taps — the tap of credit in the first place and the tap of income in the second place.

Mr. Speaker, the principal spokesman for the Opposition has actually got himself into a very contradictory posture. On the one hand he is advocating that we ought to reduce our Capital Estimates and on the other hand he is suggesting that we need to keep employment levels up. Well we really cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. You cannot reduce your Capital Estimates or your Capital Expenditure and at the same time expect that you are

going to maintain your levels of employment. That is why there is so much validity to the charge that has been made by the honourable Deputy Prime Minister when he says that the Opposition, in particular the principal spokesman on these matters, criticise, but we can never hear a single word from him as to how otherwise we would do it or they on that side would do it. They may argue that that is not their job — their job is to criticise. But equally, Sir, it is our responsibility to point out not only the emptiness but the inconsistency of the procedures that they have adopted.

3.15 p.m.

In this particular difficulty that we are facing, Sir, it is quite possible that we could suffer both in terms of the cost of living and high inflation, that we could suffer high unemployment, that we could suffer a reduction in the range of imports, a reduction in the quality of life and also a crisis in our Balance of Payments. We have chosen to maintain employment levels, to keep the cost of living within tolerable limits, to maintain and improve the standard of living, Sir, and to battle with the problem in the Balance of Payments as the sole problem.

There are not many countries in the world today with small recourses, with an open economy that can point to a difficulty only on one front. And notwithstanding that we have a difficulty in relation to the Balance of Payments we are in a position to say, Sir, that we have more foreign reserves today than we had when the Democratic Labour Party handed us the Administration in 1976, so we are nowhere as bad as we were when we took over from them. Indeed, Sir, at that time we had a crisis on every front — a crisis in employment, a crisis in the standard of living that could not have fallen anymore, a crisis in the productive sectors of the economy, a crisis in relation to the Balance of Payments. Today, we have only a difficulty in relation to the Balance of Payments, Sir, and for that the Government ought to be applauded.

In Guyana, a country the same size as Great Britain — 89 000 square miles — with many resources with a much larger population than Barbados, the position is that the economy is in a total collapse and 17 000 public workers have been laid off in the last two years. In Barbados, only 300 public servants who were on a temporary basis have had to seek employment elsewhere. That is the contrast — 17 000 in Guyana who have lost their jobs. And that is the same story everywhere — but not here in Barbados. In the last six years this has been a tightly run economy.

We have used our resources as imaginatively and as constructively as anyone could have, and in that respect, Sir, we have drawn a sharp distinction between the policies of the Democratic Labour Party and the policies of the Barbados Labour Party Administration. We have nothing to be ashamed of in relation to our running of the

economy in the last six years. Rather than having 25 000 unemployed, the Barbados Labour Party has created 25 000 new jobs. That is still the fact today. We on this side have every confidence that with prudence and restraint and with the support of the people we will triumph over the present difficulty, and come another 18 months or so, the sun will yet again shine on all of us. *(Applause)*.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with some comments which have been made on this side of the House. Ever since the 18th century when the system of capitalism linked Barbados inextricably to the metropolitan power, the notion of a country or a constellation of countries existing as a centre of an economic system together with other smaller weaker countries as their appendages have been a well established factor of the international economic scene. In the post World War II period the theorist of international economics sought to divide the world into two basic systems where you had the market economies — the developed country together with trading partners or colonies of the underdeveloped South — and in the other sector of the international economy you had the centrally planned economies that were supposed to operate a completely different system — autonomous — which bore no relation to what was going on within the economy of the market countries. Recent economic events in the world have demonstrated that there are no systems in the world that are compartmentalised and separated from other economic systems.

The repercussions of the oil prices in 1973 were felt with equal force by the centrally planned economies as well as countries with the so-called market economies and today many of those countries are still reeling from the astronomical increase from the price of oil during that period. Moreover, the vigorous pursuit of detente between East and Western countries had resulted during the past decade in the establishment of links between the two blocs. So bi-polar economic systems have now become a thing of the past and the world can be said to consist of one single global interlocking economic union.

Within this context, Mr. Speaker, it is plain folly to discuss economic developments in Barbados in isolation from the rest of the world. The business cycle in every part of the world is as old as mankind itself. If you go back to the Bible, you will read the sage men of antiquity talking about the seven years of feast and the seven years of famine. That is the theological expression of the system of rise and fall — feast and famine — known as the business cycle within economic theory.

I do not believe that the ingenuity of any economist has been able to explain fully why, historically, there have been periods of plenty and periods of scarcity, every man has recorded in history.

3.25 p.m.

We in Barbados are going through a period of relative scarcity with the rest of the world, and the period of relative scarcity in Barbados derives from our interlocking relationship with the rest of the world, and it is clearly unreasonable to expect that when our principal trading partners are locked in a desperate struggle in an effort to rescue their economies from stagnation that we would not experience the same kind of difficulties within our country. We in Barbados can never be totally insulated from the ebb and flow of international economics. So there are serious external factors beyond the control of Government, and it must be stated over and over again that the world has never quite settled down to old patterns of relationships from the moment that it experienced the new phenomenon of repeated escalation in the price of oil.

There are economies including the United States of America which has never gone back to periods when the citizens of that country could take for granted ever increasing prosperity and plenty, and there is no reason, with the paucity of our resources, why Barbadians should begin to think that they are any different from other human beings in other parts of the world.

Now faced with these difficulties in 1976, the Democratic Labour Party Government which had come into power, and had experienced more than a decade of international prosperity, was totally at sea as to how these problems should be coped with. The Government of that period, Mr. Speaker, was tired, and faced with the new problems, they could not muster the energy or the creativity to deal with the difficulties that arose. The new problems called for fresh thinking and the people of Barbados wisely put the tired leaders of the Democratic Labour Party into the Opposition. And when this Government came to power, it is to its credit that it was not only able to steady the turbulence of the economic ship of State, but to do what no other non oil producing country or non oil exporting country has done — to effect stabilisation within its Balance of Payments and simultaneously improve the standard of living of people within the country. It is an achievement for which the Government of Barbados is justifiably lauded in other parts of the world where the problems of developing countries are discussed.

Now these Estimates which are placed before this Hon. House, and which will be debated this week, must be examined within this historical context. To do otherwise would be to provide a disservice to the people of Barbados. These Estimates contemplate a Capital Expenditure of over \$135 million for the coming year and much criticism has been levelled at the size of the projected Capital Expenditure. Any Government that fails to embark upon Capital Expenditure, Mr. Speaker, is a Government that is not using the mechanisms at its disposal for maximum development of the country.

The Barbados Labour Party is committed to a programme of development which seeks to create a climate in which those who control the private sector can operate to an optimum degree, but at the same time, it recognises a Government has certain inalienable responsibilities to undertake development which private individuals and private groups can, by their nature, not undertake successfully. I believe the kind of services that Governments provide are normally characterised as public goods, and one does not normally expect private corporations within any society where there is a mixed economy to provide things like roads, schools, and for the most part, health facilities. Therefore, Government as the principal and in many cases sole provider of public goods must maintain a high level of Capital Expenditure in order to ensure that the people of this country enjoy these things.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados is to be congratulated for not seeking during this difficult period to reduce transfer payments to the poor. That matter of social policy has always been crucial in the development of Estimates or Budgetary Proposals and no circumstance could be contemplated where a Government with the kind of commitment that this Government has to the poor could reduce transfer payments on the grounds of economic difficulty because, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely in times that are not so good that Government needs to come to the rescue of those citizens who have been casualties of the recession.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Government in its social policy has sought to formulate principals which would ensure that transfer payments when made do not amount to squandermania. The entire social policy is predicated upon the assumption that social development must parallel economic development, and that economic development cannot proceed at a maximum pace if there is a lack in the social sector, and when social development policies have been carried out, they have been carried out in such a way to ensure maximum economic benefit.

3.35 p.m.

You will see in these Estimates, Mr. Speaker, an increased allocation in relation to Foster Care and the services of adoptions. What this represents is a concretisation of the parallelism between economic and social development, and I will show you how the latter seeks to promote the former.

At the present time within our system of child care, Mr. Speaker, there are some eight residential homes and 15 day care centres. Within these mass institutions, as I call them, we have at least 100 children in each centre. This Government believes that it is a barbarous and archaic policy to have young children reared in such impersonal surroundings, and it has therefore devised a community based approach to child care. This community

based approach to child care will result in the closing of over 90 per cent of the child care institutions, and such care will be replaced by community care in the development of a Foster Care Programme as well as a new modernised programme for adoption.

The abolition of the mass children's homes and the complete elimination of institutional care which warps the personalities of young children, and which create social misfits who terrorise the society, will result in significant savings under the Child Care Board. Not only will the Government spend less within the next eight years on its Social Development Plan, but it will create a situation where those children who have no biological parents, or whose biological parents are incompetent, will be admitted into the homes and brought up in a normal manner and thus become more adjusted individuals and not deviant adults who perpetrate crimes within this community.

The social development within this community therefore parallels economic development in the sense that it effects savings. All of the mass institutions except one will be totally abolished and in their place will be community programmes for children. And since our new adoption procedures, and the experts that we have recruited, will ensure that the majority of children now in child care will eventually be adopted via foster care, it will mean that there will be a significant reduction in expenditure.

Now, I hear a lot of talk about the productive sector, but this term "productive sector" needs some clarification. Ever so often economists and those people whom they influence fling out fad words, and today within the Barbadian context whenever people get together to discuss the economy, one hears *ad nauseum* the term "productive sector" flung at one, and I doubt that many people within the community understand what the productive sector means.

The productive sector applies to the entire economic arena. There are productive social services and there are productive economic services. When the words "productive service" are used in contradistinction from social services activities, what the users of this term seem to mean is that area of the economy that has the potential for generating income in the short run, income or foreign exchange in the short run.

This narrow use of the term "productive sector" by its constant repetition leaves people then to draw the inference that all the other sectors within the Government domain are non-productive. I want to take issue with this notion where sectors of the economy with the potential for generating income or foreign exchange in the short run are distinguished from social sectors and are called

productive and we are left with the belief that all the other areas of Government activity are non-productive.

Mr. Speaker, this is plainly nonsensical. Social sectors by their very nature become productive in the long run and are therefore not candidates for immediate attention when you have cash flow problems or Balance of Payments problems. But it is nonsense to assume that there is something called a productive sector that is distinguished from the social sectors.

In any philosophy for social development, in any philosophy where the Government holds the view that for a society to attain maximum efficiency there must be parallel social and economic development, it is plainly foolish to talk of a productive sector as distinct from a social sector. The social sector is part of the entire productive sector of the country, but certain areas are productive in the short run of cash and foreign exchange, and others are productive in the long run.

I said that, Mr. Speaker, to say this — that in our social programme for child care when we seek to produce well adjusted persons rather than individuals who have their characters warped and stunted within a cold impersonal institutional environment, we produce men who are productive individuals and people who when they become adults are not charges on the State. That is what I mean by a social programme being productive in the long run.

I will go further. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that in the area that is called National Assistance — a term which I find as detestable as the term Welfare itself — that the levels of expenditure of the previous year have been retained. Again, it indicates the recognition of the close link and the parallelism between economic and social development.

3.45 p.m.

There are some people who do not understand the difference between welfarism and social development — who perceive such payments as a waste of money. There are people who would prefer to see individuals out of their sight; there are some people who even advocate that the element in this community who are charging the State should be the victims of euthanasia. Some time ago, this was a very serious thought, and it has articulate exponents in the metropolitan countries, Mr. Speaker, and given the predisposition of people in a peripheral country like Barbados to emulate people whom they admire in the metropolitan countries, it must be taken seriously.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has three minutes to make his decision.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: I hope Mr. Speaker, that you will be indulgent enough to raise the question

of euthanasia which is now being whispered in the corridors as a final solution of dealing with old age. So long ago, or not so long ago, there was a movie, Mr. Speaker, that recently appeared in the metropolitan countries and when this movie appeared in the metropolitan countries — they do not appear for simple amusement, they are in many cases a way and means of testing the movie-going public before it is adopted as a major policy — this whole question came up. Elderly men and elderly women were introduced to a room during the period — and this is the moment that has the greatest impression of euthanasia — and they were gassed with an odour of perfume, they were gassed to death.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say, Sir, this is not sticking to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: This is sticking to the Resolution. It is believed that this sort of question has no economic existence; they were gassed to death and then taken to a pulverisation plant where their bodies were crushed to powder. Other elements were added to the dust of these people and then they were packaged as food for the young people to consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is very, very serious, because immediately after.....(Aside).....I make this point because the view that you must abandon old people and that you are wasting money if you allocate sums of money for their benefit is one removed from the solution, which says that if they exist they must be productive and you can only be productive in a situation where in anticipation of world famine it is found necessary to use the body of an elderly person.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure you would not subscribe to this kind of barbaric solution for dealing with the social conditions of this country. Mr. Speaker, I must impress upon your indulgence and I hope to be given the opportunity to develop the thesis of the parallelism between this economic and social development, and to pave the extremely narrow and reactionary effort of a so-called social sector existing in isolation from the economic sector. Thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 15 minutes for a Tea Break.

The question that the sitting be suspended for 15 minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

3.55 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to be involved in Estimates now for the sixth year and I have never ceased to be amazed at the shenanigans that are displayed by the Opposition Party. What I find amazing, Sir, is that they with such singular accomplishment are able to talk out of both corners of their mouth at the same time — that they can call with one voice for a better deal for Barbadians, a better standard of living for Barbadians, an increase in the quality of our life, and at the same time damn the Barbados Labour Party when it demonstrates its concern for the citizens whom they say are enduring a great deal of suffering.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central earlier today complaining, for example, about the burden of taxation. He claimed that under the Barbados Labour Party there is a taxation burden unprecedented, and he went on further to state that not only do we have an unprecedented taxation burden, but we have an inordinately high debt burden to bear.

Now, Sir, one of the realities of life is that as people grow, their needs expand, their aspirations expand, and in order to give substance to the aspirations of the people, it is necessary for a Government to conceive programmes that were not dreamed of before. The Barbados Labour Party has demonstrated that in a short five years it has come to a full realisation of the extent to which the quality of life in Barbados can be enhanced, and it has not only given verbal expression to this realisation, but it has gone ahead full speed and has implemented programmes that will put paid to the legitimate aspirations of our people.

When we talk about the debt burden, Sir, we are talking not only about economics, we are talking about social services as well — so long as we are the Government. It is possible, Sir, out of the salary which we all earn to purchase those things which we feel we need, but there is an inescapable reality that all of us must face — that throughout Christendom and for as long as this world would last, people will use the facility which enable them to acquire assets for present-day consumption and they will pay for them out of future earnings. This is no strange fact; it is ultimate reality. To put it in simple terms, Sir, there are not too many people in this society who can purchase a house for cash. I know of one or two who have done so, but it is not possible to make that kind of expenditure. I am speaking now about most of us, the vast majority. About 99.9 per cent of all Barbadians who own their own house have had to go into debt for periods as high as 30 years to pay for it. That is nothing unusual.

In the United States, in the United Kingdom and in all parts of the world, people simply have to purchase those kinds of assets using debt. The Government, Sir, is no different in that respect. There are amenities which we

have to provide for our people now, and the economic reality is that in order to provide for those services now, they have to be financed out of future earnings. So when a Government goes into debt and uses that debt for the provision of tangible and lasting assets for the welfare and well-being of its people, that Government should not be condemned.

Now, Sir, if a Government goes into debt for consumption purposes just merely to fritter it away on frivolities — living like the prodigal son — that is a different matter, and we could stand castigated if that is our attitude to borrowing. This Government has an impeccable and unblemished record in setting its goals realistically and chartering a course that has allowed us to provide a level of services for Barbadians unprecedented in the history of Barbados — and almost unprecedented anywhere in this hemisphere.

One of the unfortunate things about life, Sir, is that too few of our citizens ever had an opportunity to leave home. If Barbadians could get an opportunity to travel next door or even farther afield, I believe they would be able to comprehend what this Government in its far-sighted policy in economic and social development has been able to accomplish for them.

If you were to go to Venezuela, a country that is bathed with oil and is registered among the richest of countries in the world in so far as its oil resources are concerned, your heart would burn when you see the bad houses in which those people are forced to live. We have some houses in Barbados in which people house some of their pets and they are palaces compared to some of what you will find right in the city of Caracas. Sir, if you went next door to any of our neighbouring countries, the stark reality would hit you smack in the face.

Developed countries complain, Sir, that Barbados, a two by four country, is able to provide education up to tertiary level free of charge to its citizens. That is how we spend our money — so that Barbadians can be educated in circumstances that make them the best educated people that you can find anywhere on God's earth, where almost every man, woman and child of school age of this country can read and write with more than marginal force. And we hear the Opposition Party come in here and say, Sir, that we should give people a better deal, but in the same voice they say that we are borrowing too much money.

4.20 p.m.

We borrowed money to build schools and to build roads. Those roads are not going to be used up tomorrow, Sir, those roads will be part of the heritage that we will leave for generations yet to come. We will use them as long as we survive and they in turn will have them to

use. So it is only rational and reasonable that we should extend the payments for that type of service over a time so that this particular generation does not have the full burden today. That, Sir, is sound economics, sound management.

There is not a business in Bridgetown, I am telling you, Sir, not one in Bridgetown of any size at all that is not in debt today, not one, Sir. Every one of them operate on overdraft. They operate on overdrafts because they too recognise the fact that you use money wisely. You borrow to invest, and if you invest wisely, you will get a higher return than you will have to pay for the opportunity to use that money which I referred to. You borrow from the bank, use it to provide the service that you want to provide. You are to return the bank's money and at the same time the margin of profit is used in the lasting asset. That is sound business.

I believe, Sir, that we are sufficiently matured politically for an Opposition party to be able to recognise that this is the way to do business, and when they come in and they fulminate and talk about how extended we are in our lip service and all of that business, I smile.

I do not want to reduce it to the absolute absurd Sir, but do you realise that Sir Freddie Laker owed away more money than Barbados? Sir Freddie Laker was only one man. He was only one man and his business went bust. He went bankrupt because he extended himself too far. But I am talking about one man, Sir, and the Barbados National Debt is nowhere what Freddie Laker owed away — and 250 000 people on this island, they tell me, cannot pay back a portion of what Freddie Laker owed. I mean, Sir, that is reducing it, Sir, almost to the ridiculous. That is what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central says — that Barbados is on the brink of collapse because 250 000 of us cannot pay back a portion of what Freddie Laker owed. We have not yet missed one payment, Sir.

Barbados owes \$683.4 million, that is what we owe, and the Minister of Finance is making the point that we owe a good portion of that to ourselves. So I really cannot understand how a man who claims to have such competence in the field of economics and high finance can come in here and say that we are on the brink of collapse.

The figures indicate that over 400 million of that money that I just quoted is money that we owe to ourselves. Only just over some \$200 million is owed to foreign interest, yet we have to endure, year after year, week after week, the fulminations of a man possessed with visions of elapse, a prophet crying in the wilderness, the lamentation of Ezekiel.

I have a feeling sometimes, Sir, that we preach this kind of thought because that is really what we would like to see happen. But I am satisfied, Sir, that with the present programme, that this Government does not face any prospects with the kind of prudent management that we have brought to bear, and will continue to bear, on the management of the country. I do not see that prospect happening.

The debt service ratio is six per cent. I will again illustrate that for you, Sir, in very simple ridiculous terms. It would be as if a man who earns \$200 a week owed away \$12. Those are the kind of terms we are talking about. It would be as if a man who used to earn \$200 a week owed away \$12. So you can understand what we are talking about — a very insignificant figure.

I would like, Sir, to indicate a view point which may be of interest. We in Barbados, sometimes those of us in politics, believe that we are generally talking to infants, to people with soft heads, and we do not give Barbadians sufficient credit for being able to comprehend the matters about which we talk and which touch their minds. We say for example, Sir, that a tax burden is high, and I am a bit concerned because the generation of politicians that we are dealing with now are trying to drive into the heads of people that they can expect to get a high standard of living without any corresponding effort; that you can expect to earn without working. We tell domestics that they are not to work for \$66 a week, but we do not tell them what they should do in lieu of working for \$66 a week. That kind of politics, I believe, does not become us in this day and age.

We have to learn how to educate our people to realise that it was only through effort that we achieved what we have managed to achieve, and our parents and forefathers worked hard to establish the foundation upon which we could build. If we continue to tell people that that foundation and what we have managed to accomplish was achieved through a general attitude of do not care, happy go lucky, do not work, liming, then we are in for destruction. This country will crash, not because we are in too much debt, but because we tell people that it is alright to go out there and demand a level of services like the bus services, educational facilities and health facilities — you can look forward to them, that is your entitlement, but you do not have to work to provide means to which those things can be realised.

I do not think that that is fair, Sir, and I do not think it is good politics, because sooner or later, this monster that we are creating is going to eat us. Unless we begin to get honest with people and tell them that whatever we hope to accomplish comes with toil, we are going to breed a generation of Barbadians that are not going to be positively oriented towards work. And when

they discover that the pie-in-the-sky promises that were made to them, in order to court them, do not materialise, they are going to turn on those people who misled them and cause them to forego the preparation of themselves in order to be productive citizens in this country.

Now, Sir, a "Statement of Capital Expenditure for the Ten Year Period 1971/72 — 1980/81" is before me — I am reading, Sir, from the "Barbados Estimates 1982-83" — and I have before me, Sir, that the Capital Expenditure for 1971-72 was \$21 million, roughly \$22 million — this is when the Democratic Labour Party was in power — and from 1971 to the end of 1976, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party's Capital Works Programme was multiplied by two. In other words, Sir, in that five year period 1971-76, they only managed to slightly more than double the Capital provisions in the Estimates.

Now, under the Barbados Labour Party from 1976 until 1981, we have brought the Estimates from about \$48 million to \$138 million which would represent approximately three times what we found when we came to power. When you look around you, Sir, you can see the difference, and you can see where that money went. You see a polytechnic — a massive, impressive complex for the purpose of educating our children across a broad spectrum.

We in Barbados, Sir, have been engaging in the luxury of educating people with book learning and we have not recognised that a large portion of our national resources, our people resource, is neglected, because not all of us are endowed with the capacity to understand Latin and French or to be interested in it. The Good Lord, when He was designing this world, realised that it took a multiplicity of interests and a multiplicity of resources in order to make this world function in the way that it should function and we have not been educating people in engineering.....(*Aside*)..... My friend, the honourable Minister of Transport and Works is telling me to use the elegant term, "the Divine Architect". Those people, Sir, are provided for at places like the polytechnic or provided for through the Barbados Skills Training Programme, a programme that recognises that tradesmen are indispensable elements in the links of human resources essential to the whole development of a modernising society.

You heard, Sir, that people say that we were increasing taxation unduly. Sir, you were here during the last four Budgets in Barbados when the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance was able to demonstrate to the people of Barbados that when all of us strive together and work diligently together, we were able to build our resources and at the end of our achievement we could find some relief. But, we ought not to forget, Sir, that in order to provide the kind and quality of services that we are providing in Barbados, it would be necessary for taxes to be levied.

You know, Sir, I find it interesting; and sometimes we seem to forget that one of our first encounters with the Master was on the occasion when his parents were journeying up to Jerusalem. You will remember what they were going up there to do, Sir — they were going to pay their taxes, a long trek for the purpose of paying their taxes. So there is nothing new about this question of taxation.

What we need to do is to make certain that in the provision of services, our level of management is of a sufficiently sophisticated nature as to be able to utilise all of our resources and to diminish, or to eliminate, waste that sometimes lead to undue levies and taxes. But that has not been the case in the Barbadian economy and we are proud to be able, Sir, to point to the fact that in the last four years, the Barbados Labour Party Government has been in a position to provide a level of services to which I have referred while at the same time, reducing the tax burden.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister will wind up in a single minute.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: So I, Sir, in summation would like to commend the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance for his management and to promise that together we, the Barbados Labour Party Government and the people of Barbados, will continue to lead this country in the direction in which it should go so that we will all be able to eat the fruits of our labours.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be here to speak this afternoon on the Estimates for 1982-83.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the Democratic Labour Party would come in here and agree and let the masses of this island know, and commend this Government for a job well done, I believe it would be better for them.
4.40 p.m.

I am glad to know that this is an educated electorate. Mr. Speaker, as you look around and compare the movements of the Democratic Labour Party, they all talk about bankruptcy, but I believe that the Democratic Labour Party is thinking about the bankruptcy of their brains all down through the years till 1976. All around the world everybody is commending the Barbados Labour Party for a job well done, but the only people you can find trying to discredit the Barbados Labour Party are the members of the Democratic Labour Party.

When I was a boy we used to set eggs on Good Fridays and sometimes you would get a steam boat coming, sometimes you got a man burning the dead, all kinds of things like that, and I would say that the Democratic Labour Party used to run like that. They used to start a project and it came out to something else. Mr. Speaker, I always think about the Coast Guard, I always think about the Crematorium at Warrens where they spent \$300 000 on the foundation and left it like that.

I definitely believe that that kind of wastage over there could cause a little tightness now. Talking about the Coast Guard, I am one of those people who live very close to the sea and I am very interested in fishermen. I remember when we had three Coast Guard ships in Barbados under the Democratic Labour Party regime. Not that they brought the Coast Guard to back up the fishermen at all times, and we know that they could not afford to bring the Coast Guard only to assist the fishing boats, but we had a boat at Half Moon Fort Bay which was valued at about \$35 000 and which belonged to a poor man. That boat overturned in the sea and they were lucky enough to call to get the Coast Guard. When the Coast Guard came to Half Moon Fort Bay and asked for the position of the boat, we told them it was in the north east above the lighthouse, and the people on the Coast Guard told us they would have to go back to town to refuel to get back around the North Point. Up to now those men have not returned to the North Point, because they knew that that boat was inefficient, and that the same way the sea knocked over the fishing boat it would knock over the Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, you can look now and see that this is a Government with a difference. When you look around and you see the type of Coast Guard that we have on the stage nowadays, you will see that those boats can go all over the sea — nobody has to be scared. You see, when the members of the Barbados Labour Party spend money, they spend real money, they do not try to waste the taxpayers' money, they spend it sensibly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch a little on the Scotland District. I am very proud to know that I am associated with a Government which is taking care and thinking of the poor people in this country. I always think of the Brick Factory, because I am a little in that line. I remember hearing the Prime Minister say that he would like to see Barbados turned into a little Bermuda — there are very few wooden houses in Bermuda. Since 1976 you do not see so many wooden houses being built, everybody is going bungalow style.

Mr. Speaker, the Clay Brick Factory was erected in 1959 by the Barbados Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party came into power and stayed there for 15

years and they never saw fit to encourage that factory where we could get bricks at a cheaper price so that more people could get houses.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, is the Cement Plant in my district. The Democratic Labour Party is always talking about things, always planning — planning and wasting more time planning, but I would say this is a party with a difference. I am sure that when we have the Brick Factory up there turning over as well as the Cement Plant, the price of housing will have to be reduced.

I always listen to the members of the Democratic Labour Party trying to fool the old people of this country. They told them that they gave them two pensions and the minute the Barbados Labour Party came into power in 1976 they took away one from them — ridiculous! An old age pensioner came at my home and asked me why did the Barbados Labour Party as soon as it came into power stopped her other pension. She had a little booklet with her and when I looked at it I had to tell her that that was the law since 1967, where one person could not receive two pensions, and the Barbados Labour Party was not in power in 1967. I told her I knew she was a person who could read, so she would understand that the Democratic Labour Party was a party which likes to walk around and fool people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 when the Democratic Labour Party came into power the old people of this island were getting \$5 per week. They spent 15 long years in power and for that 15 years they could only see fit to give the old people of this country \$8 more, to make it \$15. What a shame! The Barbados Labour Party came into power in 1976 and from then until 1981 they found it clear to give \$15, which is approximately \$3 a year, so you will see the contrast.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the young people of this country, I would say that this party does not neglect anybody, it takes care of the young as well. Years ago, in the Seventies, and a boy or girl reached age 14, the Democratic Labour Party made it law for them to leave school. From the time the Barbados Labour Party came back into power they opened up a way to put those boys and girls back to school, and those boys and girls came out with subjects so that they could go and work for themselves. There is also the polytechnic where these boys and girls can learn trades and skills to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to touch a little on the Defence Force of this country. Now, we have some boys and girls who sometimes come out with six or seven 'O' Levels, but no one can control them. As soon as they find themselves in the Defence Force, they are a disciplined group, they are a group that is willing, and anybody can talk and reason with them, so you can

see how the Defence Force is helping in trying to mould our young people. There are some parents who cannot mould children, they cannot train them in that style, but I am sure the most disciplined people we have in the island of Barbados now are the people who belong to the Defence Force.

4.50 p.m.

I always say, in 1974 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power — in that gold rush, I call it — down here that year we could have been a little New York, because that was a year when we had the sugar price — but we had no sugar.

We realise now that the Democratic Labour Party was responsible for the closing down of the factory in Spring Hall which was owned by the Government in that day.

I remember a few days ago in this Chamber what an honourable Member from that side said about the closing of Porters and Vacluse which was very difficult for the poor people of St. Lucy at that time. I wonder who that honourable Member was trying to fool, because I was there when the Democratic Labour Party came to power. It found two grinding factories in the parish of St. Lucy and the Democratic Labour Party was responsible for closing down Spring Hall which was owned by the Government. But now they are trying to fool the people in St. Lucy by telling them that we just closed down Porters, the Barbados Labour Party allowed them to close down Vacluse in St. Thomas, so what are the poor people of St. Lucy going to do? Mr. Speaker, in those days when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, they were not thinking of the poor people of St. Lucy and I would not like to let them get away now as they try to smoke screen and try to fool the poor people of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch a little on health and hospitals of this country. We know all through the time you will hear morning, noon and night of people dying at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but you don't hear that now, Mr. Speaker, you can see a marked difference since the Barbados Labour Party came into power. You can see it is a Party that takes care of the people from the cradle to the grave. As a young man, when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, you would hear of our young children dying. You don't hear anything like that now. It means that the health standards have risen to such a pitch in this country, so, Mr. Speaker, let us get clear about that right now.

When we look around and see the movement of the Housing Authority and compare it with the movement under the Democratic Labour Party, and the amount of houses we built and the amount of moneys we spent as compared with the Democratic Labour Party, I don't think there is any comparison whatsoever.

The Democratic Labour Party always try, and I would say they are responsible for the movement in the tourist industry now. I was at Paynes Bay corner one night — a little before the election — when the Democratic Labour Party had a meeting there. I would say the tourist that day felt happy to come and listen to a political meeting in the island of Barbados. When those people got there, most of them, with their blankets around them, felt very happy and merry. But as fast as those people got to that spot they were running back to their hotel beds when they listened to the members of the Democratic Labour Party giving an impression like they would have the coloured people versus the white.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there are good white people and there are bad white people. I also believe there are good coloured people and there are bad coloured people, and I feel we should learn to live together. But week after week, even when you come into this honourable Chamber, you see the honourable Members from that side always try to paint such an ugly picture of Barbados, and it always have these people in a kind of a position where they are scared to come to this country. Mr. Speaker, they are responsible.

I remember a little before that same time at that meeting I heard an honourable Member from that side telling the people do not cut canes let the white people cut the canes. I believe that was disgraceful.

Now we all know the uses of the sugar industry to this country. We realize the hotel industry bring in quite a lot of funds but when you compare hotels where you have to buy equipment such as plates, stoves and all those various things, there is a lot of money you have to spend in order to get a hotel off its foot. But when you think of the sugar industry, and when the good Lord send his rain on the earth, all you have to buy is a little manure. I am sure that we in Barbados profit more off sugar than anything else in this country.

You will see Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Labour Party was trying its best to stop people from working for themselves. I always believe the Good Book says that by the Sweat of a man's brow shall he eat; and I would say that the Democratic Labour Party tried to stop people from working in this country.

Mr. Speaker, now we all know that the Barbados Labour Party last year had some experiment carried on up in the south east of the island. I am sure it has paid off already this year because we caught more fish this year — much more than we had this time last year, and we can see results of the movement. You can see that this is a party that is not only thinking about the agriculturalist, it is thinking about the fishermen; we are thinking about everybody. We are talking about everybody, also the builders as you can see.

Years ago when we had the Agriculture Department, and when the honourable Member in front of me now brought back the subsidy that they could help people with animals and so on, that was very wonderful. I was one of those people, Mr. Chairman, I would tell you that. The Democratic Labour Party regime never had uses for, or thought about the small farmer, and I tell you if you make a call today for the plough to come the next day or two days from then, you would see the plough there. I remember that day when I took cows home and we were waiting to call the insemination people and some times it took months and the people never came. But I would say that this is a party with a difference, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that when we think of the soil in St. Andrew, we all know the kind of soil and land that they have down there and we spend quite a lot of money year after year importing fruits and so on. I would say Mr. Speaker, that if the Democratic Labour Party was a party that was thinking and had its head in the right places, I am sure that we could stop importing fruits from Dominica and Trinidad and those places, because we would have our own fruits. But all I can say is this is a party with a difference.

I remember the honourable Member here again had green land down there and had a lot of waste land too, and I am sure they are going to reap tons of canes this year. They look beautiful, and that was land that was going to waste. When it comes to Bath Plantation, that was run to ruin. In my parish I can tell you that there were about 13 estates which were uncultivated under the Democratic Labour Party regime, but now today you would be happy to know that we do not have one estate down there now that is uncultivated except Lowlands Plantation, because we do not know who are the actual owners of that. (*Asides*).
5.00 p.m.

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister would be glad to sell out Lowlands. I hope the owners would be able to get it sold in a way that the poor people in Pie Corner would be able to get lots, because the people there are suffering for spots. These people are desperately waiting for house lots, and I would like to know that the people in Pie Corner are served also.

I would also like to commend the Minister of Communications and Works, because I remember, Mr. Speaker, that we had quite a lot of write-up a few months ago. We had CBC, we had the Advocate Newspaper and we had the Nation. I do not know how they used to have the luck to get to St. Lucy so early, but as soon as the rains started to fall you would see all three units down in St. Lucy watching the rain going down through that bridge in the area going to Little Bay.

That bridge was there from the time I was born, and I am 52 years of age, and there are people up there

who are 100 years who will tell you that in their early days when the rain fell, it meant that no children could get out. It meant who was out was out and who was in was in. The Democratic Labour Party always boasted about Pie Corner. They always said that Pie Corner was their stronghold, but yet the people of Pie Corner could not count on them.

I would like to appeal to the Advocate newspaper, the Nation and CBC to come back. They went down there and took pictures of it when we started to erect it and the rains came and dragged it away. I would like them to come back now and take a picture of it and let the people of Barbados see what a nice bridge the Barbados Labour Party has built in the parish of St. Lucy at Pie Corner. Mr. Speaker, I think that was something wonderful and I am very thankful to the Hon. Minister for that.

Now Mr. Speaker, in that day the people would always call in when the rains caused a division. It was the Roy Brathwaite bridge because the rain was carrying it away, but now it is finished and the Ju-C truck and other trucks do not have to stop and can drive over there. Today you might hear it called somebody else's bridge, I believe you would understand what I mean by somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Hon. Minister again on the bus service in this country. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the bus service in this country has improved by leaps and bounds, and I would like to appeal to the Minister here again to take a look at Boscobelle where we have that bridge and the bus cannot get over because it is damaged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the honourable Member will have some time to go into more detail on these matters. I appreciate that the honourable Member is talking about Boscobelle in St. Peter, never mind whose case it is. It is the people's case that he is trying to put, but nevertheless, at this stage in a Second Reading speech, he must deal with the principles of the Bill before this Hon. Chamber rather than go into details. We appreciate the point he is making very well indeed however.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to comply as closely as possible. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Estimates for this year are quite clear and fair. As you look around you can see the strides that have been made. When you think of the Heywoods Project and the improvements in that area, we can be proud.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to make the point that I do not want the honourable Member to believe that the Chair tried to stop him from talking about Boscobelle or anything else. The point I am making now is that in the

Estimates an opportunity will present itself when you can go into the works and drive home your point about Boscobelle.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see that these Estimates will allow for some funds to finish the playing field in Boscobelle during the next financial year. Mr. Speaker, I also know that the housing project we have at Maynards will be finished.

I am sure that we are all satisfied with the administration of the Barbados Labour Party over the last few years, and in winding up, Mr. Speaker, I would like also to appeal to the Minister of Lands and Housing to come back to the Road View area — Battaleys — now that it is free, and release some more lands there, because there is a demand in Speightstown for playing facilities and such things, and I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Housing to do all that lies in his power for the parish of St. Peter, because we all know how the parish of St. Peter suffered under the hands of the Democratic Labour Party.

For 15 long years not one stroke had been driven in that parish, but this afternoon I am very happy that we can say we have right now the Maurice Byer Polyclinic, we have the housing area at Maynards, we have the Skills Training Programme down there and we have the land we have just acquired at Battaleys. I am sorry it is not more. We have the playing field at Mile-and-a-Quarter already, we have just had the big tank at Boscobelle on the hill, and I think St. Peter is now getting a good share. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this Bill before this Hon. Chamber provides honourable Members with an opportunity to review the projects and the performance of the Government, and at the same time it provides us with an opportunity to analyse the programmes that are provided in the Estimates. It therefore follows that one should reflect on the programmes of the Government during the past year and at the same time look at the projects which the Government has earmarked, and the expenditure which will result from these projects.

Much is said about the National Debt, the foreign debt, and all that economic language, but what is important to the average Barbadian is the fact that he should understand that this economic language, though it may sound big, though it may sound above the head of the ordinary person, is very simple and ought to be made simple.

The Government must find money to provide services for this country. It must therefore raise money by some means in order to finance these projects. People have got to be paid and the projects have got a cost and

that cost must be met, and therefore the Estimates come before this Hon. Chamber with a view to determining what is the anticipated figure or sums of money to be spent on such projects. Whatever money is borrowed to finance these projects, whatever money is incurred, must be seen in the light that there is a cost to development.

We have got for instance, Mr. Speaker, the Speightstown Bypass, we have got the Oistins Project, we have got the St. Barnabas Highway and we have got the Spring Garden Highway among others including the Cement Plant. All of these, Sir, are projects which will be of lasting value and as one honourable Member has already said for the common heritage of all Barbadians. Any money, Sir, that is spent on projects such as these is worthwhile and all Barbadians — all and sundry — should appreciate the Government efforts in providing such important schemes for them.
5.10 p.m.

Road expansion such as the Spring Garden and the Speightstown By-Pass would certainly add to more economic activity. Anyone who has some elementary economics know that infrastructure and services, roads and telecommunications, are vital and fundamental schemes in the economic expansion of any country, and therefore one must see these developments, not in the short term, but in the long term of the total development. We must see them as investments and though there may be criticisms levelled at the Government for too rapid an expansion in these areas, or in some areas, we must consider with all soberness that Government has planned these projects because of the future economic development of the country.

The Government has got absolutely nothing to be ashamed of. The Government National Debt stands at \$683 million and it must be pointed out that a minor portion of that National Debt is known as the foreign debt. What must be pointed out to Barbadians is the fact that some \$424 million was borrowed to finance projects for Barbadians. It is Barbados' money, or money that was created in the most part by this Administration. Was the Government not ably and prudently managed? I am sure that this Government, or any Government, really would be able to borrow domestically, and therefore it is a credit to the able management of the country that we have been able to control our borrowing from foreign sources. Therefore we should be very proud as a Government and we are truly proud that we have been able to reduce it.

The Opposition was saying over the past months that the National Debt would have exceeded some \$700 million. That is a point that must be made. It is not \$700 million. They are surprised. No wonder they cannot come in here and sit down and listen to what is said on this side on this occasion, because they predicted that —

it was the Shadow Minister of Finance who made it abundantly clear. He pointed out in such a dramatic manner that the National Debt would have escalated. It would have exceeded to \$700 million, but today he realises that that figure has not been reached. I am sure that that in itself goes to show how the Opposition has been really off target and, how they have been misreading the signs.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable Member has said that I said that the National Debt would rise to \$700 million. I would just like to say that what I said was that in November 1979, the National Debt was \$702 million.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the honourable Member can get up and seek to elucidate but I have a fairly good memory and the honourable Member has on other occasions said, though he may retract a little today, that the National Debt would have exceeded \$700 million. That was the point. That is what he has said, but it is a mere \$683 million. I do not want to dwell on that particular point but we as a Government can boast of a record second to none. We do not have to be on the defensive on anything at all. We do not have to be on the defensive, not on housing, surely, not in our approach to the small business community.

One listening to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would have thought that this Government has neglected the people in this country, that the small businesses and business people are unable to carry on their businesses and that the economic situation is so tight that they cannot get overdrafts. But the honourable Member, and honourable Members on that side, ought to be ashamed of the way they seek to introduce this element into this debate, because when we assumed office in 1976, we found a situation where the small businessman could not even approach the commercial banks and get money. The commercial banks did not understand what was meant by the term "small businessman" and very frequently they were turned away from the counters of the bank and could not even get an audience with the financiers of those institutions.

I remember the honourable Member for St. Michael West, in delivering an address in 1975, saying that the days of the small one door shop are not only past — but ought to be forgotten. What he was in fact saying was that there was no part to be played by the small businessman.

When we came into office in 1976, one of the first things we did was to try to resuscitate the activity of the small business people. To this end, Mr. Speaker, this Government set up what is known as the Small Business Committee and we, month after month, had meetings with the representative of the Small Business Association.

We did that with a view to determining and to finding out what were their real problems, and having been able to identify those problems, we decided to set up what is known as a permanent Small Business Development Committee.

5.20 p.m.

It was the first time that the voices of the small businessmen were ever heard. All attempts to seek an audience with the then honourable Minister of Trade under the Democratic Labour Party's regime were futile. The Public of Barbados can judge and see who are the ones this Government has represented, or which Government has articulated the feeling of the small businessman in this community.

We went a bit further, Mr. Speaker, and these things must be recorded. The small businessman, as well as the other larger business people, when they exported their goods to some CARICOM countries could not even get the money in return for the goods which they exported. We inherited that situation and one of the things this Government did was to establish what is known as the Export Credit Guarantee Scheme whereby manufacturers would be able to find funds — there would be liquid cash. Cash would be available to enable them to carry on their business instead of waiting for cash which was tied up in some of the CARICOM countries. We have done that for the small manufacturers as well as the large ones.

And we went a step further, Mr. Speaker. We set up through the Central Bank of Barbados what is known as the Credit Guarantee Scheme and that scheme, Mr. Speaker, was set up specifically for the small business people in this country. We must understand that this Government has been to the forefront. We can boast of the record because of the fact that we have involved the small business people and put them in a position where they are able to partake of the national cake. It was not done under the Democratic Labour Party's regime. The small businessman can go to the bank the commercial bank and have his loan guaranteed to the tune of 80 per cent. That was not done under the Democratic Labour Party.

And I will say this: even in these harsh economic times, the Opposition has not been honest enough to get up and say that that scheme is working so well that the small business people in this country are able to carry out their business without many problems. They must be honest enough to say that.

There are some small business people who are not aware of the scheme and that it exists, I will say to them: if they do not know, they can enquire from the Central Bank, or go to the commercial bank and enquire, and

they will see that funds are still available for them to carry on their businesses — contrary to what the Opposition has been preaching in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it disturbs me when people do not get up and say what exactly is the position. I do not see any problem with the small business people. It is true that some of the banks are not lending. There are some very big businesses who even had privileges of getting better interest rates than the banks have been asking them to pay, or they have not been getting those concessions. But let us understand it, that is the price in every country. There have been economic problems and there comes a time when there is something known as the economic squeeze. We must say this and we must understand that Barbados is not isolated — Barbados is part of the whole world and they must understand, all and sundry must understand that we are in it together.

Mr. Speaker, credit must be given to a Government which, although it has no natural resources, has been able to combat the economic strictures and the problems as well as we have done over the past year.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, that during the Democratic Labour Party's regime, they benefitted from bumper crops and "fall money" and they were able to do a lot of things. What we must also remember is that although we have had record crops, although we have done well two years ago, the Opposition — and I am going to say on the floor of this Honourable House — must take some of the blame for the irresponsible acts that are being done to the destruction of the sugar industry.

Mr. Speaker, I will not apologise for making that statement because I heard with my very ears — and I have read transcripts attributed to the Opposition Party in 1980 — when they went around this country in anticipation of a general election in the latter part of that year telling the people do not cut the canes. It had the same disastrous effect as the speech made by their leader — that they would not want to see another cane blade. I remember when the Member for St. Michael Central at the time told the people do not cut the canes — let them stay there, do not cut a cane blade — let the white people cut them. And I would go as far as to say that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was on the platform and he lent his support to those irresponsible statements made by the Opposition. No wonder the sugar industry suffered, Mr. Speaker, because people in Barbados look up to politicians for leadership and that was the sort of leadership that irresponsible spokesmen from that side were able to show in the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, some of those statements were made in St. Peter — in Boscobelle — so you will see the result of it. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we

are having record cane fires and I will say this: some of those cane fires are as a result of the irresponsible statements made by members on the Opposition.

What Barbadians must be told is this: when they run down the country, if and if ever they take over the leadership of the country, you will be faced with a situation you will not want to stand up to. You will have at some time to pay the price for the ignorance and for the stupidity that you have been ranting and going around the country trying to lure people into. Mr. Speaker, we have got to be responsible. We are dealing with people in Barbados who sometimes operate on emotion and we must understand our national responsibility as potential leaders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be a little bit more positive, because there are some things that need to be said. When we came into this Hon. Chamber in 1980, introducing one of the most revolutionary pieces of legislation to enable Barbadians to participate in the land on which they worked for years or centuries, it was not supported by the Opposition. We felt that that piece of social legislation would redound to the benefit of all Barbados, especially those who had toiled and sweat on the sugar plantations over centuries — but the Opposition refused to support it.

But I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has seen that scheme through, we have seen that scheme through, and we can boast today that we have got the money deposited in the banks and it is ready for on-lending to tenants. That is what we have done. The money is already deposited in the Barbados National Bank — and we are setting up a committee very shortly by next week the committee will be known — and the tenants will be able to go to the Barbados National Bank and get a loan in order to buy the lots on which they have lived or rented over the years. Now that is something positive. So the Opposition cannot claim that they have been to the forefront of doing anything or they have thought about the masses. They never thought to conceptualise — I would not want to repeat what my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Lucy, has said — but this goes to show how this Government feels about the advancement of the ordinary man in this country.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has said that more money should be pumped into housing. Let that not be his fear. This Government has already taken the initiative to pump more money and make more money available for housing purposes. You do not have to worry about that. We understand it. What you now know, or what you are saying, is because you probably had a little leak, but all will be well.
5.30 p.m.

This Government understands its priorities. We as a Government over the next couple of years intend to place emphasis on sites and services. In that regard, we will be able to make fully serviced lots available to persons who will then be able to construct or erect their own houses. Not only that, we understand that there is a great demand, and wherever possible we will meet that demand. I will go on record as saying, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Parish Land, Christ Church can make application as of now to the National Housing Corporation to purchase their lots at a price of 48 cents per square foot, and that is a fully serviced lot. (Mr. J. G. ODLE: What about Belair, St. George?) Belair will be in that category as well. That is what we have done.

Look at the resiting programme. I want the honourable Members on that side to take stock. They must look at the manner in which this Government has taken the resiting programme. Look at the Housing Areas, and I must be on record as saying this — that one can go down there at Fernihurst and Rosemont and see the monuments those areas are to the Hon. Leader of the House. We can see a new direction in which housing is going, and that is a model that the former Administration could not see — and they had better look at it and take stock.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member got up and talked about expensive houses, but I do not want him to get in here and slyly insinuate or to convey the impression that I do not understand what he is talking about. Let me tell the honourable Member this: whenever you are building, you have to take a number of factors into consideration — you have to understand that there is a contractor's cost, that the land has a cost, and if there is a developer to put in roads and infrastructure, they also have a cost. These are things that need to be told.

I have seen a lot of articles in the Press, and lots of misguided people who do not take time to understand the facts pertaining to a particular situation, trying to imply that I as a Minister has been irresponsible in setting a price at West Terrace.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I realise, and this Government has realised too, that there is a cost for development. If the West Terrace project has taken \$10 million to construct, and that cost includes the preparation of the site, water, electricity, gas and the contractors for building, and that is \$1 million

Mr. SPEAKER: Deal with the principle of the Bill.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am dealing with the principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, this is in the Estimates. It is obvious that if you have 100 houses and the initial outlay is \$10 million, that those houses cannot be sold

for less than \$100,000, otherwise you are going to be called upon to subsidise. And I have said, it is my considered opinion — that when you have embarked on commercial activities you have to understand what is meant by commercial practices, and no one can force me, or force this Government, to subsidise a development that would bring in the same amount of money that was invested in it. There is no way that the houses at West Terrace would have worked out for less than \$100,000 if we were going to realise the outlay. I want to go on record as saying that. There is a time when someone has got to say certain things. One can build a house, but what has happened is this.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We are now going to hear whether it is a good investment or a bad investment.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you will hear it is a good investment, because the Government has got a programme to satisfy the needs of the people in the lowest income bracket, so there will not be any cause for concern over the price of houses in future.

If one has a taste — as someone said — of a whisky mouth, one must understand you have to look for whisky money. You cannot have whisky mouths and mauby pockets, and this Government is mindful of that, and we are going to cater as far as possible for all the social needs.

Mr. Speaker, the area of tourism. It has always been conveyed to the public that because there has been a recession or a downturn in the level of visitors to Barbados, it appears to the average man in the street that this Government came into office in 1976 and found tourism at a particular figure, and by virtue of our policies there has been a recession. Mr. Speaker, this is not so. When we took office in 1976 there were 225 000 visitors coming to Barbados. What has happened is that we had an increase over the years 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 until we went as far as 370 000 tourists. What has happened, in point and in fact, is that we have had a slight drop, but although we have had a slight drop — and the figure is now over 350 000 — we are well above the 225 000 tourists that we found in 1976. In other words, it is a drop on what we had anticipated, not on what they had created, so the facts must be clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: One fact remains — that the Minister has two minutes in which to wind up his debate.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we must consider is that this Government is capable of moving those figures from 350 000 way back up to 380 000, but as I said there are considerable external factors. I do not want on this occasion to go into them, but I am sure that when there is an up turn that this Government will take the opportunity to

introduce those measures and we will take full advantage of the markets and carry those figures to where we feel they should be, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad day in the Parliamentary history of this country. In past times when the Prime Minister delivered the Appropriation Bill, Barbadians from all walks of life could sit back and listen to the debate — the comments of the Government and of the legal Opposition. I believe that tonight when we have left these Chambers and the Reporters of the various media will have reported to the nation what transpired in Parliament today, there are going to be a lot of disappointed Barbadians. I myself, Mr. Speaker, am totally disappointed in the response and the reaction of the Opposition to the Appropriation Bill which was laid in this Chamber today.

You yourself would remember that all through 1981 there was constant talk and a lot of debate on a task force. As a matter of fact, on September 15 in Private Members' Business, a Resolution was placed before the Chamber by one of the members of the opposite side. 5.40 p.m.

Sir, it says, "That this Honourable House of Assembly expresses thanks to His Excellency the Governor General for the Throne Speech so graciously delivered to Parliament on Tuesday, July 21, 1981; takes note of the contents of that Speech; regrets that the Government is still persisting in policies which are contributing to a serious deterioration in the economic, social, political and cultural position of the people of Barbados; and calls upon the Government to establish a highly competent and impartial task force to study conditions prevailing in Barbados and make recommendations for their amelioration."

Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the Opposition today has again re-warmed his soup and has accused the Government of a number of things — falling standards of living. He spoke on the National Debt of Barbados, Personal Income Tax being too high, he predicts massive layoffs in the public sector. He also indicated that there are not accurate records being kept regarding inflation, employment and falling tourism. One would have thought, Sir, that with all these authorizations he would have been capably and ably supported by his colleagues on that side, but it seems that we have witnessed once again the boy sit on the burning deck whence all but he had fled.

It is a sad day today Mr. Speaker, that Barbados is caught up in this international economic spiral. Barbados is not in the unique position of being the country with some financial difficulty. I dare say, Sir, that with all their affluence, countries in Western Europe, the United States and Canada also have their economic problems. They are trying to battle with them and so are we.

In June 1981, when the Barbados Labour Party was returned to power, it was returned to power with the full realisation of its achievements from 1976 to 1981. The Barbados Labour Party Manifesto which is now a document of this House says in the foreword, Sir, A political power would be judged mainly on its record and the Barbados Labour Party is more than willing to submit its records for the close scrutiny and critical judgment of the electorate of Barbados. We were given the reins of power in 1976 and in our Manifesto at that time, we proposed to lead this country into a firmer economic base and to give our people a hope — a hope which was taken away sometime during the last and dying days of the former Administration. We made many promises in our 1976 Manifesto and through those five years, we performed.

We have a record which we are really proud of in housing and we have been able to some extent to uplift the standard of housing in Barbados. We have not been able to totally set aside the needs of all those who would want to better their living standards in relationship to housing. Then again which country or government has been able to do this? We were able to rescue the Democratic Labour Party and put an end to some of the bad practices — which were enforced under that Administration — by creating a new division in the housing Ministry — a division with a policy regarding housing generally.

Our health programme was one which we were unable to complete in 1976 and we are working on that also. I believe that the people of this country need to be told the facts surrounding health in Barbados, the facts about what we are trying to achieve in relation to what is happening in other similar developed countries. With our limited resources, we are doing what we can do to achieve an end for the people of Barbados.

The Ministry of Education has been at work to put back to school all those young minds who were put out of school during the administration of the Democratic Labour Party. We have a record in new schools which should not be hurt in any way, Mr. Speaker, a record that we should be more than justifiably proud to produce to the people of Barbados. We have created and devised new schools to meet the schooling needs of our young and growing country.

Our government is being criticised by the Opposition without reason, for to say that we have not tried and we have not understood the problems the country is faced with — and we are trying to do something to solve these problems — is to try to fool the people of Barbados that the Barbados Labour Party Government does not understand and is not working in the whole interest of people. We could not have fulfilled all the things we talked about in five years and so here we are today now trying to continue. That is why the

Appropriation Bill has been placed to explain to the people where the Government is, what the Government stands for and what the Government will do in the interests of all the people of this country.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central replied to the Prime Minister's Statement and in my estimation, Sir, it has been no more than what we have been hearing all year — that Government does not care, there is too much spending, too much taxation, that the Government does not consider the needs of the poor. I would have thought that with these serious accusations by the honourable Member, it would have been supported — and that is what makes it really sad, Mr. Chairman. They are not used to socializing in the restaurant in Parliament, Sir, but all of them are there today having social chats when people would rather hear what the Opposition has to say to counter what the Government has said, or is saying, in this 1982–83 Appropriation Bill.
5.50 p.m.

Transport has made tremendous strides under this Administration, and I am sure that the Minister responsible for Transport is capable. He has the power and he understands what the problems are, and in the process of time, in this year, people in this country will see a great improvement in that sector.

Barbados today has its financial problems, Mr. Speaker, and this Government in particular, representing the people of Barbados, I submit has nothing to sugar-coat. The Government has a responsibility to tell the people of this country precisely and exactly what the international economic situation is and where Barbados stands in relation to that situation.

We have been accused of high unemployment, but you tell me, Mr. Speaker, where today there is not high unemployment. Figures will show you, Sir, that in Canada the unemployment rate stands at 1.5 million. In the mighty, great, massive United States of America there are over 8 million without a job tonight. In Western Europe the figure will stand at 26 million by the end of this year. In the United Kingdom there are 3.5 million people unemployed tonight. If all these developed countries with their great resources all the technology at hand and all the industries at hand and are unable still to find work for their people, what is Barbados with just one industry — sugar, and with an unwilling work force Mr. Speaker — work force unwilling to get into the agricultural business and see it as another job, and see it as a way of helping their country, and see it as a way of doing something positive for the economic development of Barbados? When people have preferences over the kind of jobs they would rather do, what is Barbados?

There are 1.5 million unemployed in Canada with its great textiles and shipping. Only a few weeks ago I

happened to be in the United Kingdom and I made note of the tendency there, where on a daily basis, over 1 000 people within the various industrial sectors were losing their jobs. Businesses just notified them that they had two weeks to go. The shipping industry in the United Kingdom is at a virtual stand still. The dock area in London which was once a formidable area for trade is now totally deserted. There are industries standing with chains across the main gates and locks, and clocks which once carried the time stand still and the workers are out on the streets or at home looking for jobs. There is nothing happening, and we in Barbados are oblivious or unmindful that these things exist in other lands, and we still have preferences and we are choosy about the kind of jobs we want.

The people of this country will have to be told, and not necessarily by Government. It is our function and it is the Opposition's function to be in here and also express to the people they represent throughout the length and breadth of Barbados the truth of the international economic climate, the international recession and what it means to their country and the part they can play, and what they can expect in trying times like these. Economists tell you that the 1933 recession perhaps is mere child's play to what is happening today, because all the great economist cannot devise a theory nor can they come up with solutions to thwart what is happening today in economic terms. It is unprecedented in the history of mankind.

We in the Barbados Labour Party believe that all is not lost, that if the people of Barbados are asked to tighten their belts, it is with good reason and some justification because they have elected a Government to power to carry the destiny of this country for the next five years. And if the people have thrust upon the Barbados Labour Party that responsibility to take Barbados through these uncertain times, we would want to report exactly to the people as it is today. I personally feel, Sir, that Barbados will get out of this economic cycle. I believe that we are doing rather well at this point in time. I believe that the management of the present Government — those entrusted to lead the country, those in the Cabinet — are fully on top of what is really happening, but the people themselves cannot expect overnight that the standards of living which they have been used to over the past years, when things were really great, can continue without any sacrifice.

Everyone the world over — every country, all the leaders — have been telling their people that they have got to make sacrifices. In the United Kingdom, the Government has been telling the people that they have got to sacrifice, but no one is willing to sacrifice in order to have the welfare of his state improved. People, I believe, tend to see these things personally. People do not want to think that their standard of living has fallen

because the Government as a source, or as a force, has problems. Everyone sees these things personally. I believe that in Europe things will improve, I believe in the United States things will improve, I believe generally that things will improve here in Barbados, but basically people have got to understand that Barbados is just a small part of the total international economic order, and what happens in Europe, the United States and Canada will definitely affect what happens here in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, the last speaker mentioned tourism, and I would not want to go back on anything he has said. The facts are that there has been a general fall-off in tourism — not only in Barbados, not only in the Caribbean, but in countries that have more to offer than Barbados — because of the recession in the more developed countries of the world. People have less to spend and they are more selective in the destinations they choose for vacation.

6.00 p.m.

I am not worried. Personally, I am not worried since I have assessed what is happening. I am not worried about what is happening. I would be happier if we were having more tourists here, but the 4.7 percent which we are down this year is understandable in the light of what is happening with other destinations which perhaps have more to offer than Barbados.

Barbados is still, I repeat, the preferred choice for a lot of people in the United Kingdom, Canada and North America — but if people have less to spend, you cannot expect them to want to come to Barbados. I believe that once the recession is over and things are again flowing, that we can correct a few of the problems we have in that sector, that we will surpass the levels of arrivals which we had over the past years — probably 400 000 visitors. There are certain things which we have to work on probably crime, Mr. Speaker, and other things such as hotel rates, air fares and so on — but we have to understand that these problems are not germane to Barbados, and that as time goes by we will overcome those things.

Our Social Welfare Programme is by far much better than what the Democratic Labour Party was able to give the people. That is why I tend to agree with Members on the other side not to support the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, because he is at times willing to rant and rave at what might be considered petty things within the political system. He is always known to run off and come in here to get top publicity in the newspapers — that he is a spokesman on a number of issues — while, in effect, he himself does not understand what is happening. I tend to agree with his colleagues not to support him in this issue. Let him stand alone on the burning deck, let him remain alone there.

We have come a long way, Mr. Speaker, in our agricultural policy. We have been able to return to the people those lands which were earmarked for housing developments. We were able to put them into cultivation and now they are productive estates which would have been sold to private industry and others who have an interest in developing the best of our lands for housing developments.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, as I have aforesaid, have nothing to be ashamed of. We are working on the Oistins Development Project, we are working on the Speightstown/Heywoods Development Project and the Cement Plant in the North to increase the economic activity in the northern section of Barbados which is a major consideration of this Government. Even though the Opposition might want to say that it is money wasted, we believe that it will pay the people of Barbados in the long run to have other areas developed other than in the Central and city areas of Barbados. To have spent some money in other areas to develop them is a step in the right direction.

Touching very briefly, Mr. Speaker, on what I consider the responsibility of this Government, what we have got to do is not to panic. We are not going to panic. The Opposition can criticise and it is their function to criticise. We welcome that. What the Barbados Labour Party has to do — and I believe should be committed in doing — is to explain to the people, whom we assume know, what is happening in the practical world.

We have got to tell them why in the United States and Western Europe there are so many unemployed. We have got to tell the people of Barbados that the Government's responsibility is to strive under the international economic climate and guide them through the trying times. I know it can be done, Mr. Speaker. We on this side know that it can be done. The Opposition is there to criticise and to confuse the minds of the people, but they, at this point in time, when things are dark, should be joining forces, putting aside partisan — feuds and explaining to their constituents — they and the people of Barbados at large that these problems are not, and I repeat, not unique, not germane to this country, with their help the Barbados Labour Party, the Government and the people of Barbados will overcome. But it is a different question, Sir, to want to join the Government and to want to be the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will take your last minute to help overcome.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: It is a different story and it is a different ball game to want to help the Government and be the Government. It is very sad, Mr. Speaker, on this particular day when the Appropriation Bill was discussed

by the Prime Minister of the country, that the Opposition — nine members who came to this Chamber today refused to support their leading spokesman on financial and economic matters. It is a sad, a sad day in the history of Barbados when they thought it better to sit in the recreation room and let the boy stand on the burning deck. *(Applause)*.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The Estimates of this country and the Appropriation Bill which has been presented to us today by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister comes at a time when the whole world is faced with social, political and grave economic difficulties.

The fact that we are a small and open economy make us vulnerable to any problems which affect the great industrial nations of the world. We notice in 1974, or thereabouts, and within recent times, the attitude of the people who control oil — the OPEC countries. And even with all their wealth and possessions and the power to use oil as an instrument of rich flows to the world, today they are finding themselves in a tail spin.

We have been treated to a very lengthy discussion on the financial position of the country, ably outlined by Members of this side, and the position taken by the principal spokesman of the Opposition. When the total views are taken into consideration, the country would have had a treat in terms of discussion on the economy of the country.

It is unfortunate, and I would join the honourable Member for St. Michael North East in his condemnation of the Members of the Opposition who have not seen their way — except for the spokesman on economic matters — to come in and to lend a presence at least, if not their contributions. I do not believe they have anything to offer. *(Applause)*.

6.10 p.m.

But, at least, they could lend their presence whereby the country at large who are their masters, and who they will have to give an account to at some future date, will be able to assess them and to pronounce upon their worthiness for high office or otherwise.

In my view they have failed the critical examination of a very critical and sophisticated public opinion, and stand condemned by all generations to come. It is certainly unfortunate — and I believe that they stand out singularly in this respect — for there could hardly be a Parliament anywhere in the world that practise multi-party democracy where the Estimates of an Appropriation Bill can be presented to a Parliament of such a noble standing and not have informed and intelligent discussion. We are indeed saddened over the fact that the country will sadly look upon the empty seats, or nearly empty seats, of the Opposition.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion when Your Honour took the seat and you bowed to the Clerks and then to this side of Parliament, you also bowed to empty seats on the other side. You were not only bowing to empty seats but to a number of empty people who came into this Parliament on the basis of false pretences, because you could hardly, Mr. Speaker, in your stumping of the country, offer the people service and to promise them that you will be a good, faithful and true representative when, at the same time, you find it extremely difficult to sit in Parliament and do the people's business.

We have come here today, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the Appropriation Bill which seeks to spend \$501 312 980 and to raise revenue of over \$494 448 000. Mr. Speaker, this is a lot of money to raise and a lot of money to expend, and certainly, one would think that after seeing a reasonably good beginning by the Opposition party in coming to this Parliament and condescending to fraternise with the Government in the lunch room, that they would show that example by coming into Parliament and participating in a practical way on a Bill as important as this one.

I want to compliment the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — even if you may think he did it badly, he did it nonetheless — for discharging his duties to the people of this country. I consider the other people who have decided to stay in the precincts of this Honourable House and to make no contribution to be cowards, and not worthy of the trust of an unsuspecting public.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing for a very long time a number of things being said about the economy of this country — about unemployment, Balance of Payments problems and what have you. I would take it that on a Bill such as this, that the Opposition would see its way to make forceful contributions and to satisfy the public at large that they are worthy to be considered an alternative government. But, of course, they have said, without voicing it, that they are not equal to the task, and, therefore they will have to continue in the wilderness for as long as they can be around. As a matter of fact, I am advised that they have now been smoked out from where they were and they have decided to come to dwell among us. I hope that this is a good sign, not only of being smoked out of an area where they have secreted themselves, but a sign that they will make a contribution towards the national debate on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot about unemployment in the country, we have been hearing a lot about development within the country. I want to look abroad a bit at the developments that are taking place, not only in Western Europe and in North America, but right here within the Caribbean. With the exception

of Trinidad and Tobago, there is no single country within the English speaking Caribbean that is doing as well, in terms of its economic development and performance, than this small country of ours.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that either because we believe in excellence, or because we believe in political divisiveness, that certain people continue to condemn the present Government for everything that happens. If, for argument's sake, Mr. Speaker, certain people went downstairs tomorrow, or right now for that matter, and had a good cloud burst, it would be thought that this Government had caused it to be so. If the sun is warm or too hot for certain people, the Government is attacked. Whatever the problems are, the Government is attacked.

We all know that we are so fragile in terms of our economy that if the United States of America or Canada just breathe hard — not sneeze — that Barbados would catch pneumonia and we all are aware of the problems which are taking place at the moment in the United States of America. Unemployment is in the region of 10 million people. In Canada and West Germany over 3 million people are unemployed and in England by itself, over 3 million people are unemployed — despite the fact that Britain today is booming with its North Sea oil, and by its North Sea oil it is able, to some extent, to influence the price of oil among the other traditional oil producing states. But despite all of this North Sea oil, you are seeing very serious cut-backs in social spending in Great Britain.

6.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, when I saw the type of social cuts in Great Britain, when I saw what was happening in hospitals, in old people's homes in Great Britain, when I recognised that there were old people who were having their electricity cut off in Great Britain, and people who were found by social workers — friends and relatives as well — paralysed in their homes because of a lack of electricity, it was not like the sympathetic Government that you have here, and the sympathetic Minister who is responsible for Community Services — those old people were carried to court for the electricity they were using and were not able to pay for. Their gas was cut off and a number of them were found frozen in their homes. That is what the Thatcher Government did, but this Government, sympathetic as it is, in the face of all the problems it has been facing, has decided that notwithstanding these economic cutbacks that it is still going to finance schemes in order to assist the aged, the indigent poor and those people who are unable to help themselves.

Very recently this Hon. House passed a supplementary provision in order to make that situation possible. It is not the case in Great Britain today, it is not the case in the United States of America with all of its wealth. Many of us are reading day after day, and we are hearing as well on the radio, and we are getting letters

from relatives and other people abroad, about what is happening in the United States of America. There is a serious and very ultra-conservative lobby in the United States of America that is even insisting today that the Reagan Administration is too lenient, and that instead of cutting as they have now cut — they have cut where the poor are suffering the consequences — that the cuts are not good enough and they need more painful cuts in the area of social services and social spending.

The United States has reached the situation where the United Automobile Workers have agreed that they are not going to press the case for further increase in wages, but rather they are going to hold strain until the economy becomes better. But what do you find in Barbados? You find on the one hand the Opposition spokesman on Economics is putting forward the argument that there should be cutbacks in certain areas of spending. If you argue on the one hand that there must be cutbacks in the area of developmental spending and you are going to be concerned about unemployment, the two do not go together. If you are to have full employment, there must be Capital Works Programmes going on.

During the years 1977-1981, the Government embarked upon a number of very great developmental schemes which gave employment in this country — the like of which was never seen before, and this Government was able to carry out over 90 per cent of the promises it made in its 1976 Manifesto to the people of this country, and, as a result of the carrying out of the pledges made in 1976, the people, on the basis of the promises and the performance of this Government, renewed the mandate and gave us the Government again.

Mr. Speaker, the road ahead is not an easy one, but with a positive and dynamic approach to the problems that confront the country, I am sure that the difficulties will be overcome. In an open economy, and constituted as we are in Barbados, we have got to import most of the things which we use in this country. Fortunately for us, we are now reaching the stage in this country where we have seen that food has become reasonably cheap. There was a time when it was extremely difficult to get carrots at a price less than \$2.50 a pound. Today it is not so — carrots are reasonable. Under the Democratic Labour Party there was nothing called seasonal, everything was serious inflation.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, while I was in the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs, and the price of sweet potatoes and yams came down to 25 and 28 cents per pound from the sky rocketing price of 70 odd cents per pound, the honourable Member for St. Michael West was so amazed that prices could come down to that extent that he said we were having gluts in the community. There was no question of gluts — there was a

question of making prices more reasonable because of the enlightened policies of Government, because of the attitude which we took to agriculture and the encouragement which we gave to people in order to plant the lands that were lying idle and fallow. The people decided to plant again, and they have been planting and planting and planting.

As a matter of fact, more than 12 000 acres of land was put out of cultivation. Half of that land came back into production and therefore we were recently able to have all the cabbages, carrots and tomatoes at prices that were unbelievable to the other side. The other side could not have imagined that with inflation going up, as they said, that the prices are still coming down, so I do not know how you relate the two. It is a strange type of argument, but you have been seeing that for yourself, and the people have been seeing that prices are coming down.

Mr. Speaker, another thing which we have to examine is this — with the spate of building which we were having in the country — all over the place there are buildings, buildings and more buildings — you cannot get a workman in this country. They are difficult to get, you cannot get one up to now, with all this unemployment you are hearing about. You cannot get a mason, you cannot get a carpenter.

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean a good mason.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: A good mason. You cannot even get a bad mason, workers are not out there to be had easily. It is proof, Mr. Speaker, that there is tremendous employment in this country for people who are willing to work and people who have skills. Not only have we seen the need for this, we are training people in our Skill Training Programme in order to take advantage of the amount of jobs which are made available to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the type of revenues which the Government has to work with, and when you think in terms of what is happening to tourism and what is happening to the sugar industry, you must recognise that this Government has to be over careful — and not only over careful, but extremely frugal in expenditure. Last year, I think we imported over a billion dollars in goods in this country. But where is the money to pay for that amount of goods coming from? It is not the dollars which the spokesman for Finance said are being printed here, it is the foreign exchange which you earn to meet the commitments of your purchases abroad, and if your tourist plant is falling in terms of numbers coming here you have to be careful. When you have problems in North America and Western Europe the folks cannot afford to come, much as they want to come. They were up there in freezing weather, and obviously they would want to come, but there was no money for them

to come with and therefore they did not come in the numbers that we would have liked to see.

Another thing is that you have a situation where the price of sugar was at its lowest point and therefore you were in serious trouble. Not only was the price of sugar low, but it was extremely difficult to get your crops reaped, and as a result over 40 000 acres of canes were left unreaped in this country. The situation is one that we cannot afford to have, and I want to make this appeal while talking on this Appropriation Bill.

We are confronted in this country with a situation which is extremely disturbing where, day after day, several hundred acres of canes are being burnt in this land. I want to appeal to the arsonists at work, I am appealing to all the people in this community of goodwill to make an appeal to people in this community not to burn the canes.
6.30 p.m.

I am satisfied that while there may be a few fires brought about by accidents that the burning of the canes is mostly deliberately done. Burning of canes, like the burning of a house, if deliberately done, is not easily detected, and I am making a public appeal in this Hon. House to all Barbadians out there not to turn the country into a desert — and I use the words of the Chief Fire Officer. I would hope that some of the other members on the other side would consider it necessary to make the same point which I am making here. This country is our country, and no matter who is in Government in this Parliament, we all, I believe, would want to live here. It is therefore vitally important that we continue to keep the country in as fertile a manner as possible and stop polluting the environment and creating health hazards.

The doctors are calling for people not to smoke. This does not suggest that people should not smoke, but I am a non-smoker and you force me to have smoke coming into my nostrils when I travel all over the country: It is not good for us and our health. Mr. Speaker, it is important that a public appeal is made by all sides and all shades of opinion in this community. The Church must do it, the political parties must do it, the trade unions must do it and the social organisations must do it. If you make that appeal to them I must make that similar appeal here from this honourable floor of the House of Assembly.

Despite the fact that we are debating the Appropriation Bill against the background of the world economic problems, the Government has not been stingy in giving supplies to the respective Ministries. The point, however, must be raised — that the amount of waste that existed in the past in the Government sector must be cut back. There can be no free riders any more in Government. The people in the community must understand that the funds must come from somewhere to support their waste, and

the place from where it is coming would be from the people themselves who failed to do the right thing for the people in the society.

Mr. Speaker, this Government, at this time, is offering a number of programmes in the face of the world economic situation. We seek to maintain the greater standards of health, greater standards of social work and a greater standard in education. We hope to see also coming along the activities of the Ministry of Transport and Works, and I am very sure that under the dynamic leadership of the present Minister, the road building programme, designed to improve the road standards of this country, would be carried out. The road standards have not fallen over-night — they were never properly built in this country and therefore the collapse on the roads came over 15 years.

Mr. SPEAKER: And they cannot be repaired in the next two minutes.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: What we can do at this time is to assist in creating appropriation whereby the roads will be repaired and rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, this Government will continue to carry the promises which we have made, we will continue to work in the interest of this community, and whatever difficulties might be put in the way of this Government, this Government will not sway from the task of making this country a better place to live. We must continue to maintain our standards, we must continue to keep democracy alive, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that by changing of the Opposition and bringing them back into this Hon. House would certainly encourage them, during this period we are meeting, to come forward and debate — and not only debate, but debate in a constructive manner, in a manner befitting them — as they so correctly style themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the Speaker of this Hon. House I am committed to say that your time is up. Thank you, thank you.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, on the whole question of the debate of the Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue, I am aware of taking turns that have been far removed from what I consider to be substantially the issue. This morning the Minister of Finance introduced the Appropriation Bill and there was a reply from one member of the Opposition, Sir, and then I thought that we would have moved in many areas relating to various issues far and wide. Now since this is the pattern which has been started, perhaps it would be useful for me not to strike any discorded notes, Sir. I will use a half hour, Sir, to keep the ball going. I am not a dog to comment on the absence of debate by the Opposition. If the Opposition does not feel that the expenditure of \$501 million is worth a word or two of debate, that is their business.

I only hope that when the word is out and no contribution has been made by members of the Opposition that they do not feel that they are hard done by. (*Asides*). 6.40 p.m.

That is true, Sir, but it was so long ago I do not even remember. I have not heard a word from the Opposition since 11 o'clock this morning, and I am entitled at 7 o'clock in the evening to forget what happened so long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look at some of the things the Opposition has been saying over the past several weeks. I understood the Minister of Finance to say this morning that the Opposition's view of how the economy should shape up is a monetarist view, and he cited the arch-priest of monetarism, Milton Friedman in that regard. Whether you like Friedman or agree with him, you have to admit that he was consistent, even if he is consistent in a mistaken view. Not that I am saying that. I do not swim in waters that are too deep for me. I am not competent to say whether the man is competent or not, but even if his view is mistaken, at least he is consistent. The liberal economists take views and even if you do not agree with them, at least you can say that there is a measure of consistency in what they say. Not so with the Opposition, Sir.

We were subjected this morning to a very gloomy commentary on the situation in Barbados, and it made one feel like — I think in Jamaica they refer to them as "Jimcrows" — those big black birds that swoop down in the slums to eat every dead dog or rotten animal they can find in the slums in Kingston, and those animals thrive on morbidity, on ruin, on chaos and on death. I can't help but get the feeling that the Opposition would like to see a situation in Barbados that is one of death, ruin and destruction so that they, like the scavenger birds — the Jimcrows — could thrive on the ruin of this country.

Now I heard all sorts of things this morning, and I do not know how anybody in any good judgment could classify it as a monetary issue. What you have heard for the past few months is that you have taxed the people too much, therefore the result of that is that you should have less revenue. They tell you also that you have not provided enough services for the people. They complain here week after week about the Transport Board and that you need better roads. They complain that you need to spend more money in agriculture. They complain that you need to spend more money on pensions.

During the last General Election, the Democratic Labour Party used to say on its platforms, night after night, that if they are elected they would immediately spend \$50 million on young people. Now I do not mean the money they already spend through the normal

institutions, not the Education vote, not the Health vote. In addition to that they would spend \$50 million. They used to say that every night. They also said that if they won they would increase old age pensions to \$50 a week from July 1, 1981. Now, Sir, they are talking of about \$100 million more expenditure. Between increased pensions and this \$50 million on youth they were going to spend immediately another \$100 million.

When we came in here with \$52 million for civil servants' increase of pay two years ago, the Opposition said you were not giving them enough — that you should give the people a bigger increase than that because the cost of living was going up. So they would give the civil servants more which would mean maybe another \$20 million, \$30 million or \$40 million, which would be another \$130 million more expenditure. But at the same time they are saying you are taxing too much, you are collecting too much revenue, so let us collect less money. You would then have \$140 million more expenditure and maybe \$100 million less collected in revenue. Well you cannot even tell my grandmother that, because she understands that if you are going to spend money it has to come from somewhere, and that is the sort of thing we have been hearing all the time.

Today we are told in a remarkable *volte-face* that you spend too much money, you spend the people's money like money was going out of style, you spend too much money on projects. These are the people who are going to spend \$100 million on youth and everything else, but now they are telling you that you spend too much money on the people. They do not tell you that you gave away the money, they do not tell you that the money slipped through the drain through negligence. They said you spend money on the people and you had no right spending it.

Now we come in here today, Sir, with the Estimates of Expenditure of \$501 million and the revenue projected at \$494 million leaving a little gap of \$7 million. So you have \$135 million in Capital Expenditure and \$7 million making a \$142 million deficit — that is \$7 million on Current and \$135 million on Capital, and we are told that we must close the gap. That means, Sir, that you must not spend any more than you collect. That is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party today, and I have to stress "today", because their philosophy changes day after day after day.

Their philosophy today is to close the gap, do not spend any more money than you collect in the Estimates in this year. In other words, only spend \$494 million, if that is all you are going to collect. But they say you are taxing the people too much and there is a call from the Opposition not to tax any more this year, and there is a call from the Opposition to reduce the current level of

taxation. So reduce revenue from \$494 million to perhaps \$394 million and do not spend a cent more than you collect, or reduce your \$500 million by at least another \$100 million, and destroy all the services that Government provides in this country.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways and you cannot fool the people in Barbados with that if you want us to support the services. I have been hearing all afternoon, as I have been meandering around this building, statements here and there that were being made in this debate. I heard all of the fantastic housing record of this Government. I am not going to go into all. I heard what the Ministry of Health has been doing with all these polyclinics, but I have not heard about the Ministry of Education. I know how much money has been spent in the Ministry of Education — a lot of new schools, extensions to the teachers' college, a \$28 million polyclinic, a raffle of scholarships — scholarships left, right and centre — so that the children of this country can benefit from what is going in this community. Now this is what the Government has been doing. If this Government is to be chastised for delivering that to the people of Barbados, well we stand ready to be chastised.

To get back to the main point, how could anybody look at people of even average intelligence and tell them that you must tax less, collect less money. I understand from the gist of the contribution made today that Personal Income Tax is too high and you should reduce it. I heard that the Consumption Tax was too high and you should reduce it. I heard that Corporation Tax, whatever that means, Company Tax is too high and you should reduce it. I heard that the hotel industry was being over-burdened by the 8 per cent tax — that is too high and you should reduce it. Reduce every bit of tax in this country, collect less, but deliver the same services to the people of Barbados. You cannot do that, Sir. The civil servants are supposed to get an increase in salary this year, but do not tax anybody, just get down on your knees and pray, and money will fall like manna from heaven. That is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party.

6.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, we tried to do a few things with these Estimates. I am not going to go over all that has been said about the impact of the world economic situation to the economy of Barbados. It is well known to everybody with the slightest perception in this country and I do not need to join with others in saying it over and over again. But, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to realise one or two factors that impinge on the economy and the living of the people in Barbados.

One that has a particular fascination for me, Sir, is the whole question of foreign reserves. Now, I know for a fact that the Government of Barbados has almost

three months of foreign reserves. I also know for a fact that there are only two other countries in the whole Caribbean — the archipelagos, Sir — that have reserves higher than those of Barbados — the Commonwealth of the Bahamas and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. The Commonwealth of the Bahamas get almost three million tourists a year. Not three million, Sir, they get about ten times as many tourists — my arithmetic is not too good — but they get ten times as many tourists as Barbados, and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has a lot of oil.

The Government of Guyana has no foreign reserves, Sir, no foreign reserves. The Government of Jamaica has zero foreign reserves — none at all, and most of these islands throughout the Caribbean are in a position roughly similar. Even the Opposition knows Sir, — and the honourable Member for St. Michael North used to be acting as a Minister of Finance in the old days, and he could get up and tell you — that two and a half to three months foreign reserves is more than adequate for any country like Barbados.

What do you get from the Opposition, Sir? You get that this country is on the brink of ruin. That is what they are trying to tell you, Sir, because like the "Jimcrows", they want to eat on the carcass of Barbados. But it is not going to work that way, because they are some of us who are prepared to tell the people what the situation is — as it is. We do not have anything to hide, Sir.

I hear somebody talking about ups and down. Nothing keeps going up forever. You have to reach a point where you can level out and you take an occasional dip, but I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that the quality of life in Barbados now, when they say things are down, is much higher than it was in 1976 when we came into Government. *(Applause)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to address myself further to interest rates. Now I know that the interest rates in North America and in Europe were so high, and indeed even though they have dropped somewhat now, are still so high that many families cannot pay their mortgages. It is a buyers' market in North America now.

You can go into Toronto now, Sir, and you can buy a house which was worth \$80 000 this time last year for \$50 000, because a lot of people who are paying mortgages cannot continue their payments with the crippling levels of interest rates obtaining in those countries. They are giving up the houses. They are telling you, "take them, I cannot pay the interest rates that are so high." In Canada, at one time the interest rates were all up by 22 per cent.

We in Barbados have interest rates on mortgages at 12 per cent and yet you hear the Opposition with their colossal gall, Sir, getting in here and telling people that the interest rates in Barbados are too high. Too high by what standards, Sir? To me it is blatantly dishonest to put up that kind of argument knowing the conditions that are prevailing in the world.

There is something else that needs to be said about interest rates, Sir. If interest rates in Barbados are lower, the people in Barbados who have their funds here — and they are moving them out — will move them out and put them in markets where they can get higher interest rates than they get in Barbados. That is commonsense. Why should a man keep his money in Barbados where he is only going to get 10 per cent on it when he can take his money up to Canada, or the United States, and get 18 and 19 and 20 per cent.

It brings to my mind, Sir, my own view of an aspect of central banking, Sir. We have got to take a look at our laws relating to exchange control. Now I am not going to say, Sir, that you should make exchange control so tight, and enforce the laws in respect of exchange control so rigorously, that you will cause to happen in Barbados what has happened in parts of Guyana and Jamaica, because when people find that your laws are so rigorously in exchange control, they feel that there is something wrong so they will try and see if they can get their money out.

I well remember, Sir, before the Second World War, between the 1920s and 1930s, Sir, when Germany tried to impose rigorous exchange control laws, the people used their ingenuity like they used it in Guyana and in Jamaica, and got their money out. What they used to do in those days was to smoulder the gold under the chassis of the motorcars and paint it in black, and throw some mud on it and drive it over into the Austrian border. They were going on with this, and carrying all the gold out of the country, for a long time before the Government of Germany realised the amount of money that was leaving the country. So we have to be very careful, Sir, that we do not make it so rigorously as to make the native Barbadian ingenuity beat the system and rush all the money out of the country.

On the other hand, we have to watch it, because I believe that our foreign reserves should be kept in a healthy state by a new look at the mechanisms of exchange control and a better examination of the movement of money, and perhaps we need a closer analysis of this so that we can inform our discussions on this matter in this Hon. Chamber.

It is important, too, Sir, when I hear the criticism that the Government is cutting back on Capital Expenditure. Well, the Opposition says — they really do not know

where they stand. At one moment they will tell you that you are spending too much money and the next moment they will tell you you should be cutting back, not on Capital, Sir, they will tell you to cut back on expenditure in the productive areas of the economy. They will tell you that.

I feel, Sir, that you should spend more money on the productive areas in the economy. You have to spend more money in agriculture. You have to spend more money in promoting manufacturing. You have to spend more money on promoting tourism. That is my view, Sir, but we are in here with the Capital Expenditure, Sir, and even if the Government is spending \$125 million less than it had been spending in the last year, and when you take into consideration the point made by the Minister of Finance this morning that you are also spending \$200 million on the Cement Plant and two other areas of Government financing, it is important that the Central Bank take a look at the loan portfolios of commercial banks and ensure that a greater percentage of the money invested in those banks are put in the portfolio for investment in productive areas of the economy, and far less money spent on consumer durables that are imported from overseas.

7.00 p.m.

When I hear the fulminations of the Opposition — not today, Sir, because they have not got anything to say today — that the loan portfolios would be directed in these constructive areas for the development of the economy in Barbados.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a reference to something that troubles me. There is a bigger increment of 18 to 24 year olds in Barbados, year after year, who are finding a particular difficulty in fitting in easily into the job market. The technological revolution, Sir, the increase in automation and cybernation.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: What?) No, he cannot understand me, he does not know what is going on. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Cybernetics, not cybernation.)

Mr. SPEAKER: There must no cross talk, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: You always have to say something. It is a debating tactic to say certain things to make sure that the people on the other side are not entirely out of it, Sir. I have not seen their faces light up like that for a long time. I have not seen it for a long time, Sir.

The technological revolution is throwing out a newer and higher increment of young people, Sir, between 18—16 and 24 who are ill-fitted to make their mark in the world of work. Now I would have thought that the Opposition would have used whatever talents that are still left with them to analyse these Estimates to see what contribution, what new initiatives, Government

is taking to make provision for those people in fitting them into the world of work.

I have not heard any of that. They tell me, Sir, that they did not think about that. They are a pretty hopeless lot, Sir, if they cannot think about something as straightforward as that. I am no genius and I thought about it. That sort of thing, Sir, is what we want to hear in the vigorous cut and thrust of debate in this Hon. Chamber, Sir. We do not want any bellyaching in here, or anywhere else, about the nature of a Government's record that is second to none in this part of the world. I do not think that anybody in the Opposition can get up in any honesty and make that type of criticism.

The Opposition, Sir, has been straining at the leash to talk about CARIFESTA, straining at the leash, and I really would like the opportunity, if they throw down the gauntlet, to let us have a good full-fledged talk out on it. But there is one thing that I would have to say in relation to it, and it fell right out of the mouth of the main speaker of the Opposition today. I understand him to say that no Capital Projects have been met from revenue. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: This year.) That is what I heard him to say, Sir. But \$10.6 million of Capital Expenditure was made by this Government last year surrounding the CARIFESTA exercise that was left as a legacy to the young people of this country. (*Applause*) Now they cannot complain, Sir. They were going to spend \$15 million on young people and have the nerve to get talking about \$10 million that we spent on them.

I was up at Combermere last Sunday night. I went to see Dance Experience, Sir, — "the Voyage." Mr. Speaker, when I saw the high class of the presentation that night and saw the scores of young people revealing a quality of creativity unknown in this country, I was sorry they did not spend another \$20 million, Sir. I believe that investment in young people is a proper investment — and I want to argue, discuss and debate CARIFESTA. I want to put the Opposition on the spot. I want the Opposition to tell me that they are against spending that kind of money to sharpen the creative talents of young people and to move them in positive directions. I want them to get up and tell me so. I want them to tell me that they prefer to spend the \$10 million on an old boat they had about here called the North Point. I want them to tell me that they prefer to spend the \$10 million bailing out their friend from St. John with this dubious airline they had, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: As soon as the Hon. Minister winds up in his final minute, we will get closer to debating CARIFESTA and other things.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, half hour really is not enough, Sir, but I have all week, I have all week, Sir, and we are going to carry the fight to them, because I

remember when I was a little boy, you had two kinds of dogs in the district. There was the one who did not make much noise but when you mess around he would eat you up, and the one that was always barking and making a loud noise, but as soon as you look at him, he would run under the cellar, Sir. That is the Opposition, Sir, they are running under the cellar today. (*Applause*) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Where is Billie? Billie is the only person who has not talked.)

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is now 7.10 p.m., Sir, and I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. I would like to congratulate my colleagues on this side for the outstanding contributions which they have made today and let them be well assured that Stephenson is in the pavilion to come tomorrow morning.

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 7.10 p.m.

7.10 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the debate was centered on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. The Honourable Member for St. George South had just completed his address to the Chair. Any other honourable Member who desires to make his contribution may do so now.

The question is that a Bill to grant the sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same to the service of Barbados for the year ending the 31st March, 1983.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise to make a contribution, Mr. Speaker, to the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill which is now before this August Chamber. You will recall, yesterday, Mr. Speaker that this House was seeking.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to say to the honourable Member that I think the Chair has proceeded sufficiently far in putting the question that all honourable Members who wanted to make a contribution had time enough when called upon to rise to their feet.

I think that when I am speaking all honourable Members would gladly take their seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: As far as I know you were standing, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate all of this but it is clearly to be noted that access to and egress from this Chair, so to speak is still such a cumbersome exercise. It is not easy to ascend here and descend from here. It is not easy. However, it is really, I think, too late and it should proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I rise, Mr. Speaker, with great respect to Your Honour's ruling, to wind up the debate in the light that speeches made from the other side were critical of Government's policy. I am quite sure that we have always risen, maybe 98 out of 100 times before you reach as far as you have now reached. Invariably, you do get there, Sir.

Since speeches were critical of the Government, I rose, Sir, giving others on the other side, or even on this side, all the chances to rise to make more contributions. It is at that point I discovered that there were no other Members who really wanted to make a contribution and I rose, with great respect to Your Honour, to wind up the debate in the light of the criticisms of Government.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Yesterday, Sir, we were treated to a speech made by the Member for St. Michael South Central.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Hon. Minister rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: To address the Chair on the Second Reading, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Second Reading?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already stated that the honourable Member is out of order in that when the honourable Member rose and signified his intentions to address the Chair, I had already attempted and had got more than half way in putting the question.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You would appreciate at my age why this would delay my rising from my seat to address Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree that the question of privilege takes precedence over all of the matters in this Hon. House. If it is a question of privilege, I am prepared to hear the honourable Member, but I will proceed to put the motion.

The question that a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending March 31, 1983 be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.15 a.m.

ESTIMATES 1981-82

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with the Estimates and we need a Clerk at the table.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Marshal would you summon one of the Clerks to the table. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that at all times a Clerk must be at the table, at all times.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the Estimates was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

HEAD 11 – GOVERNOR-GENERAL – \$182 819

Head 11 – Governor-General was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, Sir, that Head 11 do now stand part.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, Mr. Chairman, so that we all know where we are, I wish to know whether Heads are going to be called at any point, or subheads, or whether they are simply going to be Heads. The way the Estimates are laid out, we have a Head and if one looks at the expenditure column, one would see that there are areas which could be broken down. I just wish to know what the procedure is going to be in that regard. We are dealing with Heads only? Do I understand that, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with Heads.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Fine, okay.

HEAD 12 -- PARLIAMENT -- \$842 868

Head 12 -- Parliament -- was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: In moving that this Head stands part, Mr. Chairman, I make my annual submission in respect of Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, on May 12 this year, I would have been in here for six years, and I complain again, Mr. Chairman, that this, which is the highest committee and the highest court in this land, is not a place fit and suitable for Parliamentarians to work in. There is nobody outside of this Hon. Chamber, Mr. Chairman, who is going to give us any credit for working in substandard conditions.

You have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where the Parliament of today is a busy committee. In recent weeks, we have found ourselves in this Hon. Chamber three days, two days this week. As tradition has it, we will now be here for five days, and the discomfort cannot be glossed over. We are in a situation where this main Chamber is now too cramped for us. We have gross difficulty on the front bench. We are in a situation, Mr. Chairman, where for years now we work in a Chamber that is liable at some point to fall apart at any given moment. These microphones from which we speak, from time to time fall away from their anchors. From time to time the public address system in this Hon. House breaks down.

We have a situation, Sir, where honourable Members are working on plywood and the cheapest abortive that can be bought in Bridgetown. We have a situation, Sir, where in an edifice of a certain architectural and historic import, the past Government has sought to embellish it with cheap ply wood and laminated plastic. It is not good enough, Mr. Chairman Sir. The House is uncomfortable, the House is cramped -- the House is often dirty.

It is well known that we come here scheduled for every Tuesday at noon, 1200 hours, and in a week like this we are going to be here for five days. You have Ministers on the front bench, you have busy persons on the other side of the House, and, from time to time officers from the various Ministries and other guests will come here to do business of one kind or another. We are going to be in and out of the Chamber.

There are not enough ante-rooms in which Members could do business and in the one ante-room that does exist off the lobby, it is possible, I believe, Mr. Chairman, to grow cabbages in the dirt that you will find there. You cannot sit in it.
9.25 a.m.

There is a library, or what passes for a library, in here. It is place where members of the staff of Parliament

have to find recourse from time to time in an effort to find a little nook or cranny, or a corner in which to do important work. We have a situation, Sir, where now even the dining room in this Hon. Chamber is too cramped itself and not as well outfitted as it might be to service a Parliament of this dignity.

Every year I make a complaint about the rest rooms in the House, and I am being really polite and generous in my description when I describe them as rest rooms, because they are far from that. They are still in an insani-tary and quite unacceptable condition. Mr. Chairman, I must submit again this year that it really must not, it cannot continue like this. It is getting to the point where honourable Members are ashamed to bring guests, especially guest from overseas, to this House. You meet the dirt coming up the stairs, you stand in it in the main foyer.

We have a little ante-chamber just off this House where honourable Members will go from time to time to make important telephone calls or to do other urgent business, particularly with officers of Government. Mr. Chairman, during the past year there have been times when there has not been a chair in the ante-room. Sometimes when there is a chair it is falling apart, the leg is coming out, or the cane bottom is going through the floor. We have a water cooler which leaks constantly in that room and creates an unsightly and an unhealthy mess on the floor. The carpeting is threadbare in this Hon. Chamber, Sir. Yesterday morning I had to ask the porter to relieve me of a chair which would break my neck if I had given it only half of a chance.

I do not think that this is fair to us, I do not think that this is fair to the dignity of Parliament, Mr. Chairman, and as I said, nobody is going to give us any marks, any points for treating ourselves in this manner. And if we set a poor example at this level we cannot expect people at lower levels to behave in a proper manner. We complain about falling standards, lack of manners, the disappearance of everyday courtesies and etiquette, but I do not know how we can expect people to show us these courtesies if we show ourselves the greatest discourtesy of all.

We vote certain monies. It has been pointed out before now that the tiny, the miniscule fraction of those monies which is spent on Parliament is really not going to make any difference, one way or another, to the basic economy in this country -- and yet still we go on and on. Year after year I make the same speech -- and I have reason to believe that next year at this time I will be making the same speech again -- but no effort is made, and I really wish to urge upon the Government that it cannot continue and that it ought not to continue to disrespect itself in this fashion.

This is where we work. An abundance of legislation has come down in recent years, and there is yet more legislation to come. There is every reason to believe, Mr. Chairman, that we will work in this Chamber more frequently than we have done in the past year or two. In fact, we have been told now for the past three or four years that when the new post office is completed at Cheapside that premises will become available to us in the Chamber. I have no quarrel with that, and I am prepared to have the patience to wait for it, but that does not mean that in the meanwhile we have to live in near squalor — because that is what we are approaching now, Mr. Chairman — there is no reason why we have to live in these squalid conditions in the meanwhile, and I really must urge upon those officers who are responsible for the Parliament that they really must in the coming year do something to improve upon these unkind conditions.

I wish to take the opportunity too, Mr. Chairman, to comment upon the air conditioning, and to try to prevail upon the powers that be that when the time comes to refurbish this Chamber in particular, that attention really must be paid to a proper air conditioning system. It is very hard on Members who sit on both sides of this House opposite these two vents. How we do not go away with bronchitis and pneumonia every week, Mr. Chairman, I hardly know. If you sit directly opposite the vents you are freezing. Life is not so difficult for Members who sit at the two extremities, but something must be wrong with a system which directs a cold jet stream of air at three or four Members on either side of the Chamber and allow other Members to sit in comparative comfort, from an air conditioning point of view. (Aside). The Hon. Prime Minister is saying that at his extremity he is actually sitting in heat, but there must be something wrong with the air conditioning system where some of us are sweating at the far ends of the benches and those in the middle are wishful of winter coats. It is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, and there is absolutely no reason why we must behave like this.

You can go into Bridgetown and go into bank managers' offices which are appointed in a proper fashion. You go into certain board rooms in Bridgetown — and you go into premises which are comfortable and suited to the business which is done there. The Central Bank is building its edifice just to the east of us here, Mr. Chairman. The Governor of that institution is very willing and very anxious to show you the model and to show you the comfort that is going to accrue to those who work there. And yet you go into Government Ministries, and you come into this Hon. Chamber and Ministers of the Government are expected to work and operate in some of the crudest conditions. Some of us have no bathrooms, to which we have direct access, or exclusive access, which is not too much to ask. Some of us have worse air conditioning systems than exist in this Hon.

Chamber. I must not digress, but I really do not think that I can overstate the point.

9.35 a.m.

In this Hon. Chamber we have no trade unions. We are our own regulatory body and it is for us to protest. Mr. Chairman, I protest against the conditions in which we work in here from week to week. There is absolutely no reason why we should deprive ourselves because there is nobody out there who is going to have any sympathy for us. Anybody who has sense would tell us that it serves us right and that it is our fault — and so it is.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, the times when this was a place to come and when one sat on mahogany chairs — and that included the gallery — no cheap high benches. I remember, Mr. Chairman, Sir, the mahogany work shone after polishing in here. I remember a time when you saw no ply wood, no cheap arborite in here. I remember a time, Mr. Chairman, when the lobby was a comfortable place where one could invite guests, where one could do business — and sit in comfort and cleanliness. I remember the time, Sir, when the dining room in Parliament offered a service which could be found at some of the best hotels, when we ate on proper linens and used proper cutlery and we had proper service. I remember those times, Sir. I remember the time, Mr. Chairman, when the library in this Hon. Chamber was one where we could expect to find certain volumes and certain books of reference. Those things cannot be said today and it is a crying shame. It is a cause for shame. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

I ought not be standing here making the same speech year after year. It says something about us, Mr. Chairman, if we are to go on working under these conditions. It says something about us and about the attitudes we have in Parliament. It says something about the view we hold of Parliament. Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I put out this appeal again, that even though most honourable Members are prepared to wait for this place to be cleaned, and for our rooms to become available to us so that we can do the work of the country. When Parliament Sub-Committees come here there is great difficulty to find a suitable room in which to work. Sometimes we have to work in the Senate Chamber. But I wish to make this appeal yet again, Mr. Chairman, in the interim, there is absolutely no reason why we should work in dirt and sub-standard conditions.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Member for the City has spoken quite feelingly and I endorse all of the comments and criticisms that she has made.

I would like to consider that the Parliament of this country is an institution which is not only steep in history but is one which should be an important instrument in the creation of history. Over the years I have

formed the impression that Parliament as an institution is decreasing as far as its rule of importance is concerned, and that we as Parliamentarians must carry the blame in the face of the advancing encroachment of the Executive in relation to the powers and functions of Parliament. We must carry the blame, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for the City has touched largely on the inconvenience of the Members, and indeed there are many grounds for complaint. We both sit on the Library Committee and we both share the frustrations of sitting on that particular Committee.

We are both members of the Debates Committee and I would like to say that there are developments in Parliament which, as a member of the Committee, I seem to be unaware of. I don't know if the other members of the Committee are aware. I believe if there is a Committee of Parliament charged with certain responsibilities, that the members of that Committee, either by way of meetings or by way of consultation through the procedure of round robin, should be consulted, and opinions sought out. But this does not happen, and it does not happen very often.

I would like to raise the question of the relationship between the Clerk of Parliament, who has some responsibility in the printing of debates, and the Government Printery in terms of the way in which the Clerk carries out, or is permitted to carry out, his statutory functions in respect of those debates. I think we need some clarification here.

I think we are pleased, and I would like to state the satisfaction of the Government, that debates, which previously used to take a very long time to be published, are being published very frequently. My colleague, the Leader of the House — the honourable Member for St. James North — must take some credit for that along with the Minister responsible for the printery.

But we would like to know, because Members come into Parliament and they see strange faces working inside of Parliament and they do not know one word of information. Maybe they are known to the security personnel I do not know. But for Members of Parliament whose debates are edited or whose debates are examined by personnel, there is absolutely no information to the members of the appropriate committees, or indeed to Parliament itself through a general statement by the Minister responsible, about when new staff is taken on, or about new arrangements being made. Like everything else these things are thrown at you or they just occur and the kind of consultation which oils the smooth working of Parliament seems to be missing as far as these particular elements are concerned.

9.45 a.m.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the taking down of debates by shorthand may be concerned — and I believe one of my colleagues may be adverting to this particular matter — we see new people coming in and out. They are not known to the members of the Committee, not to the Parliament as a whole are you even introduced to these new members of staff. I do not know if you, Mr. Chairman, are advised on these particular developments, but I do not think that that is good enough or that it is satisfactory. We had a situation in which the reporters have been working short-staffed for a considerable period of time and under considerable pressure, and very little is done to relieve these reporters. We need to establish a proper career structure inside of Parliament also, so that those who have worked tirelessly and committed themselves to this institution can expect promotion into higher positions when such positions are created and so on. None of this seems to be happening, and we must voice our concern on the floor of the House, because there seems to be some problem in making the Committees work.

Indeed I may say that the problem in Parliament may be reflective of the general problems confronting this country. I do not wish to be much longer on this particular Head. I believe I have made those points. The way the Estimates are set out, of course, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to know how much is allocated for what, and I am wondering if the appropriate Minister can tell us how much money out of this vote for operating expenses is allocated for the purchase of books for the library. How much money out of the amount to be appropriated here of \$100 000 for operating expenses will be allocated in the coming financial year to the purchase of books, periodicals and so on, and how does that compare with the amount in the current Estimates. I think the House is entitled to have that information.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity also to make a call for the reproduction or piping of the debates of this Chamber into the office of the Leader of the Opposition. Members of the Opposition, if they are in that office, should be able to follow debates in the Chamber just as, quite rightly, when the Prime Minister retreats to his office upstairs he can listen to the debates which may be taking place. I would like to make an appeal for debates to be also piped into the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few words to this debate. I first wish to indicate that I associate myself with the remarks made by the previous speakers, and especially the very incisive — although she indicated that it was a repetition — criticisms which were made of Parliament, in its present state, by the Hon. Minister of Education. I believe that what she had to say ought not to fall on

deaf ears this year. One can only hope that this will not be an exercise in words and that some action will be taken, notwithstanding the long-standing promise about what will happen to Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a fundamental point which has been touched on by my colleague who just sat down. The debates of Parliament, as I understand it, from the long practice of the British Parliament and the Barbados Parliament, are considered to be sacred in so far as they faithfully represent what are the proceedings in Parliament. What we say in this Chamber is supposed to be reproduced in exactitude and it is supposed to reflect totally the proceedings in Parliament. As I understand it, there are certain Parliamentary officers, the Clerks, the Reporters and others who have access to Parliamentary debates before those Parliamentary debates are committed to print.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me hasten to state that I have no desire or intention to interfere with any particular individual in the exercise of his responsibility as seen by him. I believe, Sir, that we have to congratulate the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, if it is he — the Minister of Information claims the credit but I believe it is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who is responsible — for getting these debates out on a weekly basis, I used to work in the United Nations and part of the responsibility then was to get the debates of the day before in the hands of those who would be participating the following day. It is done every day at the United Nations. Parliamentary debate in the plenary is reproduced verbatim the following day at 9 o'clock; so what I speak of I have experience in.

I congratulate the Parliament on having the debates for the following Tuesday, but these debates have to be accurate, and there are two things. First there appears to be a person who is editing the debates. I believe that if that person is to be editing the debates of Parliament, that that person ought to be attached to the staff of Parliament to regularise the matter, because it is wrong, it appears to me, for the debates to go from the Reporters to someone other than the Clerk — unless that someone is vested with the same responsibility as the Clerk. In other words, Sir, if there is going to be a Chief Editor, that Chief Editor should have the same kind of accountability to Parliament as any member of Staff of Parliament. So far as I know, and I am a member of the Debates Committee, such is not the case, and arising out of that, Sir, I am calling on the Minister or Ministers responsible — and indeed if it is the Presiding Officer of this House — to ensure that honourable Members have an opportunity to see their debates before they are committed permanently to print.

Mr. Chairman, this is the position in the British Parliament, it is the position with the United States

Parliament, the Canadian Parliament and most Commonwealth Parliaments, and it is the position that ought to prevail in Barbados — and I am fortified in the view when I have reviewed the debate as printed. Speaking only of my own contribution, to say nothing of the contributions of others on both sides of this Hon. House, the number of grammatical errors, spelling errors and plain nonsense errors is too high.
9.55 a.m.

I will give you an example. In the debate of December 15, as printed in the Hansard, in a speech which I delivered in Committee, Sir, there are no less than 17 errors — errors where "figure" is printed instead of "vigour" where "has has been" is written where "have been" should be, such simple things as getting the tenses right, where, for example, we are discussing gasolene, we are discussing oil, and I talked about the diesoline content and they spelt it "diseling".

Mr. Chairman, these are the kinds of errors which children in elementary school would be flogged for if they had committed them, and I can go on Mr. Chairman. I invite you to pages 516, 517 and 518 of the debate of that date, and you will see, Sir, that such things as "matter of fact" and "matters of facts" are confused.

I have every reason to believe, Sir, that if you have an Editor or someone who is editing the debates, that that someone must have an appreciation, not only of Parliamentary procedure, not only of Parliament practice, but an appreciation of the English Language, because these debates are supposed to take place in the English Language. I find it quite unacceptable that years from now when researchers, or whoever, come to review Hansards to discover what it is we said, what the honourable Members of this Chamber said in our time, they will tend to think of honourable Members on both sides of this House as if they were totally or semi-illiterate.

It is not acceptable, and I think that the answer to that can be found in two things. One a relief of the Reporters' pressure. It is not right that this Parliament, which has provision for a minimum of five reporters has been living on four reporters alone for the last two years, and Mr. Chairman, the reporters have constantly been under pressure.

We are having meetings of Parliament. As the honourable Member said, we have had three meetings in one week and two another week. We have been meeting every week and the business of taking shorthand notes is not in the same category as other work where concentration can lapse for a period of time and yet efficiency of the job is not lowered. Every single time a Shorthand Reporter lapses, there is a possibility of error. It becomes necessary for the Shorthand Reporter to revert to

recordings which are not allowed to be made officially because we in a developing country and following the tradition of a developed country that has all of the resources which we do not have and so the recordings which are made, not fully officially, then have to be of poor quality and hence reporters are unable to check what they have written to see if it is accurate.

I am calling for honourable Members of this Chamber wherever it is practicable, or wherever there is a demand — as it is a right of such honourable Members in the concept of privilege of Parliament — to be allowed to see their alleged reports before they are printed, because once they have been committed to Hansard, that is what the persons stand committed as having said — whether he or she said it or not.

Mr. Chairman, in keeping with that particular position, the so-called lobby that is reserved for the Members of this Chamber — since Members of the Opposition do not have a room with a leaking water cooler, we have to go to the lobby — we now find that we are unable to carry on a private conversation in the lobby because, again without so much as “by your leave”, there is a functionary sitting in that room working. It is not his fault, but he is there, and therefore if I want to tell the honourable Member for St. Michael South what I really think of the honourable Member for St. Thomas, I have to speak sotto voce.

If I want to discuss the honourable Member for the City in terms which I do not wish my constituents to hear, I cannot do it because somebody is eavesdropping — not necessarily deliberately — and furthermore we are in danger of being recorded by the Shorthand Reporters when we utter words, because the facilities of this Parliament are such that they are forced to put us in jeopardy when we attempt to speak.

I believe, too, Sir, that some of the practices concerning the ability of the citizens of the country to hear the debate which is going on in their name in this Chamber, the difficulties which are attendant on some of the persons in this country coming into Parliament, need some kind of review by this Hon. Chamber. I believe that provision has to be made for the citizens of this country to be able to observe the proceedings of Parliament without reference, necessarily, to the antiquated concepts which are more in keeping with 1689 than they are in keeping with 1982. And I believe that if Parliament itself does not make the kind of reforms of our system that honourable Members have been talking about, that we are going to be in danger, in the end, of bringing down the very institution which we are all sworn to uphold. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is there no other honourable Member who wishes to speak?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister is winding up?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In Committee, Sir, it cannot be a matter of winding up because I always have the right to speak, Sir. I am just replying to comments made.

Mr. Chairman, I share all the views and the sentiments expressed here this morning by the Member for the City — the Minister of Education — as well as the Member for St. Michael South and the Member for St. Michael West. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a long history behind Parliament of which we all can be justly proud. I think it is either the second or third oldest Parliament in the entire Commonwealth and it boasts a tradition of which all Barbadians can be justly proud.

When I first came to Parliament in 1966, there was a degree of dignity, there was a degree of decorum. It was a Parliament of which one could safely say they could enjoy working in — and working with all those concerned. I would not like to make this controversial in saying that there was a downward trend during the last Administration. I do not believe this was intentionally done. There was a lack of foresight, put it that way. The Administration at that time did not see Parliament in the light in which we are seeing it this morning from the sentiments expressed from both sides of the House. If Parliament is the highest office in the land, it must be treated that way. If Members are prepared to have verbal clashes across the table, there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. In other Parliaments people draw guns and things of that nature.

10.05 a.m.

I think that we get too involved, too concerned at times, with the verbal clashes, but when it is all said and done this is the Parliament for the people. We are sent here by way of their wishes and I have no doubt, Sir, that the sentiments which we have heard this morning are sentiments which we should all take note of.

If I were to respond first to the sentiments of the Hon. Minister of Education, I would sum it up by simply saying that Parliament is dirty. It is dirty. It is dirty to work in. Today, Sir, we are operating almost under the same facilities as the first 21 Members that came to Parliament, almost under the same facilities, and they met probably once a month to have a drink and decide what they were going to do. Today, you have a Parliament with 27 Members, a large staff and yet the physical facilities remain the same, and I believe these are some of the problems.

I am told by Mr. Speaker, for example, that there is difficulty in even having a maid to clean Parliament,

something that I am quite sure cannot be done by any one or two persons in this day and age. It is filled with cobweb, the seats are dusty. The lobby which allows Members to discuss matters with their constituents or for honourable Ministers to discuss matters with their Civil Servants, their advisers and people who may be coming in to see them on other matters, can be described by nothing else but deplorable conditions inside, and the fault, I believe, started with the last Administration.

When you examine just the furniture in here alone, I mean these board box things that I would not even have, two screws of the microphone in.....I saw the late Ernest Mottley who was a man about 68 or thereabouts hold one and wring it out and he was an old man at the time. The table is made up of cheap...(ASIDE: Aborite.) aborite. The chairs that you sit in here.....this one here for the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister is broken, the back is broken, and there are two behind the Speaker's chair in a similar state. The water cooler, as the Hon. Minister of Education said, is dirty, but not only dirty — you believe it is a Jumbo when the motor cuts in, Mr. Chairman. The facilities in the dining hall are inadequate but we can appreciate that for the time being. We have to ask ourselves, where are we going?

I am confident that both Parties have failed for this simple reason. We have sold ourselves cheap to the public. We have sold ourselves cheap to the country and as long as you sell yourself cheap, you are going to be bought cheap. That is the whole point. You have a cheap Parliament.

Only a couple days ago, there were some young people demonstrating against what they consider some injustices and grievances. Now Members on the Other Side are well aware of the Standing Orders and practices of Parliament — that while Parliament is sitting, the proceedings should not be disturbed, the highest office of the land should not be disturbed — and, when we drew it to Mr. Speaker's attention, the Members of the Opposition started saying, "Hands off, you are wrong". You are selling yourself cheap to these young people so they must treat you in that way.

So when money is not moved into the Estimates to give Parliament the necessary provisions for the purpose of working in here under pleasant conditions, then we have no one to blame but ourselves. As Minister I am not holding myself responsible for this. Get this very, very straight: I am not going to hold myself responsible for the rails that you have around here, and the dingy curtains. I am not going to hold myself responsible. Both Parties are responsible. You have failed in 15 years to give Parliament the physical lift that it should have had and in our five years and X months, we have failed so far.

But there is going to be a determined effort as long as I have anything to do with it by sitting in here. As long as I have anything to do with it, I am going to make sure that it will be a place where we all can work.

There are 27 Members in here, two Deputy Clerks and a Clerk at the table, one telephone, three numbers. If someone called the distinguished physician specialist today, the Member for St. Michael South Central — as they say that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was dying and he stepped over him and said that he would not touch him and so on — if he called him now, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was outside or the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted to get a message to the distinguished gentleman, it would take at least one hour to get through. And, while you are in conversation with someone, you hear other people on the other lines talking.

I am saying that in here you should not have less than a dozen phones. I feel this way about it. You have the Press reporters who have to telephone their messages to the(Aside: Head Office.).....Head Office and they cannot get through. During the Estimates, we may have to call one of the Ministries to get the appropriate information, you cannot get through because the official reporters may be doing something, or saying something on the other line, Sir, and this is what we are reduced to.

So all criticism must start from 1969 when we changed Parliament around and destroyed a mahogany table — cut it up. The very chairs which the Chaplain of Parliament the Marshal and the Chairman of Committees sit in, any of you — well no, none apart from the Prime Minister and the Speaker — would remember that they were the chairs that we used and a mahogany table on the other side. They have disappeared. The table, I am told, was destroyed, and now you have been saddled with this aborite and pieces of pine board bars which you now have to work in — after 300 years of Parliamentary democracy in this country.

10.15 a.m.

I believe that in this day and age, and because of the work which Parliament now has to do, that — now, I want to be very careful when I say this, since I have some interest — a professional cleaning firm and there are several in Bridgetown, should be brought in here the day before Parliament sits, a few hours before Parliament sits, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of cleaning Parliament. No one maid or two maids can clean Parliament. The duties of a maid nowadays are not to come sweeping Parliament. They should be serving Mr. Speaker or the Leader of the Opposition with coffee or something like that, or serving you with a rum and coke sometimes, or a scotch.

There is no provision however, Sir, for the library, I am told, and I know this has been a repeated problem in here. There is no provision in the Estimates for it.

There was also a comment made by the Member for St. Michael West in respect of Hansard. I believe that we are all happy to see Hansard for the first time ever coming on the bar of Parliament one week after the sitting of the House, but I am also aware of the fact that you have these teething problems, you have to have them ironed out. Chatting with the Clerk earlier this morning, I learned that it was the function of the Clerks to edit Hansard before it went off to the printers. Whatever grammatical errors there are, I sincerely hope that the Member for St. Michael West is not laying blame on the Editor himself, who I have no doubt is well qualified to do the job, but give us some elbow room. We have been able to get them here in a hurry, and I am going to have a talk with Mr. Speaker, the Clerks and the Editor to see how best we can rectify that problem.

Mr. Chairman, finally let me assure the House that as soon as the Post Office is completed.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Minister would give way for a minute, Sir, I would like when the Minister is discussing the matter if he could allude to the conventional difficulty of the debates being sent, as it were, to the printers before they are authorised. I am putting it that way because I do not wish to ascribe blame to anybody, because this is the fundamental point I was making — that when the debates leave Parliament to go to the Printery they are assumed to be the correct thing, so it could not be somebody at the Printery.

My understanding is that the Editor is attached to the Printery. I am saying that if that is the difficulty, put the Editor as part of the staff of Parliament, or if we need an additional Clerk let us get an additional Clerk but insist that when it leaves Parliament it is authenticated.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I take the point made by the honourable Member and I believe he can leave it to the experience of Mr. Speaker, the Clerks and myself to have this matter resolved.

Finally, Sir, let me assure Parliament that as soon as the new Post Office, which I sincerely hope will soon be finished, is ready, money is going to be made available for the whole refurbishing, the decor and everything in Parliament. This is also a Manifesto commitment, and I hope that when we come back next Estimates we may not be able to sit in here we may have to ask the Other Place to allow us to use up there in the light of the hope I have to see the necessary renovations to Parliament started and completed.

As far as the Debates Committee and the Library Committee are concerned, I am going to call on all Members of Parliament who are members of the Debates Committee, in particular to meet, because we must call a spade a spade. We are having difficulties. The morale of the staff of Parliament is at its lowest ebb, and the Debates Committee is responsible for staff and management of Parliament. Therefore, I am calling on all Members who are members of that Committee to meet and I have already instructed Mr. Speaker to call a meeting so we can have these problems ironed out.

There are very, very serious problems in relation to the staff and the work of Parliament. It is not only just the physical conditions and the cleanliness of Parliament, the morale is very low, the entire staff is at its lowest ebb, and I am going to make sure that I do everything in my power to raise the morale of the staff at whatever price it costs. I will make sure that Parliament will be a happy place where we all can come and work and carry out the wishes of the people, because in the final analysis it is the people who make the final decision. We are only their apostles for a short period.

I hope I have answered whatever questions have come from both sides of the House, and I would like to assure them that I will try to do whatever lies in my power....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: There is no money provided). But we can have a supplementary. I sincerely hope we can have this done. Sir.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House, the Member for St. James North, said he did not want to be controversial. We had three very balanced speeches from the Member for the City, myself, and the Member for St. Michael West, but I am sorry that the Leader of the House did introduce a discordant note. To blame the past Administration for the fact that the top of the Speaker's Chair is very dusty is patent nonsense.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. I think the honourable Member is just playing to the Gallery. I would blame you for not dusting up there, not the past Administration. What I said earlier was that it was the cheapness of the past Administration that introduced this sort of cheap looking furniture in here, and you sold yourself cheaply to the country, therefore if you cannot get a maid or a professional cleaning firm to clean it, you blame the past Administration for starting the ball rolling at a cheap price. That is all I am saying. I can put you on my shoulders because I am strong enough and I am your M.P.

10.25 a.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You are not only my M.P., you are a professional duster. You are the one that should do the dusting.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not only am I a professional duster, Sir, but I have cut canes in Florida and now I have stepped into the highest chair in the land; so from duster to Deputy Prime Minister is a credit to me. Some of you have been around here for years and are in the same position.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: To blame the past Administration, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that there is a curtain or drape, more or less yellow, draping the division in the area where Members sit and where the public Gallery sit is blatant nonsense. All it calls for is the Government to find the money to take them down and send them to the cleaners. How can you blame the past Administration for that? It is time the Government realize that it is the Government of the country to show their responsibility and shoulder blame where it is allocated. That has nothing to do with the past Administration.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am blaming the past Administration for their cheapness. That is the point I meant, Mr. Chairman, that is the point I meant.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: To blame the past Administration because there is only one telephone inside the ante-chamber or ante-room, and it takes an hour to get through to your Ministry or for anyone to call the distinguished physician specialist, to blame the past Administration for the fact that you brought in the present system is also nonsense and has nothing at all to do with the past Administration. You changed the telephone system in here and you should have brought in adequate telephones for the Members and staff of Parliament.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will continue to blame that side. You were neat and mean, that is the point which I want to make. You started the cheap telephones.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: To blame the Opposition for the fact that you put a stop to workers demonstrating their grievances concerning their work place is also nonsense. This has nothing to do with the Opposition. You stopped the workers from demonstrating, and to say that noise came back into this Parliament.....(*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, we had the courage to tell the demonstrators that they were disturbing the proceedings of Parliament under an Act which you brought before Parliament in 1963. You are the person in 1963.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You brought the Act that was placed on the Statute Books by the Democratic Labour Party in 1963, but you should know how to operate under the Act. I am not ashamed of that. There was no disturbance of the proceedings in this House and I could hear everybody who was speaking over there. That you invited the jets from the United States when we could not hear one word in this Chamber because of the noise in the skies of Barbados and Members could not hear themselves, and when I protested you told me to get a rocket and shoot them down, you told me to shoot them down.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, it is very unkind to refer to me as "you" in generality.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am sorry the honourable Member for St. James North, my M.P.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would never have invited the honourable Member to get a rocket and shoot the jets down because I don't think he has that ability. All I am saying is that they passed the Act and now they are afraid to have it enforced. It is as simple as that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Labour Party has nothing to be ashamed of as far as the Parliamentary affairs are concerned. We gave this country an independent Parliament for an independent country in 1966, not a colonial Parliament. We transformed those relationships to an independent Parliament. We provided additional facilities for the public to come in to hear debates and enjoy and follow the discussion of public affairs of this country — nothing at all to be ashamed of. We asked the Minister of Communications and Works to carry out a refitting of Parliament, there was no Government Minister who sat down and said that the material should be this or that way. In any event if you were worried about the furniture you had from 1976–1981. You said that the economy was good so you could have refitted in here from 1976–1981/82. You had ample time to carry on whatever renovations or upgrading or whatever you wanted to do as far as the provisions of Parliament are concerned.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I think the honourable Member would have been more honest if he said we had only two years to do that, because we had two years to correct all the mistakes you made.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would like to make another particular point. I share responsibility for Parliamentary Affairs and I will be behind you like a tiger. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another point. It relates to the way in which we conduct our business in Parliament and I believe that the time has come where we should set up an adequate Committee

system in Parliament. We need an adequate Committee system and I refer to the fact that there is a vast body of legislation passed in this Chamber which does not get the type of scrutiny that it really deserves. It is time that we set up a proper Committee because if Parliament is to be the body which should scrutinize legislation and there is nobody doing this, then the Executive runs on its own.

The Government has set up a measure for the Committee on Foreign Affairs who did not formally make the provision for such. Why they allowed it to die, I do not know. I believe that when you get away from the flare of the Gallery and so on the solid contribution of Members over here may be a thorn by them. Anyhow, that is one point which I wish to make and I will stop at this time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise one subsidiary point. Very soon after the Government came into power, they instituted a system by which they gave some Parliamentarians some secretarial assistance in their constituencies.
10.35 a.m.

At that time a regime of remuneration was arranged. Since then all sectors of this community have had some kind of review of the emoluments paid to secretarial staff, and almost two years ago, as I understand it, there was an indication that the secretarial remuneration for Parliamentarians would be reviewed. That has not been done, Mr. Chairman, except that there was, I think, a re-allocation after one of the revisions of salaries in the system. But it was indicated very clearly that those persons who work as secretaries to Parliamentarians would have their emoluments reviewed, and I believe some considerable time has passed since that indication was given.

I would wish to find out from the Minister if the matter has been forgotten or if it is the intention of the Minister to review that matter or to have that matter reviewed. I believe that if Parliamentarians are acting under the illusion that they have secretarial assistance, that that secretarial assistance should be at a certain level, of a certain quality, and therefore they should not be languishing and left to chance. I would like to hear from the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to carry out the review which they promised more than a year ago.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this debate on Parliament unnecessarily, but I would like to make one or two comments.

Firstly, one has to be very careful why the honourable Member for St. James North slips in certain things in the debate. I would like to make it absolutely clear that I have never been called upon in a professional capacity to offer assistance to any Member of this Par-

liament during the sitting of Parliament, and that if called upon at any time, then the precepts of the Hippocratic Oath will take precedence over all other considerations. So I wish to make that absolutely clear — and free, Sir, because there is a section in the Privileges and Immunities Act which I think refers to the question of remuneration for services within Parliament, the same Act which I think was referred to earlier on by the honourable Leader of the House.

I, Sir, would like to raise two particular areas. I feel that the Press deserves better facilities in and around Parliament. I would like to see a situation where the Press, when they come here during a Parliamentary debate, can not only take their notes, but they can probably prepare their reports here in Parliament, that they can have further Press briefings with Members of Parliament right within the precincts of this House — not in the Chamber but certainly elsewhere — so that there can be a constant communication to ensure that reports which go out reflect more accurately what took place within the Chamber, because not all of us have the facilities of the honourable Member for Christ Church East, the honourable Minister of Agriculture, who prepares his brief in advance and hands it on to the Press. There is nothing wrong with it, it is good technique, but not all of us can do it. I would like to make that special plea on behalf of the Press. I think we should provide better facilities for the Press.

Another area that concerns me is that I believe that we should have a research team in Parliament attached to the library. In other words, if I wanted some information on how much money the Government spent in 1972 on a given area, it should be possible for me, Sir, to call up the research department of Parliament and get that information, and I believe that we should try to strengthen Parliament in that area to make research facilities and research personnel available to all Members.

I make this special plea, Sir, on behalf of the backbenchers on the other side in particular, and on behalf of the Opposition, because we are faced with a situation where we do not have a large number of civil servants available to us to assist us in these matters, and as you know, Sir, very often you have only 24 hours, sometimes 48 or 72 hours, to get yourself prepared for a debate, often with a weekend intervening. This means that if you want to get information, it is very difficult between Saturday afternoon and Monday morning to get information unless you have the material at home where you can research the matter at home, and for someone like myself who insists on a very high level of presentation before speaking in this Parliament, I find this a particular difficulty. I would certainly hope that whilst steps will be taken to improve on the physical environment of Parliament, that we look at these func-

tional areas in giving support to those Members who do not have civil servants at their disposal to help them in their research.

I am sure that those who are new on the front bench would appreciate the kind of problems that I am talking about, and I think it would enhance considerably the standard of debates in Parliament. Certainly, we would never get a situation where the honourable Member for St. Thomas, if he had an adequate research team, would have come in this House and gone on the public platform and said he could introduce a free National Health Service for \$3 million to \$5 million. He would never have done a thing like that, but I think that is because research facilities were not available to him. I do not think that he was misleading either this Honourable House or the public. I think he made that remark because he did not have adequate information available to him.

Now, Sir, on the question of telephones, I think that is a high priority and I would strongly suggest that you get a few more lines into Parliament as soon as possible. Sometimes it takes hours to get through to Parliament and it can be a very frustrating experience if you want to get information on some simple matter to find out whether a document is available or something like that, and you spend a whole day calling down here and the lines are busy all the time.

On the question of Sub-Committees, I believe that the time has come when this Parliament should have a Science and Technology Sub-Committee. Health, education, agriculture, even construction, new developments in housing in order to reduce the cost per unit often involve complicated, scientific and technological concepts which should be examined before a Committee of Science and Technology.

10.45 a.m.

The appropriateness, Sir, of the transfer of technology from the developed to the under-developed countries or the appropriate listness of our acceptance of such technology and the implications Sir, not only — I want to keep away from finance today, Sir — but the implications of job substitutions and so on are things that should be subject to appropriate examination by a sub-committee of Parliament, and I would hope, Sir, that something be done in this area.

I would hope that the honourable Member for St. James North who is responsible for Parliamentary Affairs would recognise that we are serious when we are making this kind of contribution and that we would expect to see such a committee operative in the future. I would tell you why — it would help the Ministers more than anybody else because there are relatively few people in here with a scientific background except yourself and myself, Sir. From classics to science to Economics to finance —

no problem. There are not many people with a scientific background but if we can have evidence from the scientists and make those reports available to Parliament, it would be of tremendous advantage.

There have been major decisions taken in Barbados in relation to a major sector, and when that decision was taken there was clearly not sufficient scientific input into the decision-making process, otherwise I do not think that when that decision was taken the Cabinet had been aware of all of the scientific implications at the time or that decision would not have been made. It does show how you can make major errors if as a decision making body you do not have available to you the relevant information in the area of Science and Technology.

I would also like, Sir, to support the position taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition where we objected strongly to the fact that American airplanes were allowed to fly over Parliament, I think it was during the Estimates debates, and nothing was done about it. The provisions of the Immunities and Privileges Act, I think it was, were not invoked and they must have had permission from the Government of Barbados and the Minister responsible for Defence and Security to display their power and their strength over the Parliament of this country. No doubt the intimidatory effects of such blasts might have had an effect on lesser persons, but certainly not on those on the Opposition. That was a bad precedent. If that precedence was not established, one would be on sounder ground to deal with a lesser serious problem of a disturbance by an unfortunate group of persons in our community who had been subjected, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: who had been subjected to the serious problems of excessive work and extremely low wages — almost at a starvation level. Thank you very much.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman. Sir, I used to speak a lot under this Head and I was going to let this be the first time in 16 years that I allow the Head — Parliament — to pass without saying anything. But something has been dragged in — two things have been dragged in the House. I do not know how it is really possible for a Vote for Parliament to talk about the National Health Service or American airplanes.

If when we were in Opposition we were guilty of estimating what the National Health Service would cost, it was because the figures available to us referred to the Income Tax returns made by doctors. We in Opposition were not to know that doctors would go before a Commission and admit that their incomes in some cases were 120 percent higher than the return

to the Inland Revenue. We were not to know that when an investigation was made and the Inland Revenue said that the average return by doctors was \$44 000 a year, that we were going to find that the doctors claim that they true incomes were between \$80 000 and \$100 000 and that they should not only be compensated at the true level but something else should be added on to make up for the Income Tax they would now pay. They cannot blame us. No research facility in Parliament could produce such facility. It was only when the type of Health Service that we brought in forced the doctors in their own financial interest to start telling the truth about their incomes that it was realised how much money doctors worked for in this country.

The second thing is about the American airplanes — I heard it from the honourable Member for St. Michael South and I heard it from the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. I must confess that the incident escapes my memory, but apart from that, there is no penalty in law on motor cars driving through the Public Buildings, driving next to the Public Buildings, and airplanes flying at roof level over the Public Buildings — well there would be a penalty for flying at less than 1 500 feet. There is no control whatsoever over mechanical noises outside Parliament.

The Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities Act is directed to the actions of persons who disturb Parliament. The idea that American airplanes flew over the House of Assembly deliberately, or with the connivance of the Government, is so absurd that I am wondering if the incident ever took place.

I fear that I am not so sensitive as honourable Members opposite. I know that recently upon being questioned by a visiting American of some official standing, I was told — I cannot say I know — that the honourable Member for St. Michael South indicated that the Democratic Labour Party was a left wing party. I do not know if this is some new move on the part of the Opposition to align itself with the left and they want to make sure that they do not only tell the Americans privately that they are a left wing party, but they want to say it publicly as well.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have been referred to by the — I am rising on a point of order — Member as attributing some comment to me.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Foreign Affairs, that is who the honourable Member told that to.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we said we were certainly left of the Government which is far right. The Government is a Right Wing Party and we were asked specifically whether we would consider ourselves left of

the Government and we said that we were certainly left of the Government and there are out on the far end, anyhow. But how would the Prime Minister know of the proceedings of a private meeting between members of the Opposition and a visiting House of Commons Select Committee. These are some very serious questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get to Parliament business. Order, order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I wonder if we are really safe in any kind of conversation we carry on anywhere..... bugging?
10.55 a.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with Parliament and the Parliamentary Vote.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member can perhaps look to the honourable Members of his own party if he wishes to know how the information has reached this side. The honourable Member is sitting down next to a gentleman who glories in leaks and the revelation of surreptitious information. He is sitting down next to somebody — there is nothing more than the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is on a point of order.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I do not know if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is referring to me because there were only two members who held discussions with the visiting delegation — the honourable Acting Leader of the Opposition and myself. I do not know of anyone else. There was no one else present. (Aside) I too would like to know where the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister got that information from. I would like to know that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are other Members on the honourable Member's left.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Only two persons were present, Sir, only two persons were present — the honourable Member for St. Michael South and myself. Only two Members of Parliament were present.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I always admire honourable Members who get up and point the accusing finger at themselves. I think that it is so good for Parliament that we have candour and honesty in the ranks of all the Members.

The damage done by the American aeroplanes flying over Parliament — which I do not even remember, far less

gave any sanction to as Minister of Defence and Security — surely, Mr. Chairman could not equal the damage done by the HARP gun which an Act of Parliament has actually brought in here to protect.....(Aside).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Are we so self important that a few aeroplanes flying overhead causes us to have a debate about it when we passed an Act to allow a gun to be fired in Christ Church and break up people's houses and....(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Grant immunity).....grant immunity to the people that lived in it? Why do you not have some respect for the people outside? It does not lie in the mouths of honourable Members opposite who allowed a pack of ruffians making atomic bombs for South Africa and making shells for South Africa to come here and test out the shells and break up people's houses. (Asides).

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is not usually known, or commonly known, that HARP was brought into Barbados by the previous Barbados Labour Party.....(ASIDE: Headed by Dr. Cummins.) headed by Dr. Cummins. That is a fact, Sir. You cannot come in here.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, order. I must point out to all honourable Members that we are dealing with a Parliamentary vote and I have no intention of allowing this debate to stray too far. Please, please, Honourable Members take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just deal with him though, and do not let him mislead the Hon. House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would not dwell on it, Sir, but I mean the fact is that it was not Dr. Cummins who brought in Dr. Bull.....(Laughter).....as His Honour's newspaper had to comment as to who went to Canada to Bull. You remember it, Mr. Chairman, the famous headline in the Truth newspaper. It was not the Barbados Labour Party that brought in the people who went to jail for committing the offences. They were two generations later than the Space Research people that first came in here carrying out genuine space research. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Carry on with the debate.)

Dealing with the points about the conditions of Parliament, Sir, I would say this. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: For the last time.) There are few more persistent strains in democratic countries than the general

public tendency to criticise Parliament and Members of Parliament for trying to make themselves as comfortable in order to carry on the people's business. Oppositions unfortunately lend themselves to the question of Parliamentary salaries and the public resents the concept of privileges for Members of Parliament, as much, I think, as they resent Parliamentary salaries. I think you just have to grasp the problem and deal with it decisively.

I would like to support the honourable Member for St. James — the honourable Leader of the House — the honourable Minister in charge of this Head — when he says we should never have had these abhorite foolishnesses here, pieces of pine and ply wood. Parliament deserves better than that. We are showing ourselves up as being less conscious of the dignity of Parliament than the Parliamentarians of 120, 130 years ago who in 1874 decided to have those stained glass windows put in — some of the most outstanding works of art actually to be found in Barbados. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: They want cleaning though.) I read in the newspaper they were not too satisfied with "Queen Victoria" when she was put there in 1902 or 1903. But a Parliament Chamber such as this should have some money spent on it. The woodwork in this Parliament Chamber should be mahogany. The carpets should be adequate. You should have proper public address systems. We should have better secretarial aids in the Parliamentary office.

Long ago, the schemes for improving the library and the research service should have been put into operation. The current Mr. Speaker, showed me a plan some three or four years ago to recruit a young boy and a young girl with the necessary number of O Levels and give them training in library work and let them come into Parliament to make Parliament a career, not only seeking promotion ultimately to the post of Librarian but perhaps to other posts within Parliament, because the staff, although small, need not be unskilled and need not be in one position for a very long time without hope of promotion — if you really apply your mind to it.

But the Debates Committee has done, so far as I know nothing about the library scheme. It came to the Library Committee when I was a member and as far as I can recall, we did not do very much about it either.

We have done some physical work on Parliament since 1976, the mezzanine work. I regard that as being possibly the greatest achievement of MCW since I have known it. I mean to make these beautiful doors — and they did it so quickly — panelling, the mezzanine carpeted throughout and air condition throughout the central block all for \$120 000, was an outstanding piece of work and the artisans of MCW deserved and got congratulations for what they did. But it is time to put them to work again.

The honourable Member for St. James is pointing out to me — and I am glad I remember — that even prior to that, the MCW, as it was then, was able to match the coral stone and the Gothic architecture, the early English Gothic architecture in which style this building is constructed. They were able to match that with the stairs going up to the new public gallery.

It really is time that we have a conception and direct the MTW, tell them that we want such and such done. Maybe it will be in the form of having a mezzanine in the public gallery and extending the benches. We do not know. Maybe, in fact, they need three rows of benches on this side. I do not know. But an architect should be employed and instructions be given that the best materials be used.

I personally think that the dining room has now got so crowded that you need a staff dining room. It is not fair either to the staff or to Members. It is too crowded for the staff to eat at the same time as Members, therefore, the staff — the Police — I believe, have to wait until 2.30 p.m. and 2.45 p.m. to get lunch on ordinary afternoons. We should have better facilities in the dining room itself.

A serious effort should be made at obtaining more portraits or famous Parliamentarians, and I believe that there is at least one Member of Parliament who we will all expect to commemorate with a bust or a statue at some stage when he is no longer with us. We should be putting arrangements in train from now for the necessary photographs, if necessary three dimensional photography, to be done so this could be facilitated.

11.05 a.m.

We have to understand that we are heirs to something that did not merely start in 1966, we are heirs to the struggle that preceded that, and indeed to the struggles of a different sort which preceded even that. The Constitution of Barbados did not hesitate to use the Preamble to the Declaration that preceded the settlement of the Commonwealth in 1652. We should not hesitate to remind ourselves of the fact that this is an ancient Parliament and that we are the proper and legitimate heirs of those who operated Parliamentary traditions in Barbados for 300 years.

I think that while this year the Minister of Finance may not find it possible to approve a grant of say half million dollars for refurbishments in Parliament, that we should be prepared to spend that on improving Parliament after the Post Office has moved out. I have not heard any suggestion here today which I think is too luxurious for honourable Members. Every single suggestion is one which will enable Members of Parliament to do the people's business a little better, and I think that we should be making plans from now for offices down-

stairs for the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, the Leader of the Opposition, perhaps it would be easier to pipe the sound through if it was all on one floor. The Prime Minister certainly needs an office at Parliament, I do think there is a need for a new dining room and a need for improved Press facilities. All of these things should be done, but perhaps the most important is proper research facilities which would help Parliamentarians to educate themselves in things that they have not got the time to look up, even if they are professionals like Ministers, to help all Parliamentarians in educating themselves, also to educate themselves in the process of educating the public.

I think the Parliamentary debates in the last six years since we have been in power have undoubtedly assisted in educating the public very greatly. I think this process should be continued so that when we have major economic debates, major matters, the public can follow them on the basis of being a better informed public than in years gone by.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I cannot promise any assistance this year, but if all the Committees concerned will meet with the Minister and let the Minister put up an adequate plan for next year's Estimates, we can expect some action at that time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, earlier when I made a contribution I touched on the question of the staff of Parliament, and then I examined in a little more detail the actual amount allocated under Other Personal Emoluments and Statutory Personal Emoluments.

Now, Sir, it appears to me that whereas in the past provision was made for six reporters, it now seems as if provision has only been made for four Reporters. I would like the Minister to confirm whether this is so, and if it is so, what is the policy behind it, because although Parliament has been getting by with four reporters, given that the Senate has been meeting and that this House has been meeting more frequently, I am certain that we are headed for serious problems where we make provision for only four reporters.

I go further and say that we are being unfair to those persons who now function in that capacity, because it means that they are restricted to taking their vacation at a specific time every year whenever Parliament goes into recess, and it also means that no provision is being made for illness, no provision is being made for their relief in the terms I spoke of before. In any event four reporters, from my own experience in this kind of work, cannot ever be sufficient for Parliament, and I would like the Minister to consider that.

There is another aspect of the Parliamentary vote which is somewhat puzzling, if not disturbing. Mr.

Chairman, let us look at Act 1980-68. In 1980 we passed an Act called the Ombudsman Act which sought to establish a Parliamentary Commissioner, or an Ombudsman as we choose to call him in Barbados. Section 16 of that Act states:

"All expenses incurred by the Ombudsman in connection with the functions under this Act or the Regulations shall be defrayed out of monies voted for the purpose by Parliament."

The Parliamentary Commissioner, or the Ombudsman, would normally be attached to Parliament since, unless we would be preparing to follow a different method, he would be reporting directly to Parliament, he would be reporting in his examination of the administration, and then he would be reporting directly to Parliament. I am not sure if the Minister responsible for Establishments has included him under some other Head in the Estimates -- in which case we will hear about it from that Minister -- but it would seem to me that the appropriate Head for a Parliamentary Commissioner would normally have been Parliament. I would like to find out if it is still the intention of the Government to implement the terms of the Ombudsman Act, 1980, or whether the Government has given up the idea of having an Ombudsman altogether, or whether there is some problem related to the establishment of the Parliamentary Commissioner's Office -- the Ombudsman's Office -- which we are not aware of, and which the country would wish to hear.

Sir, when the question was canvassed in this Hon. Chamber, one formed the impression that the Ombudsman was a matter which would be coming to the Chamber within a relatively short time as a very serious input into the administrative affairs of the country, and I would wish therefore to hear from the appropriate Minister, whether it is the Minister responsible for Parliamentary Affairs -- and I believe that this would be his area -- or the Prime Minister. I would like to know what is the position with regard to the establishment of the Ombudsman.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, in response to the question of the honourable Member for St. Michael West about the Ombudsman, the Government is well aware of the need for an Ombudsman and although we have not made provision in this year's Estimates, I can assure him that we are as concerned as he is about this position. I had a quick word just now with the Minister of Finance and I am told that he is looking into this and we should be ready for such a provision very soon.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If that is the case, Sir, should not the Minister wish to include the usual token vote of one dollar so that the office could be established? After all, even if the money is not available, the princi-

ple of the establishment of the office I took it, when we canvassed it, suggested it was urgently needed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is not necessary to have the token vote of one dollar, we give you our word and you can accept this.

There is something else which has been drawn to my attention, Sir, since we are making references to Parliament. Quite a number of asides have been made -- and I have heard it on more than one occasion and I ignored it -- about dismissed workers. I know how parties in Opposition operate.

It has been drawn to my attention -- I have not looked at the papers yet for the morning -- yet I am accused of asking people to leave the gallery and a lot of nonsense. No Member, not one single Member can ask a person sitting in the public gallery to leave the gallery. As a matter of fact, Sir, the only person who can do that is you, Mr. Chairman, while you are in Committee, or Mr. Speaker, but there are some, I am going to say quite bluntly, political nuisances who walk about this country misinforming a lot of young people. I fear they are political nuisances, I know what I am talking about. What I see in this morning's papers, because we may as well talk it out, all the side swiping the Opposition is making, "BIGWU can sit in Parliament." 11.15 a.m.

Now I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if the Speaker gave BIGWU the right to come here and sit here this morning. I read the papers this morning for the first time to see here, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to make it a document of the House, because this is very important:

"Most of the 200 odd workers recently dismissed are expected to turn up in Parliament today for the second day of the 1982-83 Estimates. According to the claim of the General Secretary of the Barbados Industrial and General Workers Union BIGWU, their industrial representative, the workers attending the session wearing black arm bands."

I therefore conclude, Sir, that persons wearing black arm bands today in the public gallery are demonstrating in Parliament, and the only person who has the power to stop that is you, Mr. Chairman, or the Speaker. Mr. Chairman, you are not supposed to see anybody in the gallery at all, you do not see strangers at all. You are to see Members as they catch your eyes. It is Members who are to draw these things to your attention. But I just want to make this very, very clear -- the reason I am bringing this up is because I believe it is also unfair for members of the public who come into the gallery, who are not *au fait* with the Rules of Parliament.

I discussed this matter some time ago — that there should be outside of the entrance or somewhere in the building before you enter into the Gallery, regulations as to what members of the public should do and should not do. It is unfair to them and equally unfair if they do not know. It is foolish to hear members in the gallery cheering and applauding when a debate is going on between two elected Members. It is not their fault that they do not know they should not cheer. If these regulations are not instituted we are going to be in a hell of a lot of trouble. It has been drawn to my attention that I have been asking Mr. Marshal to check this out. Even if I did, I am a Member of Parliament; so this is nonsense. (*Aside: Wait until 1986!*) What do you mean 1986? BIGWU — do they know who they are dealing with? I am not going to get back in in 1986! I have been hearing this since 1966 and the Leader of the Opposition and all the power base never stopped me. I moved from 200 to 1,000 because I gave honest representation both to my constituents and in my contributions in here.

I am champion of the aged and under-privileged and I feel it is difficult and unfair for people to be misguided when they do not know. I do not even think that some people are aware of the fact that Mr. Speaker has the power to summon people in here as if this is his court day. He has the power to summon people in here and send them to jail, but this is the jail. Put them in here if they do not know the power of the Speaker. But members of the gallery come in here, not through me — at Mr. Speaker's pleasure or you, Mr. Chairman. I know you have the power to clear the gallery, to send everybody outside. That is the power that is invested in you. You have a lot of misguided puppets walking about here misguiding a lot of young people, and then when the problems come, the puppets will run and leave those people. I know this only too good. All the generals you see, they are the very people who are misguided. The generals are going to pick up speed and run and hide in their big houses in St. Thomas. I know what I am talking about. It is very, very unfair to those persons who were told to wear arm bands in the public gallery to demonstrate their grievances. I share their grievances and sympathise with them. I share the views of anybody in this country who is unjustly treated because I know of my humble circumstances as I was reminded today by my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am well aware of that. I am also equally aware of my achievements in life, and those persons who have been misguided better take note.

Sir, I am going to set about again to have regulations placed out there that people are not to applaud in the gallery, that gents are not supposed to wear hats and when they move around, they must walk gently, quietly out. He really is an old time puppet so when he comes in here he has a style of walking hard — he is to be seen — he is merely an ignorant and complete

fool. I mean Eric Sealy, that is who I am talking about. I see him come into the gallery.....not you, you are not to see him, Sir. I am to see him or Members on either side, but Members are afraid to speak out, Mr. Chairman, that is what they are afraid to do. I am a man who has great courage, that is why I have gone from a duster to Acting Prime Minister — never to a university, I was not to go there — the typical snobbery of the Oxford grads — if you did not get to Harrison College you do not have a place in the society, typical of all things, Sir, because of the old college tie. I have the power to get back in.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that within a few days after the Estimates I am going to have some printed regulations put outside. Many persons come in here who do not know the police. The police is part of Parliament's staff, Sir. Mr. Speaker gives the order to the policemen — that is the power of the Chair. You have unfortunate persons who are misguided. It was drawn to my attention that some of these persons were rather rude to the Marshal. They have the right to laugh too, as we can laugh, simply because they do not know, they have not been told and therefore they have my sympathy in this respect. But I hope to have this matter settled once and for all.

11.25 a.m.

When Mr. Speaker is leaving the Chair during the lunch break, before Mr. Speaker can even stand up to leave the Chair, you find people in the Gallery moving out. They are not supposed to do that. As a matter of fact, Sir, in the House of Commons you are not allowed to go into the House of Commons and listen to a debate if you have a common cold, because the security officers, if you cough or sneeze, ask you to leave so as not to disturb the proceedings of the people, not mine, the people. That is where the power lies — in the hands of the people, and they gave it to one party to govern and to use that power for them, and the other side to make a critical analysis of the policies which they have accepted.

In the Manifesto of this Party for the 1981 General Election, there is a commitment to upgrade Parliament and its facilities.

In closing, Sir, the Clerk drew to my attention just now that telephone facilities are already in train, and it is only a matter of lines which the Telephone Company is now awaiting.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member in his response did not touch on the question I raised about the reduction of the number of reporters from six to four. I am sure he did that inadvertently.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Earlier today I indicated that the morale of the staff is low. It is not always that one should go into detail. There are times when some things

must be said and some things are not to be said, and all I can say at this point in time is that I have discussed this with the persons in charge.

I know that there has been a reduction in the Estimates. I do not want to say for what purpose at this time again, but I have no doubt that supplementary provision can be made so as to increase the reporters in the House. They have my sympathy. They are operating with four, there should be provision for six, if I am not mistaken. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was at the Debates Committee meeting. I am not here to wash Parliament's linens. The honourable Member is a member of the Debates Committee and knows the problems. You are a member like me. You know some of the problems with the reporters — one in Canada, and the question here with interviews and all that nonsense that went on. I am hoping to have this matter sorted out.

I regret that we could not have done it before the Estimates and the coming Budget, but just give me some time to work with Mr. Speaker, and the Clerk. It is as simple as that. That is all I can promise you at this point in time.

The question that the sum of \$842 868 under Head 12 — Parliament — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 13 — SERVICES COMMISSIONS

Head 13 — Services Commissions — was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 13 stand part, I want to speak very briefly about a matter that has been somewhat controversially in the news. It is connected with this Head and with the succeeding Head, and I will take this opportunity to say what I have to say. It relates to the situation of uncertified sick leave in the Public Service.

It has long been a part of the observations of those responsible for discipline in the Public Service and for administering the bureaucracy that there is no doubt that there is a great deal of absenteeism in the Civil Service disguised by the use of a colonial survival — the 21 days of uncertified sick leave which takes place, broadly speaking of casual leave, and it is enshrined in the General Orders of the Service of Barbados. The General Orders of the Public Service say that any public officer is entitled to not more than two days' sick leave without a medical certificate if he can satisfy his Head of Department that he has been sick. If he does not so satisfy his Head of Department, the Head of Department is obliged by the General Orders to deduct any days that a civil servant does not come to work from his vacation leave.

The blame for the situation which has now arisen, which is that in many departments at junior staff levels the 21 days sick leave is treated as 21 days casual leave and people take this whether they are sick or not, must lie mainly on the shoulders of the Heads of Department. The Government proposed originally to deal with this matter firmly and at once by reducing the number of uncertified sick days to six to correspond with what prevails in most private employment.

Civil servants do have superior conditions of service to privately employed persons. They have long had longer vacations, they have a very general non-contributory pension scheme. Again there is no doubt that the attendance at the office of junior officers, in many cases, would not be tolerated in private industry. They come to work late and leave certainly not late. They leave on time or early as the case may be.

But the President of the National Union of Public Workers made a personal approach to me to discuss this matter and a number of other matters relating to the Public Service, and I therefore allowed the Chief Establishments Officer, (Acting) to speak to the NUPW about this matter. The discussions were intended to see if the problem could be handled in some other way other than cutting off the days.

The National Union of Public Workers probably speaks with more than one voice, and parallel with the talks which the President is having with the Establishments Division, perhaps the General Secretary was preparing another of those exercises in militancy for which he hopes to be well known, and the matter boiled up at the same time as the sugar business. This put the Government in a very awkward position because while we were quite prepared to resist any demonstration, equally we did not wish to go back on our word to the President of the NUPW.

We have therefore, in the end, agreed that the matter will be postponed for a year while the situation with uncertified sick leave is examined in some depth. Heads of Departments are being instructed that whatever misconceptions may have existed in the past, that they have a power to disallow any uncertified sick leave, and, indeed, it is their duty. And I am treating this as a matter of discipline by the Heads of Departments themselves — to disallow the sick leave in cases where they think that malingering is taking place and officers are not really sick.

All departments are being asked to report to the Establishments Office with lists of all officers who have taken uncertified sick leave — this happens once a month — and these lists are being studied to see if there is any indication that malingering takes place or whatever.

There is little doubt that the first reports which have come to the Establishment Ministry do reveal that there are very suspicious circumstances surrounding the use of uncertified sick leave. For example, hardly any senior civil servant ever takes it. Uncertified sick leave is something that happens to clerical officers, labourers at the Agricultural Stations, nurses at the QEH — in fact, everybody in the QEH. A quarter of all uncertified sick leave is taken at the QEH and I do not believe that the Services Commission deliberately choose people who are not well to work at the QEH, deliberately choose people with chronic illness.

11.35 a.m.

We have observed that occasionally a Permanent Secretary might be ill. It is a phenomenon and that even some junior ranks very seldom get ill. For example, the grade of Secretary in the Public Service, you hardly ever find a secretary calling in ill. Secretaries work for Ministers, they work for Permanent Secretaries and Chief Technical directorate and so on.

We can readily recognise that the motivation of junior officers who work so closely with the decision takers, and the executors of decisions of Government, is probably higher than others. We can recognise that. Indeed, there is evidence that some secretaries come to work when they are sick, and this is one of the conclusions that we are drawing from the whole exercise — that motivation is very important in this matter of uncertified sick leave. But we cannot, Mr. Chairman, have sympathy with a situation where 10 per cent or more of all junior civil servants call in at least once a month to say that they are not well and take a day off from work.

It is also significant that casual staff are never sick on a Friday — which is pay day. Sickness happens on a Monday with casual staff, never the day they are to be paid. If you hear that a temporary officer has not been able to come to Government Headquarters to collect his money on a Friday, you can be absolutely sure that that temporary officer is under a doctor's care in bed somewhere.

You can take up to two days at a time. I used to think it was the end of the week. It is not so much the end of the week. It is Monday which is, overwhelmingly, the day on which public officers seem to fall ill. The next most unhealthy day appears to be Tuesday. Wednesday is the most unpopular day of all. Very few public officers seem to fall ill on a Wednesday but the days next to the weekend are these days.

February, last month, I found that two Immigration Officers felt sick four times on a seven day interval when their shift would have taken them to Grantley

Adams International Airport on a Saturday or Sunday. I found a temporary Customs Officer again who fell ill five times during February. He took five uncertified sick days, all separated from each other, on four separate occasions during February — all when the strain of work apparently was too much for him.

The belief that you need to have 12 uncertified sick days in order to accommodate the particular position of women of child bearing age turns out to be a myth since in the Mental Hospital, a careful check of the figures reveals that the male nurses seem to take more sick leave than the female nurses. And certainly porters, messengers and others at the Mental Hospital have just as high a rate of absenteeism as the female nurses.

Indeed, if honourable Members opposite, if whoever is the shadow of this subject, would like to look at last month's reports, I would gladly show him if he wants to see the extent of the problem. The names of the officers, of course, must be confidential. You would understand that. I would be glad to show him the sick leave returns.

It is no answer to say, as the Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers has said, that the rest of the society has had 21 days off. Barbados is simply not a country in which you can afford to give people seven weeks vacation a year. We have to work harder than that. To get on in the world, you have to work harder than that and I have no doubt that the sick leave, if 80 — 90 per cent is used, is additional vacation. It is used as days off.

Some particular problems need to be identified. One is the question of sick leave in the Agricultural Stations. Perhaps I would be forgiven, Mr. Chairman, if I say that my belief is that there is a shortage of agricultural labourers in Barbados, a shortage of people who know about weeding and looking after grounds and so on, and that it would be all too easy in an Agricultural Station which is near to some area of private enterprise where workers are occasionally needed, for somebody to draw his money from the Government and at the same time give a casual day's work here and there to somebody else, but at the very least he is going to work, perhaps, in his own parcel of land.

I regard this as a different problem altogether. You will have to decide if this is tolerable or if some other structure for employment of payments to persons that work on Government land can be devised. I do not think that that is a question of taking a day off for nothing. It is a question of taking a day off to go and work somewhere else or to do something useful. This perhaps, should be treated in a different light from how you treat people who do not want to attend to duty and take one or two week-end days off so that they will have a long passage of doing no work.

I do not believe that any Member of the House wishes to encourage 10 per cent of the Civil Service to double its vacation entitlement in a year, or would defend the use by junior staff, an abuse by junior staff, of provisions whose generosity was provided to set civil servants apart from other members of the society when they were first instituted.

We have to remember, Mr. Chairman, we inherited a colonial Civil Service with regulations which did not vary very much from the British Empire, regulations which allowed senior officers to go home — home meaning England — regularly on very generous terms with long home leave, as it was called, and regulations which also wanted to set civil servants apart from the population which was being administered by the colonial power.

Entry into the Civil Service used to be a great privilege in this island. Even when I was a boy, it was recognisable that there appeared to be some social and racial prejudice exercised in recruitment even at the level of Clerical Officer in the Civil Service. This, of course, has long ago vanished, but the conditions which were created to attract people who could form a buffer between the colonial power and the rural population still remained, in many cases, on the Statute Books, and in the General Orders relating to the Civil Service.

Better pension conditions, better conditions of leave, casual leave which could freely be taken, — all of this was necessary to attract a class of persons, 80 years ago, 100 years ago, into the Civil Service who could be relied on to maintain colonial rule in the country.
11.45 a.m.

I really think, Mr. Chairman, that we no longer need the privileges of colonialism in today's Public Service. The taxpayers have to support a much larger Public Service than was envisaged in the days to which I referred. There are 25 000 people in all who, in one way or another, work for the Government. The conditions in Civil Service employment are attractive, but sometimes it is said that the salary is not attractive. So when you have statutory corporations, you have enormous pressure from the statutory corporations to have all the Civil Service terms and conditions of work — vacations, pensions and the like — but to have higher salaries as well. These pressures, sooner or later, will overwhelm the Government under the cost of the bureaucracy. There is no doubt about it, no doubt whatsoever about it.

I could go on and to draw a few examples, perhaps, from the statutory corporations, the banking institutions and the financial institutions in Government. I have unlimited pressure, Mr. Chairman, from the financial institutions of Government for better terms of service — more money, more generous house loans, more generous car loans, more leave. I have to deal with financial institu-

tions who, in a year of restraint, will regrade their secretaries so as to create a class of secretary all of whom get paid more than the Private Secretary to the Governor-General. I have to deal with institutions that employ 30 and 40 people — no more than that — demanding wages for general managers and other officers which far, far exceed those of public officers with similar privileges.

There is one bank in Barbados which although it is only marginally the largest bank in terms of its earnings, pays out twice as much in salaries as any other bank. (*Aside*) It is not the Barbados National Bank. I say it is only marginally the biggest bank in terms of its earnings, but it has twice as big staff costs as any other bank. Now I have never heard of any financial institution in Government comparing the salaries of its officers to the salaries of the American banks which are quite modest. They always compare the salaries that they should get to the salaries got in the one bank which, it is accepted on all sides, overpays staff and has too much staff. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Central Bank?)..... No, I am not talking about the Central Bank(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Which bank are you talking about?)..... I am talking about a private bank in Bridgetown. So everything seems to be that privilege in the bureaucracy, and the search for privilege, has to take the primary place rather than the search for efficiency or the search for more work.

Officers who in private business would be no more than ordinary hard working men or women in the Civil Service, appear like Hercules and Atalanta — they seem to work so hard. People who get to work — well, I do not think anybody now gets to work at 8.15 a.m. which is the official starting time — but people who get to work at 8.30 a.m. at Government Headquarters, I can count them — not on the fingers of one hand — on the fingers perhaps of both hands. If I get into Government Headquarters at 8.25 a.m. the motor car — S2 I think it is — which parks next to mine, will be there; the Cabinet Secretary's car will be there, perhaps the Permanent Secretaries cars will be there but I will stay in my office and at the end of half an hour at 9.00 o'clock I am still seeing cars arriving in Government Headquarters.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: What time do they leave?)..... As for going home in the afternoons, you cannot get down the stairs at 4.30 p.m. for people flooding down. People never think of waiting upstairs for a lift. If somebody's husband is coming for her, or wife coming for him, there is no question of waiting in the office and finishing off something. You go downstairs and wait in the lobby. (*Aside*) But, I do not go home — if I go down the stairs at 4.30 p.m., it is not because I am going home.....(*laughter*)..... it is because I am going downstairs perhaps in the office of the Hon. Leader of the Hon. House — not because I am going home.

We must make an effort, Sir, to remotivate persons in the Public Service to the point where they will think

that they are letting the country down by taking sick leave when they are not sick, that they are letting the taxpayers down when they do not do their best at their desks or wherever their workplaces are.

I want to turn again to a department that is often criticised and to turn back to a subject in the Head we have just dealt with — the MTW, the former MCW. Honourable Members who were in the House at the time when the mezzanine was being put in and the House re-decorated in preparation for a Joint Session of Parliament which Her Majesty, the Queen was to open, will recall that at 6.30 and 7.00 in the evening, you could see MCW people here and you will recall how the senior artisan would carry home a tool if it did not work and get it repaired, and bring it back the next day to be sure that the work would be finished on time. They were motivated, they wanted a good job, they were given a good job to do, they were motivated to do it, and they worked hard. And clearly they did no feather-bedding, because it is one of the most cost effective jobs ever done by the MCW. That was when the honourable Member for St. Andrew was the Minister.

So, I think that we should all be trying to persuade public officers that our interest is their interest. As you know, Mr. Chairman, wage negotiations are a very regular thing in Barbados, and honourable Ministers get involved in them. There is one question that the National Union of Public Workers and people who negotiate on behalf of public officers have never been able to answer when I ask it, or when it is asked by the Chief Establishments Officer what possible interest can the Government have in telling public officers that they should have a small wage increase other than the reasons you give for it? In other words, Mr. Chairman, our interests are their interests. The interest of a civil servant in maintaining the Government is the same as an honourable Minister's interest and vice versa.

If I tell the NUPW, "I would like to give you 100 per cent, but this year we can only afford 10 per cent," no more money is going in my pocket. I am not an employer. In that sense, I am an employee just like them. If I say 5 per cent at the top and 10 per cent at the bottom, I will get the 5 per cent and they will get the 10 per cent. If I say 25 per cent at the top and 38 per cent at the bottom, I get the 25 per cent they get the 38 per cent.

We are all negotiating in the same direction, and it may be of enormous assistance to the public process in this country if public officers could realise there is no 'us and them', it is not us the Government against them — that we are all in the business of making the Government work — Government, Opposition, civil servant, casual worker, established worker, temporary worker or employee at a statutory corporation.

When I think how much it would be in the political interest of the Government to ignore wage restraint guidelines — as the Government of Jamaica did on I think three separate and each one more disastrous occasion, and in order to grasp for popularity authorised wage increases far beyond the country's capacity to pay — when I think of that, I cannot understand why the representatives of public officers do not also see it that way. If we could give abundant increases, we would be glad to, we would love it.

11.55 a.m.

I am sure that if I can say tomorrow, "I am going to revalue the dollar, put our dollar on par with the U.S. dollar," I would like to know what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central could say that would get him a seat in the House of Assembly again.

It would be a wonderful thing to do, from the purely casual political point of view, but it would be a terrifying and destructive thing to do to the island. Effectively it would double everybody's wages, but it would be a terrifying and destructive blow to the foreign reserves which would vanish in perhaps two and a half months if something like that were done. But instead, we have all these pseudo-economists with arguments that wage increases do not harm the Balance of Payments, and we have arguments that wage increases must keep up with the cost of living, when it is clear that the whole world is going through a period when people are not getting richer — they are getting poorer, and there is no reason to believe the policies we follow will prevent that trend from reaching Barbados, and so on, and so forth.

These are all, I think, matters of understanding and matters of commitment and matters of motivation, and the Government certainly is going to make an effort to improve motivation in the Public Service, reduce the spate of absenteeism and the spate of not giving of your best, so that in these difficult times and in the more prosperous times which are to come, the Civil Service will be taking its place in helping all Barbadians along the forward road.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$234 926 under Head 13 — Services Commissions — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour, until 1.00 p.m. today.

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

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

12.00 noon.

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 of Supply. The honourable Member for the City.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the introduction of this Head — Head 13 — the Hon. Prime Minister made the point that there are still certain colonial institutions and colonial thinking with us today in 1982, some 15 or 16 years after independence. The fact of the matter is that perhaps this Public Service Commission is one of the most important of the Commissions or Committees left over from what are sometimes described as the bad old colonial days.

A lot of talk is made about 1966, and I heard in here already that we were brought to independence in 1966 and we are an independent nation, but it seems to me that we are very picky and very choosy when it comes to the abandonment of certain colonial institutions. We are very fast to want to do away with some things, but other things we hold on to. We hold on to Leave Passages designed for colonial public workers who had their homes in England, and we hold on to the Public Service Commission, archaic and ancient in its framework, expecting it to service a model and modern Civil Service in 1982. This is my quarrel with the Public Service Commission: that it is in fact so outmoded and so out of step with modern procedures and modern Civil Service thinking that it in fact makes life twice as difficult for the Government.

We have a situation in Barbados, even now in 1982, where civil servants take the attitude that they cannot be dismissed, no matter what they do. We heard talk

about the uncertified sick leave already this morning. I have great difficulty, Mr. Chairman, with the 21 days uncertified sick leave. There are officers in the Public Service today who tell me that when they came into the Public Service in the 1940s, the 21 uncertified sick days were in operation, and today in 1982, fifty years later, with a completely different looking health profile, we have a situation where people think that that aspect of the bad old colonial days is to continue.

What is the point of our spending the second highest portion of our National Budget on Health through successive Governments year after year, decade after decade improving the health profile? Part of the rationale for the spending of these huge sums on Health is that we are going to be improving, apart from everything else, the physical well-being of our nation. What is the point of our doing all of that and at the same time hoping to say that 21 uncertified sick days is reasonable? In my view, if a man or woman requires 21 uncertified sick days in addition to all the certified sick days and the holidays that are permitted, that person is really and truly a very sick person. But we hear today after the first month of monitoring the real truth about these uncertified sick days, how they have them either on the Friday before the weekend or on the Monday after the weekend.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hold, and am responsible for the portfolio of Education, and I have discovered in my own monitoring that there was a certain degree of public outcry about truancy and absenteeism of school children.

1.10 p.m.

I have had a survey done, Mr. Chairman, the results of the survey very shortly will go before the Cabinet. But I can say — I am alive to the honourable Member of St. Michael West...I have been told that I have been saying uncertified instead of uncertificated — that the survey done among both primary and secondary school children in Barbados discloses that in the primary school there is a 90 per cent attendance on any given day. We in the Ministry of Education do not think that is good enough. Outside of the Ministry of Education, there are people who will tell us that this is an excellent record.

In the secondary schools the percentage rate of attendance is even higher than the primary schools and I am satisfied that the parents of some primary school children are not careful enough to see that their child goes to school. There is absolutely no reason why a primary school child should not go to school. It is provided with everything that a child would need to take to school. Very few primary children have to take a bus to school. I find it necessary to look into that 10 per cent margin of truancy from the primary schools.

But the point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: there is a higher rate of absence among teachers than there is among pupils and this is the cause for great concern in this Ministry. These are the pressures under which we in the Ministry of Education have to work — where teachers are delinquents and in default, and delinquent time and time again absent from school without an excuse, drunk — drunk I said, Mr. Chairman — drunk while on duty. We have a teacher who stood before the Public Service Commission and said that I am an alcoholic and I intend to remain one, and that teacher has not been reprimanded or suspended — but sent back into the teaching service. These are the difficulties under which we operate in Government — a Public Service Commission which does not at all appreciate the problems when civil servants come before it — after years and years, because we have a system, Mr. Chairman, where people protect each other. Nobody will report anybody else — no matter what they do.

There is a teacher who comes to school one-third of the term and the other third of the term in which he does come, he comes late and without an excuse or apology. Put that person before the Public Service Commission and the Public Service Commission behaves like certain magistrates in this country — they kiss them up and tell them how sad it all is. We may be able to put up with alcoholics, Sir, and we may also be able to put up with quite unsuitable people in certain locations of the Civil Service, but in the teaching service we have a duty to be more than careful about the kind and quality of persons we put to stand before the nation's children and to instill in them certain standards.

There is, built into our system of Government, a large gap between the Public Service Commission and the politicians. I have no quarrel with that, that is how it should be. We do not have a system like the American system — when any new Administration comes in, a whole bunch of civil servants come in and a whole bunch goes out with the old Administration. We have a gap, and I am approving of the gap, but that gap makes it very difficult for me to have access to the Public Service Commission. I cannot think of any good reason why I, who is in charge of a Ministry of Education, ought not to be able to have access to, or to have ordinances before the Public Service Commission.

I have gone as far as it is possible for a person like me to go. I invited the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, when I was Minister of Health, to come into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with me and I pointed out certain factors to him — what the every day working result of his decision on people could mean. I showed him dirt on the walls, and bathrooms where there was no

toilet paper, to try to bring home to him that a certain individual who went before his Commission — and who went on more than one occasion — was sent back once, twice, four times and every time sent back they put him on three months probation — an officer who did not bother to come two days to work out of every week.

All of that we have to put up with and I took the Chairman and I showed him that. I said it is only a decision as a favour to you, but translated in a work place this is what it means — dirt on the walls, holes in the linen, or in some cases no linen at all, and civil servants do not stand in here, or on the public platforms, and take any flack from the man on the street. We, the politicians, have to take it. They do not go before the electorate and put themselves up on the public platform and take abuse as we do.

Please make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, civil servants in this country enjoy better conditions and service than anybody else. They like to think that people in the public sector are better off because they could make a good deal of money, but that is not true. (*Aside*) In the private sector yes. They are better off in the public sector, they always have been. They get the best vacation holiday conditions, they get all sorts of allowances which are unknown in the private sector. They have that wonderful thing known as the pension plan, Sir, which until twenty to twenty five years ago was virtually unknown in the private sector. Despite all of this they steal and as the Minister of Education I have had to see in recent months that every single day of the civil servant's life they steal from the public society.

They not only steal by not coming to work, but they steal by coming late every day and taking extended lunch hours and leaving work as early as possible. I am not saying that this is true of every single civil servant but I would say that this is true of the majority. I do not leave my office to eat lunch. The Government gets less than an hour from me every day of my life. I take my lunch every day in my office and I am told that officers in my Ministry are seen walking about in Bridgetown two and three hours a day. I would not know because I am not in Bridgetown to see them and it is not a matter of cheapness. I am working through my lunch every single day.

The big rush that the Prime Minister talks about..... "I have got twenty five minutes after four" — I can hear it from my door, but you would not hear one single door shut — and I am in my office every day at half past six every evening. Even when it gets dark, if we had that Day-light Saving Time, the Government would even get the extra hour out of me. You would not hear a door close and you would not hear

the telephone ring after 5 o'clock. Some time you have difficulty in certain departments in getting some one to answer the telephones as late as 9.30 in the morning. 1.20 p.m.

People behave as though they are entitled to these uncertificated days. Now all of this is within the knowledge of the Public Service Commission, Mr. Chairman. They cannot claim not to know, but you see the whole method is outdated. You do not have a system built in where it will create a situation where a particular person might not be pinpointed or might not be blamed for reporting. If you had a system where the system itself would be what you would blame if you were reported, then that would be the case. As soon as you talk about time clocks, you hear how they would not work, that people are going to clock in for other people and so on, but if the time clocks were outside my door, they would work, but they fight against all of that.

We hear the unions talking 90 per cent of the time about all the reasons why people ought not to work or cannot work, but I can never hear them on productivity. (Asides) Well punctuality has to do with productivity. Just like we never hear the unions talking about the unemployed. They are only interested in the employed. You will never hear them talking about certain things. They do not see that as part of their function. It is a very lopsided and one-sided affair. Even, Mr. Chairman, I have had a situation where the union itself knows that particular workers are at fault and you could not expect them to be honest then — the most they would be is silent.

But all of this costs money too. Where you have officers in Ministries, senior officers, middle range officers who have personal and private businesses of their own, I do not care about that. I would not stand in the way of a man making a dollar, but he must not put his business before the business that he is being paid a salary from the public purse to do, but that is what we live with on a day to day basis.

I am not talking about examples, Mr. Chairman, where this thing may happen once a year or you have met one or two cases over the past five years. I am talking about problems which come before us every single day of life. They eat up precious time, and you must understand, Mr. Chairman, that they only come to you when it has really reached a point of no return, because in the Public Service you have a 'scratch-back system' which says that if you do not report on me I will not report on you and this goes from top right through to bottom.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a Civil Service Commission operating on a part-time basis with a lot of

retired people sitting down on it. It can no longer continue like this. The Government cannot look for productivity to increase within its own ranks if it does not do something about this Commission. You need a full-time Chairman of that Commission with a proper staff which will service the Public Service on an on-going, continuous, day to day basis.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to take part in this debate because the question of sick leave which was taken up by the honourable Prime Minister is a question that has been engaging the minds of corporations and of businesses for quite some time. It does not matter, Mr. Chairman, whether the allowable sick leave is six days, 12 days or 21 days. Those in charge of businesses and corporations always have their reservations when persons report sick and take out all the days. As you may know, Mr. Speaker, I am an engineer at Cable and Wireless and we have had this problem as well, but I will venture to say that sick leave is basically a social problem, and unless we realise this, we will be going around in circles and the basic reason will still be there.

If someone comes to work on mornings and the work is monotonous — every day you do the same thing over and over and over — it is quite likely that the person who has to do this monotonous work will feel frustrated and would take sick leave — and take it often. We have gone through this thing a lot of times before. What about the lack of initiative. If you are in a firm or any business organisation and your initiative is stunted, Mr. Chairman, the easiest way out is to report sick. If you look at the Civil Service, this bureaucracy is full of a lot of regimentation, there are a lot of rules, and what happens if someone lower down the ladder shows any sort of initiative? If a normal worker shows some sort of initiative, it is quite likely that the Permanent Secretary, or the person above this person, will think that this low person is stealing the show, and this happens in a lot of organisations. I am not saying that it happens in the Civil Service, I am saying that it could happen, and this may be one of the reasons.

The honourable Prime Minister, in his presentation, said that there is need to motivate people in the Civil Service to think about the good of the country. We are in total agreement with this, but you cannot motivate people just by telling them not to take sick leave. You see what is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that if you are in a firm or any business organisation and you consider that you are doing a good job, your boss might not consider this, and someone who has, let us say, come in after you and you consider that that person is not doing as good a job as you are doing but he gets promotion before you, there again the frustration sets in and you tend to report sick.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that what we need to do to tackle this problem of sick leave is to engage the services of good indigenous, local sociologists. For too long, Governments — I am not saying that Government or this Government — have been reluctant to engage good local sociologists because of the findings that these sociologists might come up with. What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that instead of engaging local sociologists, Government tends to engage sociologists from outside, from the United States and these areas where these sociologists give reports — I will not say that are not favourable to the Government — that are not against Government's wishes. Until we can allow local sociologists to tackle the local problems of Barbados, we will not solve the social problems that exist.

Mr. Chairman, the NUPW has been given a further year to look at this problem of sick leave. I believe it was a good decision, and I would think that the Government should take this year to look at what is happening with sick leave, as well as to engage good local sociologists to look at the social problems which are causing people to report sick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1.30 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments, first of all on this question of uncertificated sick leave. When I listened to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister making his presentation, I wondered whether he was aware that he was repeating a phenomenon which manifested itself in many industrialised countries years ago.

The question, Sir, of Monday morning absences from work is nothing new to Barbados. It is a problem that many Statutory Boards in the United Kingdom — for example, the Coal Board — has had to cope with for many years, and they tried all sorts of methods in dealing with that problem of Monday absences and the fact is that people spree on weekends. They probably get boozed on the weekends and they wake up on Monday mornings with a splitting headache and a hang-over and they report sick for work.

Now the question arises, Sir, as how to cope with this problem. What has certainly been shown as the wrong way to approach the problem is to require certificated sick leave in that kind of situation. For sure, that is the wrong way to approach it, because the kind of symptoms which a patient presents to a doctor on a Monday morning — complaining of splitting headaches, dizziness, tiredness — are largely subjective symptoms. In other words, there is nothing objective on which a doctor can base a decision. Therefore, after analysing the patient's complaints rather than findings, and the patient's assessment that he is unable to work, he is left with no choice but to issue a certificate. The chances are that if you demand certificated sick leave in that situation, what

is likely to happen is that you will not get one day off but several days off.

So the answer is not to reduce the number of uncertificated sick leave and demand certificated sick leave. What you do is you increase costs to the workers. You put money into the pockets of doctors. You probably will be creating more problems in relation to the National Drug bill in respect of drugs and you have increased the amount of days lost from work so I think that that is not the way to approach the problem.

As a matter of fact, several corporations have done objective studies of this kind of situation and have given the patient the authority to write their own sick leave rather than go to a doctor. And by and large, at the end of a year, less time is lost in that kind of situation in terms of days off work than if they had gone to a doctor. So quite clearly that is not the answer.

The areas, Sir, which the honourable Prime Minister identified as areas of high absenteeism, you will note, are in areas where the morale of Government is exceedingly low. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is one area which he identified and there is a whole range of problems there, particularly that there is a shift work operation that goes on at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the morale of the staff at that Hospital is low and this has been a situation going on for some three to four years now.

I, myself, have always felt that another look should be taken at the abortive Queen Elizabeth Hospital Act of 1965 to see whether or not a Board could not be established to run the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where there would be some greater immediacy between the type of operation, persons who are employed there and the disciplinary process within that institution.

You will find, for example, Sir, that that high level of absenteeism would hardly apply to the medical staff where it might apply elsewhere within the institution.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If I may elucidate. Of all the things you can say from looking at the list, it is junior officers only. It is not people higher up at all that are guilty of absenteeism. Above the rank of Assistant Secretary it is unknown.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I take your point, but the point I am trying to make here is that there is a subsidiary disciplinary process within the professional component of activity at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where a Head of a Department, for example, who is a doctor, would be in charge of junior staff and the members of the junior staff, particularly the pre-registration house officers, would know that if they do not perform, then they would not be certified as having completed their six months or their 12 months satisfac-

torily for the purpose of permanent registration. That is the point I am trying to make, because when a junior doctor first comes there, he comes on the basis of a provisional registration and he has someone who is immediately superior to him who would be able to issue a certificate to prevent him from becoming fully registered if he does not perform.

I find it amusing, Sir, the comparison between the absenteeism among males and females at the Mental Hospital and this is why I invite the Government to have a more professional look at that problem. Has the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister examined that the contraceptive pill might have been all the difference in that situation, or the contraceptive injection? (*Asides*) Yes, the pill reduces the incidence of pain and probably shortens the period of the psychological thing and even females.

That is why I am saying that you have to look at these things in depth and not just simply say. If you take that situation, you look at males and you look at females, and this may have a significance, you may draw a conclusion when the correct conclusion may be that there is a high incidence of the use of pills and therefore a reduction of pain at that particular time of the month. So I think that these things show that there is a clear indication that there needs to be a considerable professional input into the analysis of that situation rather than just looking at the figures as presented.

Sir, there is one other point I want to make. One is trying to avoid economic debate but the former Attorney General — I am sorry he is not here — and unfortunately the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister today kept on repeating these statement about what they will do during weak times in respect of wages and what should be done during more prosperous times in respect of wages.

I want to say that even in that kind of statement is one of the major problems that Barbados face on a cyclical basis. I think you will understand what I am saying and I will say this: there were only two serious attempts in Barbados to tackle that problem, both of which were seriously opposed by the Barbados Labour Party.

1.40 p.m.

Maybe you would recall, in terms of our export earnings, the position taken by the former Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, in respect of the sugar export levy, to break that cycle between years of significant foreign exchange earnings and wages demands — you might also recall the irresponsibility shown then, Sir, by the then Leader of the Opposition, our distinguished Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, in attacking the levy although it had important economic significance in terms of smoothing out our foreign exchange position in Barbados. And I well recall in those days, he

was not talking then about wage restraint in 1976, although it was quite clear that if we did not have a measure of wage restraint, we would have run into even more serious Balance of Payments problems, which he inflicted on us at the end of 1976, by not taking the appropriate steps after the increases in salaries in that year.

Many will recall, "Go back to the bargaining table, give them 85 per cent." As a matter of fact, he rewarded the chief spokesman of the NUPW at the time by taking him into his office as a Parliamentary Secretary, if I remember correctly, a reward for undermining a very fundamental principle which he himself now wishes us to support — the principles, Sir, of relating your wages and incomes to your foreign exchange earnings and to find ways and means of smoothing that out so that you do not have these sudden increases in salaries triggering further problems in relation to your Balance of Payments, and then, all sorts of curbs in order to protect those Balance of Payments, and when you get a good year then you start the cycle all over again.

Sir, these are already two occasions today where I have been able to demonstrate the level of irresponsibility demonstrated by the former Leader of the Opposition and now that he is in Government he has to live with those things. That is why we are so careful on this side and so constructive at all times....(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Not to speak.).....to make sure that we do not make irresponsible statements which will haunt us in future years. (Hon. Miss. B. A. MILLER: Like, "Not a cane blade".) (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: "Do not cut canes, burn them".)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more. One minute.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If you want to hear a statement from me on cutting and burning canes, the statement is very simple: the people of Barbados must stop burning down the canes otherwise they will destroy the economy of Barbados and I will associate myself with anyone who wishes to make a statement to that effect (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Too late.) (*Asides*) It is a clear statement. So if I am asked to make a statement on that, I have no difficulty whatsoever in joining with anyone in urging those who are burning down the cane crop to stop doing so, because they are not helping themselves, they are not helping the country, they are not helping the economy in any way and they are creating problems for the country, not only this year but in years to come. It is as simple and straightforward as all that. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You deny Caddle now? You are right.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have strayed but the time is up. Please take your seat. Does any other.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I want to move an amendment to this Head. The Overseas Service Agreement Act, as far as I remember, has now been repealed. I think we have to have a constitutional amendment to deal with that and we want to eliminate this in the Note to subhead 2. Delete the words after "cost" in line 1 to "for" in line 2 so that it will read, "This subhead provides for the cost of passages, baggage allowance" and so on.

I beg to move that this be the amendment. *(Aside)*

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

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I just require, perhaps, about two minutes. A number of questions have been raised about this uncertificated sick leave, about motivation in the Public Service, about malingering and about productivity — all areas of vital concern. But I would like to make this general point first of all: Barbados could not have attained its level of economic, financial and social attainment without the work competence and dedication of the Public Service. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: True.) And too often, when we talk, we tend to be critical of the Public Service. But I would like to say — I am speaking for myself..... (ASIDE: Barrow called them an "Army of occupation")......But you are now calling them a malingering lot. I am saying that the Public Service of this country has made a significant contribution towards whatever we have been able to achieve in this country, and it is time that we stop trying to attack them at every level. *(Aside)*

The other observation I would wish to make is that I do not think it serves much purpose for honourable Ministers or backbenchers on either side to get up and pontificate in Parliament on this matter. I do not think that serves any useful purpose. I believe that there are bodies which represent the public servants, that those at the higher levels in the Public Service are capable of putting forward their viewpoints, and that what is required is what the honourable Member for Christ Church East, himself, recommended and this Parliament approved some time ago — a study of the Civil Service, not political comment on the productivity of the Civil Service, but the establishment of a body to study the operations, workings and requirements of the Public Service. That was put forward in a very erudite and thoughtful speech by the Member for Christ Church East. At that time, he used to make sensible contributions in here. He was on the back bench then, Mr. Chairman. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Uncontaminated.) But, up to now — he has gone on to the front bench — he has advanced, and he has

not been able, even from that elevated position, to persuade the other members of the Cabinet to accept and implement his particular proposal. *(Aside)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: But that is all that is required, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have order in the Gallery, please.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be long on this matter. There are two sides to industrial relationship. Sometime earlier, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister said, quite clearly, that because of the economic situation in Barbados, there are certain people who are in temporary positions whose employment had to be terminated of necessity.
1.50 p.m.

I would like the Hon. Prime Minister in his reply, to share with me some thought on what is happening with those people who have been in the Service in a temporary position, some of them as long as ten years. It came home to me quite forcibly only on Monday when a gentleman who used to drive a tractor in the Agricultural Tractor Scheme came to my office and said he got a letter of dismissal, and when he enquired whether he was entitled to anything after working for 14 years continuously, he was told by the Ministry that he was in a temporary position and therefore could not benefit in any way. This is nothing unusual in the Government sector, and it is not fair that after someone has worked for as long as 14 years that he is not entitled to anything. He drew to my attention that there was another chap who had put in 20 years who had also been given a letter of dismissal and was not entitled to any type of compensation.

I would like the Minister to turn his attention to these particular cases which are the result of the cut back in establishments due to the pressure of the present financial situation.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise to speak on the Head under discussion. This Hon. House will remember that about four years ago, I introduced a Resolution into this Parliament calling for the establishment of a working party to review all aspects of the functioning of the Civil Service. This Hon. House gave its approval to that Resolution. Some Members on the front bench abstained in their wisdom, some voted against the Resolution, and the Opposition joined with the back bench in ensuring that the Resolution was carried. Whether the manner in which it was carried has anything to do with the fact that no action was taken on the Resolution, I do not know, but they are the facts by way of background.

The considerations which informed that Resolution related to the fact that the Civil Service in Barbados, since independence, had not had a thorough look to ensure that the terms and conditions — recruitment, transfers, promotions, classifications, etc. were in keeping with an independent country as opposed to a constitutionally dependent country. In addition, the Civil Service has become very large in Barbados — it is today almost one quarter of the entire working population of the country. We spend a huge sum on the Civil Service and I felt we had a responsibility to ensure that the Civil Service system functioned effectively and efficiently, and that we got value for money.

The former Prime Minister, the right honourable Member for St. John, has often referred to them as an army of occupation, and on another occasion he said that they were a service but were no longer civil, and from time to time in order to score political points we would repeat these charges in the hope that we would win the support of the Civil Service — without quite appreciating that he was speaking perhaps more out of distress than anything else, and that he was speaking out of very close working relations with the Civil Service.

This question of uncertificated sick leave, Sir, is just one of the many problems which we are experiencing in the Civil Service. The particular question of uncertificated sick leave perhaps is a symptom of the outbreak of indiscipline in the entire society, and what is particularly unfortunate about our attempt to deal with this problem is that the managers in the system, the Permanent Secretaries and their deputies, and senior members of the Civil Service, refuse to recognise that discipline is an important part of management responsibility.

They tell you that they are afraid of getting their houses burnt down, and all sorts of lame, nonsensical excuses. I have never heard of any civil servant getting his house burnt down for carrying out his responsibility in a humane and just way, or even as I have been reminded by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, in an inhumane or even an unjust manner. No civil servant has ever had his house burnt down, and yet they take delight in saying that they cannot discipline this officer or that officer because they are afraid of having their houses burnt down. That is the sort of lame excuse that we run up against when we deal with the question of the people in the system who are paid to manage — but not managing.

I find myself on this occasion, Mr. Chairman, in disagreement with a lot of what was said by the honourable Member for St. Philip South. For example, I do not agree with him that the recruitment of indigenous sociologists is the solution to the problem. I thought he might have been making the point that what we need is a modern personnel system in operation. But on one particular point I believe that he was on very good

ground, that is, when he spoke about the fact that there is considerable frustration in the Civil Service resulting from the feeling that the merit principle is not always applied. That is a point that has worried me for a considerable time. I would like to think that I am as keen a student of the Civil Service as anyone around, and there are people who come in and, for reasons which are not obvious to any perceptive onlooker, bypass other people, and when you trace it, it is because they are well connected to a certain clique in Establishments and Personnel.

I wish to make the point that the Establishments Division of the Civil Service does not always conduct its business in a professional way. The same point must be made in relation to the Personnel Department of the Civil Service. This brings me to the wider point as to who has ultimate control, namely the Public Service Commission.

I have long said that the Service is so big that we need a full time Public Service Commission, not populated with retired men who are friends of people in high places. We need vigorous and able men who are in their middle years, not in the evening of their days, particularly working full time. That is a very important point as far as I am concerned and we need to rewrite, in a quiet way, many of the rules and regulations relating to civil servants.

2.00 p.m.

We just had a case in the Civil Service where it took twelve years to fire a man, and during that time he was working for either three quarters or half pay. I have represented people before the courts who were subsequently dismissed from the Civil Service. But before the dismissal came, they were on three quarters pay, sometimes for four or five years. That system cannot be regarded as efficient or as effective, and that system should not continue to go on.

Mr. Chairman, I think the point should be mentioned as we have to speak about these matters. In the end this is not an appropriate forum in which to come up with solutions to these problems. We now only highlight and mention these problems. In the end the matter must be approached in a systematic way. That means that in the end we have to take up the idea which I advanced for the support of this House a few years ago. We have to get a working body to look in a quiet and systematic way at the whole problem. Hearing from the representatives of the workers, hearing from the said personnel of the established divisions of the Civil Service, and hearing the views of persons in the Community who have interest in these matters, is, in the end, the only way that we can begin to attack these problems which have manifested themselves in the Civil Service.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I had intended to wait until we got under a separate heading in this area to adjoin in this debate concerning the personnel administration of the public sector in Barbados. But since this debate has taken the turn it has, I believe it is proper and necessary to add my contribution at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes listen with amusement and amazement as I hear statements being made. I say with amusement, because, for a substantial part of my adult life, I spent time studying discipline.

I listen with a certain amount of interest to what the Hon. Minister had to say and I wish to draw to the honourable Member for the City that there are certain aspects of the Barbados Constitution, if they are carried out the way they were intended or the way they can be interpreted, a number of the problems which she identifies could disappear from the public administration of Barbados. I believe it makes provision for the appointment of the Prime Minister and Ministers and if I remember correctly, towards the end of Appointments Clause, responsibility for any business of the Government, including the administration of any department of the Government.

I have long contended, and I now contend again, that it is the responsibility of the Minister of a department to administer that department and that includes the administration of the personnel in that department. Some of the difficulties which have been outlined since independence by persons who have this responsibility, are difficulties which are more imagined than real, and there are persons with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo who will not permit the management which is necessary for administration to have a proper service.

I go further, and I take the honourable Member for Christ Church East and make this point — he said that the managers are the Permanent Secretaries. That is true in part. The ultimate manager is the Minister and he has to work out a system of administration in any department where, together with his permanent managers, they arrange for proper administration of the department. If the Government of the day, whether this side or that side, is prepared to deal with the matter in a modern and consistent way, then the Public Service Commission can only retreat in the face of the Government which decides on the personnel administration.

I think there are certain aspects of personnel administration which must be taken into account when one is dealing with a community the size of Barbados, and when one recognises that the public sector is the largest sector in Barbados. Hence, it sets the pace in the public sector,

and more important the private sector, because although there is this distinction made between the two, the fact remains that to a large extent the public sector has outstripped the private sector in its personnel policies and techniques. So it has become a model for the private sector. Therefore, it behoves the public sector to be more modern and more scientific in its approach to this matter.

The first problem which confronts the country is the arrangement which is made for such public administration as we now discuss. I have always contended that the division of the three departments of Establishments, the so-called Public Service Commission where the Chief Personnel Officer is functioning within the Service Commission and a truncated Training Division, all speak to the confusion which exist in the minds of all those whose responsibility it is to make decisions about proper personnel in this country.

It is impossible for three departments which are not coordinated at the level of professional manager to function effectively in the management of a unit the size of 25 000 or more. When I say 25 000 persons, I am aware that not all 25 000, of whom we heard, form what we describe as the Civil Service. But I think that the rules apply more or less to 25 000, and what I am saying has no less force because some may be in public corporations and others in the Civil Service proper. I am saying that the techniques and the attitudes which will flow out of an attractive established public sector would apply to all 25 000 persons who found themselves recipients of remuneration from the public purse.

Mr. Chairman, it must start at the very highest level of policy. I believe criticism will be taken in which the Opposition itself offered, that attempts early in the 70s to establish a Civil Service College were attempts in the right direction. There were attempts to allow those persons working in the public sector to recognise there was an institution that could be geared to their difficulties and would arrange for them to receive training that is very necessary in an organization of that size.

I have never heard the reasons for the abandonment of that project for the establishment of a Civil Service College. I contend that the decision which was showed to you was short sighted and may have been based on bad information given for the wrong reasons. I contend that the absence of executive training now is a millstone around the neck of the public sector.

The absence of executive training has been exasperated in recent times by the announcement of the Prime Minister — I believe he was the one making the announcement — that there will be a curtailment of the need for executive training except in very rare circumstances.

2.10 p.m.

Now I have no doubt that he can advance the most erudite and the highest motives for such a decision, not the least of which would have to do with the availability of money. But I say that in a situation where you have 25 000 persons, and you determine that they are not going to be allowed to continue on a progressive acquisition of advance training, you are beginning to curtail their initiative for advancement, you are beginning to make the service moribund and you are creating a situation where there is a lack of the kind of intellectual fertility, where there is a lack of the kind of imaginative environment in which a society like the Civil Service must thrive.

I believe that when we concern ourselves with the less important issues, for example, the tussle between the National Union of Public Workers and the Government itself on the question of sick leave, I believe that that is a peripheral issue. It may be a serious issue to the Government in terms of dollars and cents, but in terms of motivation, which I have heard being called for, that is a peripheral issue. There are much more fundamental issues concerning the Public Service which are not tackled and which have not been tackled in this country for some considerable time.

I believe that phrases such as "army of occupation" and "crabs in a barrel" coming from one Prime Minister and then from a second Prime Minister, "crabs in a barrel" from the current Prime Minister and "army of occupation" from the previous Prime Minister, "asbestos suits" and "fireproof", are designed to serve a particular short term purpose, but they result in a long term detrimental effect on the body politic. And I believe that it is not right that the highest civil servant, as it were, the Prime Minister of any country, should say these kinds of things unless it should be felt that one is grandstanding on this issue. This is a position which I have taken in the past and which I intend to take in the future.

It seems to me that such things as transfers of senior public officers, in a manner calculated to create embarrassment and humiliation, is bound to have an effect on the total body politic. It is the duty on the part of those who are at the top to see that such matters are handled with the highest level of delicacy. To allow a man who on the one day is operating at the highest level to be seen grovelling at a comparatively lower level on the following day is not in the interest of the development of morale in the Service; the kind of mentality where a man is working in an air-conditioned office one day and then on the following day he is seen down in the yard because he needs a little discipline, and then when this is done by one who subsequently becomes part of the Cabinet system, one begins to wonder at the kind of attitude which would inform the decision making of that particular Cabinet Minister.

When, for example, the Ministers are talking to senior civil servants in a manner calculated to embarrass them because of their alleged political allegiance, that in itself does not bring any measure of high morale to the particular service. When an honourable Member of this Chamber can look at persons who are working in a quasi-public institution and describe them as educated derelicts, and then when this is read by other persons in the Public Service itself, that is not.....(Asides) The honourable Member for St. Michael Central was describing persons in a governmental institution as educated derelicts. When other members of that same service read that kind of talk on the part of persons in this Chamber, that is not calculated.....

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of elucidation, if the honourable Member would give way.....On a point of order then. I did not want to disturb the honourable Member, but I never really said anything about the civil servants. I made reference about educated derelicts with specific reference to the Barbados National Bank, but not to the Civil Service.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is clear that I am speaking at a level which is beyond the comprehension of the honourable Member, so I shall proceed. I am saying that such statements are made by such honourable Members — and they get up in their total innocence and re-make the statements — and I am saying that when persons in the public sector read those statements coming from such persons in this Chamber, that is not calculated to give persons.....(Asides).....let me finish the sentence.... that is not calculated to give the persons in the public sector any sense of morale.

The honourable Member for the City is saying from her seat that when I was a Minister I victimised two persons. I put it to the honourable Member that she is unable, at any time in her career or mine, to demonstrate that I have ever at any time — and I challenge her or any other honourable Member in this Chamber to produce information — ever participated in the victimisation of anyone.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members on this side and he has challenged anybody on this side. I am stating emphatically on the floor of the House that the honourable Member for St. Michael West sent home Leroy Murrell and also Mrs. Crawford.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two honourable Members on their feet. The honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will have more time. We will spend a long time on this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not really know how the honourable Member for St. Michael West has managed to get into this highly political and, indeed, personal speed wobble. It was only yesterday that certain members of the Cabinet were commenting on the fact that of all the Ministers Barbados has ever had, possibly the one who had the worst relations with the Civil Service was the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and we were remembering a case of Mr. Leroy Murrell whom he purported to dismiss from the Public Service and who had to be reinstated, if you want to talk about victimisation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, the Prime Minister cannot mislead this Hon. House. The Prime Minister would be required to bring the record and demonstrate that what he is saying is true, because it is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN ordered that certain remarks made by the Member for St. Michael West be struck from the records.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We must not have these interruptions. Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution?
2.20 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Where are we going? You have been called upon to withdraw the remark. The Chairman overheard it. You have been called upon to withdraw it and you must come to yourself and withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member must withdraw the remark, please. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: I withdraw, Sir.)

The honourable Member for St. Thomas may continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You know, Sir, you push and you push and you push people. What is the honourable Member pushing me to do? Produce the letter that the civil servant's wife wrote to the former Prime Minister? Produce the details of the three months.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is he asking me to do? I am sorry. I know the honourable Member flies off the anvil when things that he has done in the past are pointed out to him, and he flusters and shouts and he shouts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not want to do him any more damage than his colleagues, than the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has done him,

and the honourable Member for St. Michael South, too. I do not want to do any more damage.

I want to deal, first of all with the very humane intervention.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of order. It is a question of order, because it is disorder arising out of a comment made by the Prime Minister, the Member for St. Thomas. He said that I did damage to the honourable Member for St. Michael West, and we have the most cordial relationships.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: No, and I hope that this question of the civil servant will be put to an end, because the civil servant was promoted into the Ministry of Health when I was Minister of Education, so I do not see how he could damage anybody.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: But that was one of the causes for the disruption between the two of you. Does the honourable Member really want me to say that he cannot damage the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that the honourable Member for St. Michael West does enough damage to himself every time he opens his mouth? All right, I will say so. I withdraw any suggestion that his colleagues need to damage him. He can do it all himself.

I want to deal with the very humane point made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North. The Tractor Scheme is being transferred to the ADC. I will not deny that the scheme has had its difficulties, apart from any financial constraints under which the Government is now suffering, but the Government has been making money available both through Sugar Factories Limited and through the ADC for the carrying out of agricultural services for small farmers.

Sugar Factories Limited will carry out tractor and transport services for small sugar farmers and it is intended that ADC will carry out tractor services. We feel that there is no point the Government having two separate pools of tractor equipment and two separate sets of maintenance and so on, and undoubtedly, it has been found that the Tractor Cultivation Scheme was not achieving any results commensurate with the amount of money being spent on it.

The persons who were formerly employed there have been giving notices of termination of the temporary employment because it was always a temporary scheme. It was never properly assessed. It should either have been made permanent if it was working well, or restructure it if it was working badly. I believe it goes back to the dates of the former Barbados Labour Party Government and it never gave satisfaction to anybody, not to the farmers and certainly not to successive Ministers of Finance. It will now be restructured and there is every possibility that the useful employees, employees whose work was carried on well under the stress and strain of the former system, may be re-employed at the ADC.

As it is known, the Severance Scheme does not apply to the Government. There are cases in which the Government has, as a matter of grace, made severance payments and I am sure that the honourable Member will advise the two people who have seen him, if they are in his constituency or if they are not, to make sure that they keep their names in the pool if they wish to be employed in any service which the ADC sets out. We are conscious of the staff implications of winding up a service of Government, and we have no intention of being inhumane to anybody.

The question raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West relating to the training and organisation of the Personnel Department is, I think, not well taken at the present time. There are not three departments. There are only two. I do not think that training ever merited full-size departmental status and the Head was of Permanent Secretary level. While it is true that we have had some good training officers as Permanent Secretaries, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting just as good training as we need with the position reduced and placed inside the Establishments Department.

I have, on many occasions, thought of having a Ministry of the Civil Service, Ministry of the Public Service headed by the BSPS who would have been an officer of the senior grade. Grading considerations are less important at this time, but the matter is still under consideration. At the moment, we still have two departments — one headed by a Chief Personnel Officer who liaises with the Services Commission and the other headed by a Chief Establishments Officer.

It may very well be that it is not necessary to have separate departments, but the very numbers involved — 16 000 or something like that coming under the Chief Personnel Officer, including the police and the teachers, and the whole 25 000 coming under the Chief Establishments Officer — he has some input into the staff structures at Statutory Corporations. In fact not the whole 25 000. I do not think the Chief Establishments Officer has ever been allowed any input into the Barbados National Bank or the Central Bank of Barbados, so say 24 600.

The Chief Establishments Officer has to deal with all the positions. He had to conduct wage negotiations. He has to deal with grading within the Government Service, job descriptions and so on. These are fairly formidable functions and there is obviously nobody in Barbados with the personal responsibilities of the Chief Personnel Officer. He is the only person who has 15 000 persons or more to deal with in terms of salaries, discipline, vacation and the whole gamut.

On training, a little bit too much emphasis can be placed on training for his own sake. I have forgotten how many Officers there are with second degrees in the Ministry of Finance. There are a very great number, I can tell you. I used to hear something like 40. Forty with degrees who have something pass graduate status.

I wonder what stage we have got to where I have in my Ministry an officer with two degrees on the level of Z9-3. Those salaries vary from \$15 067 to \$19 055. I wonder where anywhere in the world you can ask a man to get two degrees to work for a maximum of less than US\$2 000 a month. At that stage, you are encouraging people to be trained for training sake. You are spending money on university degrees for the sake of encouraging people to have letters behind their names. Not only that, it is not worth spending enormous sums of money to train all the holders of the offices for just that and the numbers are so great that the prospect for promotion to Permanent Secretaries, Planning, far less Director of Finance and Planning, are indeed remote for 90 per cent of the people who have this abundant university training.

The Government has not put an end to training. We have put an end to much of the overseas training that used to be given and the diminution in the Training Vote is due to that.

2.30 p.m.

Major Headley, whom I would like publicly to thank for his work as the last Chief Training Officer, went to work with a will to re-orient training from being primarily overseas — directed to being primarily locally directed and, with his administration and the wisdom of the Training Committee, I am satisfied that we achieved a very high standard of local training which is now being maintained under Mrs. Shepherd who succeeded him — but at a lower point in the scale.

I see no signs that we are getting civil servants who are untrained for the jobs for which they are sent. There is some evidence that in terms of secretarial and typing skills and work processing — data handling — that we are a little backward. I think I can go more than say sometimes — there are a lot of times.

But people can be no better than the equipment which they have to use and I would like to think that in

my own office I have made a start by getting a little free instruction for persons who handle the secretarial duties in my office with a view to equipping them for handling a Word Processor machine which you will see later in the Estimates — I think the honourable Member for St. Michael South has already seen that — I would not anticipate — and such training as is necessary for that sort of qualitative advance into new office skills will, of course, be given by the Government to all who are going to be expected to work with the new skills and perform at a new level.

On the general burden of not attacking the Civil Service, you are really asking, Mr. Chairman, for almost the impossible, sometimes, when you ask people not to express their frustrations and some of the infelicities which they see. And whichever honourable Member it was who spoke about "Civil Service in asbestos suits", "the army of occupation" and "the crabs in a barrel" also answered himself when he pointed out that situations do arise where you find it necessary to say something.

I think it is necessary at this time to say something to the Civil Service, not just through the NUPW, not just through departmental memorandum, but openly and publicly: that the public is not behind them; nor is the Government, nor, I think, is the Opposition, in any attempts which they have to maintain privileges that have been so totally abused for 20, 30 or 40 years.

Nobody believes in his or her heart — not even, I can tell you, senior officers — not the President — only other senior officers of the NUPW — that it is right that at the end of the year, you have civil servants enquiring about how many sick days they have taken during the year and how many they have left. This is a regular thing as the end of the year comes around. None of us think that that is right, and the NUPW and the public servants should not delude themselves by the silence of those in authority into thinking that the public supports them in the promotion of idleness among those paid from the taxpayers' pockets. All of us pay taxes so that people can stay home for 21 days a year uncertified sick leave.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central spoke of the Monday morning syndrome. It does not take a doctor to know about that. As a matter of fact, those who follow these things would observe that it has nothing necessarily to do with drinking. I really do not think that the nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital get drunk on Sunday so they cannot come to work on Monday. I rule that right out. I do not think that people who take leave on a Monday take it because they have had too riotous a weekend and have a hangover. You do not even find that to any enormous extent in MTW.

In other countries, the Monday morning syndrome is being analysed in greater depth. In the motor car industry

in the United States, there has been a recent study which reveals that there is a difference between motor cars according to which day of the week they are made, that motor cars made on a Monday have measurably more faults — this is new cars — than motor cars made on a Wednesday or a Thursday. (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: MP1?) (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Was MP1 made on a Monday?) It is perfectly possible that MP1 was made on a Monday and that the steering was changed around on a Friday. *(laughter)* But this is one of those organisation and methods study which has now reached right down to salesman level and it is well known that motor car agencies in the United States ask General Motors, Ford and American Motors to identify on what day of the week the cars that they buy were made, and that nobody who has a car agency of his own will ever drive a car themselves that was not made on a Wednesday or Thursday, so deeply is it believed and so deeply is it understood, not just believed, so deeply is it understood that there are productivity variations within a week.

Now I do not mind if people come to work on a Monday morning with the Monday morning blues and they do not work so well, but they should at least try and come to work. They should at least do that. I go to work every Monday morning and so do most people, I suppose. It is not too hard to ask the Civil Service to do the same thing. I have not come here today to be critical of the Service as a whole, but implicit in my remarks is support for the theme of the honourable Member for St. Michael South — that without a devoted, educated and dedicated Civil Service, Barbados could not stand in the first half dozen of developing countries in terms of the economic progress it has made. And I would go further and say this: when we first came into power we sought to step up the rate of productivity in the higher reaches of the Civil Service.

In all departments we sought to improve the speed at which things were done. The number of examples is legion where we have been able to succeed. Right here in Parliament people have pointed out that at least you now get the debates right up-to-date. It took a little time. But I could give you another example. You used to get Government accounts sometimes 18 months late. Government accounts now nearly always come to Parliament within a month or six weeks as required by the law in time for Members to study. We have gone years in which there was no Economic Report, another year in which the Economic Report was a cyclostyled document coming out at the last minute. The Economic Report is always laid as a companion document to the Budget. I am crossing my fingers now, Mr. Chairman, because I would not like to contradict myself and to find I am contradicting myself on Budget Day but that is the intention.

MCW is a much criticised Ministry. It is a Ministry where over staffing undoubtedly has led to bad work

habits. All the Technical Directors that I have ever spoken to at MCW agree that all the work they do could probably be done with half the people and more equipment. But the system has been otherwise, the system has been to employ a large number of people.

There are areas, Mr. Chairman, at every level where MCW has surprised departments of Government, and I think surprised itself, with its productivity. I would like to pay a tribute to the new Chief Technical Director who, I must confess, surprised me when his department, on a request for a plan for utilising the land where the new Central Purchasing building is, where Land's End road used to run — the land between the Shallow Draft and the new road — produced two alternative schemes with full drawings and studies of each for children's playground, restaurant, parking space, driving facilities, warehousing the Central Purchasing — the whole lot within I would think ten days.

2.40 p.m.

I do not believe that at a time when the department was more demoralised and less motivated that it could have produced work at that speed. It is not really a matter of particular individuals, it is a matter of the whole tempo and the way the department looks at its functions, and the way the Department considers whether its functions and workings are being appreciated or not.

The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education has surprised me by the immediacy of his addressing the problem of reducing the fringes around the spending that had got into the vote in previous years bit by bit, and his applying cost effective techniques to pruning the Education budget without actually reducing the service which the children themselves are going to get by way of teaching in the schools. I am using the word "surprised" because I am not implying any criticism of the officers. It is a surprise when work at that speed is done at any level anywhere in the world, where in a month or two months plans can be developed, fully thought out and costed when principles of zero budgeting indeed, Mr. Chairman, that had never been used in the Public Service are applied to the Estimates and the effectiveness of a particular department. Therefore we still have, I think, the motivation and the capacity to be motivated within the Public Service. What we have to try and do is reduce demoralisation and remove the bad examples.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is one temporary officer who could find himself taking five uncertified sick days in one month. I mentioned him already. He could only do that through bad example, or really through ignorance, because he must know that when the time for appointment comes up that his record of ill health is bound to be considered by the Public Service

Commission, and he should also know that he would be fortunate if he gets to that stage. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: That does not stop him from being appointed). He is a temporary officer and there are other means of stopping him from getting a job, but there is no question of looking at individuals at this level. I quote that as a bad example. Nobody who goes into the Civil Service to work can go into the Civil Service with the belief that in the Civil Service, in his first few months of work, that he must stay home three weeks. Nobody could go in fresh from an ordinary Barbadian household to think that the Civil Service is a place where you work four days a week and telephone in sick on the fifth. All of this is an example, and that is why perhaps we get this so prevalent in some departments and not so prevalent in others. It is the example which is set.

I think there is somebody in Central Purchasing whom the Chief Purchasing Officer told me about. All of his sick days fell on a Monday one year, every single one, and he took all 21.

These things obviously are indefensible, and I will say this for the NUPW, the officers to whom I have spoken: they never sought to defend them. They just say why punish those who may need the sick days just because some people abuse the system. The NUPW perhaps takes the point of view that the system is abused by a minority. I take the point of view that the system is used by a minority, and perhaps only a very, very small minority. (Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I hope the Government is looking at it as well). The honourable Member for St. Philip North is saying he hopes the Government is looking at it as well. It is the Government that is looking at it and which will discuss it with the NUPW. I am trying to institute some system by which the Government's findings can be discussed with the NUPW as the year progresses.

I really do not think that anything else has arisen, unless honourable Members wish to raise something new at this stage before I move that it now pass.

I beg to move that the sum of \$234 926 under Head 13 — Services Commissions — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 14 — ESTABLISHMENTS

Head 14 — Establishments — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3 558 638 under Head 14 — Establishments — stand part of the Schedule.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In seconding that, Sir, I beg to move that the sum of \$530 000 appearing in the Description in the Explanatory notes be deleted. It should just read: "This subhead provides for payment to the Training Fund..." The \$530 000 is an error. There is no need to mention it anyhow.

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

HEAD 15 – CABINET OFFICE

Head 15 – Cabinet Office – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In moving that the sum of \$1 631 438 under Head 15 – Cabinet Office – stand part of the Schedule, I will answer the question raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West on the Ombudsman. The service of the Ombudsman is one of the services whose introduction has had to be curtailed at this time, and we are therefore moving the amendment, the deletion of subparagraph (c) – "Provision for the operating expenses of the office of the Ombudsman." We do not want to put in a token, because we are positively not doing it this year.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on the question of the Ombudsman, he is striking it out and I accept that. I think though that they should examine whether that should properly fall under Cabinet Office in the eventuality of bringing it back. I think it should properly fall under Parliament, because he is the Parliamentary Commissioner and is directly responsible to Parliament. For whatever it is worth, I think the honourable Member would wish to be aware of that, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Answering that question, Sir, the Cabinet Office and Parliament are connected together. The officials of Parliament at Civil Service level are responsible to the Cabinet Secretary, and therefore putting it in the Cabinet Office does not preclude giving Parliament a very substantial share in dealing with it. I would not think it proper to make the Clerk of Parliament the financial officer for the payment of the Ombudsman, but I would not rule it out in respect of staff organisation and where his office is going to be, so the matter will be considered when we revise the office.

I would draw to honourable Members' attention that the Government's cuts are not falling only upon staff and the other services. We have removed \$30 000 from the Government's Hospitality Vote. It is now at its lowest level for many many years. If necessary, we will have to give up eating lunch in Cabinet, and we have also removed a much larger sum of \$630 000 from the Conferences and Delegations Vote and strict economy will be enforced on attendance at conferences abroad. During the

current year also we do not intend to have any conferences in Barbados, if it can be possibly avoided, that will involve the spending of money.
2.50 p.m.

It is from the first vote that President Reagan's visit will be accommodated and just to assure the public, the cost of this visit to the Government will be negligible. Any function that will be held for the President will be so limited in number as not to make any serious indention on the Hospitality Vote whatsoever. In security matters and so on, we do not have to be so elaborate for the President of the United States, as they might be say, for the Queen. The President is providing the great majority of his own security and will meet the cost of his own local transportation under security circumstances.

I know that one of the first reactions to the news of the President's visit to Barbados is how can we have this visit when you are calling for a restraint. Unfortunately, first reactions in Barbados are very often mistaken.

One only has to read the extraordinary views presented in the *Nation* newspaper 'reporter comment column' to realize the views that would surprise any Member of Parliament, on either side. We even had one man saying, it was all right to send people to prison for debt in the old days because things were better and they could pay debts earlier, but in these days we should not do it because things are harder. Just another example, we had another man saying that the people would get a better service if the Transport Board would go back to private enterprise, better service up to 8 o'clock at night with no buses in the middle of the day. We could do well to educate the public occasionally when we see this extraordinary opinion uttered.

I really do think it is extraordinary, when I was told, not by one person, but a number of people, that the President's visit would cost Barbados huge amounts of money. It really is not going to, Mr. Chairman, and we can accommodate the entire visit well within the 30 per cent cut that we have made for Government hospitality and still have some left over for the rest of the year.

Sometimes inquiries are made as to the size of the Contingency Vote on the Cabinet. It is \$75 000 now. I would just mention that it is there because we do get contingency. We get situations where we may want to make a grant to help out another Caribbean Island from a hurricane when they want to meet expense of emergency relief at certain times. We may want to send somebody abroad in short notice. All of that is going to have a big Contingency Vote on us.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, of the \$1,631,438 that you credit to this heading, over

\$200,000 of that, on the subhead 4, is for the operation of the administration of the Electoral Office.

Sir, we on this side would feel a lot happier if we had the assurances of the Government that the problems that manifested themselves in the last election would be corrected, and be corrected with speed.

Sir, there can be no doubt about it, that at the last election there was massive confusion on election day. And the first candidate to publicly draw attention to this was a Member from that side, and it was a Member from St. Michael North East. Scores of persons could not find where their polling stations were. Persons who had voted in certain polling stations before and who had not moved residence, and had not been affected by constituency changes — their polling district remained in the same place — still did not have their names on that list.

I myself spent considerable time trying to help a person who would normally vote in St. Michael North East whose name should have been there. I spent a time taking that old lady to various polling stations. Finally I left her at St. Matthews because I had no more time to help her. That is in the constituency of St. Michael North East. There were other problems in every constituency including my own.

Mr. Chairman, in 1977, some time after this Government came into power, several officers were relieved of their duties. I am not suggesting that this is a problem, because it is my belief that the cause of the problem was indeed the amendment in 1978 to the Representation of the People Act. The Representation of the People Act was enacted in 1971 and at that time we instituted a system of permanent personnel voter registration. By that it was meant that persons came on to the Register on a monthly basis as they qualified, whether they qualify by virtue of residence or age. They had the opportunity to come on to the Register, and not only come on to the Register, but to investigate the Register and see that their names were there. But in 1978, on the eve of the election in the St. Michael South constituency, we had changes to the electoral law. Those changes reverted the system back to the old system where we had one register only for a year, and removed completely the supplementary register system. So a person who becomes of age after January in one year could not get on to that register until January of the following year, when a new register is published.
3.00 p.m.

Under the old system we had supplementary registers published or prepared on the basis of monthly lists, and at the end of the year, or in January of the following year, all the supplementary registers were consolidated with the register that was published in January of the previous year to form the register for that year. A

system was instituted in 1978 whereby persons could not know that their names were on the list for a certain constituency, and this created a big problem. Of course, too, what compounded it was the increase of seats and the redivision, if you like. Someone said gerrymandering. That also helped to create some of the confusion.

As I understand the amendment of 1978, it was done on the basis that the publication of monthly registers was too costly. I myself cannot subscribe to that view: that the monies that were spent on preparing and publishing supplementary registers were too much for maintaining and ensuring a democratic system in this country. And when in 1978 that amendment was made, to my mind — and I said it time and time again on public platforms — that was a blow for democracy in Barbados.

I am not saying that democracy went out of the window. I want to make that clear. I am saying it was a blow for democracy, because it is important not only that people should be able to vote, it is important that people should know well in advance where they are to vote. The 1978 amendment to the Act allowed for a publication of the register as late as three days before a general election.

Now how can a candidate scrutinise a register for errors only with a three day interval before a general election? As a matter of fact, it is difficult even for persons, who are not candidates, only in a three day period to be able to find for sure where their names might be.

The Act now requires that there should be a publication of a register for elections 17 days after the issue of a writ. Let us look at what happened in 1981. Parliament was dissolved on May 26, 1981. On that same day writs for elections were issued. On the following day, May 27, a revised Register of Electors was issued.

I want to make this point here: I do appreciate the efforts of the Electoral Office in publishing, even before the revised register, even before Parliament was dissolved, a register to assist persons both in helping them to find out where their names might be as well as assisting the candidates. But that had only become necessary because the requirement to publish monthly registers was abolished.

If we had the publication of monthly registers as we had had previously, there would have been no necessity for the Chief Electoral Office to publish an unofficial document. It would not have been a register; it was just a list. It was not a register because none of the laws made provision for it. It was just an attempt on behalf of the Registration Office to assist persons. In other words, that was an attempt to fill the gap that existed, that was created by virtue of the amendment to the 1978 laws. So we have this problem.

I have had responsibility for elections before. As a matter of fact, the 1971 laws came about when I was the Minister, and I did a considerable amount of work on them, and I realised the problems that could exist. I realised the impossibility for people to scrutinise names in the short period allowed by the present laws, and I made a suggestion.

I paid a visit to the office of the Electoral Officer because I wanted to submit to him a list of persons who had changed their residences. I believe every candidate must have done this. As we went around our respective constituencies, we discovered persons in that area who had moved from one area into that area or had moved out, and we from time to time carried around a "Change of Address" form.

I went to the office of the Chief Electoral Officer and I took in these forms. I happened to see him and I had a word with him, and I made a suggestion that the office should make available to the respective parties contesting the elections — not to each candidate for reasons which I will say in a minute — what is known as 'the master registrations'. The master registration list is a computer print-out of all persons registered in Barbados to vote, and it is done in alphabetical order. It is not done on a constituency basis, it is not done like a regular register. It is just a computer print-out of all names of persons on all 27 registers.

As I said before, it is done in alphabetical order, and I made a suggestion to the Chief Electoral Officer that that computer print-out, that master registration list, should be made available to the respective parties contesting the elections. It would have been too voluminous for every candidate to want to have a copy to walk around with — it has 160 000 odd names. That list would have assisted considerably in eliminating some of the confusion that reigned on election day, because persons, instead of looking to the one source where this list was — and that is at the Chief Electoral Office as far as I am aware — and I believe there was only one such copy — could have contacted the respective parties, and that would have taken a considerable amount of strain off the Electoral Office and persons would be better able to locate where they would be able to vote.

As it was, as I said, only one copy was available at the Chief Electoral Office. Persons were calling at the office all day — persons could not get through to the office to find out where they could vote because there were numerous errors on the register. On my own register, I had persons' names and addresses in St. Joseph and St. Andrew. The point is that we would have been more able to identify for those persons who sought information, where they were supposed to vote, and the suggestion to the Chief Electoral Office was made at least four to five months before the elections took place.

Well shortly before election day, I enquired if they were able to get the master registration list. I was told that the answer to that was "no". I did not query any further. I left it at that, but I sensed that because of the absence of the list that the problems for the Chief Electoral Office itself would have been multiplied. I know persons who left where they should have voted, because they could not get through to the Electoral Office by telephone, and went to the office of the Chief Electoral Officer. Persons in my constituency did that in order to be able to find some place where they could vote.

Now in the light of all these problems, it is my submission that another look should be made by the office of the Chief Electoral Office, and by the Minister in charge at the system that prevails — and I am not making this recommendation for the Opposition. I am making this recommendation for every single candidate and every single elector in this country, because I do not believe, Sir, that we should make things more difficult for the electors of this country. As we move on, we should try to make things simpler, not more difficult. We should not attempt to put more difficulties in their way, and one of the ways, I believe, that we can assist is by making better and fairer use of the respective Registration Officers. 3.10 p.m.

At the moment, Sir, they do very little. I think greater use should be made of these Registration Officers. Put them in the field. They do not do this. The Registration Officer should be accessible — not in the case of St. Michael North or St. Michael North West where at one time the Registration Officer lived miles away from St. Michael North West in St. James, and persons from Jackson, say, were required to go to his home in St. James, in Appleby Gardens, in order to get any registration matters looked after.

Registration Officers should be available in the constituency. If he has to live in St. James, let him have an office in the constituency with regular hours. There is nothing wrong with that. But of course, if he lives in the constituency, let him have an office otherwise, and let that person go into the field and seek out and carry out the requirements of the Act — seek out persons who have moved out of the constituency — because there is a requirement in the Act for this, and when a person has moved out, or moved in, appropriate amendments should be made to the respective registers. This is important.

There were also cases of persons who had been registered before, and whose names were not on the register. I can call one such name — the daughter of someone in my constituency in Belle Road who had been a presiding officer at an earlier election. But he had died, he died about two or three years before. Ironically, his name was on the list, though dead two or three years previously. But his daughter's name was not, although she was living in the same household. These are the problems.

There are other problems. The National Registration List should be an administrative matter. I am not suggesting that provision is made in the law for this, but the National Registration List should, at the appropriate time, be made available to respective parties from time to time. There are other recommendations they would want to make.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. You can come back later.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I have some suggestions to make which I will make at a later stage.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this Head, I would like to draw attention to a few areas of concern to me. One — I sincerely hope that there is no increases in the salaries of Ministers these years — and they do not deserve any increases — and in view of their performance, I think that they should accept a voluntary decrease in salary.

Secondly, Sir, on the question of Government hospitality, I hope that that would be kept to a bare minimal this year, until we get out of this economic crisis.

Thirdly, Sir, under Conferences and Delegations, I would hope that the Government would cut down on the excessive travelling abroad, and also use some discretion in the matter of travelling first class. I honestly do not think that if one is travelling from here to New York — four hours — that you really need to waste Government's money in a first class passage.

I would say if a Minister was travelling to London for a weekend conference, leaving on a Friday and coming back on a Tuesday, that it would not be unreasonable for him to travel first class under those circumstances, but use some kind discretion in this matter to cut down the size of their delegations — I am trying to be as reasonable as possible — in order to reduce the cost to the taxpayers of external travel by Ministers of Government and others who are paid out of this particular vote.

I sincerely hope that on that trip to Australia that arrangements were not possible to include travel by Concord, although I understood that was being investigated — whether or not, I think from London to Singapore by the Concord was peaceable. I do not know whether that had happened, but nevertheless.....
(Asides)..... I am sticking towards it here. I am saying that it is quite unnecessary for Ministers to travel first class routinely — quite unnecessary — and try to be selective when you use first class facilities. You use it because you are in a situation where under the pressure of work and time you would need some comfort in travel and be able to function when you reach the end of your journey, and

when you come back, so let us use some discretion in this matter. After all, the country is in a state of economic crisis. The Prime Minister himself has said that he is cutting back in this area, and I am calling upon the Government to use some discretion in this area and look and see how they can reduce travel on air tickets.

Now, Sir, some very serious questions on the 1981 elections. All of us, I am sure, will agree that something went very wrong with those elections. When you look.....
(Asides)..... You had threatened to beat me already for saying that you were going to rig the elections and I am not going to say so today. Anyhow, something went very wrong with those elections, and when you look at the number of seats which were won or lost by a small number of votes, one begins to wonder whether or not the errors involved in the preparation of those lists could not have meant that another party might have formed the Government of Barbados.

The errors, Sir, were very substantial and a large number of people were involved, and it was quite irrelevant to produce a report showing that only a small number of people were enfranchised on the basis that their names were included in an overall register for the country. The fact is that if you lived in St. Michael South Central and you went to vote in St. Michael South Central, and you have lived there and voted there for 15 or 20 years, and all of a sudden you cannot find your name in any register in St. Michael South Central and you cannot contact the Chief Electoral Officer — and there is no master list at any polling station to tell you where you can vote — that error in itself has effectively disfranchised you in respect of casting a vote on that particular day. So it is certainly legalistic nonsense when each and every one of us in here would know what happened on that day.

The Prime Minister himself was in the office of the Chief Electoral Officer where hundreds of people were down there trying to find out where to go. I can see at least two or three other Members on the other side sitting here today who were in there trying to get information in relation to persons in their own constituencies. I was down there. Many other Members on this side had to go to that office, Sir, and could not get any information to advise our constituents where to vote. I had to provide facilities for persons resident in my constituency to go and vote in other constituencies on the basis of information obtained through someone who I had in the Electoral Office permanently on that particular day.
3.20 p.m.

Now, Sir, what were the problems? One of the problems, Sir, is that there were electors whose names were removed from the Register of Electors. Whether this happened at the computer level or otherwise, that I do not know. They were persons who were qualified as electors whose names were not placed on the Register of

Elections. There were electors, Sir, whose names were placed on the Register of Elections in the wrong polling district within the constituency, and there were electors whose names were placed on the Register for Elections in the wrong constituency. I can give a clear example. There is a gentleman whose name appeared on the St. Michael South Central list who lives in Lears, and his name appears in District RE in the Britton's Hill area — on my own electoral list. There were several others like that.....

Additionally, Sir, there was the appearance of the names of several electors more than once on the Register of Elections. There was the appearance of the names of persons who were not eligible to vote on the Register for Elections, 15 and 16 year olds — their names appeared on the registers for elections, and here you have a three year old apparently with a name on the list for elections. But I know of 15 year olds and 13 year olds appearing on the Register.

Another major factor, Sir, was the failure to remove from the Register of Elections the names of a large number of deceased persons, despite a recent enumeration — and this is a serious matter. We spent thousands of dollars doing an enumeration here, and yet at the end of that period there were still on the Register the names of hundreds of people who had either deceased or had been away from Barbados for more than five and ten years. Their names still appeared on the Register after a recent enumeration which took place just before the elections.

All that is necessary is to make some arrangement with the Registrar of Deaths. Every death in Barbados is registered with the Registrar of Deaths, so information could be passed on to the Electoral Office so that action can be taken on that — and for the Returning Officers to do some work, because if they would even listen to the notices of deaths coming over Rediffusion in the morning, they would be able to pick up people in their own constituencies.

There are numerous instances where friends, where neighbours of Returning Officers have died and their names remained on the Register. You must have a situation where the Returning Officers understand that they are being paid to do a job, and that they must go out there and do their work. Many of them just collect the money and do no work whatsoever, and this is not in the best interest of the democratic processes in Barbados.

And I would also say this: that in any future enumeration, you should not set about employing party yardfowls in order to do the enumeration. I very much support the position taken by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that you cannot appoint party yardfowls

to carry out important functions of that kind. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Except in Christ Church East.) (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Not true.) I say you need to appoint people who are respected in the particular constituency, people who know the people in the constituency, and I would go further and say that the enumerating officer should probably be accompanied by two scrutineers — one representing each of the major parties in this country.

It is important that people should have confidence in the democratic processes of Barbados and when the sort of thing which happened at the last election occurs, then you start the process of erosion of the democratic process. Whether it was deliberate or not, I cannot say, but what I can say is this: enough mistakes were made that even if it were not deliberate, you could still end up in that kind of situation.

The gerrymandering of the boundaries, the attempt to construct a register on a negative basis.... that is a dangerous practice where you register all persons above a certain age, and then, through a computer, try to remove from that register persons who are not eligible. What happens is that persons who are not eligible and persons that are eligible get taken off the register through that computerising process and the third and important factor, Sir, that I would like to bring to your attention is this.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute to wind up.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will finish in a minute. I am not going to take too long. (*Aside*) Yes, there is one thing about computerisation. I am talking about constructing a list — not by a positive process of registering people, but by registering persons who are not eligible to vote and then seeking at the same time to take off the names of those.

I think another bad thing that was done was that this country was fooled into believing that that enumeration process had nothing to do with elections. They were told that it was done under the Statistical Act in order to bring in a National Health Service. Subsequently, and at the last minute, there were amendments to the Representation of the People Act to make an enumeration carried out under the Statistical Act valid for the purposes of an election. Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Time? I will speak again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I could not believe, Sir, that I would be subjected to so much nonsense coming from the other side at this time of the day.

On January 12, Mr. Chairman, a Resolution was brought into this Hon. Chamber under, "Private Members' Business" by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition and it reads as follows, Sir:

"To move the passing of a Resolution urging a review of the system of publication of lists of electors and the provision of certain facilities at polling stations."

This measure was disposed of....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No.) (ASIDE: It was not disposed of.)....fully aired....(ASIDE: It was not.).... it was introduced...(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It was not introduced then, the Speaker said it was not introduced.).... It was on the Order Paper then. It is on the Order Paper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is on the Order Paper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Look on the Order Paper and tell me if you see that Resolution. The facts were clearly put by the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition whom I greatly respect for his 25 to 30 years in here dealing with elections. It was clearly put.

This evening we are hearing again the same nonsense about dead men voting, three year olds on the master sheet, "they would have been the party in power instead of this party — another party would have been in power then."

3.30 p.m.

The other party which you used to finance, another party would have been in power. The other party that would have been in power obviously would have been one that could have been financed by the Member for St. Michael South Central, but they continue to quarrel with the electors of this country. All that happened is that you would have had 7 000 more votes, but the Deputy Prime Minister may have had 20 000 more votes. We may have won 23 seats and you may have won one, but as far as you are concerned another party would have been in power. The same thing happened in 1971. In 1971 you had people living in one house and were voting at two different polling stations, and this is always the problem whenever there is a shift in the boundaries and a new enumeration. That is all it is.

The people elected this party because we were doing a good job then, and they will turn us out of office if we do not do a good one now. It is as simple as that. Stop quarrelling with the people, they do not owe you a single thing.

I want to deal with the other side of it, Sir, this decrease in salaries. I have made it very, very clear. I want an increase in salary, I need one. If there is inflation, I need an increase in salary, but I can tell you what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central can do, he can stop trying to catch headlines and bring a Private Member's Resolution in here calling for a voluntary decrease in M.P.'s salaries. And I challenge you that some of the Members over there will not vote for it, because I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, he made his position quite clear in here with that nonsense he is always talking.

He was going to give away his salary. I am going to ask Mr. Cumberbatch to let me know what time they come for their salaries, I know them well. I see the Deputy Clerk looking at me because he knows it is true. The ink cannot even dry on the cheque before they are not up here asking if it is ready. I know well, I see them in here. So what nonsense is he talking about a decrease in salary for M.P.'s? Does he want the Deputy Leader to cut his throat? He is there with a city college, struggling with a M.A. in Economics while the professional duster out here is putting the case, and he is calling for a decrease in M.P.'s salaries.

Now, he is saying that Ministers or Parliamentarians should not travel first class. Mr. Chairman, I am no hypocrite, I want the best things in life, and I believe that is my whole ambition, and to be a good politician. I believe I like the best things in life for the people I represent, but I must set the standard, I must set the pace. I want the best things in life and I want them for the people of Barbados also. I do not want to fly economy, I do not want to fly in any LIAT small plane, I want to fly Concorde and Jumbo because I want the people to fly that way too.

The Member for St. Michael South Central is accustomed to getting free trips from British West Indian Airways, from Air Canada and from Caribbean Airways. He does not have to pay for his trips, not one single cent, but you will find him going to Antigua, St. Vincent and Dominica, travelling first class, and he is asking a Minister of Government to go and sit down by the toilets travelling from here to another country. You are asking for money to run this country, but you must sit down in all the discomfort you can think about. Do not shake your head, get up and agree with me. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Give me a minute). I will give you a minute, I want to hear you talk about it. Get up and agree with me.

Only today in here, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing how we are downgrading Parliament, only today we were discussing how cheaply we sell ourselves, and this evening, not even before you pick the bails, you hear you must have a voluntary decrease in salaries for M.P.'s. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Ministers in particular). Ministers in particular? You want a bull pistle lash, you clown! As my colleague from Christ Church East, the Minister of Agriculture, said earlier, that sort of talk is for Quakers Road corner with the boys talking nonsense, fooling them that you do not want a Jaguar to drive about, and your office air-conditioned, and charging \$60 per patient.

Why do you not charge your patients \$5? If you are so humane, and all these nice things you want, charge your patients \$5 and attend to the people of St. Michael South Central free. That is the sort of thing you should do. That would happen outside the election, but like now you want a decrease in M.P.'s salaries. What kind of nonsense am I hearing? Something went wrong, what went wrong? What went wrong in the election?

I know what is going wrong in your party. I know there is a showdown in your party for the next election between outside right and dead left. That is your big problem, that is the election you have to worry about. We have four and a half years. Stop running down the people, stop quarrelling with them — they rejected you at the polls. Stop quarrelling with the Electoral Office, what more can they do?

You should be ashamed of yourself. Do you remember the boundaries in that year when there was an election? The election was to be in September and you made the adjustments some time in July or August, or something like that, four weeks before the election, and had people scrambling all over the place trying to find where to vote, and now you are talking about an election being rigged, and a lot of nonsense. The Barbadian electorate is too intelligent to think about an election being rigged. There is no rigging of elections in Barbados, people do not vote by symbols.

In Jamaica they vote by symbols. So do they in St. Vincent and St. Lucia. There is a high literacy rate in Barbados. People go to the polls and see their names there and they vote Craig, or vote Haynes, and they do not have to use symbols. So you do not have to rig any election, you go out there at night and put a case to the people.

The trouble with you is that the people knew you could not give them \$60 a week for the old age pensioners, and they knew you were trying to fool them on that. You could only give them \$7.80 over 15 years, so how are you going to give them \$25 in three months now? People know these things only too well, so do not underestimate the electorate of this country. As the old lady

said to me, they got fooled with the motor cars — too many, the Member for St. Michael West singing at night. What is the name of the song you used to sing? (Mr. B. M. TAITT: We are ready). "We are ready." We are ready to go back in the Opposition.

Stop running down the Electoral Office, give them a chance. And all this nonsense about decreasing salaries and Parliamentarians should not travel first class, do not worry with that.

3.40 p.m.

As the Minister of Finance said earlier today he is going to restrict some of the travelling this year. If I am to fly from here to India in economy, then I will not go at all if I cannot travel the best. I want the best to eat, the best to drink and to wear. That is what you need for your family and I need it for my family too. That is why Barbados, I am quite sure, has the best transport system, the best education system and the best Government for the people of Barbados. I will not downgrade myself by going economy and by decreasing my salary when a bunch of idiots somewhere else is getting a big bunch of money — some clowns around here, like some bank managers, getting \$4 000 to \$6 000 a month. Your own Prime Minister has to ride around in an old broken car. (Aside) It may be two years old but its broken down but it is not his fault. (Asides).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was not here for the whole debate on the Electoral Office. Sufficient to say that the Government is satisfied that there was no irregularity of any sort as to affect an election. That the normal number of people could not find their names on polling day, is no more than has been usual in Barbados. Some 20 000 voted in the last election and that is more people than ever voted before, and that was due to the devoted work of the Chief Electoral Officer in having such and up-to-date register. We are aware, and we had a report lately that in some cases they were genuine mistakes, and I dwell on the report only to say that it is really time to stop selling ourselves short in respect of matters of statistics.

I have knowledge that the people do not want to believe that the price of food has fallen. It is absolutely accurate for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to say that the public will not believe it — I know that too. When English potatoes are advertised at Carlton Supermarket at 29 cents, when it costed 44 cents last year, no service is done by telling the people of Barbados that the food is cheaper — that is an ordinary fact. You can do no service to yourself in playing on the public's perception when you say something and know it to be false. You know that it is not true when the Statistical Department comes up with a figure that there has been a genuine decline in the local food prices.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the honourable Member is committing two infringements against the House. First, he is repeating a speech which he already made in this debate. Secondly, he is being irrelevant in the context when he continues to talk about food prices etc. Let us stick to the Electoral Office.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The point is that the denial of the report prepared in the House in relation to the election is the same quality as denying the Statistical Department to report the debt and resale prices.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was most careful to say that a report which indicates that X number of people were disenfranchised in respect of the register for the totality of this country does not in any way deal with the question of the effective disenfranchisement of those in any constituency who were unable to vote on that day because their names were not on the list or they did not know where to vote. I just want to make that clear.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have documents to read, and, generally speaking, I have more important statements to say that the honourable Member could possibly have to say.

I am glad the honourable Member of St. Michael South Central has explained the denial of his report. You cannot go on for ever because there is always a fraud in the mainstream of public life which is contradictory of authority, contemptuous of the truth and of rumour. Look at the zest of the population in Barbados when told that the Prime Minister had a heart attack or stroke and was in St. Joseph Hospital. I was tormented with the telephone calls and my mother tormented with the people who wanted to know how I was.

The wrong story of course, and it is to that that you are planning when you say not to mind the statistics that cabbage cost less because everybody knows that is not true. Don't mind to say that only 29 people could not vote. Everybody knows that is not true, but these things are said. This is a very political country and you see a true side of political colour. The opponents say what the Opposition would want them to say, and anytime when they get beaten at an election where they were expected to win, you naturally want to get your point across. This country has repudiated all the arguments we have heard today.

Parliamentary Members' salaries have been raised by the largest percentage ever, the people were told untruthfully that I work for \$100 000 a year. Actually I work for \$99 000. All that has been a scandal, and

all we are doing when we rehash it is warming up trouble for 1986 or the year 2001 when you may eventually win an election. I say as a fact that you have to take the perception and behaviour of Parliamentarians and Ministers into account when you fix their salaries. If at any stage any country allows its legislators to be so underpaid that the legislators become very resentful of public opinion, they will also become contemptuous of public opinion. I am sure that in countries where Parliamentarians are expected to work for nothing, it is forbidden, and you will find what Gibbons said in his autobiography some 200 years ago of the 18th century Britain, that "corruption is an infallible sign of constitutional liberty".

Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. James North, in speaking on salaries, commented on bank managers salaries, but I never forget having to deal with an immigrant in this country. His only education was the Matriculation Certificate from Durban High School in South Africa, and he was receiving \$7 000 a month in 1976 working with an organization in this country. Now how do you expect your honourable Member for Christ Church West — it was then South Central — to react. We would have to be superhuman if we did not ask ourselves, "what are the rewards in Barbados that dictates that the rewards for public servants in responsible positions are so much less than the rewards in other aspects of public life in this country?"

3.50 p.m.

Nobody is asking that Ministers get the best salaries. We are asking that Ministers get paid salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. And I have said before that it lies very ill in the mouth of — I think he is the third best-off doctor in this country — either the second or the third best-off doctor in this country who employs a butler, who drives a Jaguar motorcar, who brags that if he never works again in his life his standard of living will not fall, to come in here and try to gain cheap popularity by snatching at ministerial salaries.

And the fact that he made the money himself does not alter the fact that he is a rich man, and is not ashamed to tell you outside Parliament how rich a man he is, and to discuss the power of money, and how you can exercise the power of money over people from journalists right back through, and when he comes in and tells you, because it could only be catching in a cheap and — can I say nasty? I can't say nasty — in a cheap way for advantageous popularity to say anything about reducing the salaries of Members of Parliament or of Ministers.

Ministers' salaries are tied to those of senior civil servants, and they will move with those of senior civil servants. If senior civil servants — the Judges — accept a

wage freeze, so will Ministers. Parliamentarians' salaries and the salaries of the Assistant Clerks, if I recall correctly, used to be tied to the salary level of an Assistant Secretary in Government service. It is now Administrative Officer II. Whatever level it was, so it will remain.

The Government is not paying any lip service, or actual service, to those jealous people in our society who wish to drag down men merely because they are up, who instead of asking us to help them up prefer to ask us to be dragged down by them. We are not over-paid, and I am satisfied that we are not over-paid in this country.

I travel privately, in which case I can only afford to buy an economy ticket. And I travel publicly, in which case, if outside the Caribbean area, if on the business of the International Monetary Fund or the Inter-American Development Bank I travel first class. Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable Member can say it till he is blue in the face that Ministers should travel economy, because if I go to an IMF meeting or a Committee of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank, they do not give me an option to travel economy — they send a first-class ticket marked "non-refundable." I can't even turn that in and get an economy ticket.

On the occasions when travelling privately that I have sat in the back seat of an aeroplane, it has been obvious, especially on British West Indian Airways — on all — that it is an embarrassment to the airline to be having a Prime Minister sitting in economy, embarrassing as anything could be, and indeed the airlines actually ask you not to do it. The honourable Member should know this anyway, I believe, and I deplore this continual picking, and picking at ministerial travel and ministerial salaries.

Nearly all countries are coming around to understanding that it is wise to pay politicians well. It is wise to give them facilities to run their business by way of office equipment, secretaries, research facilities and so on.

The Travel Vote which is effectively what we are now discussing — and this is a Cabinet matter and not a House matter — we have not even voted an increase for at least three years, I think four, for the daily allowance of Parliamentarians abroad. I tell you as a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the US\$40 per day which is voted for me for meals cannot buy meals — unless when I am in New York I am going to walk out and have breakfast at the Chock-Full-O'-Nuts, which I have done, Sir, and try to catch as much beer as I can drink along with a Texas-Burger in the Beef-Burger, or perhaps at night indulge myself in \$15 or \$20 in Chinese food. That is the only way it can happen. \$10 a day is the allowance for catching a taxi and so on, and \$35 a day for what is called

"Subsistence", which means your laundry when you are abroad, or the casual entertainment you may have to do.

I remember when I addressed the tourist promotion at the Ritz Hotel not so long ago, I gave lunch to a journalist whom I know very well. I did not ask for any reimbursement. The lunch cost me £68 for two people. As it happened, I did not ask for a reimbursement. In other circumstances, maybe I might. We bear these things because it is to that extent that we are economising and we are not increasing, and that is why the vote can be down at this level.

But do not tell us now that because Government does not put up its travelling allowance, and is therefore able to hold down the Travelling Vote, that we must reduce our salaries and do not travel first-class as well. *(Asides)*

The easiest way of spending less money is to travel less. I agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in his aside. That is the easiest way, and that is the way we have adopted, but we are not going to decide to travel a lot on it at economy class. The easiest way to effect economies in travel is not to travel, not pursuing chimerical things like this, but to save first-class fares. We have even given instructions that all travel, wherever possible, should be on Caribbean Airways so as to make use of the new regency class which has been introduced.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I know that this head is, in fact, the ministerial salaries Head, although honourable Members may not all realise it. But I do not think we want to have a debate on ministerial salaries. You are going to have one in a few months anyhow depending on the outcome of the wages negotiations, but I would only really appeal to Members not to return, forever and ever, to this theme which is one of the most popular opposition themes in the world, and which has never been known to succeed in its purpose of making a Government unpopular with the electorate.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 15 minutes.

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.

4.00 p.m.

On Resumption:—

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Speaker, this whole question of people not being able to vote, their names not being on the list in the right constituency in which they reside, is nothing new.

To answer the charges from the other side, in 1971 there were complaints that the very same sort of thing existed. In 1976 there were complaints, and I am not at all surprised that in 1981 these complaints have once again been aired. But, Mr. Chairman, there are reasons why these complaints are aired. There are reasons why these things happen.

I remember in 1976, Mr. Chairman, I ran in a constituency with which you are very familiar, and at that time, I remember there were several hundred people who could not be found on the Register and they were several hundred others who could be found, but their names were not on the Register. The elections were fought, and some won, and some lost. The same sort of statements which were aired from that time could have been aired at this time as well.

In 1981 after the boundaries were realigned and I declared interest in the constituency of St. Michael Central, I started to do my own little survey based on the list that was published on January 31, 1981 and it is a matter of record that I wrote to the Chief Electoral Officer on February 26, 1981. I wrote to the Chief Electoral Officer bringing to his attention, that based on the surveys I had carried out in the new constituency of St. Michael Central, that they were 609 persons who had fallen into four categories that could not be found.

They were 609 persons on the Registration List, but throughout the length and breadth of St. Michael Central

these people could not be found. I wrote them down in four categories (1) moved; (2) unknown; (3) deceased, and (4) overseas. To the best of my ability I tried to identify 609 people in those categories and I submitted their names and their addresses to the Chief Electoral Officer on February 26 urging that something be done, because I was very concerned that there were 609 people on the Register which I could not approach, which I could not ask for their support in the forthcoming general elections.

Sir, in relation to the cases of persons that have moved or persons that are regarded as unknown, I would like to bring to the attention of this Hon. House Section 7, subsection 3 of the Representation of the People Act Cap. 12 and it says:

"Where a person who is registered as an elector for a constituency has cease to reside in that constituency, he shall not on that account cease to be qualified to be registered as an elector for that constituency until he has become qualified to be registered as an elector for another constituency"

Now this is very difficult. If the law states that a person can move from one constituency to another, and until that person has registered in the new constituency they are still registered in the old constituency, this leaves room for a lot of errors.

Now with regard to those persons who are overseas, a look at Section 9 of the same Act states that:—

"A person registered pursuant to this Part shall remain registered unless, and until, his name is deleted from the register because —

- (a) he has died; or
- (b) an objection to his registration has been allowed; or
- (c) not being a foreign service elector, he has been absent from Barbados for a period exceeding five years; or
- (d) he has become disqualified for registration as an elector under this Act or any other enactment imposing disqualifications for registration as an elector."

In essence, Mr. Chairman, what this says is that the Chief Electoral Officer cannot remove the name of a person on the Registration List unless one can prove that that person has been out of the island for more than five years. Now this causes another problem, because there is no check made, or until recently there was no check made.

When a person left the island they did not have to inform anyone that they were leaving, so there was no way that the Chief Electoral Officer would have known that people would have left the island. Therefore, according to the law, the Chief Electoral Officer could not check the names of people who were reported not be found in the constituency unless it could be proven that they were out of the island for five years.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these are some of the reasons why, from time to time, whenever an election was called, you would find people who are registered in an area who would not find their names, and people who are not registered having their name on a registration list for that area. Until we can determine and establish the sort of procedure that would allow the Electoral Officer to follow the patterns of the movement of people, particularly in the St. Michael area, Mr. Chairman, then these sort of cries will from time to time be heard from members of the Opposition, be it the DLP Opposition or the BLP Opposition.

I have every reason to believe, Mr. Chairman, that the election was carried out according to the democratic and constitutional right of the people of Barbados, and that the Chief Electoral Officer, in particular, did a good job, and generally his support staff as well.

Mr. Chairman, the Chief Electoral Officer is the very same Electoral Officer that we found when we came into power in 1976. I just want to state for the record that I do not think that anyone on that side is shouting foul-play, because they appointed the Chief Electoral Officer. We found him there. The Hon. Prime Minister, who has responsibility for this area, re-appointed him, so the very same man who worked under the DLP Administration is now working under the BLP Administration. This Sir, goes to the credit of the man himself, because I do not think that anyone on this side of the House could say that the Chief Electoral Officer acted improperly. Quite the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I think the Chief Electoral Officer acted and did the best that he could do in very trying circumstances.

A few general points, Mr. Chairman. The polling facilities for the polling agents through the country have to be improved. The situation in St. Michael Central is no different, Sir, from the situation in the other 26 constituencies in Barbados — whether they use a dance hall, or a church, or a private citizen's home, the polling clerk was cramped. In many cases there were no desks, there were no chairs upon which the polling clerks could write.

My polling clerk had a list — by law they are entitled to have a list to check the names of the people as they come in to vote — and many of them had to have the list in their laps and they sat there with this list in

their laps from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m. It was very difficult, Sir, and I think that better facilities have to be made available throughout the whole island when a general election is coming up.

In my view also, Mr. Chairman, the police are not particularly *au fait* with the law. The police are not *au fait* with the Representation of the People Act. On more than one occasion on June 18 last year the police stopped me from crossing the boundary so that I could go and check to see if everything was right in the Polling Station because I was reported by my opponent who was also ignorant of the law, and the police tried to arrest me for breaking the law until I was able to convince him to call the Commissioner of Police to find out whether I was in fact right or wrong. It was only after he had contacted the Commissioner of Police that he came back and said to my opponent and to myself that we were entitled to cross the line to go into the station and check to ensure that everything was going on all right in our own interest, and that was that, Sir.

My opponent did not know and even the Police did not know. I think that the police that would be on duty during Election day, should have a one day seminar and be brought up-to-date and be made *au fait* with the law so that they themselves, when trying to give directions, would give proper directions.
4.30 p.m.

Certain regulations, Sir, can be distributed in the Police Force by the Chief Electoral Officer, or by the Commissioner of Police, himself, setting out the do's and do nots of the election day. I cannot over-emphasise, Sir, better facilities for the polling clerks, polling agents, counting agents, because 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. is a very long day and at the end of the election, irregardless of who is the winner, it is important that the loser feels satisfied that he has not been cheated. And I think that if these discrepancies and if these inconsistencies within the law can be sorted out, and the law more clearly defined in the area of people moving from one constituency to the next, then I believe that the Opposition, be it DLP Opposition, or BLP Opposition would certainly not put such a tinge to the Government after the election, because it does Barbados no good when an Opposition can get up and question the authenticity of an election. It does this country no good.

We are the third oldest Parliament in the Commonwealth, Sir, we have 350 years of democracy behind us of which we should be very proud, and it is a bad reflection, both on the Government and the Opposition, when such cries are made in this place, or in any other place.

In relation, Sir, to the last point which was made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in respect of Parliamentary salaries, I would just like to say I cannot support the honourable Member's call

because I believe that salaries should be commensurate with ability and responsibility and, by the same token, you cannot put people in charge of billions of dollars and expect them to be honest and conduct themselves in a dignified manner and make their sacrifices to this country unless, at least, they are well enough paid that when they go home they can afford some of the niceties for their family.

Sir, in private enterprise, Assistant Bank Managers, General Managers of private organisations that have nowhere near the responsibility of an ordinary Parliamentary Secretary draws more money than a Minister. Bank Managers in this country draw twice as much money and, in some cases, perhaps three times as much money as an ordinary Minister. I am not saying that they should not be drawing that kind of money, Mr. Chairman, I am not making that point at all. I am just simply saying that we in this country must begin to recognise that it does not do anyone any good to try to make the headlines by calling on Ministers to reduce their salaries when Ministers of Government work 16 and 18 hours a day invariably, Sir, seven days a week. They give of themselves to the country. When they make that sort of contribution, when people have that sort of commitment, Sir, I do not think it is fair that one should now ask, in addition to all that you are doing, that you should accept less than is being paid to the private sector. Already, you are accepting less, Mr. Chairman, already. The call has come now for you to accept less. I find that unacceptable.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Wind up, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: In winding up, Sir, in the words attributed to Abraham Lincoln — I just throw this out to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central — if I may quote, Sir:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich and you cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred."

Those were the words of Abraham Lincoln and I close on those.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....the honourable Member for St. Michael North.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. Sir, I had indicated earlier that I wanted to.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I remember the honourable Member indicated that he had some suggestions to make.....

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: That is correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: and he did not intend to go through a lot of what has been gone through before.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I did not say that, but that is correct too. Now, Sir, I said earlier that I wanted to make some suggestions, but before I get in to that again, there are some observations I want to make.

I am one of the first persons to acknowledge that one advantage made possible by the 1978 amendment to the Act was that it enabled persons who qualified right up to polling day to get on the Register. But, that in itself, Sir, helped to create the very problems of which I spoke earlier.

Frankly, Sir, I believe that there should be some cut-off period, and if it is necessary for persons who come of age or otherwise qualify on Polling Day to vote, maybe, Sir, there could be some way in which it can be done. I would still suggest, and I would want to suggest, that we have a return of publication of supplementary registers. That is the recommendation, Sir, I want to make. I do not believe it is too costly to keep people's confidence in the system alive, and for that reason, Sir, I think and I would urge the Government to make further amendment to the Representation of the People Act so as to make the publication of monthly or as they were called supplementary registers — or by whatever name they care to call them — possible so that people can understand that they will be able to come on the Register at a regular interval.

Now, having done that, Sir, it is my suggestion that there should be a cut-off date before Election Day so that the Register for Elections, if you want can retain that nomenclature, can be published sufficiently far in advance to enable persons to scrutinise it to see if their names are there, because registers are published off revised registers and so on — but scrutinise them to make sure that their names are there and to know where they should be going.

If it is then necessary for those who qualify after that cut-off date for the publication of the Register and Voting Day, it is very possible, Sir, for them to have another register for those persons only as we have a register of Foreign Service electors. Foreign Service electors have their own registers and they can cast their votes, and their votes are valid for whichever constituency they belong.

Similarly, Sir, for persons who come of age between the cut-off date and Polling Day, there can be a similar register for those persons. The advantage of that, Sir, is that it will enable candidates and electors alike to know sufficiently in advance where they are registered so that

we can have the return of the publication of the monthly register, we have the master registration list being made available to the respective parties, or maybe, Sir, made available to the Returning Officers for the various constituencies, if that is necessary. I am not too sure if that is necessary.

I spoke about the registering officers. I believe they should be more active in the field. Sir, I think it is important if we are to have confidence in the system that members of all political parties, candidates, should know how the system works, and I would suggest that their respective parties should be invited to see and witness the system, observe it, inspect it and see it in operation. I believe too, Sir, that the Press should be invited to have a look at the operation of the system.

I do not believe that there is anything sacrosanct about an electoral system. There is nothing classified about it, and if we are to have confidence in it I think that we should know how it operates. And my suggestion, Sir, is that these persons should be able to observe the system at work and be familiar with the system. In this way, Sir, if that is done, if the Press is involved, if the candidates are involved, if the general public is involved, — after all they boast of open Government — if these people are involved, Sir, then, there is no way that one can lose confidence in the system. These are my suggestions, Sir.

4.40 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under this particular Item, I would just like to query the appropriate Minister — this is Subhead 4 — 11 — where we see there is a reduction of operating expenses from \$300 000 to \$300. I wonder if this is correct, and I wonder what operating expenses can be done with only \$300.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is very perceptive. In respect of that Item I would only repeat to him what the Supervisor of Elections said to me. He said, "Make sure that no Member of Parliament does anything to cause even a by-election this year." That is the Item that deals with the actual holding of an election. You are perfectly right that \$300 cannot cover the holding of any sort of election, but we sincerely hope that all Members will enjoy good health, and I am fairly sure I will not have trouble with starters for a 27 horse race during the coming financial year.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, on this point, I would only like to support the call by the honourable Member on this side for the return to the monthly lists. There were two occasions during the last couple of years relating to elections which I want to speak about. One gave me occasion for a lot of sadness and the other for a lot of joy.

I remember when I was in England there was a documentary done on an election held in Guyana. The next day after that documentary, I do not think there was a single West Indian who could have held his head up in the light of what the documentary revealed, and that was the famous documentary shown where there were votes from England, and when they visited the addresses there were no houses, etc.

The second occasion was just after the 1976 election when a friend of mine from Guyana said there was no place else in the world where you could have been a member of the Government in power and lost an election by seven votes. That made me very happy, Mr. Chairman. It made me very happy because it amply verified something I always knew — that Barbados is looked up to among other things in the fairness in the conduct of its elections.

This is one of the reasons why there is always so much confidence placed in Barbados, and that is the reason why we have always been a people that would wait, because we believe that the time would come when we would be able, freely and democratically, to change any Government that we wanted to change. As a result, it is a kind of buffer and it keeps pressures down, and emotions running as low as is necessary until the time is right, and anything that would restore or keep the high confidence in the electoral system of Barbados is one to be welcomed.

In this respect I must say that it is not often that I have the opportunity to say that the Member for St. Michael Central's contribution is very measured and very responsible, but I can say that on this occasion. And I quite agree with him, because an election is an emotional thing and at the end of an election, be you winner or loser, you would like to be able to feel convinced with yourself that you have fought, that the results are accurate and fair, and that the better person won. Anything that would give you anything to doubt must be removed, and I am saying that returning to the monthly electoral lists which would allow all candidates to make ample examination of the lists, to prune the list and remove those who are not entitled to be on it, and put on those who are entitled, is an improvement.

There is one other suggestion I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. I think the conduct of the election is something that we should remove from the straight political partisan system, and I would like to see, if it is possible, some type of consultation at the level of the selection of Returning Officers for the constituencies. I think it can be done between the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister in charge of the appropriate section.

There was a lot of suspicion, because quite a lot of us felt uneasy when there was the mass removal of Returning Officers just after the last election, but luckily for me I am happy to say that the fears were not justified. I believe it was due to my vigilance and the fact that I made myself acquainted with the procedures, and I fielded a very good team.

But anything to make one comfortable in going into an election is good and right for this country, and I would like to appeal to the appropriate Minister to have some type of consultation at the level of the selection of the Returning Officers. It would certainly remove a lot of areas of suspicion and would make a lot of people feel a lot easier.

On the point of accommodation in Polling Stations, I agree with this, because there was a particular station in St. Philip South which was so uncomfortable there was no way people could have functioned properly. I would like to see very careful thought given to the selection of stations.

In closing, a lot has been said about the Civil Servants in this country. I think I am the only one in this present Parliament who has had the opportunity to head a Department, and I know the frustrations the Ministers complain of. I would be the first to join in beseeching all people to make every endeavour in this country to give of their best, production wise, because it really needs an effort on everybody's part.

Certainly, an occasion like this is also time for one to appreciate and put on public record that in Barbados, in our electoral administration, from the Civil Service point of view, I think we can all be justly proud. It is an area that I do not think any of the 27 or the 54 candidates had any doubt about the integrity of the person administering the election at that administrative level. In the same way that you can take a look at the adverse side of the Civil Service, I think you must take a look at the positive side of the Civil Service, and be grateful that we have people of integrity that could administer a system like that.

I must say the system last time had a few faults in it, but if you return to the monthly lists I am certain that after any other election there would be no area for complaint, and this would not be a topic that would take up the attention of any Estimates for any considerable time. Thank you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just a brief contribution to this Head 15. I shall speak first on a matter that really does not require a lot of debate. I do not believe that the question of the comfort of Ministers when they travel on official business is a matter which needs to be canvassed in this House. I would like to

believe that what we would be concerned with, primarily, is the amounts they are spending, the benefits which are to accrue from the conferences which they are attending, if any, and wherever possible that the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs should give an accounting of the benefits which have accrued from the travels of the Government.

Having had the opportunity and the honour of serving as a Minister in a Government of Barbados, I am aware of some of the difficulties attendant upon ministerial office, and certainly one of the things which I could not engage in debate about is the manner in which Ministers should travel. I do not think that that is a matter which requires any particular debate. The question of the comfort of a Minister when he or she is travelling ought to be a matter that we could put aside and leave out of the political arena. I therefore propose to leave it there.

I will wish, nonetheless, to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister, who is responsible for this Head, that it is important to the people of Barbados that there not be a feeling that Ministers are able to get additional perks through the Conferences and Delegations Vote. 4.50 p.m.

I think that was the first time we have managed to get the specific allowances which Ministers get and I think they should be made public. I don't think there should be any question about it, but I think it would be in the interest of the people of this country as a whole if this information would be made available to the public from time to time, and certainly when it has been improved or amended.

On the question of the Electoral Office, I was under the impression that the Government, toward the end of the last session, had committed itself to the establishment of an Electoral Board and that the last elections we had was going to be under the system of managerial direction, and to achieve an electoral office. I believe that the establishment of an impartial institution for the holding of elections, and the granting of that institution with the kind of power with which we have become associated in the context of the courts, would go a long way towards instituting the kind of confidence which my colleague the honourable Member for St. Philip North has just alluded to.

Whatever the Prime Minister may say about the reports, and however he may feel about the integrity of the Chief Electoral Officer — and we do feel strongly about his integrity — it is still a fact that in a substantial number, and indeed in all constituencies, there was sufficient confusion on Election Day to warrant a review of the system by the Government, or by the power who is responsible for an election. We think it is necessary

to point out that a number of persons in our constituencies had difficulty.

In my own constituency there were persons who voted more than once. There were poor persons who were unable to vote, and there were persons who had a valid ID card whose names could not be found for that constituency or any of the constituencies. It would seem to me that something is fundamentally wrong, and if a citizen goes through all the processes which are designed for him and he receives an appropriate ID card which is the final step in confirmation to be on the Electoral List, and then on the election day that citizen finds it impossible for him to vote, there is concern in the population when in the final result there are constituencies which have been denied 15 votes or 50 votes.

When you have that kind of problem, it is not sufficient for a Minister subsequently to state that we ought not be dragging over this and bringing up this matter as if this matter has been completed. The fact is that although an attempt was made to bring this matter to the Hon. House that matter was not completed in a manner that could be described as satisfactory to anybody in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the honourable Members of this House did not have the opportunity to express their views by way of a vote on the question of the return to monthly lists. I am satisfied that the Government can do this country good if it accepts the suggestion of the honourable Member for St. Michael North and return to the system of monthly lists for the Electoral List, because, Mr. Chairman, it is not only fair voting which must be done in the context and analysis of justice where voting must be seen to have been done.

It is well known to those who ought to know, I believe, that 1 700 to 2 000 workers' names appeared on the Electoral List, but somehow did not get to the computer room. And somewhere between the time we did an analysis, something went wrong, and it was my business to do this analysis. When we did it, between 1 700 to 2 000 persons whose names were certified in the Electoral Office as being eligible to vote did not manage to get to the computer room. That sort of information is sufficient for us to be concerned.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, when I began to speak I was not absolutely certain in my mind, but I am now. We indeed, in fact, made provisions in the Constitution by the establishment of a Boundaries Committee for Barbadians which would consist of a Chairman and Deputy Chairman and three other members. I am now able to categorically call on the Prime Minister to make provisions in these Estimates for the establishment of that office. I am now in a position to call on the Prime Minister to indicate to this Hon. House when the Government intends to institute these provisions which were

passed in 1981, Section 24 of the Statute which amended the Constitution of Barbados. In fact, it appears to have been proclaimed. I don't know for sure.

I believe that these steps should be taken to institute that Act. It would permit the Commission to not only establish itself, but to make leisable and reasonable separation for the next election whenever that election is to be held. Then the Government would free itself of the charge which has been heard in the highways and byways: that they "thief" the election. I am not laying the charge, I am just saying it has been said.
5.00 p.m.

I find it strange then, Sir, for us to be doing Estimates some considerable time after the last election and we are not yet dealing with the establishment of a Boundaries Commission. Such a Commission would, as it were, remove the holding of an election from the partisan arena — which once it is in the partisan arena is going to create a problem.

I would wish to ask the Prime Minister a specific question concerning Head 15, Item 26. I see here that professional services will be \$28 000. There is no detail information in the Explanatory Notes as to what these professional services are. I am not certain if these are computing services which are paid for through this department, but I am sure that it would be helpful if the Prime Minister could indicate what these professional services are.

I believe too, Sir, that while it is his desire to lessen the amount of appropriation, I think that the point raised by my colleague, the honourable Member for St. Philip North, requires some more thought. For him to indicate that \$300 in the vote is dependent on there not being a by-election, and for him to assert that he agrees that if there is a by-election \$300 would not be enough, I am advancing the view to him that it would be better for him to include an amount of money that would be reasonable, because if there is no election the money will not be spent.

If however, for whatever reason, there was a by-election, he has to go through the whole process of spending the money to bring the supplementary to get the amount of money that is necessary. It would be a case there of including a figure that is reasonable to avoid having to spend additional money, because if there is a by-election — and with the honourable Member admitting to arthritis you never can tell how these things will go, and we know of at least one other honourable Member whose situation will.....well, let me not go down that road — if there is a by-election he would then have to spend the cost of the election plus the cost of bringing the supplementary vote to the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have made the points that I wanted to make on this particular debate, and the other point which I wish to make can wait for another time. I think I will stop at this point.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not winding up, I am just trying to deal with things. I am trying to do the people's business and my memory may not carry me through three soporific speeches.

To the honourable Member who has just sat down, the answer to the question of the Electoral and Boundaries Commission is that as soon as it is feasible the Act will be brought into force and the Commission appointed.

I am surprised to hear the honourable Member raise it, because he and his party voted against the establishment of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission, and incidentally excited a comment in one of the London newspapers — I think it was the Daily Telegraph — that this is the only Opposition party in the history of the world that has ever voted against free and fair elections. I cannot help if the honourable Member has had a change of heart and he now.....(*Asides*)..... I don't know who put it in the newspaper. I read it and I was amused at the impact the Democratic Labour Party had had on independent observers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN instructed that certain remarks be struck from the record.

Nobody can come in here and say things that are said about the honourable Member for St. Michael West — how he has five houses, how he got them, what used to be in his garage in New York, and so on and so forth — and then say of course none of it is true — you should know it is being said, but it is not true. That is a tactic which should play no part in political life in our country.

You all do not know how many houses he had and how he is able to live on an MP's salary. All these snide remarks — because what I have just said is what is known as a snide remark — were intended to draw the attention of the public to something nasty in the woodshed, but then you say that there really was no woodshed there and there was never anything nasty in it. I am reminded of Dr. Johnson's statement when.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way.....the honourable Member while deploring a technique proceeds to use it. I will explain what I said. It is no nastiness. It is what the honourable Members on that side must have heard in the streets. People said

that. I am not trying to raise it as a technique to say it is true. Mr. Chairman, let me explain my position. If I wanted to say that, the honourable Member must know that I am bold enough to get up and say it. I would not have to use that technique like how he on about six occasions referred to nonsense about me. I do not wish to do that. If I ever reach that technique I will deal with the honourable Member myself, personally.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again I was reminded when I was interrupted that I had heard Dr. Johnson's comment on somebody's argument about patriotism. He said "patriotism, patriotism, the last refuge of a scoundrel."

I do not think that honourable Member talked about monthly lists. I think that the former Minister of Home Affairs whose competence during the 1971 election undoubtedly led to great advantages for his party — I refer to the honourable Member for St. Michael North — has always shown a great interest in electoral matters.

We are contemplating, and indeed I can say that I am now convinced that while we can never again have the excesses of spending involved in publishing a monthly list for every polling district in the entire island when the majority of them have nothing to report every month — in any given month there would be only one or two names on three foolscap sheets of paper, and it was a great waste, and it takes a lot of time and trouble to do it — what we are thinking is that we can have a single monthly list of all additions. That probably is the easiest way to do it. Just have the computer print out every addition to the list at the end of each month.

Certainly, there would be a reasonable output for the next couple of years, because at the time of the national registration exercise people aged fifteen and upwards were registered, so as they become 18 their names will go on to the list automatically, and the computer will have little difficulty printing those out.

The honourable Member asked about professional services. The Chief Electoral Officer also carries on the national registration exercise which is separate from electoral matters pure and simple, and the vote for professional services is for materials, the cost of hiring photographers, keeping the equipment in trim and so on. The job of the national registration exercise is regarded as not directly being part of the operating expenses of the Chief Electoral Officer's department, and therefore we put it into professional services because the chief payment, I believe, is the payment of photographers.

Perhaps we could have a new item. I will think about it for the next financial year. It has never crossed my mind before.

5.10 p.m.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a very small contribution to this Head here. I believe that it is right to say that no one enters an election with the understanding that they would lose. Even Mr. Webster who ran repeatedly in St. John believed that he would somehow, sometime, win that constituency. Mr. Haddock who ran repeatedly in the St. Michael South constituency, he too believe that somehow, sometime he would win, and Mr. Garner, another Barbadian who exercises his right to run in any national election. And so the Opposition believe, quite rightly so, that during the last election they too would have won.

What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is, when we called the election, the abuse that the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff was subjected to. I believe that there are honest public servants performing for the country at large and not for any one Party in power and to hear the accusations which followed after the Democratic Labour Party realised that they had lost — that there was general gerrymandering of the constituencies and that the election was stolen from the Democratic Labour Party — is understandable because no one enters an election with a view of losing. But I believe, Sir, that it is really unfair to that office that the accusations which the Democratic Labour Party put against these people were repeated so often.

The fact is that part of the problem prior to the election in this country was the people themselves. Before the election, Mr. Chairman, the Government Information Service, repeatedly on the news media, stressed the fact that there was a national registration going on in Barbados. The point is, Sir, that the people thought that the Government was using this registration for taxation purposes and they gave a lot of wrong information to the enumerators who were doing the process because they felt generally that the information was going to be used for taxation purposes.

Also, Mr. Chairman, after the writ was served for elections to be held in June, the same week the Electoral Office was inundated with over 6 000 applications in one week. That is the number of applications the Electoral Office had to contend with in one week. After having quite a considerable length of time to go and register at the Insurance Office, the strain was too much, I believe, for the limited number of people there, and I would contend that the people themselves are to blame to some extent for some of the confusion which followed on Election Day.

Gerrymandering of constituencies is a common charge by the Member for St. Michael South Central. I believe that no matter what this Government tries to do that the Opposition will come up with some reason to believe that there is some clandestine axe behind it. I represent the constituency formerly with over 12 000 people. The Member for St. John had about 4 000.

people, St. Lucy about 4 000 people — just over, St. Andrew about 4 000 and the Government said that it would try to regularise and create a fair balance within the various constituencies, so a Boundaries Commission was set up and yet we are to hear that it was an unfair.

It was wrong to try to equate the number of constituencies, to make fair recommendations to the people but I guess that.....(Asides)..... that is what you think. You said that it was general gerrymandering of the constituency. I had 12 000 people. It was unfair for the Member for St. John to have 4 000 people and get the same salary. (Asides). Never mind. I will be getting rid of, and so will you.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the people of Barbados are better informed as to what their responsibilities are as citizens of this country, and they were to be more involved and understand that there is nothing clandestine about elections, that they have a right to take part and that it is their constitutional right, to register early rather than wait and flood the National Insurance Office for registration, that they will be doing the country and themselves a good. That is the point, Sir, — not to say that the information which is going to be given to the enumerators is going to be used as a means of getting taxes from them, that is a non point. They have their commitment to the country and they should exercise their democratic right.

I do not understand what is coming from the other side. The honourable Member for St. Philip South said that one thing Barbados can be respected for is its fairness in its conduct of the elections. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is accusing the Government of gerrymandering the constituencies. It seems to me that that side is not *au fait* with what is going on, and they, themselves, are not really *au fait* with what is happening.

The Electoral Office will have to devise a system for those who are automatically struck from the Register. That is one of the problems we are having. I believe there is more than one John Brown in Barbados and if John Brown lives, let us say, at Rendezvous and John Brown dies, the Electoral Office should have some means of finding out whether John Brown of Rendezvous has died and not John Brown from Pie Corner, so remove John Brown from Rendezvous.

It is also wrong to say that the Electoral Office has a great number of deceased on the Electoral List. They cannot remove people from the list unless they are notified. If I went away or my mother went away, or any Member of this Chamber went away, and the office was not notified, they could not remove that person, so there is some area where the machinery would have to be put into motion to notify the Electoral Office as to the

movement of the people in Barbados. They cannot remove a person unless that person has given notice, or they themselves have been notified that the person no longer resides in Barbados.

I live in the St. James South constituency and I wanted to exercise my right on Election Day, and I went to two Polling Stations. My wife and I live in the same house, and when I checked with her she told me that she did not see where I was voting with her. I went to that office and when I got there they sent me to another office, so, generally, something must have been wrong.

Moreso, is the fact that I find the processing by the officers conducting the affairs of Government on Polling Day to be rather slow and during the closing hours of Polling Day, Mr. Chairman, generally there is a large build-up of people.
5.20 p.m.

I would want to suggest that some system be devised that people more knowledgeable of the electoral process be involved in future elections in Barbados because we find there is a long line of people and a clerk going through the lists cannot find a name, he does not know what to do, and the line continues to build up — people want to exercise their right to vote and then you hear it is almost time to close the polls. I believe, as one Member said, that an impartial body should be set up to administer the clerical routine, the functions on Election Day — that should be established.

If I may say so, Sir, an area which the Hon. Minister responsible should be able to shed a light on is the matter concerning incapacitated persons.

Just before the elections, we were told from the Electoral Office that incapacitated persons would be visited by a vehicle from that department and the normal registration would take place. I want to know whether the Hon. Minister can tell me if this is still happening and what would one have to do if it is not happening, because there are quite a few people who are incapacitated who cannot make it down to that office to be registered. They are at home and they need to have some kind of identification to cash their cheques and it would be unfair to have them at home with a cheque in their hand which the banks would not honour unless they have some form of identification.

Those incapacitated persons, I believe should be registered. If it is not being done, I would like to know that some vehicle be sent to them, or something be done to have them put on the Electoral List.

People who have gone overseas also, Mr. Chairman, something should be done to notify the office that they no longer reside in Barbados after the specified time allo-

cated by law for the continuance of their names on the Registration List.

But, generally, I feel that the people themselves added to the problems in the last election waiting until the last moment, the very last moment, to register at the office and creating a problem there for the limited staff at the Registration Office.

If these few points could be verified, if the people feel that they have a part to play in the electoral process and it is in their interest to register early, I believe we can easily remove the doubts from the minds of people that elections are rigged in Barbados and there is a measure of unfairness, generally, in the electoral process in this country.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief points at this point in time.

Firstly, I believe that we should make a very early start in getting the various lists in the constituencies brought up-to-date. In my own constituency, Sir, I would believe that about as much as 20 percent of the names on that register for St. Michael South Central would be incorrect.

With the gerrymandering and the changes in the boundaries, major areas in the Brittons' Hill area — some are registered in St. Michael South — whole blocks have not been transferred to St. Michael South Central. With the changes in the Halls Road area — although an attempt was made by me when I informed the Chief Electoral Officer — there are still many persons in that area registered in the City who should be registered in St. Michael South Central and persons registered in St. Michael South Central who should be registered in the City. These are just two examples.

Large numbers of deceased persons, large numbers of persons who are known to have been away for 10 or 15 years, large numbers of persons who have left the constituency permanently and are residing elsewhere, their names can be still found in St. Michael South Central and either not found in the constituency in which they are living now where they would have been living for five, six or seven years, or their names appear both in St. Michael South Central and elsewhere.

And it is my feeling that there is a need to carry out an enumeration of each and every constituency starting now and that this should be done under the Representation of the People Act where people know that the only purpose of that registration is for the purpose of voting, and that the lists would be so constructed as to

avoid all the problems adverted to by the Member who has just spoken before me and the many other problems that arose out of the attempt to construct a list using a completely different Act, and then to remove names.

We have never attacked the Chief Electoral Officer or his staff because we recognise that the problems created were those due to bad decision-making in respect of the elections by the Government itself. If, for example, when that registration was being carried out the Government had said that this was for election purposes after having said on several occasions in this Parliament that it was not for that purpose, and then at the last minute try to use it for that purpose, that in itself would have created a lot of confusion in people's minds because they felt that it was all right if they had their old identification card. They were told publicly from the Floor of Parliament, they were told on the GIS programmes and they were told by various other releases that that exercise had nothing to do with elections and many people did not go to get their new ID cards, and that was responsible for the sudden flood of people into the Electoral Office in the last week.

So I support very strongly the return to the monthly list and sharply disagree that this would involve any significant cost. It would be the cost of paper and maybe the cost of typing or something like that, or cyclo-styling the list. It will not be a significant cost but it will certainly give a lot more comfort to all of us that we know what is happening in constituencies from month to month.

But there is no point doing that unless that information is being grafted on to what is essentially an accurate list, because at the moment — I do not know about other Members in the St. Michael area but I believe that this problem would principally affect representatives from the St. Michael area — there are many errors on the list, many wrong names on the list, whole districts not included in the list in one or two instances — that whole area up in the area of Warners Gap and the surrounding area there has never been properly transferred from St. Michael South to St. Michael South Central. There are also major errors in the area along Layne's Road where there is a border in the Britton's Hill area and there is a lot of confusion with the list in that area.

So unless you get the basic list correct — which means a fresh enumeration under the Representation of the People Act so that you can get your basic list right — and then gradually graft on by the publication of your monthly list, and then each year at the end of January you publish the Official Register, I suspect that most persons will have the same problem.

5.30 p.m.

There are hundreds of people on my list that I cannot identify, and I have a pretty tight operation on a polling district basis in St. Michael South Central, and nobody can identify those names. The point is that the list is so confused at the moment that you need to start off by an enumeration for the purpose of an election under the Representation of the People Act, and the people who are included on that basic list would be people who are *bona fide* electors. You need to clear that ground first of all and, in the meantime, revert back to the publication of the monthly lists.

One final point I would like to make, Sir: I strongly believe that we get too concerned in this country about images. I strongly believe that.

The United Nations has just taken a major step and cut out first class travel, except for one or two people, the Secretary General and somebody else at that kind of level in respect of the U.N. The British Government has taken steps in that direction, but what we are seeing here in Barbados is that you would not even draw the line at Ministers.

I have seen with my own eyes people from various Statutory Boards in Barbados travelling all over the place tax free, at taxpayers' expense, first class. If you want to make out a case that Ministers should travel first class, I do not agree with you, but it is not a matter that I feel strongly about — I have already said that I believe that on long trips it is reasonable.

But I am telling you that there are people way down the line in the Public Service of Barbados taking advantage of that situation, and advantage of the public purse. I am drawing it to your attention because it should be examined, and while in Barbados you feel it is a big image-building thing to be travelling first class, let me tell you what is happening in the world today.

The people that have money are beginning to realise now that with the diminishing standard of services and so on, the value is no longer there, and that is happening all over the world. I will tell you this: up to ten years ago I would opt to travel first class, and now I travel economy, because I find most of the time I do not get value for my money. Do you hear what I tell you? So it is no big thing. Look and see where public money is being wasted way down.

I have seen junior executive officers of Statutory Boards in Barbados travelling at public expense—first class. That is right, I have seen that, and you have to start cutting out that foolishness. If you are asking people to hold strain, tighten their belts, wear dog collars instead of belts

and this kind of thing, if you are asking people to do that, then at least show some responsibility in cutting back on areas of expenditure.

If you wish to draw the bottom line at Ministers, no problem with me, but you must accept that there is a genuine case for looking for unnecessary expense further down the line, particularly when you are dealing with short trips and so on that would not involve any significant discomfort for anyone. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: LIAT?) LIAT does not have any first class anyhow. As a matter of fact, a lot of the major carriers do not have any first class any longer, and probably in another few years you may find the whole business of first class disappearing, and this stupidity of image would gradually disappear as first class disappears.

So that even if you take the decision in respect of Ministers that it is reasonable, no major quarrel with me, but look further down the line, look and see what is happening in the Statutory Board, because the same case that can be made out for Ministers cannot be made out for them, and that involves the wastage of public money. I feel strongly about it, I feel it is a bunch of nonsense.

I know that very often when I have the option of travelling first class — paid for by somebody — or travelling economy, I travel economy. Why should I travel to New York first class when I can travel economy? It is a waste of people's money, and the service is terrible.

I had the experience of travelling to America with American Airlines — economy — and got good service, but when I came back down first class there was no difference in the seating and the service was lousy. That is a fact. Even the food was terrible on the way down, so we have to get out of the area of images and start looking at the bottom line.

You have to draw the bottom line somewhere, and you know what I am saying is true — that people are taking advantage of that situation. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know you cannot sell Taitt, Sandiford nor Blackman on that). It does not matter.

As I said, if you want to draw a bottom line, draw a bottom line somewhere, it has to be done. Very often a first class passage costs about twice an economy passage, and what is the point of wasting money in that direction? At least if you are dealing with Ministers you are dealing with a small number of people. (*Aside*). Yes, if you are dealing with Ministers you are dealing with a small number of people, but the point I am trying to get across to you — and you would not face up to — is that I am telling you that there are many other people in greater numbers than Ministers.....(Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: But you have made the point). I have

made the point and you have to address yourself to the point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You must address yourself to the point, but I am going to come back to it again, I am going to keep beating it all the time, because it is a waste of money.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Prime Minister is within hearing distance. He did not respond to the question as to when, or if, it is his intention to establish an Electoral Boundaries Commission. He did raise the question about the Opposition not having voted for the particular amendment, and I believe the record has to be put straight, so I have taken the trouble to send for Hansard, because the particular question which was being canvassed and which was discussed in this House was not the desirability or otherwise of an independent Boundaries Commission.

I read, Sir, from page 5521 of Hansard. I am reading my own speech because of the debate we have. I began:

"Mr. Speaker, at first blush it might appear that if one looks at this measure in a plus or minus way and one takes a position that one cannot support this Bill, it might appear as if one were arguing against the concept of an independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. I wish to submit, Sir, that this issue is not whether one agrees with the establishment of an independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission or not. The issue here, Sir, is much more fundamental, and deals with a matter that is of much more importance in the long term for the people of Barbados — both the present generation and the generations to come — than whether one agrees or not with the establishment of an independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission."

Then, Mr. Chairman, as I concluded my debate, I had this to say:

"Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not a desirable thing for Barbados. I submit that the question of excluding the courts is one which we ought to have looked at in some more detail, and it strengthens my view that this particular Bill ought to have been subject to some canvass outside of this Hon. House before it had been brought here. Out of an abundance of caution, if nothing else, Sir, it would be difficult to agree to vote in favour of this Bill, and hence even if all the honourable Members in this Hon. Chamber had found it convenient to

vote for this amendment to the Constitution, I say, Sir, that I find it impossible in the circumstances to subscribe to what is about to be done. I will not vote for this Bill, Sir, I will not support it. It has nothing to do with supporting the principle of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission that is free of political interference, it has to do with a manner of doing things and a system which has been accepted as the way to do things in our society. I do not accuse anybody of chicanery, I do not accuse anybody of attempting to stay in power — I could not do it here — but I say that the way it is being approached is wrong, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I find myself unable to support this Bill.”

5.40 p.m.

I see, Sir, it is not the first time the Prime Minister in a debate has done that sort of thing where, thrusting to his own memory at the exclusion of other people, he seeks to pass a different gloss over a particular issue. We never said that we were against an independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission. That is why I am able to be consistent when I call today for the implementation of the constitutional amendment. What we said then, and what happened in that particular debate, is that the constitutional amendment excluded the courts, and we argued that because the courts were excluded within the constitutional amendment, the courts would have to stay excluded because whereas in the past the courts may have attempted to issue a review of statutes of the Constitution, it was in that context we did not vote for the amendment.

I thought the record should be set clear on that and for the benefit of the Hansard Reporter the last quotation came from page 5525. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I sat down and listened to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and I really listened with some wonder and amazement when he attempted to dramatize the idea that Ministers of Government should travel other than first class when they go overseas on Government business. I think it is only fair that I note this for the record of interested honourable Members.

I had a rather embarrassing experience which I am sure that the honourable Member would not wish to be faced with. I was delegated to represent Barbados at a meeting of the CARICOM Council of Ministers held in Guyana, and I was booked to travel on Guyana Airways. I flew into Trinidad and from Trinidad I caught Guyana Airways.

But what really was amusing about that experience was that there was no first class, or rather I had to sit like all other persons. At the airport there were people who wanted to get back home with lots of boxes and big

bags. The first embarrassment that I had was people asking me to carry some of their luggage along with me. When you got on board I was seated along-side children screaming and people smoking in an uncomfortable manner.

Sir, I would like to ask the honourable Member if he was representing Barbados in a high level position, and if he travelled in those conditions, would he be satisfied to travel again to represent Barbados? The situation was that when you got up you were smelling of smoke and all your clothes were rumpled, and you were expected to be met by dignitaries of another country. That is the unpleasant experience which a member of this Government had.

I support any Member, either from this side or that side, when they have to go first class. One has to allow for the very short time he has at his disposal. Sometimes meetings are of urgent nature and Ministers are asked to respond at the eleventh hour, and that means that in order to acquaint yourself with very vital information it would be necessary to do some research whilst sitting on the plane.

It is important why people must see these circumstances and understand why Ministers should travel first class, because it helps them to concentrate when they have very important meetings, with limited time at their disposal, to do some work aboard the plane. I am not saying that one would not get some opportunity to do the work on some trips, but one cannot expect to relax in comfort or to do work for his country with this sort of movement.

I am allergic to smoke and had to be seated in a smokers area. I feel if I am called upon to represent my country, I should be accommodated with the best and anyone in that similar capacity should be afforded that same treatment too.

Now on the question of the Electoral Office a lot has been said — views, criticisms have been expressed. I am not going to be a defendant of the Electoral Office but what I would like to say is this: what the Electoral Office of Barbados is experiencing is not uncommon of other electoral offices?

It is very difficult for the Electoral Office to be able to strike off every deceased person. Everybody knows that it is easier to know with the new register system when someone comes on to the register and who obtains the minimum age of 18 years. It is difficult if people die a couple of days before the election for the office to know that the person has died and should be taken off the register. It would depend on information coming from the Registration Office before the Chief Electoral Officer can act.

There are cases where persons have moved from one polling district to another. Here, again, the Chief Electoral Officer cannot act immediately because there is a time factor, some three months must elapse before the Electoral Officer can move in and take appropriate steps. Here, Mr. Chairman, one has got to consider the facts that even though the Chief Electoral Officer is empowered to automatically change that registration of the elector, he must be guided by certain information. He has to know where the person has gone to live and in order to get that information he has to send someone from the Electoral Office to check that. In the absence of that check-out information, the Electoral Office cannot proceed to make the necessary amendments. So we must understand that and give some allowance for these things. 5.50 p.m.

It is not fair for one to be critical, time and time again, of the Electoral Office, and I will say — and I am not going to compromise my position on this — that if all of us in here had done our homework, or do the sort of homework which we should do as professional politicians, I am sure a lot of the problems that confront us, or some of the things we complain about we would not complain about today.

There are some of us who I know operate on a very high professional level. They know when people die, they know when people move out and they know how many families and how many people will be coming on to the Electoral List — because they have a proper system.

And I will say that maybe this was one of the very reasons why the Hon. Prime Minister and Government opted for the idea of introducing secretaries for Parliamentarians. These secretaries can be invaluable in situations like these. The secretaries can be given certain responsibilities to see that the list is kept up-to-date, and if this is being done and the politician is doing his homework, then I am sure that at election time there would not be any problem. He should know exactly how many people are off and where the people have gone.

I will say this for the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central: — you know I listen to him very carefully, because he knows he has a very up-to-date system — there were people who moved out of St. Michael South Central and they were living in St. John and St. George, and because he knew that they were his sympathisers and they would vote for his party, he never knocked them off the list. I know that for sure and he would not deny it. He kept them on, and any clever politician would do that or go through this exercise. It is a political game.

On the other hand, as the Hon. Prime Minister has indicated, if the person is a known opponent of yours and your party — he is not a sympathiser of yours — it is

in your interest to raise an objection and there is a form provided. All this talk that people get in here and talk, the people must understand that there are Objection Forms and Change-of-Residence Forms, and they are provided by the Electoral Office. It is not fair for anyone to get in here and criticise the Electoral Office if they did not change someone's address, because the politician, the representative, can use these forms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I have used them. That is one of the main reasons why I am in here as the elected representative for St. Michael South East. I did my homework because of all the things that were said and encouraged by the Opposition members. I had to use my thinking cap, and use it very well, and do my homework, because I had to look to see that the people who were not sympathetic to my cause and had moved out of the constituency were knocked off. I transferred over 300. That is how I was able to get home. No wonder the honourable Member for St. John said that I came in here by accident. There is no accident in this. That was a planned accident and I like to plan these accidents.

So as I said, let us not take the Electoral Office and use it as a whipping boy. It is not fair. Let us realise that we have a responsibility, and if we are professional politicians as we should be — because I have learnt that this is a career business — we should do our homework and make use of all the relevant information, and I am sure that many of the criticisms now levelled at the Electoral Office would no longer be valid.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 10 o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday, March 24, 1982.

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

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

On Resumption:

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Your Honour, that the question be now put.

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

The question that Head 15 with amendments stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Head 16 – Prime Minister's Office – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16 do now stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 16 stand part.....

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Head 16, Subhead 3, Item 3(a) Maintenance of Property and the note reads:

"This subhead provides for the expense of the Prime Minister's official residence."

Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the way we have been debating these Estimates, and in keeping with the new consensus – that it is better in times like these to allay any fears and suspicions – I think that the time is right for us in this Hon. Chamber, and for Barbados as a whole, to have some proper estimation of the money spent in the renovation of the premises for the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of this country.

We have all accepted as a fact that there is an official Prime Minister's residence. We have all accepted as a fact that the building needed some type of renovation to bring it to the standard necessary for this type of use. All of us are aware of this.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary that we should have some indication of the cost to the taxpayers for the preparation of this house for its present use. Time and time again, we on this side have sought to

ascertain, in a comprehensive way, what the renovations had cost so we could satisfy ourselves that it is money well spent and that there was no undue wastage – particularly in a time like this where there is such a short supply of money available to the Government.

My understanding is that this was always very difficult to ascertain since various sections of Government, and different agencies at some time or the other, had something to do with the renovation, refurbishing, *et cetera* of this House.

For argument's sake, it is within my knowledge – I have been informed – that the Parks and Beaches Commission has been responsible for the landscaping of the property. I understand at some time that part of the Vote from the Ministry of Education has been used. I understand that there might be funds from the Ministry of Transport and Works that went towards this, and I seek, in a very level way, Mr. Chairman, to let us all get this behind us, because if we are going to press forward in riding out the crisis situation that we are in, we must remove all areas of suspicion and doubt. You always open yourself to suspicion and doubt if people seem to think that you are hiding something from them, particularly Parliamentarians, and I think that this is a good opportunity for the Hon. Leader of the House or someone who is more *au fait* with the situation to give us a breakdown of the expense to date on the renovation of the Prime Minister's residence, how soon the Prime Minister is expected to take up occupancy, *et cetera*, what is likely to be the annual cost for maintaining it so that we will be able to have one documented evidence and one statement on the full cost of this particular project to the taxpayers in Barbados.

By doing this we will remove it and would not have to get back to it at any other time in the future. We have accepted that it is a *fait accompli* – the house is there, the building is being refurbished – and all we seek to do is to find out and to make sure in our minds that the taxpayers' money has not been in any way used badly by lack of productivity or anything.

I would be very grateful to the Hon. Leader of the House or the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, if he comes before this Head is finished, if we can get a resume of the expenses to date on this particular area.

Thank you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am seeking the information as to the up-to-date cost of the repairs for the official residence of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister but I also would like to remove any fears, allay any fears, as to money badly spent at Ilaro Court.

The Honourable Member who seeks this information, the Member for St. Philip South.....(ASIDE: North)..... North — I beg your pardon, Sir, South is not in here yet — for St. Philip North is a land surveyor by profession and also a part-time builder and real estate agent. He is involved in all of these things, I know this as a fact, and I think that he is well aware that when you have to repair an old building it is always difficult to estimate its cost and I think this is one of the problems which we may be faced with. You are either going to repair Ilaro Court now, do a very good job of it once and for all, so that all Barbadians can be justly proud of the residence of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

The house was bought by your Administration when you were in power. It has fallen into a state of disrepair and we have undertaken the challenge to repair, to renovate and landscape Ilaro Court where it can be — not a show piece for Barbadians or for the present Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, but for all Prime Ministers.

It has a history behind it, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall exactly how old it is but it was owned by a former Governor of Barbados, the late Sir Gilbert Carter, and it was built, I am told, for a very small sum of money somewhere in the 17th or 18th century. May be I would be in a better position to tell you what period it was built in if the Clerk of the House.....anyhow, it was built many, many years ago. I believe it is under National Trust but I am subject to correction.

I can appreciate the honourable Member for St. Philip North's fears. But as far as money badly spent, and in this time, if you know the present Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Barbados and Minister of Finance, even in his private life he is very, very, very close with a dollar, and he has made it abundantly clear to his colleagues that when he has to spend his own money, his personal money, that he can hold on to it — that when he puts his hands on a dollar, you can hear the dollar holler.

Therefore, if it is the taxpayers' money which he has control over, you can rest assured it is in very good hands — as you have seen in the past how well he has managed the money, how well he has managed the finances of the country. And even in these very difficult times where there is a world-wide recession, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is still in control. Honourable Members on both sides, and people in the country as a whole, can rest assured it is in the hands of a man with a fist like a vice grip.

I hope to give you the information as to what the outlay is going to be a little later in the day as I have sent off to get the information from the officers responsible. I hope that answers your question.
10.15 a.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I think that if we continue this way it would create the atmosphere in Parliament that we need to get ahead with the people's business, and I am very grateful for the assurances of the Leader of the House that figures will be made available.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$766 567 under Head 16 — Prime Minister's Office — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Head 71 — Prime Minister's Office was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$974 635 under Capital Expenditure — Head 71 — Prime Minister's Office — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one question under Head 71. I notice that under Subhead 4, according to the Explanatory Notes, that funds are included to pay the balance of professional fees due to the Contractors, and provision is also made for the demolition of a building in relation to the Administration of Justice and the Supreme Court complex. My understanding is that that is a project which has been deferred, and it would seem that a substantial amount of professional fees are still outstanding.

While one can appreciate that while the project was in train there would have been the need for the preliminary professional fees, I would like a little explanation of that cost, and particularly — I am not sure if the project is being abandoned — why is there the necessity to make provision for the pushing down of a building? I believe that if one sold that building by auction, as is the custom in Barbados, or if one gave it away to persons who would remove it — and there are a number of people in Barbados who seem to specialise in that field — there would be a saving of funds. I am wondering why the Government considers it necessary and/or desirable to pay for pushing down the building, especially in light of the fact that the project is not being continued.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I think that some information would help the honourable Member on his queries, which are very valid queries. With respect to the professional fees, there has been an argument going on in Barbados for some period of time as to the percentage which is payable to the professionals — the architects, the engineers and the quantity surveyors — when a decision is taken that a project is not to be carried on at the particular stage. We have reached the stage where the project was past final design. There is a strong argument as to whether 75 per cent of the total professional scale fee is not due and owing at that period of time. I think the honourable Member for St. Philip North would be familiar with this argument.

As you know, the engineering scale, the architectural scale and the quantity surveying scale are at preliminary design stage, at final design stage, and then you have a fee for post contract work. Now this building had reached the stage of final design. The cut off point at that time is when you have presented documentation which is sufficiently detailed to go to bid. I think that answers that. There is a claim when you reach that stage which obviously has to be evaluated.

Now, Sir, with respect to the professional fee due to the contractors, in order to do the design the contractors had to be called in to do the test pits. Honourable Members would be aware that nowadays, so sophisticated has the preliminary work in the construction industry in Barbados reached, particularly now we are building above three and four storeys, that there is a lot of foundation design work that has to be done. The engineers are particularly cautious and they demand actual test pits to be dug so that they can get the soil mechanics. So the contractors involved here would be contractors in relation to that preliminary work, digging test pits and all that. They are not building contractors overall.

Now, the other point about the building. The usual procedure in Barbados is that you invite tenders for the demolition and removal. There are two or three specialists in Barbados. I think there is one called Mr. Bowen, who is a well known specialist in this area, and a few others. There are a few other people who use heavy equipment and knock them down, but every attempt is made to salvage the raw material that is left. Some of those buildings might have been constructed with soft stone and it is a fact now that there is a good market for soft stone once again, so that the Chief Supply Officer, the man who is in charge of all Government contracts, Mr. Reece,..... each Ministry has to request the Crown Solicitor to draw up a preliminary contract and the Tenders Committee advertise it. This is completely outside the control of the Ministry, it is done by contractual arrangement after advertisement.

Now, after the buildings have been removed, it is the intention to do some small grading so that the site can be used as a car park. Also, within this Head, I believe that something is going to be done on trying to ensure that some work will be done to Codds House, which was the old Waterworks building. We cannot in this year do the full repairs to Codds House, but some work will be done to prevent further deterioration of the roof — with the water and things like that.

That is the whole area of the Supreme Court, but we are not going to tender for the Supreme Court contract this year. We said that before.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Just one thing on Head 71, Subhead 2, Sir, where there is provision for \$120 000 for the purchase of a log-grabbing truck and boat slings. I am wondering if this is not going to incur an expense under Other Statutory Emoluments, because since you have this type of equipment there must be somebody to maintain it and also to operate it. There is no provision in your Estimates for personnel to man this type of stuff.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Honourable Members would recall that when we had the hurricane — I am not sure if it was Allen or David — about two or three years ago, when we had damage in the north, and particularly in the rest of the island, we had a lot of trees that were felled by the force of the wind. One of the problems we found in Barbados was that we could deal adequately with a great part of the damage but there were some very large trees we could not deal with because we did not have the sophisticated equipment, and it took a much longer time to clear the roads. I remember a classic case was outside the old hospital by the former nurses' residence. I think you can still see part of a tree trunk there. They managed to take off the branches, but it has a big girth.

There is also at the Ministry of Trade a very big tree that was blown down, and it went over into Tropical Batteries building. We managed to take off the branches, but it took a tremendous amount of work. We had to hire cranes from, I believe, a Mr. Edghill and others.

The Ministry of Communications and Works will be providing the personnel to work, but the Ministry of Communications and Works will say that it does not fall under their Head, but this is for an emergency, and CERO is responsible for this. But personnel will either be provided by them, or the Defence Force will work it, because we are trying to build up an emergency integrated unit in Barbados. It has always functioned so before.

The honourable Member may not be old enough, but I certainly was old enough because I was here in

the hurricane in 1955, and I knew at that time that there was the equivalent of CERO and everybody from various Ministries worked together, but there is bound to be a co-ordinator, and CERO is the coordinator, so they must have equipment within their vote to be able to deal with these situations.

10.25 a.m.

The question that the sum of \$974 635 under Capital, Head 71 – Prime Minister's Office – was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Head 17 – Defence and Security – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 – Defence and Security – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are amendments.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17 – Defence and Security – as amended stand part of the Schedule.....as circulated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These should have been all circulated.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, circulation is not moving amendments in this Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not speaking to the honourable Member.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if we move a Head and there are amendments to the Head, this Committee must be told what the amendments are. You cannot say "as circulated". That is not in accordance with procedures in this House. We must get up and indicate to the House what the amendments are.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member would give way, I just had to ask for the amendments. I can only assume that you had the amendments too, if that answers your question.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Leader of the House agrees – there is no quarrel about this – but this is a procedural matter. If the amendments are circulated to the House, you still have to get up and move them on the Floor of the House on your feet, not just say "as circulated".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Honourable Member wants to know exactly what the amendments are.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have not got to get up on my feet and say in detail what the amendments

are. If they are circulated, the Head stands part as circulated. If there are additional amendments then I will draw them to the honourable Member's attention. Do you want me to stand up and say "delete \$1 197, put in a comma here, remove a full stop, put in a question mark"? What nonsense am I hearing? They were circulated, you have them and I move that the Head stand part as amended.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if you want to do things in an unconstitutional way, we can continue to do them in an unconstitutional way, but we are warning you that there are going to be problems arising out of this way of doing things in an unconstitutional and unparliamentary manner. I am certain, Mr. Chairman, you would not wish to preside over anything that is being done in an unparliamentary way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head 17.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way as far as matters relating to defence and security are concerned, a very long way since we were told that this country did not need any Coast Guard service, a very long way since we were told that the money to be spent in these areas should be spent in other areas of the economy.

Everything that took place as far as defence and security are concerned indicates the wisdom and foresight of our party over here, the Democratic Labour Party, in planning for the adequate defence of this country. And now, those who were the arch-opponents of the establishment of that service have become the stoutest and staunchest defenders of the Defence Force and the Coast Guard service.

They said we did not need it, but now they are saying that we need it more than ever, and perhaps one of the few estimates in these provisions which have not suffered severely in the cut-back and in the retrenchment, the laying off of workers, is this particular Head of Defence and Security. We are told that the Government finances are in a bad way, that we have to tighten our belts and therefore that we have to reduce our expenditures, but one of the few areas which such reduction of expenditures did not affect is the Head – Defence and Security.

We make it clear that we have no objection to the establishment and maintenance of a Defence Force for Barbados and for the necessary Coast Guard services as part of that defence. We make it absolutely clear, because, in fact, the original idea and the necessary papers and documentation and the necessary requests for funds for the establishment of such a service were all initiated

by the Democratic Labour Party — so it cannot be that we are against such a service.

What we have to ask ourselves is whether in the present circumstances of economic recession, in the present circumstances of belt tightening, in the present circumstances of cut-backs, retrenchment in the Public Service and the sending home of a vast number of employees in temporary positions and maybe elsewhere — I do not know — the Head Defence and Security should not bear its fair share of such cut-backs.
10.35 a.m.

Why should it be that those who work in the Ministries, that the supplies, materials and equipment necessary for adequate housing, health, education, agriculture and so on, must suffer severely from the cut-backs but when we look for the Head of Defence and Security you can find an overall increase in the provision? The question is, how much should there be provided for such a service in competition with the other services required for the good government of this country?

We have been told a lot of things about the Coast Guard service. We were told that the boats originally bought could not be refitted because the contractors who had provided those boats, such as the George Fergusson and so on, had gone out of business. That is what we were told. But what this House has not been told is that the company which fitted those boats may, in fact, have gone out of business, but that the business might have been taken over by the company which built the hulls. Therefore it is not only the hulls, but at least also the fittings of that business has been taken over by this company.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to know what is the position in respect of the fitting out of those boats, how many of them are actually serviceable? How many of them are actually in service? All of them? (*Asides*) All can be serviced? Oh, well, I have the answer. All can be serviced, so I would like to know how many of them are in actual operational condition. How many of them are in actual operation now? Is there a problem? Two out of five, or four? Why the others are not in service? Can they not be refitted? Are parts not available and if those parts are not available, can there not be refitted by one of the many competent yards that may be around for this? (*Asides*) All are in service? Well, I am asking the question, and I would like when the reply is given that that will be told, and I want those names, the Fergusson, the Enterprise, whatever they are. I would like to know what is the operational condition of each one of them.

Mr. Chairman, we would also like to know what are the armaments that may be fitted on this 37.5 metre boat,

the Trident. I hope the Deputy Prime Minister may be in a position to supply this information. Do not come and say this is top secret, because when you get all kinds of foreign aircraft coming here from different countries you can see, and these things are no real secret. So I want to know what kind of armaments you carry, four and a half, whether they carry missiles or whatever it can carry? I think we are entitled to know. There is nothing top secret about these matters because we are aware that boats of similar design were provided for other countries, not only Barbados, and therefore there is nothing in itself that is necessarily secret in the information that we are seeking.

We would like to get some information of the final cost of this boat called "The Trident." I do not think this House has been given the final cost for that vessel and I am making a request for that information. We should be told what is the overall cost for that particular vessel. At the same time, we wish to get information as to what damage has been done to that boat so far, and what repairs have had to be carried out on this new vessel, if any. We would like to know this information. Has it been damaged? On how many occasions? If it has been damaged, what is the cost of the repairs to this spanking new vessel called the Trident?

I may be speaking again depending on the responses from time to time in this debate. I do not think this is going to be rushed through. It is not going to be rushed through so. I do not want to ask all of my questions at this stage. I will hold back some of the fire, because this is only the surface of it.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, this document, "Promises and Performance, General Elections, 1976," the Barbados Labour Party prior to June 18 last year produced 40 000 of these books and they were distributed throughout the length and breadth.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I submit that the honourable member is being irrelevant. The distribution of Promises and Performance has absolutely nothing to do with the Head before us. If he wishes to discuss that, then he can do that. He cannot get up in here with that every time.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Please continue.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have made reference to this book. But the point is that the last speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, indicated that we said that we were not going to have a Defence Force and yet we have implemented one after 1976. That is true but it is also true to say that in 1981 the people were aware that we had promised in 1976 not to have a Defence Force and that we had one by 1981.

In this document, Sir, if I may quote from it in relation to the question about the Defence Force, on page 36 we stated publicly that — and I will read it for him —

“Events threatening to the security of our country, such as the Sydney Burnett Alleyne invasion attempts persuaded the Government of the need to modify this policy and to equip the country with a defence arm capable of providing protection for our most vital security interest”.
10.45 a.m.

It goes on to say, Sir —

“The party has not departed from its view that the objective of world peace is most likely to be achieved in a world that emphasises peaceful measures rather than military armament, but the party is not so naive as to refuse to arm itself reasonably in the face of present dangers.”

Sir, we intimated to the public of Barbados coming up to the election of June, 1980 — 81 that although, as we stated in our Manifesto of 1976, we had no intention of implementing a Defence Force that the course of events in Barbados had changed that and we were forced to change our policy on this particular matter. Based on our explanation the people still elected us on June 18, 1981, and that is why we still have the reigns of Government for the next five years, because we were honest enough to come to the people and say that even though we stated one thing in our Manifesto, we are weighing the reasons for the adjustments in our policy and hope that the people would understand. The people of Barbados understand only too well that we were forced to do that, because there was a man claiming that he intended to overthrow the constitutionally elected Government of Barbados.

I don't think the point which the honourable Member for St. Michael South raised is a valid point, because that was dealt with on June 18, 1981. I reserve my right to speak a little later on on the same matter.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I wish to touch on another aspect of this Head, Mr. Chairman, but before we get to that I think that this debate on defence and security has to be put in perspective. I do not believe for the rushing of a document which he admits was prepared primarily for an election, primarily for telling the people of Barbados why they had not carried out their promises made five years before — and then using the fact that he scraped through with the numbers as an endorsement by the people of the Defence Force in its present form — I think that to do that is judging the credibility if not the credulity of the individuals who hear and understand the spoken word.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, I don't understand the words “scraped through”.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I need not go into any further details to explain the words “scraped through”. But the honourable Member who just sat down and the Hon. Minister of Labour can explain that for you. I say the Minister of Labour because he was biting his finger nails on that night. If that is not scraping then there is not anything that is called scraping. But that is im-material. I don't want to dwell on that.

The fact is that the defence and security debate leading up to election was replete with a lack of candour and information on the part of the Government. To this day there are two questions concerning our defence which have not been specifically answered for the people of Barbados. First, has Barbados made a commitment to a regional security force? What are the terms of that commitment? What are the implementations of that commitment? Further, how is it prepared to implement that commitment?

Mr. Chairman, you will recall, or you may not recall, that in an earlier Estimates debate we had asked the then Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs, and we had also asked the Minister for Defence and Security, to establish for us what statements had been made in London that the then Prime Minister Callaghan and the Prime Minister of Barbados and other Prime Ministers in the region had entered into a secret pact. To this day we have had no response. But what has been happening in more recent times is we had a Commander of the Coast Guard making a statement that the newly acquired equipment and ship were to be the main thrust in a regional security force. I do not doubt that might be desirable, but what I believe is that the people of Barbados should be politically and morally aware of any international and regional commitments made on their behalf through the regional system or the international level.

Mr. Chairman, I believe people feel that the time has come for answers to be given to those particular points. There was a second point which was canvassed and in which there was a substantial amount of confusion — not the least of which was the confusion engineered by those persons whose responsibility it ought to have been to enlighten the public concerning the actual amount of money spent on defence. Let me put it that way. I recall vividly Sir, having been called a liar by the opposing forces including the force of establishment when I pointed out prior to the days of the election that we had spent in excess of \$50 million. I remember the claim that when you make a commitment to the ship — which in itself cost \$20 million — that you do not consider that any money, that it is only money committed, when, in fact, we all accept the spending of money has to do with the money you commit as well as the money you actually disburse.

What the people of Barbados need to hear is what the exact cost is because, as we heard when we were dis-

cussing Ilaro Court, if this is a *fait accompli*, we are stuck with this useless Government for the next four years or so. If we are stuck with this Government let us know what the facts are. We would then be in a position to judge properly and confine to the facts of history. We will be in a position to praise them if they are deserving of praise. But at least we would not be continuing this debate which is based on misinformation or no information at all.

As I have had occasion to say in the past, Sir, whether one is in China, USSR, or US, or even in Nicaragua, the whole amount of money to be spent on arms opposed to money to be spent on buses is a proper debate for the citizens of the particular country. And it is no less a proper debate for the people of Barbados to enquire to what extent the scarce resources that are available as a whole are being allocated — on one hand to arms, defence and security, and food, social security and social development on the other hand.

1055 a.m.

Each citizen, young and old, white and black, has the right in the context of a democracy to be able to assess for himself or herself whether the resources of this country are being allocated in a manner that he or she would prefer to see. It is really not very helpful for any honourable Member to be drawing attention to a particular document which was designed for a specific purpose.

He says that the Barbados Labour Party changed its mind. We would not condemn them for changing their mind. We know that they change their minds on a daily basis. We see evidence of this from time to time.

What we are contending, Mr. Chairman, is that this is too important an area for us to be making the kind of skirmish-like thrust and barring. This is not an area in which there ought to be any doubt or any confusion. It is an area in which candour, to the extent that the national security allows it, should be the order of the day. All one is calling on the Government to do is to be candid with us to the extent that they are able to be candid without, in their view, undermining the security of the country.

If the Hon. Minister responsible for Defence and Security gets up and says, "I cannot tell you the actual cost of a particular installation for the Defence Force because we believe that it would not be in the interest of the country from a security point of view" then, whether we believe him or not, we would have to accept that since he has the responsibility for our security that that is a proper thing for him to say. That is how it is done every place where there is a democratic system and that is all we ask of this Government — that it treats the people of Barbados as if we are functioning in a democratic system.

I believe that there are other matters concerning this which will be dealt with in due course. But I believe that if we got a few answers or a response at this point it would be worthwhile, and then I will determine whether I wish to go on that again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, heavy weather has been made of the Barbados Defence Force, Sir, only since this party came into office.

I think it was in 1969, I am subject to correction however, that the then Administration — the DLP Administration at the time — introduced into the Estimates a Token Vote of \$1. I recall very well when the then Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance — the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition — made it clear that he was going to have a battalion, I remember that very well he was going to have a battalion.

The Government is accused repeatedly by the Opposition for putting in its 1976 Manifesto that it would not have a standing army. After coming into office on the very opening of Parliament, Barbadians were shocked at the unfortunate blowing up of CUBANA — terrorists at work. A few months after, Sir, again the Caribbean Islands were also shocked when a very good friend and a member of the Democratic Labour Party, a Mr. Sydney Burnett Alleyne, a long standing member, a member of.....(Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Your friend too.) Where did you come from at all? Sir, this invalid has now come in here all of a sudden. You see why Ezra Alleyne should be shot. (Asides) But, he is an invalid, a political invalid, that is what he is, Sir. Then the entire.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of Order. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He is a girl then.) Mr. Chairman, ...(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Would you defend that?).....On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I draw attention to the Standing Order which requires that in debate offensive language, especially if directed to another honourable Member, ought not to be used. I submit that the indication of one honourable Member that another honourable Member might be an invalid is offensive, and I ask the honourable Member to withdraw the remark, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask all honourable Members on both sides of the Hon. House to refrain from remarks which could lead to further discord in this Hon. Chamber. I would rule the word invalid out of order. Please withdraw the word, it is offensive.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw the word, "invalid", Sir, that it is offensive. He is a Parliamentary joker then, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let us get ahead with Defence and Security.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Early this morning you heard your colleague get up and say in here that the debate started at a relatively high order and he hoped that it would continue. They say all cats look alike though at midnight.

Sir, the entire Caribbean was shocked, and Barbadians in particular, when it was discovered that it was a good friend and a member of long standing, a Mr. Sydney Burnett Alleyne, a man who the now Rt. Hon Leader of the Opposition gave a banker's licence to operate in Barbados. And it went beyond that, Sir — so strong was he a supporter, at the financial level in particular, that he was given a licence by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, that honourable Member there for St. Michael West to import.....(Hon. L. R. TULL: Cement.).....cement into Barbados, Sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is on that premise that this Government had to take a different stand — thereby not establishing a Defence Force, not by establishing a Coast Guard, but by upgrading it. That is what we have done and that is the purpose of this vote here this morning — to upgrade it. Your Administration bought three fishing boats that could not fire even piece of dynamite off one of them to blow up fish, namely the T. T. Lewis and the Commander Marshall. You had to turn off the engine and drop the anchor for a man to fire a revolver to defend the waters and the lands of Barbados.

Now, today, we are hearing from the honourable Member for St. Michael South. On one hand he is saying that there is lack of employment in Barbados. On the other hand he has now called upon the Government to send home all, all of the soldiers and the sailors. Now,.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. The honourable Member for St. James North is accusing me of making statements in this House that I have not made. I have never said that the Government should send home all, or indeed any, of the soldiers or sailors of the Defence Force. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: You said cut-backs.) I never said that, and it is therefore misquoting me. I would ask you to have those words withdrawn by the honourable Member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure the honourable Member would not want to put words in the mouth of another honourable Member. Withdraw.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is saying that you should have cut-backs on the expenditure of the Defence Force, I take it that you should stop sailing some of the boats because you would not be able to buy fuel, and if you do not sail the boats you would have to send home the sailors. Therefore, he is asking this Government to send home all of the people and leave our territorial waters exposed to the friends of the Democratic Labour Party to come in here on a fishing boat to overthrow the loyal and lawfully elected Government of the day. That is what he is asking. We cannot do this.
11.05 a.m.

Any captain who puts a ship out to sea knowing that the winds are going to be blowing in one direction and suddenly the winds change, he would be a foolish captain not to set his sails to suit the wind, and that is what we are doing.

We discovered that your friends want to drive away all the tourists and the manufacturers from Barbados by having discord in the country, coming to have bloodshed on the streets of the country — your friend, Sydney Burnett Alleyne. The Member who is resting back in his chair — happy to be in here — gave that very man an import licence to bring cement into Barbados. I believe you had an idea he was coming back, and the cement was to build enough gaols to put the Government and the people of Barbados in. I believe that was your plan, you were deep in it, and not a single word was said. Now we are hearing this morning from a responsible person, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that we should send home all the Defence Force.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If you are in any doubt as to what I said, send for the records of the House. I am maintaining I never made any such statement. He is misleading this House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not all of them, some of them, reduce it, cut back.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am maintaining I never made any reference to sending home personnel of the Defence Force, and you cannot find that anywhere in the records, and for you to permit the Member to go on repeating that is to mislead this House and that is a breach of the Standing Orders.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Why did you not tell your colleague on your left that I did not use the word "starve"? You revelled in that. You are playing with words, but "a cut back in expenditure" means that some of the people must go home.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman I must say this at this point: at no time did I hear the honourable Member for St. Michael South say that there was a need to send home all the people. What I believe the Committee understands is that the Leader of the House is saying that his remarks are capable of suggesting that some people should be sent home.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not some, Sir, I understand it on this side and that is why I am defending it. I understand that we should dismantle the whole Defence Force — send them home, and dismantle all the Skills Training Programme. All the soldiers and the sailors that are keeping our young boys and girls with skills must be sent home, leaving these young boys and girls now to send up the crime rate. That is what you are advocating. We are not going to advocate that. We cannot advocate that.

We are prepared to defend this country even when you get power at some future date. I do not know when, I leave this in the hands of the Almighty, he knows best. If you are to govern a country you would need that protection equally. All of us in Barbados need it now, and it is an irresponsible statement for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to advocate any cut-backs at all in expenditure on the Defence Force.

I do not know why you do not stop running down the Defence Force. You ran down the Police Force and now you are running down the Defence Force. I do not know why you do not stop doing these things.

The Member for St. Michael West, the President of the Democratic Labour Party, on one occasion advocated in here that the Chief of Staff should go back to Jamaica and shoot down black people — all of this sort of nonsense, rather than trying to build and bolster the morale of a young army in this country. Nearly every one of the Caribbean territories has a standing army. All through South America there is bloodshed, and we are trying to fight it off.

I will say this now: when Prime Minister Bishop starts to curse the Prime Minister of Barbados again, I will not have any sympathy for this Prime Minister. In respect of that reactionary Government of Reagan, all the Reagan reactionary Government has done is to drive these territories into deeper trouble. His high interest rates in the States, all the reactionary programmes.... Thatcher and Reagan, both of them are alike. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: And the Barbados Labour Party). I would have expected that with this beautiful country of ours, I would be seeing millions of dollars flowing into Barbados with the CBI....ten cents. Therefore, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that the expenditure under this Head is well spent.

Let me ask you: have you ever seen them on parade, how smart they look? How fit they are? (Mr. B. M. TAITT: True. They look good). And do you not feel good? All you are going to do is to run them down, pull them down all the time.....trying to drive the Police against the Defence Force? This is what you have been doing — trying to play one against the other, and in the interest of the country I feel we at a national level should see eye to eye on this.

Mr. Chairman, on this Head — Defence and Security, I am sorry that we are not even in a better position to have a more sophisticated area of defence. I am not on the Defence Board, I do not know what they have and what they have not got. I heard one Member asking about weapons. Have you ever heard of a naval secret? Are they to tell you what weapons they have on board so you can tell Sydney Alleyne? You would like to find out all of these things. Do you want to tell Sydney Alleyne what is the blueprint for the hull?

Sir, I beg to move that you put the question that Head 73 stand part.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, you cannot put the question, we have asked some questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The rule, as we all know it, is that honourable Members may speak for 15 minutes at any one time, and I think that was intended to give an opportunity to as many honourable Members who desire to speak a chance to speak — provided it is possible. The honourable Member has spoken already, and before he rises to speak again, I would like to enquire if there is any other honourable Member who would like to speak.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I thought it was who catches your eye, Mr. Chairman, I am not against giving way, but I thought it was the person who catches your eye.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has not caught my eye.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sure it would help all honourable Members in this debate if I rise to move in. We have to increase this vote. I said so in the Second Reading speech.
11.15 a.m.

Has anybody moved the amendments?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The amendments have been moved.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Only the Minister can move amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The amendments have been circulated.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I wonder if they are the right circulation. I wonder if the correct things have been done, because the summary requires some alterations. Subhead 2, the Item – Grants to Public Institutions which stands at \$7 717 104 should be amended to read \$9 717 104. The increase in the total should be \$2 717 104 instead of \$717 104 and the total "Other Expenditure" column should be \$11 549 453, and the "Total Increase" column should be \$2 553 205.

I am quite prepared to have a long debate on defence. I can talk about it until the end of the Estimates.

I beg to move that those be the amendments.

I can talk about it all day if necessary, but to deal narrowly with the questions which have been raised so far, it is not normally a part of information which the Government will publish, but there is such information to include the specifications of weapons systems.

There was some question evidently of what armaments were actually mounted on the vessels. Anybody can go to the Careenage, they can look at the vessels and they can see that they have a weapon. Each of them has a 20mm machine gun. The large gun that you see on the Trident which fires salutes on Independence Day – you all would not know about that because you have never been known to attend the Independence Celebrations – is a 40mm Bofor gun.

I understand that you asked the question as to which of the earlier vessels were in operation. The earlier Coast Guard, to all intents and purposes, is non-functioning. Great mistakes were made in purchasing the vessels initially because the vessels were built by a company which basically was very insecure and it became bankrupt soon after building the Barbados Coast Guard. We have never been able to obtain spares, or anything else, from that particular company.

In addition, one of the vessels was very badly built. There is some flaw in the material of which it is constructed and the hull actually absorbs water. When you put it in the water the water soaks into the hull rendering it unseaworthy.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was not questioning whether the company had gone out of business or into liquidation, or whatever it may be. I really asked whether parts were not available from the company which built the hull, because as I understood it, the hull was built by one company and it was fitted out

by another company, and that company which fitted it out went out of business, and you had previously told the House that the company which supplied the parts and so on went out of business. My understanding was that the original company which built the hull had taken over the entire operations also of fitting out and supplying spare parts and matters of that sort. I wonder if I am right or wrong on that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the Prime Minister answers, let me point out that a Minister cannot be compelled to answer questions. He is only expected to give the country such information as he thinks reasonable.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is very well informed. Indeed, in this, perhaps he is better informed than I am, and if his information extends so far as to allow for the replacement of a hull as a matter of spare parts, I regret that mine does not. The hull itself is porous and at the moment the boat is out of the water and has been for some time, and we are trying to get it dried out in the sun and maybe it can take to the water. We have some plans for it. We are going to let the Sea Cadets train on it, but it will never be a viable, as I understand it, Coast Guard vessel again.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. Is it only one boat that needs parts or was in need of parts? I understood the Prime Minister to say that one hull was unseaworthy because it was taking in water. I accept that, but there may be other boats in need of parts and I was asking whether parts are not available from the company which originally built hulls. I was not saying that the hull was a spare part – that would be ridiculous.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will enquire whether we have been able to get the parts that we need. One boat is in operation. The George Fergusson is in operation, but there is a flaw which also cannot be corrected by buying a part. I would not say what the flaw is, but I would like to support what the honourable Member for St. James North said about those boats.

I remember once indicating in here that those boats could not satisfactorily be fitted with weapons, and the honourable Member for St. Michael South West, as he then was, said what do you need weapons on them for at all. We had reached the end of the debate and therefore did not have a chance to reply adequately to a comment from an honourable Member who asked why should a coast guard vessel need a weapon.

Now that we have a Coast Guard, I can tell you that we were advised that the Coast Guard vessels would have been no match for the rubber boats which Sydney

Alleyne bought from a firm in Nottingham and had shipped to Marseilles, and which were intended to carry the mercenaries from Dominica armed with weapons — no more than they could carry. We were told that the Coast Guard vessels would have to steer well clear of the landing fleet because they would not have the means of protecting themselves against even small arms fire or revolver fire.

As far as the George Fergusson is concerned, again, until we had a vessel — I kept it secret and I do not think it is necessary any longer to keep it secret — I hope the Colonel will not be angry with me — when its gun was fitted to it, it did in fact prove impossible to fire the gun while the ship was moving, which is what the honourable Member for St. James North alludes to.

This was the Coast Guard with which the previous Government saddled the country, and it reflected a mistake in public financing that unfortunately was all too common in the last days of the other regime. It reflected a mistake that you could get things on a cheap and that you can succeed in having a service such as a Defence Force for sums of money which really do not make any large impact on the public consciousness.
11.25 a.m.

The expectation of the two or three million dollars which previous Governments expected would be adequate for the Coast Guard, was always mistaken.

The small vessels were bought because those were the biggest vessels the Government thought it could afford — and they were never of any use. They were never of any use to the Police. The Police need inshore launches for policing purposes along the Coast, and they are no use to the Coast Guard because they really do not have any adequate capacity to go anywhere — even the George Fergusson.

When we sent the George Fergusson to Grenada on the day after the Grenada Revolution with diplomatic representatives of the United States and Canada, that vessel found it very difficult to come back up against the prevailing currents that stretch from Barbados to the West, and it had to make its way up the Grenadines and then make a dash across to Barbados from St. Vincent — occasioning abundant seasickness among the journalist and other passengers who were on it.

The Trident is altogether another matter. It sailed the Atlantic, sailed down the coast of Africa and made a crossing on the South Atlantic to Barbados, quite successfully.

Once, Mr. Chairman, the necessity for a Defence Force is accepted, the necessity for a proper Defence Force has to be accepted. There is really no point buying vessels that, like the Fergusson and the others, are not suitable for the purpose.

The Caribbean is not an inland river. Honourable Members will remember, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition admitting that the only tests ever carried out on some of those smaller vessels were carried out in sheltered waters at Southampton in England. They were never exposed to the open sea far less the open Caribbean which is seldom particularly calm.

Now, once we accept that the main component of the Defence Force should be the Coast Guard and it is the Coast Guard that is causing the escalation of costs, once you accept that, you are starting from scratch.

The previous Coast Guard was a collection of technicians with no element of military discipline whatsoever and no proper command structure. Our Coast Guard is now organised along naval lines. It is commanded by an officer of the Royal Navy on secondment to Barbados, Commander Oliver. The Captain of the Trident is a Lieutenant Commander of the Royal Navy and there is another Engineer Officer, Lieutenant Commander Tom Adams who is in charge of the engineering works.

Below the level of those officers, actually in the operation of the Coast Guard we have no trained Naval Officers in Barbados, except the ones who have recently passed out of Naval College in Britain. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the British Government once again for the \$2 million in assistance — a grant in technical assistance, training and in the supply of the three officers and a number of other personnel whom they have sent to us.

The foregoing is intended to explain to some extent the reason for the move in of the \$2 million. Originally we had thought we could make a separate item — Training and Operation of the Coast Guard, but it was decided to put it into the overall grant because this vote was subjected to a limit of a 10 per cent increase. We did not realise that a significantly greater increase would be needed since at the time of last year's vote for \$7 million, there was no airplane and no Coast Guard other than the Fergusson and its satellites.

We now have three more ships and one airplane to cater for, and I do not think honourable Members would wish the investment in an airplane and three ships to go for nothing, for want of proper operating facilities and proper funds to maintain the vessels. But there is also a major training programme to be carried out.

I have already explained the personnel position. Perhaps I could go a bit further and explain the personnel position of the Coast Guard Reserve. We also intend to have a Reserve. The Coast Guard Reserve consists of five Lieutenant Commanders who hold the substantive rank of Major in the Defence Force. There is Lieutenant Commander Tomlin, there is a gentleman of the University also, and Emptage, one Midshipman and one Petty Officer whom we are very fortunate to have. He is a Public Officer, a Security Officer in the Public Service who is a very experienced military man. He used to be a Tank Commander. He is a diver also, but the whole Reserve consist of five people.

Clearly this is only the structure for training used, setting up the Field Cadets and so on, and some funds will have to be provided to put the Reserve to work.

There is also no point having a loan service team from Britain down here. While it is true that their services are offered free, we have to meet the local costs of housing and getting about and various other local costs. There is no point having a loan service team down here unless funds are provided to allow them to carry out the function for which they have come, that is, to train people to take over the Coast Guard entirely in due course.

To the extent that we are still a part of the Training Agreement with Britain — it is still continuing — extra funds are therefore needed at this time which may not be needed at some point in the future. So there is a decline in spending from last year to date and it is very probable that there will be another decline in spending next year, if possible. Perhaps I should not say probable, but there will come a stage at which the training will be completed and it therefore not be necessary to meet, perhaps, the half million in Capital, and perhaps more than that in Current, which will go to the peculiar training that is necessary to start a navy from scratch.

We now have to train people to run the Coast Guard. It is going to surely take two years. It had been going on already. It will surely take two years and some levelling out of expenditure can then be expected, because we are not planning on any additions to the Coast Guard or buying any further aircraft at the present time.

The time for training of pilots will also come. Numbers of persons have applied to the Defence Force for positions as Pilot Officers and the Defence Force intends in the fullness of time to go into the business of training pilots as well. But that again, is in the future, and we are not contemplating any expenditures in that regard.
(Asides)

I do not know who the honourable member for St. Michael South Central wants to visit, but the Government does not intend to buy any bombing planes as he is suggesting. He will have to wait until he is in a position to decide that the country must have bombing planes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, implicit in attacking the Defence Force, or discussing it, or discussing the funds that are spent on the Defence Force, is the questioning of the need for a Defence Force at all. I have said over and over again that the Barbados Labour Party had to change its views on the need for a Defence Force as a result of activities soon after we came into power.

The public of Barbados are great discounters of the fact of modern life. Because we lived so long under the defensive umbrella of Great Britain — and there could never have been any question of a coup in Barbados in those days — we believed that no such thing could ever take place.

Now, I am going to give a scenario, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if any of us would doubt that there was a serious threat to the integrity of a country in Africa.
11.35 a.m.

Suppose we read in the newspapers that there was an election in Africa in a country which has been ruled for 15 years by the same party, and the election resulted in that party being put out of power, and that within one month the former Personal Aide of the defeated Prime Minister met two Americans and drove them to a secluded beach house in the former Prime Minister's constituency, and in that beach house was found a list of arms — grenade launchers and M-16 rifles and so on — and at the same time a prominent member of the defeated party was discovered to be conspiring in the island of St. Maartens with persons to get a boat or an aeroplane, and chartered a boat, put some weapons on board and was approaching the country, would anybody in Barbados reading of that in Africa doubt that there was a serious situation?

Indeed, I suppose the French has more experience of this than we have, and their experience may have led them to some extremities. But the French went to the trouble to send me by hand — an officer — a warning against certain persons in the very security systems of Barbados itself, as a result of documents which they seized on the vessel and on the person of Sydney Alleyne when he was arrested. (Asides: Who were those persons?) The very least of those documents was the operation orders and the amount of money to be paid to people who were to be hired by the gentleman, Mr. Capi... — I can't even remember his name — and the two gentlemen with Italian names who live in the Mafia territory of Long Island, operations orders indicating where they got money from, indicating a connection with the Guatemalan Ambassador at the United Nations

— Guatemala, the same country where there was a coup yesterday — indicating that a number of mercenaries — I won't give you the number — were to be hired for so much each and were to come here as tourists to meet at Mr. Earl Glasgow's house where they were to be provided with weapons — all that was written down and found on Sydney Alleyne. Earl Glasgow was the former Personal Aide to the former Prime Minister. That a certain number of them would be required for only one month and a smaller number would be required to remain in Barbados after the Democratic Labour Party was restored to power was in the handwriting of the gentleman from Long Island.

If there is anybody who thinks that after that the Government of Barbados could maintain a position that it did not need a Defence Force, that person should have his head examined. I am very glad that the good friends which Barbados have in France, the French Antilles and in the intelligence services of other countries enabled us to expose and forestall that plot.

All of us have seen on television the plot to take over Dominica and perhaps people doubted that at the time, but anybody who say the gentlemen that made the slip when he talked about the 265 engineers who were to go out — he made some silly mistake by calling them engineers when in fact they were mercenaries — cannot doubt that there was an intention of doing some damage to Barbados.

The names which are mentioned — Banks..... photographs exist of Mr. Banks in the company of Sydney Alleyne and the then High Commissioner of Dominica in the United Kingdom. Details exist of visits made to the South African Embassy in London. The name of the contact in the South African Embassy that Sydney Alleyne had is also known and we are well satisfied that a complicated plot was also set about for that. The ship that was to bring the mercenaries to Barbados has been identified and again we have to thank friends in Europe for forestalling the action.

Again, Mr. Chairman, we would have been lunatics having been advised that the George Fergusson and the other boats could not have forestalled the rubber boat landing that was planned at Foul Bay.....that is where the vessels were to come in and were to meet in Oughterson Plantation yard. Honourable Members on the other side should take note of these things. Although there is no suggestion whatsoever that the owner of Oughterson knew anything about it, not the slightest suggestion. The people who went up to Oughterson and spoke to him he had not the slightest suspicion as to the reason why they were checking his yard and looking around the roads, and so on. And that plot got quite a far way. The boots were bought, the boats the men had to land in all had compasses and

weapons, I believe the weapons were bought from a warehouse in Marseilles. All of that was put together.

Now on both of these occasions honourable Members of the opposite side pooh-poohed the Government's fears, but since then we have seen an actual coup in Grenada, carried out by weapons which came into Grenada in oil drums, and which was distributed through the connivance of a customs officer. We have seen Dominica subjected to a second coup attempt.

The coup in Dominica is especially instructive. There was a man called a David Duke who was a member of the American Nazi party and was a former Grand Wizard of Knights of the Klu Klux Klan, and he now leads an organization called the National Association for the Advancement of White People. He had a man called Perdue and the first person they contacted was Mr. Gairy to go and take over....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: This is no disrespect to you, Mr. Prime Minister, but we are going under the rules. The Minister is not introducing the measure and the rules of this House state that 15 minutes are allocated. I am interested in this development, because it is very interesting, and I would like to hear more on it. But we cannot ignore the rules and I hope that you will administer the rules as laid down in the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can only take it that it is drawn to my attention that the Hon. Prime Minister has spoken for 15 minutes. Is that what you really intend?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: More than 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I believe it is the wish of the Committee that the Prime Minister deserves a longer time on this matter. Please continue.

11.45 a.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The mercenaries approached Sir Eric Gairy, this American Nazi, apparently they told Gairy — Gairy went to Miami to see them and they had discussion in Miami — that he would have to land with the troops himself in Grenada and Gairy was hesitant about that, and they therefore looked for another target.

In a way one is glad that they exposed themselves by choosing Dominica as the second target, because if they had ever only approached Gairy, one might have suspected that they had official backing. But the fact that they then chose to attack Dominica I think rules out any question, any suggestion that there could have been any sort of official sponsorship or encouragement for them.

They had a skillful plan, I have seen a copy of the plan — how many men were to stand by the police

station door, how many were to run across the square, how many in all would be needed, what weaponry the Dominicans had, and so on and so forth. The plan was exposed, I believe, first in Canada, and people are now serving time in jail for it but Dominica has had yet another confusion with the attack made on the central police station and I had once again to be woken in the early hours of the morning to hear of plots and counter plots, coups and counter coups. Fortunately, communication is stricter in these days than it used to be, because you can telephone direct to Dominica, and I venture to think that the assistance which Barbados gave was of some comfort to the Government of Dominica at the time.

Now, I wonder if honourable Members really want Barbados to become a country that is going to be subjected to all these alarms and excursions. I would suggest that politicians especially, try to assess the situation of the country on the international scene and also try to assess the security situation within our shores itself.

First of all, I would have thought it was in the interest of the Opposition not to attempt to politicise the issue of the Defence Force. I would have thought so. There is little doubt out there in the street corner that the Opposition is perceived to be against the Defence Force. There is little doubt about that. I just throw that out to the Opposition in its own interest. It is in the interest of all of us ultimately, but it more particularly concerns the Opposition.

The Defence Force is, at the moment, not as large as is consistent with a full posture of national defence. I can tell you that from now.

You speak of cutting down the numbers. If the numbers were cut down... (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Who said so. Nobody here said so)... all the \$7 million would have done is to pay and feed the existing soldiers. You would not even be able to put the Coast Guard to sea. I do not know how you can cut back any more than that. And the \$2 million that I have moved in is to provide for the training of the Coast Guard. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: How would we know that unless we ask?)

Well, honourable Members have said they could not know that unless they ask. I can give honourable Members the assurance that the Barbados Defence Force does not intend to fire off hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money in weapons' training and in practising high class naval gunnery or anything of the sort. (*Aside*) We are proceeding on the basis of the minimum training necessary to make the Coast Guard an effective maritime organisation, and sufficient training to make the land-based forces adequate for the purpose

of repelling external threats, with some reserve relating to internal security as necessary.

You may have seen a television programme about the Defence Force's training. I think that those who made it should be congratulated and I am sure that we are satisfied that adequate training programmes are being carried on.

The Defence Force is certainly not over-manned, Mr. Chairman. It would find difficulty carrying out the agreement, which has existed for some time, that it should take over guard duties at Government House. Customarily, the Head of State is guarded by the Army, the Head of Government is guarded by the Police, that is the customary system. But Government House is guarded by the Police — not only carrying out ordinary duties, but also carrying out the full dress guard duties at the gate. This would normally be done by the Defence Force, by an army, but the Defence Force has not really got the people to spare to do it although the framework for so doing exists. I would give honourable Members the assurance that there simply is not enough money in the vote to allow any wastage.....(*Asides*).....and to allow any fat to be built up. The Force has to train officers, it has to train men and it has to pay and feed its members, and so on.

We do not spend a great deal on defence, contrary to the tone of the speeches of members of the Opposition. An analysis published in the New York Times, of which you have heard me speak before, shows that Barbados spends more per capita on education and health than any non-oil developing country, and more than many developed countries — more than nearly all communist countries for example — while on defence it spends only negligible amounts.

The figures given by the New York Times, even if you up-date them, you will find that to spend less than five per cent on GDP — it is much less than that — what is the figure again? It is a very, very small amount, it is less than.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Who did you ask?) We spend about one and a half percent of GDP on Defence which is really a negligible amount, Mr. Chairman, in the context of world defence spending. And we do ourselves no service by suggesting that more could be spent on health and agriculture compared to the Defence Force, because, quite truthfully, we already spend a lot, particularly on Health, a lot, and what we should be looking at in Health is more cost effective means of using our money.

The speech by the honourable Member for St. Michael West — the fulminations about Mr. Callaghan and a regional security force — showed how easy it is to twist words. Mr. Callaghan said that the Trident would

be the main component of a future regional Coast Guard and we now hear this magnified into a regional security force.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister was not in his place when I made my speech — I think he heard parts of it — so it is necessary to elucidate.

What I said is that we had asked the question concerning the Callaghan visit sometime ago, that we had raised a question as to whether Barbados had entered any pact with the United Kingdom and/or any region — a secret pact — and that we had not got an answer.

11.55 a.m.

I said further, that since then, we had heard from a Commander of the Barbados Coast Guard that the Trident would form the main thrust. What I said about Callaghan had to do with whether you had entered a secret pact of any kind, and we ask that you would answer us candidly. That is all we were saying.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I thought the days of secret diplomacy, were over, and I do not believe that the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would want any of you to suggest that the Government can have a secret. He is always so keen to show that he knows everything, that goes on in Government, that he does not even want you to give the public the impression that something could happen and he could not find out. Ask the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central if it is a secret pact, he will tell you. True or false, he will tell you.

There is no Defence Treaty entered into by Barbados with any country. We have an agreement for defence training with Britain, a Memorandum of Agreement on the supply of officers and so on. There is no agreement on coming to aid or not coming to aid, or anything like that.

I am not ruling out for the future that some agreement between like-minded countries in the Eastern Caribbean might not be desirable. I have said over and over in this House from 1977 that we should have a joint Coast Guard, or at least arrangements for sharing Coast Guard facilities.

In 1977 we were not prepared to co-operate with the then regime in Grenada, and we made approaches to St. Vincent and St. Lucia for a joint Coast Guard. But that is as far as it has got. To some extent we are prepared to go a little further, and perhaps Dominica could be included in a communications network, but our little islands need protection, do not fool yourselves, and

there will be nothing reprehensible about seeking mutual protection among ourselves in so far as our limited resources will allow.

One of the most heated debates we have ever had in here in which tempers rose and hostility really was thick in the air, was the matter of sending the small contingent of the Defence Force to St. Vincent to relieve the police to allow them to recapture Union Island. I remember the word "interference" was used, I remember aid and comfort was given to those who might have been — one never knows — engaged in shooting at Barbadian soldiers by somebody — I cannot remember if he was in the House then or not — on the other side. But that was a serious plot — doubt not. It was hatched in the Grenadian island of Carriacou with elements of the People's Revolutionary Army. They trained the man — I forget his name — who is now a prisoner in St. Vincent.

I spoke to Prime Minister Bishop the day when the troops were going there. Without saying that he was aware that the People's Revolutionary Army had actually encouraged the matter, he told me he would do everything he could to assist St. Vincent in putting them down. He made no objection to the Barbadian troops coming, and eventually he handed over the plotters to the St. Vincent Government for trial, and it was fully exposed that there was a serious attempt to subvert the Grenadines and not Union Island alone. It does not seem to be generally known that there were also disturbances in Bequia at the time.

How that is magnified into interference in the internal affairs of another country, I cannot understand. I see Cameron Tudor is quoting Lewis Carroll today in the Nation newspaper, "I said it once, I said it twice," and so on. He should have gone on a little further and quoted the part which says "A word means exactly what I want it to mean," because that is the only context within which any honourable Member opposite could use the word "interference" in respect of the sending of 50 soldiers to the assistance of a friendly Government at its own request.

It is neither interference nor intervention. It was a straightforward matter of assistance, and I would hope that if I were in Opposition and there were an uprising in this country, in St. Lucy or St. Andrew or wherever, and that honourable Members opposite were in fear of their lives, and the country in fear for its Government, that I would be given the opportunity to say how much I would welcome the intervention of troops from St. Vincent to assist the lawfully elected Government of Barbados, even if it were the Democratic Labour Party, in maintaining law and order in the country.

That is the difference between the parties. Nobody on this side is going to give any aid and comfort to any enemy of Barbados whether we are in Government or in Opposition. That is one thing you can be sure about. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Are you suggesting that we give aid and comfort to somebody to come to Barbados?) The honourable Member for St. Michael West has never telephoned Maurice Bishop in Grenada, as far as I know, so he need not worry his head about it.

Mr. Chairman, there may be other points which will arise, so I will not trespass on it, I will leave it there.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister has given this House the kind of information that some of us have been asking for, and it is really good to hear the responses of the Prime Minister, as a true Parliamentarian responding to questions from the Opposition. The question that we ask from over here had nothing to do with any secret. Sometimes the kinds of information that are considered to be secret you can pick up and read in any journal or magazine or periodical which may be put out in Britain, the United States, Canada or wherever they may be put out, so long as they are available.

The Prime Minister in his sweet words of wisdom indicated that the Opposition should co-operate with the Government on all matters, and that if they were the Opposition they would give the Government all kinds of support, and so on.

Now, anyone listening to this, or coming into this Chamber for the first time, would not believe that there is a history and a background to it. What the Government is trying to answer is how has it come about that when the Democratic Labour Party proposed the establishment of a Defence Force and a Coast Guard service for the defence of little Barbados they were violently and bitterly opposed to the establishment of that service.

Now they say that in 1976 there was a change and then you had the threat of Sydney Burnett Alleyne and matters like that which call for the establishment of such a force.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. The Rules of this House, I am sure the honourable Member would recall, do provide for the prohibition of repetition. 12.05 p.m.

Now I was in here at the beginning and I heard those precise words from the honourable Member's mouth. I went outside for a considerable period and came

back in, and the honourable Member is exactly on the same thing.

It is repetitious because he answered it already and then we would have to answer it again, and we would never finish the Estimates. It is unnecessary repetition. I submit that the honourable Member is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a French expression for it which I do not recall. The honourable Member is entitled to retract a bit to carry on.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will carry on, Mr. Chairman. What happened was that when the Democratic Labour Party put forward proposals for the establishment of the Coast Guard and the Defence Force, there were threats to countries — small countries, large countries — in this hemisphere, in Africa and throughout, and in our wisdom, with an interest as an independent country to provide for the adequate defence of this country, we made provision for the establishment of a Coast Guard and a Defence Force.

What was the reaction at that time? This Hon. Chamber receives copies of the newspapers of this country including the Advocate-News, and what was said about the Coast Guard? Let me quote from the Advocate-News on that occasion. (*Asides*) The newspaper has already been taken by this House. Do you mean you do not want to hear what you said? I will leave it at that. The truth is that they said on that side that we had no need for a Coast Guard. The most guarded words came from the Prime Minister.

That was at a time when the Advocate-News carried an article in 1969 that Mr. Sydney Burnett Alleyne, a former member of the London Executive of the Democratic Labour Party had resigned from the Party and had set up a Party called The National Liberation Movement of Barbados. That is what was said in 1969. Then again in the 1970s he got up and he said — he was quoted in the Advocate again — in 1975 that he was going to raise mercenaries in order to overthrow the then Government of Barbados which was the Democratic Labour Party Government. All that is in the Advocate newspaper.

The fact is that against that particular background there were threats to the duly constituted and constitutional Government of this country. You have coups and counter-coups both in the Caribbean, Latin American and African areas, and to protect the integrity of this country we proposed the establishment and development of a Coast Guard service for Barbados and a Defence Force, and we got no co-operation at all from the then Opposition, the Barbados Labour Party Opposition, which now forms the Government.

You know, the trouble is that the Democratic Labour Party in Opposition perhaps realises the way that the then Opposition treated the then Government. They politicised this matter when they were in Opposition, but we have said that we believe in a Coast Guard service and we believe in a Defence Force for Barbados. What we call for, and what my colleague — the honourable member for St. Michael West — has been saying, is that there should be candour in these matters — not dodging from debate.

By procedural matters, we have been prevented from having any kind of meaningful debate on Defence in this particular Parliament, but we want cooperation and we want understanding and all that. We are prepared to give it, but not on the basis of withholding information, not on the basis of depriving us of the necessary facts and figures on which we can come to conclusions.

I am the spokesman for defence and security matters, and I say that when it comes to the national interest, there is no person or no body in this country which can in any way deflect us from making our contribution and giving our support where the national interest of this country may be concerned. But we have to determine what is, in fact, the national interest. If we are not given the facts, figures and information, there is no way that we can determine what is the national interest.

When you take up the troops of Barbados and send them abroad without any kind of information and when there is an attempt to have the matter debated — this fails for a variety of reasons — how can you expect us to give that kind of co-operation in those circumstances? I repeat that if you come and tell us this is the situation, we need this kind of provision, these are the circumstances in the hemisphere or in the area, we stand ready to give our co-operation — but we must be kept informed.

Now we have this further increase in the defence estimates for operating expenses. It is a global figure. We do not know how it is broken down or what are the main components.

Some time ago in this Chamber the honourable Member for St. Michael West, I believe, drew attention to the fact that the Trident uses a considerable amount of fuel. There is no way from these estimates that we can get any specification as to the engine, or the capacity, or the amount of fuel which this particular vessel uses. I wonder if the Minister can tell us how much money is allocated for the provision of fuel. *(Asides)* Tell us how much it uses. What is its capacity?

I have heard information from a colleague of mine and I was amazed. I do not know where he got that information from, but I was amazed that he had that information. *(Asides)* The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central told the honourable Member for St. Michael West?

So do you mean they are not telling me? I can only get information if I come on the floor of the House and ask about this fuel and what is the cost of the fuel, because we want to know.

There was a very disturbing letter appearing in the newspapers recently that a boat of the Barbados fishing fleet went out to the fishing banks, got into trouble — engine failure or something like that — and was unable to get assistance from the Barbados Coast Guard, and that in fact the Coast Guard with all of its boats was unable to respond to that particular call to assist the fishing boat. We want to know what is the position on that, because one of the fundamental purposes of such a service would be to preserve the lives of Barbadians when they are in danger, and in such circumstances and cases in which the Coast Guard can be of service.

Now we want to get some information on that because it is the money of taxpayers which is being paid to maintain that Coast Guard service. We want to know if it can only go down to St. Vincent to defend the interest of St. Vincent, and when Barbadians are in danger at sea they find difficulty in responding. I mean, a vessel that has traversed the Atlantic — and did he say the Pacific too? — a vessel can cross all of those oceans and cannot go to the rescue of Barbadian vessels in trouble? We want to get some information on that.

12.15 p.m.

What is the cost? Ten thousand dollars a day to rescue a fishing boat? Ten thousand dollars a day? I wonder how this is broken down. *(Asides)* You can come and supply the information. We want to get information as far as that is concerned. Ten thousand dollars a day to rescue a fishing boat!

But you know, we have some boats here, some shrimp boats.....*(Asides)*.....I do not know, shrimp boats which should be for the development of the fishing fleet, and instead of refurbishing those boats for improving the capacity of the vessels, for increasing our capacity to catch fish, we talk a lot about lagoons and something on the East Coast.

We had the boats, and instead of refurbishing those for improving our fish catch, we take some of those boats and we send them down to Trinidad to fit them for service in the Coast Guard and they come back here, Mr. Chairman — I do not know why you did not send one of those boats out there to rescue the fishermen. Why? Why did you not do that? What are they called though? Do they have names? What are these two shrimp boats that you have converted?

It is my understanding now that those two shrimp boats that have been refitted, that they now.....you

know the Jolly Roger is faster than any of them now? The Jolly Roger, I understand, is faster than either of those two shrimp boats that you have sent down to Trinidad and now put back into the Coast Guard. *(Asides)* You are talking about the George Fergusson — you have to drop anchor, as I heard from the Member for St. James North, you have to drop anchor and fire it. I understand that if it goes to rescue anything, that the Jolly Roger is faster than those two shrimp boats. Now, we want to hear something.

We heard recently also about the opening of the hospital. There is a hospital, or whatever it is. I believe the Minister for Defence calls it a Medical Aids Station or hospital. I wonder if the Minister could give us any information on this.

We passed the Defence Act some time ago and there is provision for internal discipline and matters like that. Are we having any problems within the Defence Force? Are there any problems between the Force Reserve and those who are the permanent full-time professional soldiers. The Force Reserve believe that they have been the backbone of defence in Barbados for a long time and they are not now being given the kind of consideration or status and so on that they deserve. In fact, as you know, Mr. Prime Minister, they are many armies like the Yugoslav Army which depends on private citizens for that kind of support. We want to know if there are any problems in these areas.

As far as the hospital is concerned, are we getting any problems in there? I do not know. Maybe I will ask the Prime Minister privately. I think I will ask him privately about that. I think I will stop at that stage.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I am really astounded at some of the statements that emanated from the shadow spokesman for Defence. The honourable Member as shadow spokesman for Defence, has obviously not been following the programme of education which the Coast Guard has been trying to carry out as to the limitations and the problems that arise in rescuing fishing boats.

I have had the pleasure of witnessing many of the demonstrations that have taken place and they take great pains to point out that Barbados is a small island surrounded by a large body of water. There is therefore a large amount of square meters, or square kilometers, to be covered and for the Coast Guard to be 100 per cent effective, it is necessary that the fishermen and those who man the fishing boats have some idea about where they are when they get into problems.

The honourable Member is obviously not at all following what is going along in the fishing industry in Barbados. Because of the need to save money and to provide the most effective rescue services, all new boats

going into the sea, and particularly those that receive help in the form of loans from the Government, are required to have radios and a minimum level of equipment, because with that equipment search and rescue becomes very much more effective.

I also watched the GIS Programme — it was on the radio and on television — where part of this public education programme was demonstrated to the public. They used as an example of the most ideal situation, one of the larger fishing vessels which ran into engine problems off Barbados, and because of the expertise of the Captain, he was able to precisely indicate his bearings and within a short space of time he was able to be rescued.

Obviously, the honourable Member is referring to the incident which occurred recently. I think the name of the boat was the Guernel or something like that. Honourable Members would be aware that the incident occurred far outside the territorial waters of Barbados. Is the honourable Member as Shadow Minister of Defence, indicating to the public, because that is all he is speaking to — he is trying to impress the public — is he telling the public that it is within the competence of the Barbados Coast Guard to go into the territorial waters of another country to carry out a rescue operation? That is what he is telling the public.

He is trying to indicate to the public that it is within the competence of the Barbados Coast Guard to go into the territorial waters of another country. Well he only displays a fundamental ignorance — and I used the word “ignorance” advisably — a lack of knowledge of the laws relating to territorial jurisdiction and the respective competence of our authorities to deal with that matter.

Obviously, once a boat is missing and there is no indication from the boat itself, all the Coast Guard can do is to alert other Coast Guards in the area where the latest information that they have on hand indicates that the boat was in. But that is part of the search and rescue operations too.

He is only misleading people today when he attempts to criticize, using the factual situation of that last incident. Sir, the newspaper reports indicated very clearly that when last seen by a fellow fishing boat in the area, that the boat was well within the territorial waters — the original 12-mile limit or extended to 200 miles — of either Trinidad and Tobago or Venezuela.
12.25 p.m.

He talks about using the fishing vessels — the shrimp boats — for the purpose of fishing. Fish where? Where would he fish with those shrimp boats. Whose territorial waters is he going to fish in? Down in St. James, St. Michael South Central, or St. Michael South?

It is a known fact that despite strenuous efforts — not only on the part of this government, but of previous governments and other governments in the area — that it is totally impossible to sow up an agreement with the Latin American countries that have shrimp off of them with the exception of Cayenne which is part of the European Economic Community being a part of France.

It is also a known fact that the economics of shrimping today is very different from what it was when it started in Barbados. The price of diesel oil has moved up, probably five times since 1974–75. It is only economical if you have your boats based very near the fishing grounds, and even then — in the case of Guyana — it is a known fact that Cuba, Korea and a number of other fishing vessels who were operating using Guyana as a base had to pull out of Guyana because it was uneconomic. That is a fact.

But to suggest that it is a correct policy to continue the farcical economic situation of trying to shrimp in other people's waters when you cannot get a proper agreement, and when economics are against you, is only an indication of the Democratic Labour Party propensity to chuck money down the drain. I am surprised today that after we had a thousand debates in this House, the honourable Member would still repeat that nonsense.

The reason the shrimping vessels were converted into coastal vessels was because a new contingency had arisen within this area of the Caribbean over the past three years. The new contingency is that it is estimated that some four million barrels of oil a day are passing through the Caribbean in tankers too large to go through the Panama Canal. They use the alternate route of coming from the Middle East, around the South American coast, through the Caribbean and into the north-east and south-east ports of the United States. That contingency was not in existence during the time of the Democratic Labour Party.

The United Nations in conjunction with a lot of organisations, maritime and otherwise, have been trying over the last two years to impress upon governments the risk which their countries are exposed to, and the high probability of risk being taken considering the magnitude of traffic that is passing through this area.

Those boats were ideally suited to carry out an oil-spillage contingency plan and that was the primary reason for their conversion. They were not designed to be fast vessels. As shrimp vessels they never went more than ten knots or so and they won't be able to go more than ten knots now. But they have big bellies and they have good capacity to hold the necessary dispersants to deal with the question of oil spills. That is the reason and I have always said so. There is no mystery in this.

Secondly, the vessels have shown that they have the capacity to carry large amounts of stuffs in a contingency such as a hurricane, and it is not beyond the realm of possibility for a disaster to take place in Barbados, particularly on the West Coast and South Coast. Those vessels can be utilized in the event of the road systems being completely blocked, whatever is the cause of the road system being blocked.

It was demonstrated during the hurricane in Dominica that two of those boats could be used for carrying various food stuffs between Barbados and Dominica to keep the population alive with certain vital necessities. So again that was a factor — their potential use along the coast in the event of an emergency for the carriage of essential materials.

He says that he is surprised at the statement that \$10 000 a day is spent on such a rescue operation. Well, a day consists of 24 hours. Divide 10 000 by that and you will get \$400 an hour — \$400 an hour — that is no money. The honourable Member of St. Michael South Central will tell you that he can see ten patients in an hour, that he charges \$60 a patient that is \$600 an hour. I know that there are lawyers who charge \$1000 a day for what are called refreshers based upon the concept which is enshrined in the Rules of a four hour day.

So when we think of what is involved in a search and rescue, the cost not only of fuel but the cost of the crew and the proportionate time that the engines run — and I will teach the honourable Member a thing or two now on how you calculate cost in relation to mooring articles — that you have a certain amount of engine time and you charge so much depreciation — it is built up upon the basis of how many hours the engine is running. So \$400 an hour when you think of that is small.

12.35 p.m.

If you look at any of the salvage cases or the towage cases, you will see that the charges are based upon an hourly rate and when you ask for how it is broken down, you see what is taken into account. It is the crew time — and there are various levels of crew and each of them have an hourly cost — it is depreciation, it is fuel, all of those things. All of those components bring in so that \$10 000 per day is to me, a very reasonable charge.

So when you take all of these matters into account, one will see that the figure of \$10 000 per day is not an unreasonable figure. But in order to cut down on this figure, the object is still to educate the fishermen and those in charge of other vessels in the area, in navigation and other skills so that they will reduce the number of hours it takes to be found.

One of the great things that I know about the Coast Guard is that during the course of the off season in

Barbados, services will be made available, by way of technical education, to a large number of people in such subjects as navigation and things of that kind. I hope that a corps of people will come out of the Coast Guard, in the future, with that kind of expertise where they will not only man the new type of fishing boat which, under the Barbados Labour Party, is gradually emerging. There are now over 11 fishing this year and by next year there will be 20.

I also hope that mechanical and engineering skills will be built up for the maintenance of boats. Also, I hope that when our new Shipping Bill comes into operation this year, that we will have, in the course of years to come, a corps of young people who will go on.

So Sir, it is the honourable Member who is at sea, it is the honourable Member who has ventured into waters, and into depths of waters with which he is not very familiar, not this Side, Sir. These are the spin-offs of the Coast Guard. This is the real purpose of a Coast Guard.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I really had no intention of speaking in this debate, but as soon as I take my seat in this Hon. House, there seems to be a determined attempt to draw me into the debate — even when I have decided that I have no intentions of participating.

I have heard yesterday and today that my fees are \$60 per patient. The fact, Mr. Chairman, for the record of Hansard is that between 1971 and 1982 my fees were \$20 per patient, for ten years....(ASIDE: Not true. You are advertising.)....and in 1982, they are now \$25 per patient. (ASIDES)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Defence and Security. Order, please! Defence and Security.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Just let me correct this for the record, just for the record. I do not wish to get into that area any further, but I do not think that it is right to come in here and tell lies on people in that way. And not only that, when you check the fees charged by physicians and other specialists in Barbados, you will find that there are people like myself and Frank Ward who are at the bottom of the scale.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, let us deal with Defence and Security, I think you are making too much of the matter.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think that one of the problems in relation.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An honourable Member is on a point of order.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I consider that the honourable Member is totally out of order. This has nothing to do with the debate on Defence. This is a commercial, an advertisement for the medical profession. (Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Why did you not stop St. John?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Fine, your point is taken.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was simply referring....Are you speaking, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member may continue on Defence and Security.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now, Sir, I really am concerned about the policy and the cost of the Defence Force. And I want to say this; I think one of the most regrettable things that has ever happened in Barbados took place in 1976 and 1977 — when the present Government made every effort to suggest to the people of Barbados that this Democratic Labour Party was, in some way or other, associated with an attempt to displace the elected Government by force. I believe that was mistake one that was made by this Government, by the present Administration.

You cannot accuse people of treasonable conduct, because I remember in fact — in fact that the Hon. Minister of Finance the Hon. Prime Minister actually, during a television broadcast, reminded people in this country that this was treasonable conduct which was punishable by hanging. Those were his words used on a television programme, and they sought to associate the Democratic Labour Party with that kind of conduct. They did it in relation to the CUBANA affair, they tried to drag the Democratic Labour Party into whatever problems they might have had with Sydney Burnett Alleyne who gave them cheques which were used in this Parliament during a Budget reply, whatever problems they might have had, I do not know.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order, I must correct the Honourable Member, he was not even in the Hon. House.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I was watching the Debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sydney Burnett Alleyne never gave anybody in here a cheque. He gave the cheques to George Moe and Cameron Tudor. Those are the ones he

gave the cheques to, and Asquith Phillips — not to anybody in here, no Member in here. Sydney Burnett Alleyne signed cheques, and I would send for some of them again to prove that they were drawn to James Cameron Tudor, at that time High Commissioner, and to George Clifford Ross Moe now Chief Judge of Belize. He is still a member of your party and at that time he was Attorney-General and Minister of Foreign Affairs. That is a fact of life. And they were displayed here, signed by Sydney Burnett Alleyne. He never gave anybody in here a cheque unless he gave you one.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, let us.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: for medical attention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Since I am the person that produced the photostats, back and front, of cheques which passed through a bank in Bridgetown in which the drawer was Sydney Alleyne from the Alleyne Mercantile Bank and the payees were in some cases Mr. Cameron Tudor, in other cases Mr. George Moe, I would just like to set the record absolutely clear I never got any cheques from Sydney Alleyne, I never got any cheques from the person who drew the cheques.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, to continue. The point that I am trying to make is that the attempt to suggest to the public at large that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition was in some way involved with an attempt to invade this island or to.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: At no time during my speech or any of the Members here speeches that I recall, was it ever said that there were Members of the Opposition. What we did say is that a friend and a Member of the Democratic Labour Party in the person of Sydney Burnett Alleyne was the person found drifting off Martinique.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, go ahead. It is mere explanation I do not see that it is a point of order. Continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: set out to overthrow a lawful Government of Barbados.

12.45 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in that level of debate at all. All I am saying is that one of the problems that has made it virtually impossible for this Parliament to come to grips with the question of defence and security was the serious division created at that time which really struck very deeply at the commitment of a major party which brought this country to independence and gave it a democratic Constitution.

However, Sir, it is quite clear that, for whatever reasons, the Government has embarked on a defence and security policy that has serious implications for this country in respect of Capital Expenditure and Current Expenditure. With the addition of \$2 million in the amended part of the Estimates, it will mean that on Capital and Current Account we would be spending somewhere in the region of \$60 million over a three year period.

Now, Sir, I do not want to make comparisons with other areas of expenditure and so on, but what I am saying is that once you acquire military hardware, then you can expect an upward spiral in the cost of maintaining that military hardware and the keeping of a Defence Force at a high level of professional activity. I believe that this Parliament should have had an opportunity.....

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I believe that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet went through a lot of tedious hard work to come up with Estimates for 1982-83. They are currently being discussed before the House, and here we find the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central discussing estimates for two years hence, 1984-85. We do not know what costs there will be in 1984-85, and I am saying this is not relevant to what is happening today.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if I should really respond to that, I said during the last three years, 1982-83, 1981-82 and 1980-81 that would be the cost, \$60 million. What I am saying, Sir, is that there is going to be a constant demand for Capital Expenditure, and associated with that, rising demands for Current Expenditure.

We have tried on the floor of this House on many occasions to debate Defence and Security in a constructive manner. I recall in the Estimates of two years ago that after certain commitments were given to the Leader of the Opposition the Minister responsible for Defence and Security talked right up to the time of the guillotine, so that there was no opportunity for a debate on the Estimates for Defence and Security in that particular year.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I must rise again in my place. Estimates go for five days, and one hour before the

end of the fifth day there is no such procedure as the guillotine. As you waste time, as you are doing now, and you get up to Defence and Security on the fifth day, how can you now accuse this Government of not allowing you to debate it? Two days have gone by and we are still at Head 17. When we reach Head 43, then we are going to hear they were not allowed to debate Head 43. If you get up and talk nonsense all the time and spend two hours alone on the Appropriation Bill in response to the Minister of Finance's 20 minutes, how can you blame us?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a very long point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am sorry. I heard one in here already, with you in the Chair, for almost an hour, if I may remind Your Honour.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken for five minutes since I rose to speak. There was an arrangement at that time communicated to us by the Leader of the Opposition after a discussion with the Prime Minister of Barbados who had requested him not to enter into a particular area of discussion, because at that time there was some difficulty, as I understand it, between the then Commander of the Defence Force and his deputy, and the question of the resignation of the Commander of the Defence Force was being considered. On the basis of that discussion, the Leader of the Opposition approached the then members of the Opposition and told us that an arrangement had been made whereby.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. I would like the honourable Member to give the House an assurance that the Leader of the Opposition authorised him to disclose to the public the content of confidential conversations held in the presence of the Cabinet Secretary between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. I would like him to say that he has been authorised to disclose that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Leader of the Opposition has spoken on it in this House and subsequently already, because that arrangement broke down because you did not honour your side of the agreement. No debate took place in that year. When we tried to debate the sending of the troops to St. Vincent and the Grenadines, no debate took place in this Parliament. It is not surprising that this is the first occasion that there has been any attempt on the part of the Government to try.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I must rise in my place again.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On what do you rise? Sit down and let me get on with my debate, man. You are just making a fool of yourself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. An honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir, I did not rise on a point of order, I rise to ask you to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked 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 o'clock 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.
12.55 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. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central may resume.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, of the 12 minutes or so available to me, five having been taken up by interruptions — an example of what I mean by the inability or the difficulties which we have found of debating the Head of Defence and Security in this Honourable House — I set out initially to point out that the politicisation of the whole area of defence and security was started not by the Democratic Labour Party, but by charges made in respect of the Democratic Labour Party that it was involved in subversive activity.

I pointed out, Sir, that the cost implications of a Defence Force have never been properly discussed in this Parliament. I brought to the attention of Parliament that some \$60 million will be spent in the three year period ending March 31, 1983 on defence and security, and that this has very serious implications for spending in this area over the next decade or so.

There will have to be capital replacements as your hardware becomes outdated, there will be further demands on your Current Expenditure from year to year by increasing costs. Indeed, Sir, a point will come where if the country cannot meet the demands, legitimate or otherwise, of a Defence Force, that it creates problems within the Force itself — problems of morale, etc — and a small country has to strike a balance in these matters. They have to strike a balance between defence against external aggression and the problems which defence forces present to civil authorities in small countries.

I did not listen to the news today, but I understand that two countries were taken over by the military this morning. I do not think in the last 40 years that there has been an overthrow of a civil authority in a developing country by any external force, but in all of these countries where coups have taken place, these coups were mounted by the defence forces set up by the countries themselves.

This is a matter that you have to look at and very often it stems from the militarisation which becomes part of the professional fostering of an army, and the failure of the civil authority to respond in terms of resource allocation to the professional and military demands of the Force itself. These are areas that I wish to discuss and was trying to discuss. I got numerous interruptions on all sorts of peripheral nonsense.

Sir, I, myself, have always been of the view that, bearing in mind the problems of Barbados, more of our resources should be placed behind the Police Force than behind the development of an army. I have never heard, Sir, of any Third World country being taken over by a Police Force. Their attitudes to law and order, their attitudes to constitutional problems, appear to be different throughout the world from the attitudes of armies, and I would feel happier to know that we had an expanded Police Force and that that Police Force was competent to deal in the area of crime, probably with a specialised group within the Police Force itself trained and equipped to deal with minor civil disturbances and so on, rather than going into this area of expenditure.

Much has been talked about Martinique, the French Islands and the assistance from the French. I happen to know of the French connection in terms of security in this area, but with the change of Government in France itself, where Monsieur Francois Mitterand no longer expounds the kind of policies towards Third World Countries as his predecessor, that connection has now been broken, and the inputs from that connection has had a decided influence on the direction of policies in Barbados in relation to Defence and Security. It is not surprising at all to see so much time being spent talking about our

friends in the area of the French Empire, because you know the role that they have played in the area of information, in the area of spying within the Caribbean area, and the connection with the Minister of Defence and Security in Barbados.

Now, Sir, you know sometimes we enter into areas of expenditure, we set up systems, and we do not look down the road and see what the implications are. Our attitude to borrowing is now beginning to bring home what the impact of this could be on a small country like Barbados. We are now beginning to see what the impact of our attitude to health care delivery can be in terms of allocation resources. We are beginning to see it now, and we know what I mean when you hear of vital sectors being closed down yesterday, whether that report was true or not. Whether it is true or not, we are beginning to see the implications. We will see the implications of this army in four to five years' time. My advice, Mr. Chairman is to try and strike that benefit balance.

We have seen what has happened in Trinidad, and it was fortunate that Trinidad has a strong enough sector of its armed forces offshore so that there could be a division within the armed forces themselves. You just cannot protect yourself from those armies. You have to be exceedingly careful how you set about establishing an army, because the risk of the destruction of a civil authority in a Third World country is far greater from the army that is set up to protect it than from any external agency.

That has been the record over the past 30 years. Ever since these small countries have become independent, relieved of colonial rule, that has been the pattern, and history has a strange way of repeating itself.

I am not saying that anyone in the Defence Force today is likely to walk up to Bay Street and arrest the Prime Minister or arrest members of the Opposition. I am not trying to say that.
2.10 p.m.

What I am saying is that there is a dynamism in militarism which is very difficult to anticipate, very difficult to foresee, and that it is only logical that one should look and see what has been the pattern in these areas if you are capable of conceptualising and if you are capable of looking at patterns. You must not just simply look at things on a day-to-day basis and react to events without thinking through very carefully, not only the financial, but also the ultimate constitutional problems that might arise from your action.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Thinking Members on the Other Side will understand what I am talking about. The clowns will not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has one minute more.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Those who are capable....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Up jumps a clown now.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is referring to people over here as either/or, and I do not think that there are any clowns on this side, Sir, and I am inviting you to rule, Sir, that that is an unparliamentary remark.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I withdraw the remark, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry about that. I withdraw the remark.

The point I am making is that those of us who are capable of looking at these matters in a broader perspective will understand the implications of what I am saying. Those who react to events emotionally, and only look at the immediacy of their decisions, would not clearly understand what I am saying, or probably would even think that it is far-fetched. But there is a way in which these things tend to become realities.

There are events that catch up with us and they catch up with us in such a way that whoever forms a Government very often cannot change them. I only invite you to look at certain social programmes entered into by one administration, say in the United Kingdom, and when the Government changes — again and again you have had changes in Governments — each one would like to dismantle it, but no one can even touch it because of other factors involved. Thank you very much, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very short. I cannot always, as I say, Sir, follow these arguments through two speeches.

First of all, the honourable Member's claim that we said that the Democratic Labour Party was involved with Sydney Alleyne and that we attempted to smear the Opposition with this, would have more substance if the Democratic Labour Party had ever condemned Sydney Alleyne, they never did, they said there was no threat, they never condemned Sydney Alleyne either year — never.

And also, Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic Labour Party had carried out an investigation as to what Mr.

Glasgow had to do with the 1976 plot — there is no way in the world where you have to smear a political party, when a well-known member of it — the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister — carries two known mercenaries to his house — on Government land — and in that house, in the premises of the former Personal Aide to the former Prime Minister, is found a list of arms, and on the person of a mercenary arrested at sea with arms is found an indication that that house is meant to be the collection point for an invasion force.

Those are the facts which affect the Democratic Labour Party — not anything we said — and if the Democratic Labour Party could not repudiate Glasgow, they have to stand condemned....

Mr. Taitt stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member will give way... Mr. Chairman, Sir, the honourable Member is aware that I am the President of the Democratic Labour Party and I think the honourable....*(Asides)* You are not aware of it? Well, the honourable Member has made other mistakes too.

The fact is that if he is aware that a member of this party — and I say it now — either a sitting member here or one outside — any member of the Democratic Labour Party who has been guilty of any crime in this country ought to be taken before the police. He should have arrested Glasgow, arrested everybody who was concerned. Do not smear all of this Party.

The Democratic Labour Party is not Glasgow or anybody else. The first time I have ever heard any claim made by him I heard today when he was specific. You should have put Glasgow in prison, and anybody else whom you believe is plotting to overthrow a legitimate Government lock them up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, you are not making a speech. You elucidate briefly.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is point one, and I thank the President of the Democratic Labour Party for the assurance that in his view Mr. Glasgow should have been put in prison.

Now, to go on to the other matter with defence forces, countries needing to be defended against their own defence forces. I cannot help that. It is open to the honourable Member to say so.

There is a history of coups in South America. There are sometimes carried out in Panama by the Police.

General Tereose was a Brigadier of Police. There are sometimes carried out by the Navy. Peron was overthrown in 1952 by the threat to bombard the Presidential Palace by the battleship the Argentinians had bought from the Royal Navy, and in many countries the Army views itself as an ultimate guardian of constitutional liberty and overthrows civilian Governments in times of turmoil. That is South America.

There is also North America where the army has never attempted to overthrow the Government of the United States or the Government of Canada.

You go into the Caribbean and there is Cuba, Batista who was overthrown by Castro without the assistance of the army, he himself was not a military man. He was a Policeman, a Sergeant of Police. The honourable Member is saying that the Police have not overthrown anybody. The Police do plenty overthrowing too. Batista was a Policeman and overthrew the previous Government, on two separate occasions, I believe he so did.

If you want another recent coup carried out by the police, one was carried out in the Seychelles. It is the police who helped President Rene come to power. And I well remember Colonel Banfield putting in a celebrated Minute to the Commissioner of Police here in Barbados when this very issue was being canvassed departmentally.

In Europe there have been very few military coups in recent times. There was one in Portugal. There was one in Spain 1936 – 1939. There was one in Greece. Many countries in Europe – very few military coups. There has never been a military coup in Britain. There has never been a military coup indeed in France, unless you count the events of *Des huit de la mere* as a military coup.

In Africa the first military coup did not take place 30 years ago – it took place 20 years ago in Togo. It was the army. In most African countries it has been the army. The boundary between the army and the police is sometimes a little narrow in the form of French territories.

In Asia military coups by armies are extremely unknown except in Thailand. There has never been a military coup in Japan. There has never been any serious military coup in China, although the system of *War Lordism* was prevalent.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that to speak of all armies as threats to the security of the State is a mistake. In Latin America, every country has, at one time or another, suffered from a military coup – even Mexico, at one time or another – military meaning either the army or the police, or the navy, or in the case of Bolivia, even the airforce.

We just have to be careful to run our business in such a way that there are no military coup in Barbados.

There are many, but because more people are killed every year by being knocked down by motor cars than from infectious diseases, you do not ban motor cars. You try to make people drive better.

2.20 p.m.

There are many countries which undoubtedly brought military coups on themselves. I can say that without any fear of contradiction. Not all military coups have been malicious, and I will go on record that I cannot understand the double standards which the European Economic Community have adopted against Poland and Turkey.

In Poland the army intervened against the people against what the people wanted, against the wishes of the people, in order to maintain an unpopular ideology which is probably foreign to most Poles.

In Turkey, the army intervened in a situation where professors at the universities were leading squads of university students to throw bombs at politicians and blow up police stations. The army intervened and closed down the universities – some of these universities need a little discipline.

The second thing it did is that it not only locked up the Government, but it locked up the Opposition as well – and it was necessary, because Turkey had reached the stage where it was the least credit-worthy country in the world and bankers were putting Turkey at the bottom – below Jamaica and Zaire, and places like that. There was widespread civil disorder and the country had become ungovernable.

Now no more than the honourable Member is making a plea to defence forces to carry out coups am I making a plea. When you start telling a Defence Force about its power to overthrow the Government, that is what you are doing – whether you know it or not. When you tell it about coming in and locking up the Opposition and so on, perhaps you are putting ideas into its head that were not there before. (*Asides*)

I have drawn these examples to suggest that while the majority of military coups may be recognized as aggrandizement, pure and simple, that Governments invite violent overthrow perhaps most of the time by their conduct, – by their conduct – and it is their conduct if they were ever in Opposition, as well as their conduct when they come into Government. That is sometimes taken into account by those who have violent instincts and the power to indulge those instincts.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as saying that I have no fear that the Democratic Labour Party, even, if it were led by the honourable Members for either St. Michael West – who has said the Colonel

should go in the jungle and kill people like he is accustomed to — or St. Michael South Central, even if it was led by those two, or either of them, I do not believe the Democratic Labour Party would run the country in such a way as to justify the violent overthrow of the Government. And I don't think anybody other than Eric Sealy, when he was being paid by persons who will remain nameless because of the Rules and the Orders of the House, to say that the Barbados Labour Party must be destroyed and the people must rise up against it. *(Asides)* But the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central told me that Eric Sealy wanted \$200 a week and that he was getting too much for his pocket, and he could not afford it any longer.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, let us get this straight. I never made such a statement to the honourable Member. *(Asides)*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If he did not say that, then he said \$800 a month, Mr. Chairman. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order, order!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You are charged with the fact, apparently other members were only paid \$25 per night.

The point being made about Trinidad — that Trinidad perhaps was saved only because it had strong enough armed forces themselves — has some validity, but to make that point is to make a point that disloyalty is unlikely to spread through every single member or officer of the armed force. The majority of the money spent on the Barbados Defence Force is, in any case, spent on the Coast Guard, as I pointed out. The honourable Members may not fully grasp this in the debate. It cost the Coast Guard \$14 000 in equipment to build the tanks of the Trident and on that it could go to Jamaica and come back. *(Asides)*

I told honourable Members \$10 000 a day. That includes the maintenance of the vessel, the cost of the salaries to carry out the rescue operation. But the fuel bill for the entire Coast Guard is unlikely to reach any more than three quarters of a million dollars cost for a year for a lot of petroleum. In harbour, naturally the bill will be very, very considerably less.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of immigration. The question is, I believe, we had heard..... *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. I am calling on the honourable Member for the City.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I apologise to the honourable lady, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to address an aspect of this which I consider to be of tremendous importance. It has been referred to in the debate before lunch in a very short period of time and in a cursory fashion.

But there is a certain function for the Coast Guard and that is the function of oil spill surveillance. The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister referred to it but I would like to expand on this, because, at this time, I believe it could be the most important function that the Coast Guard must carry out. We hear from the Hon. Prime Minister that these monies may perhaps clothe and feed the Defence Force, but I should like to think there is a sufficient amount of money to carry out this important function.

Mr. Chairman, this oil spill surveillance is a term that is used fairly frequently, but it is a very technical term. It is very important that people understand the way in which it can affect an island such as Barbados. It so happens that the Caribbean basin would include the gulf of Mexico for these purposes, Mr. Chairman, but in particular, today, I want to talk about the southern Caribbean, the southern-most part of the Caribbean basin.
2.30 p.m.

It is known, Mr. Chairman, that an exceedingly large quantity of the world's oil perhaps in excess of 80 per cent, is freighted through these waters every year. The Caribbean Sea and the shipping lanes between these islands in the Caribbean Sea are known to environmentalists as the "Caribbean Corridors", and it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that every single day more than one billion barrels of oil pass through the Caribbean Corridors.

You must recognise that the majority of the world's refineries are to be found on the Caribbean basin. We have an installation next door in St. Lucia. There is a Hess installation there and another elsewhere in the Caribbean. Many people may recall that for years Barbadians, from time to time, went down to the Dutch Islands to work in the refineries there. There is also Venezuela, a member of OPEC; Trinidad with its oil, not to mention Mexico and other territories on the northern wall of the Caribbean basin.

And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that in the Caribbean these islands also have to depend to a very large extent, and a growing extent, on the tourist industry. At the same time, the people who live in the Caribbean Islands eat a large quantity of their protein out of the Caribbean Sea and so you will begin to see, Mr. Chairman, the importance of oil spill surveillance.

I think we in the Caribbean must face the fact that sooner or later — naturally, we would hope later — there

is going to be an oil spill of major proportion somewhere in the Caribbean basin. There was a narrow escape just a few years ago when there was a collision off the island of Tobago, and I think that it is fair to say that it was only through the grace of God that wind and sea currents took that massive slick of oil away from the shores of Barbados rather than towards it. But when you consider the quantities of oil moving through the southern Caribbean on a daily basis, it is fairly certain that there is going to be a major collision or major spill of some sort.

The consequences of an oil spill of any magnitude in the Caribbean are many — some more important than others — and this is where the Coast Guard has this role to play. I should just like to think that on a daily basis Coast Guard vessels are out there not only as the Note shows us in the Estimates — monitoring smuggling and other illicit pastimes or activities — but monitoring on a daily basis a number of ships and tankers who very carelessly, wilfully and deliberately wash out their bilges either within the territorial waters of most of these islands — one or the other of them sometimes, two or three at the same time when they are close together, or they will sit just outside the territorial waters and do this.

We in Barbados already begin to see the tar balls on the beaches. It is impossible to go to the East Coast now, Mr. Chairman, and walk on the sand or swim in the sea and not expect to come away with sand on the soles of your feet or your swim suit, or other parts of your body — and that is only the very thin end of the wedge.

It is possible for even a medium-sized oil slick to put paid to the tourist industry in Barbados for a year at the very least. It is possible for a medium-sized oil slick to destroy marine life within our territorial waters for more than a year, for years at a time — fish will die, spawn will die, marine bottom life which is very important to the whole cycle of marine evolution will die.

What the crude oil will do to our coral reefs is not properly understood by most Barbadians. Coral is a living animal organism, Mr. Chairman. When I was in the Ministry of Health I commissioned a study on the effects of oil on the coral reefs and the results of that study was frightening. The nature of coral reefs is, of course, that once damaged, certainly once dead, they cannot be resuscitated.

The importance of the coral reefs to an island like ours is vital, it is critical. They protect us from the ocean out there, they protect our marine life, they give us the possibility to fish in relatively calm waters.

An oil spill will destroy all of this, Mr. Chairman. It will destroy the fishing grounds and we would not expect to eat fish for a considerable length of time. It will damage coral reefs beyond repair, and what that will do

to us — not now — for generations to come, I cannot even begin to explain to this Hon. House, and what it will do to our tourist industry will make Hurricane Janet seem like a fair — you know, a fair ground. It would have been child's sport to what an oil slick will do.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is very important that the Coast Guard is out there, with as modern equipment as we can afford to give them, to monitor these oil spills. They happen. I know that the Coast Guard carries out this function.

In very recent weeks, in fact on the occasion of the official opening of the base at the Pierhead — now again known as Willoughby Fort — in conversation with senior officers of the Coast Guard, I was reassured that oil spills surveillance is in fact carried out by the Coast Guard. I cannot be sure that it is done on a sufficiently frequent basis to make it the kind of surveillance which can be expected to protect us from the horrors of a major spill, but it is very important.

And I would urge upon the Minister within whose portfolio this falls, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, that it is very important that if fuel is provided for nothing else in the Defence Force, it must be provided for the Coast Guard vessels so that they may carry out this oil spill surveillance on a daily basis — and I mean 24 hours a day. They must be in the business of tracking down ships which persist in washing out their bilges, they must prosecute where it is possible to do so — where we have got the evidence, we must prosecute. I know that certain Conventions which it was important for us to agree to that in recent months, if my memory serves me correctly, I am sure that in recent months we have corrected that situation.

2.40 p.m.

It is very important that we do not underestimate the damage and the danger to our very survival as an island community if there were an oil spill even of relatively small proportions.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that sufficient has been said.....

Mr. L. L. SISNETT rose.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I give way to the honourable member.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a small input into this debate. There are a few points which have been going through my mind and I believe I would be abdicating my responsibility if I did not mention them here at this time.

What is not clear in my mind is the true feeling of the Opposition in the matter of the Coast Guard for Barbados. It does not seem clear as to whether the Opposition wants to support the Government in the establishment of a Coast Guard service in this country, but, Mr. Chairman, they are accusing the Government of criticising the Opposition party, when it was in Government, of not wanting to have a Coast Guard and a Defence Force for the people of Barbados.

Following the election of 1976, there were some circumstances which I contend would make any Government, or would want to make any Government, reflect on whether a Coast Guard or Defence Force is necessary, whether the country has come to grips with the necessity for having a Coast Guard, and in particular a Defence Force. Following the election of 1976, on October 6, we are reminded of the fatal CUBANA incident off the coast of Barbados, outside the waters of Barbados, and we were told on the very day that Parliament was opened, by a leading member of the Opposition, that that aircraft did indeed crash within the territorial waters of Barbados.

We had no Coast Guard service and I do not know how many lives would have been saved if Barbados had an effective Coast Guard service then. The *George Fergusson*, which was the main armoury of the Coast Guard, was totally incapable of offering any meaningful assistance to survivors of that fatal crash had it reached there on time. The country was left with the only alternative, and that was the services of the crew members of the Jolly Roger to go to the rescue of that ill-fated CUBANA aircraft.

But let us assume that the *George Fergusson* had reached the point where the aircraft had gone down and it was able to rescue some lives. I understand there were about 76 persons and it was my understanding that the *George Fergusson* would have been able to rescue six people.

It is my further understanding that by law, wide bodied aircraft coming into Barbados must be supported by ancillary services in the form of vessels at sea to operate sea rescue operations in the case of emergency. The present service would permit the *Trident* not to monitor every aircraft, but in the case of an emergency to be able to put out to sea to rescue, by dint of eight additional life rafts, some 200 people, and it does not have to be out to sea continuously as other units of the former Defence Force always had to be at sea protecting and providing these ancillary services. The present Defence Force and the present services offered are much better than those which were offered by the former administration.

I believe it is the responsibility of governments in power to rise to the occasion in times of crisis, and even though this Government might have been critical of what the former Administration thought was necessary at that time, I believe we will be abdicating our responsibility to go on believing that a Defence Force is not necessary for this country. I think that events in the Caribbean over the past few years have clearly demonstrated the necessity, the need not only for Barbados, but for all independent developing emerging countries, to have some form of defence, whether it be military or in naval form.

Threats of invasion threaten every democratic island in the Caribbean. Since the events of March 13, 1979 the Caribbean has not been the same. The Caribbean, Mr. Chairman, will never be the same, because on that eventful day we saw what I would consider the first coup in the Caribbean by the now Government of Grenada. Following that, or the ease, or the facility of the success of that coup, we have also seen other threats of coups in neighbouring Dominica on two occasions and in St. Vincent.

But it would seem to me that unless the Government and the Opposition tell the people of Barbados that this country itself is perhaps threatened, and is perhaps exposed to the fateful events of March 13, 1979, we would not understand the gravity of the situation to have a Defence Force or some sort of defence for the country.

Hurricanes, storms and coups which occur in other parts of the world are things in the minds of most Barbadians because we are at times miraculously saved from the onslaught of a devastating hurricane, many Barbadians do not believe they are actual threats to this country. They believe that it is just propaganda put out by the machinery of Government to make some merchant richer, to sell torch lights and that kind of thing.
2.50 p.m.

Only this morning in a distant country, somewhere in Bangladesh, there was a coup. What does it really mean to us in Barbados? — it happened over there so it cannot happen here. When we are warned of storms and hurricanes, they might not occur, and for the past three years they certainly did not occur, so they do not exist.

When Barbadians are told that people were caught with arms in a boat en route to Barbados to destabilise and overthrow the Government, they are led further into their belief that it is not so by the Opposition. It is all a play, it is a dream, it is the makings of the Government. I feel, Sir, that a Defence Force is necessary for any developing country. They are not protecting me or the Barbados Labour Party; they are protecting the people of Barbados.

The Opposition should join hands, as the honourable Member responsible for this Head has said, in supporting Government's efforts in protecting the country. The vast expanse of Barbados surrounded by open sea, unless it is constantly monitored by a professional and vigilant service, Mr. Chairman, is subject at any time to the incursion of people who would want to destroy the democratic freedom which we have enjoyed over all these years. What I am saying is that if there is one right that should be protected in Barbados, it is the freedom of democracy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more to wind up.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, if I can speak again, I will certainly do so, because I feel very committed to speaking on this Head, because I feel that the Opposition are abdicating their responsibility in explaining to the public the necessity of a Defence Force in times like these, and all the monies being spent today are not being spent to protect the Labour Party government in office but the totality of the Barbadian populace.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few observations in respect of this particular matter. It seems to me that both parties are in agreement that we should have a Defence Force, but where we seem to part company is the way in which the Force apparently is developing. This is possibly so because we are not getting as much information as to what is going on in the Defence Force, and this does not only apply to the party, but I believe a number of people on the outside are also concerned, and if they were given more information, no doubt all these doubts could be cleared up.

As far as the spending of money goes, I believe that when we notice, for example, that a barracks block and other facilities are built to the tune of \$1 million, and knowing that the women police have no barracks, then this is where one is in some doubt as to the wisdom in spending that type of money.

I believe, as I said at the outset, that both sides are in an agreement with having a Defence Force. My main concern really is possibly to ask the Minister responsible if, or when, steps will be taken to introduce a national service scheme within the Defence Force.

I believe all adults are worried about the indiscipline among young people and it is obvious to me that some military training can assist our young people. On the other hand, it would give them an opportunity to engage in sports, if they are not occupied, such as cricket and football. Many of them are coming out of school not capable of holding a job because they have not learnt as well as they should have, and it would give them

an opportunity to have a second bite at the cherry, and it might indeed reduce the number of youngsters who have become involved in crime over the years.

I can recall myself that when I was in England and in the Armed Forces in 1965, I think it was, the National Service went out and it was very evident when we saw the advent of the "Skin Heads" and all those young groups coming on the scene as though there was nothing for them to do.

In our particular case, I would say that our youngsters seem to need a challenge, and if we can have a national service scheme alongside the Defence Force, a number of people in the Defence Force itself would not concentrate possibly on what we on the outside think of — just getting trained in arms and combat tactics, but indeed could concentrate on developing the youngsters in some meaningful way.

For example, the Duke of Edinburg has a scheme whereby youngsters go to some of the neighbouring islands and become involved in expeditions, climbing the hills, and they do various things for badges. These are areas in which our Defence Force can get our youngsters involved, and possibly the Minister responsible for Defence and Security could enlighten us as to if, or when, the Government is thinking of introducing a national scheme. That is my contribution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In response to the honourable Member for St. James South.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have called on the honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this Head. As I sat in my seat, I wondered what was the quarrel with the extension of the Defence Force in this island. Now I realise that since the Barbados Labour Party came to power that every possible area in this country has been improved, and it really worried me here this afternoon why the members of the Opposition are so scared to have the Defence Force improved in this Island.

Now we all agree that in the 1970s the Democratic Labour Party introduced a Defence Force in this country — yet Sydney Burnett Alleyne and others had no fear for the Defence Force, and I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that since the Barbados Labour Party has improved the Defence Force to the state it is today, that we would have anybody like Alleyne, or any kind of group, that would have the audacity to come to these coasts and say that they would overthrow this island. It really does not

sound sensible to me, Mr. Chairman, to know that the Estimates for Barbados for this year are \$501 312 980, which is a big sum, and people are telling me that this is a waste of money and all sorts of things.

Mr. Chairman, we have to watch the position in this country. When we had the overthrow in Grenada, we know who ran to the assistance of Grenada — the members of the Democratic Labour Party. We know that the members of the Democratic Labour Party are the friends of Patrick John. So, Mr. Chairman, when you see an Opposition that is so critical of the improvement of a Defence Force, you will understand what they would be heading for and where it would be looking.

3.00 p.m.

I heard an honourable Member speak about the Police Force. I remember, Mr. Chairman, on this same subject in the Other Place, one of the honourable members of the Opposition discredited the policemen for going to Bridgetown where we had a fire for law and order. They said that the Barbados Labour Party brought out the policemen and the Defence Force to shoot down the people of Barbados and I always wonder why the Democratic Labour Party always oppose law and order.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Defence Force has done a wonderful job since it started, and especially since the Barbados Labour Party improved it. Now, you know for sure, all the years you always hear of constant oil spills around the island. Mr. Chairman, you would hear about the dynamiting of fish all about the North Point. Nowadays, I can assure you that the fishing industry for the last five years has improved considerably in the island of Barbados because you know the danger, as you will say, of oil spills. You know that the flying fish spawn and the eggs float and when that float in the oil, you can understand the destruction to the fishing industry in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are people in the North. They had the Defence Force under the Democratic Labour Party regime and yet the men used to throw dynamite in the sea all through the day. Sometimes when people go to haul their fish pots, they were all macerated and the fish inside destroyed, but, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to report to you that since the improvement in the Defence Force, and the frequent visits that we have around the North Coast, I am sure that we have a good improvement.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I live further north of the island than most of you in here. They had a Defence Force, but yet, Mr. Chairman, on nights going home, I could tell you, I saw all colour of people coming ashore from boats to the pipes—catching water and going back out to the boats. I used to be very worried about it because, Mr. Chairman, I realized that those people could be

people coming to overthrow this country and I feel very happy now that we have a Defence Force that can demand respect.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, I am sure we had a boat off the West Coast and the Defence Force could catch up with that boat to find out what it was doing in the area and I am sure that we all now can be more relaxed to know that we have someone that is taking care of us.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I draw to Your Honour's attention that this House does not have a quorum, Sir, and that the bell be rung.

The bell was rung.

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

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, you will remember a little after the Barbados Labour Party came to power that we had the CUBANA crash west of this island, and we had honourable Members from that side who were arguing that it was inside the territorial waters of Barbados, and we had to get the assistance of a boat from England to do the measurements in that instance. But I am sure, Mr. Chairman, a day like today you will not have that problem because we have a Defence Force — one with a difference.

Mr. Chairman, as you compare the help of the Defence Force in the last hurricane that we had, I worked head and head beside those people, helping to put back old people's houses, clearing the streets and doing all those sorts of things, Mr. Chairman, and that, really, is an asset to this island. As I say, Mr. Chairman, you always used to hear the Democratic Labour Party telling you there is unrest in this country and the only people who used to know about this unrest used to be the Democratic Labour Party. You do not hear about all of this unrest now. We have security now to take care of us.

Mr. Chairman, when you think about the employment of many boys and girls who could not find jobs, you will find that nowadays those boys and girls are contributing. And the Defence Force is not only learning people to drill, but are learning them skills and trying to improve their way of living where they can come back and help improve this country. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to let you know I do not think that there is any organization, any place in Barbados, that has more discipline than the Defence Force.

I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister in charge of the Defence Force that he would extend it a little further, because I believe that if members of the

Defence Force are allowed to visit these canefields and cart roads on nights and days, that we will have less fires than we are having nowadays and I believe if those members of the Defence Force could patrol through these places, I believe that the canefields would automatically watch themselves. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tire you on this score but I believe definitely that we all can be very proud of the Defence Force.

You talked about those boats parking above here. In those days the captains knew that we had a Defence Force in this island of Barbados in the 1970's, but they could still afford to let go their oil and things like that because they knew they did not have anybody to detect them. But nowadays we have boats with a difference.

I spoke this week in this Hon. Chamber and I told you about an instance occurring on the north coast. I had to ask one of the Coast Guard officers in the area, why they did not go to help that boat? He said, "Man, we are so frighten for the North Coast, the boats we have are just shallow water boats. We cannot afford to go that way." Now we have a Defence Force with boats of quality. They can go anywhere in the world and I am sure that people have to respect us now.

You look now, Mr. Chairman, and you will see smaller islands than Barbados with a Defence Force and they are trying their best to demand respect. I had the privilege already, Mr. Chairman, to be sleeping under the arms of a watchman and it made me feel so secure because I knew that I would be really taken care of by the watchman, and the Lord would take care of me otherwise.

The way we see things going these days, you are getting problems here and you are getting problems there, and now people are complaining week after week and quarrelling about a Defence Force. Mr. Chairman, this thing makes me think over again that there is something in that, something in the back of their brain that they would like to see an island free from overthrows and things like that.

Mr. Chairman, it makes me feel happy, as you know, to meet visitors from all over the world, and they tell me about the improvement of this country. They tell me that this Prime Minister is really trying his best, and they are really satisfied with his movements. You can bring the best Bill inside this House and you would be surprised to know that honourable Members from that side would always try to drag it down. But I thank God to know, Mr. Chairman — and I will give the Democratic Labour Party credit for this — that they were the first people that tried, I would say, to introduce strong education in this country — that you are talking now to an educated electorate.

3.10 p.m.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when the Democratic Labour Party had the belief that they could fool

some of the people. But you cannot fool all the people all of the time — you can fool some of the people some of the time. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Members on the other side should get up and commend the Government on this side for work very well done. I believe the people over there and outside will respect them more.

I believe the Democratic Labour Party have in mind, and are anxious to get back in power. I believe that in the year 2001 that they will come again. Mr. Chairman, as you will realize they do not seem to be fortunate at the ballot and I definitely believe they are out to do any danger to destroy this country. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that after we had heard that brilliant, elucid and erudite speech from the honourable Member for St. Lucy that we can leave the Defence Force and move on to immigration matters.

I agree with him that the view of different approach has come to these matters and I believe that it would be a travesty to attack the honourable Member. The honourable Member said that the Democratic Labour Party would do anything to destroy this country, I really do not think he understands what he said, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe he intended to say the Democratic Labour Party. Mr. Chairman, he actually said that. I don't understand why an honourable Member would want to say something like that. He does not understand what he is saying most of the time, Sir.

I wish to deal with immigration matters. Mr. Chairman, one of the areas in this country which has been of extreme concern to citizens of Barbados is the Immigration Department.

Now I believe that the Immigration Officers are people of integrity. What I am saying is not to be misunderstood. I do not believe that civil servants who work in the Immigration Department are persons who are capable of being misled. I also understand they are under extremely difficult pressure in carrying out their responsibility and I therefore consider that the political directorate must take all of the blame for the problems surrounding the immigration.

Now when I look at the reality of this kind of situation where it is a fact that a person arrived in Barbados with papers stating that he was a citizen of Barbados, when that person had never been to Barbados before..... — it is a fact that persons have arrived in Barbados with papers which said that they have a work permit, and those papers appeared on the face of records to be valid papers, and those persons have never been to Barbados before. It is a fact that persons on the advice of certain people functioning in this community have been able to get their status in this country organize, settled, without going through all of the processes which other people seeking similar status had to go through.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am following the honourable Member for St. Michael West very closely, and I would like for him to repeat again part of what he said, if he would be kind enough. It has come across to me that what he is conveying is that there is some sort of fiddling around in paying the people in the Immigration, or are you making reference to the Minister in the light of when you said "political directorate"? You better go a little slower because there will be sharp replies.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have no doubt there will be sharp replies, but I am not interested in sharp replies, I am interested in truthful replies.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member is obscuring the occasion, but I will not be caught in that kind of trap. I have said that before in this House — that there is some corruption in the immigration area. I am not accusing any particular person of corruption, but it has been stated, and the Immigration Department itself confirms that there has been corruption.

There was one man who was recently deported to Grenada because the legitimate authority discovered that because he had been given instructions and those instructions were carried out by him, and he was deported because he had in his possession documents which were illegal. He was led to believe that if he carried a certain amount of money and deposited it at a certain bank that he would be able to operate. I am saying, and I believe officials of the Government said, that there is some measure of corruption in the whole area of immigration. I cannot say who receives money and who does what, because I am not ready to get involved in any cross talk about who is responsible for the corruption.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I wonder if you would also make available to the Director of Public Prosecutions all of the information that you have told on this Floor in this Hon. House. It is unfair to the entire country, and to you as a Parliamentarian, not to make available all of the information which you have whereby people have been asked to deposit money into particular banks for the purpose of receiving documents. If you will be kind enough to make that kind of information available, rest assured I shall do whatever I can to assist you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I just say the Chair does not view kindly these allegations which have been made. I would just like to warn all honourable Members that we cannot do indirectly what we are not permitted to do directly. I will say no more at this point.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am guided by your direction in this matter, Sir, but I am following the highest traditions of Parliament, and as set out in May's, and in the United Kingdom, and in this Hon. House.

In this Hon. Chamber today, we heard that one Glasgow was involved in some shenanigan, concerning the security of this country. I am saying to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are persons who go to Trinidad and Tobago to receive information on Indians to bring back here falsified information to the immigration authorities so that the information can be brought to this country and certain people can masquerade with documents which they have got — and those documents are presented as authentic documents in Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, what is even worse is that from time to time they have been able to get authentic documents illegally. That is a fact, Sir. And, the honourable Member wishes me to send the information to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

3.20 p.m.

The last time that I indicated that, I indicated in this Hon. Chamber that there were 63 persons in this country illegally, the Immigration Department could not find them. And I said that I had the information and that I was willing to give to anyone from the directorate that was interested in having the information as to where the 63 persons were. That was more than four months ago and nobody made any contact with me.

I am not a police informer. I am not in the business of touting. I am saying that as a representative of the people in this country, there are three things that are happening which are important to all of us in this Hon. Chamber. They are Indians who have lived in Barbados for a substantially long time who have made a contribution to the development of Barbados. Those Indians are now seen and treated with a high degree of suspicion, hostility and prejudice by ordinary Barbadians because other Indians — through their contact and — I want to be very careful — through illegalities, have been able to filter into Barbados illegally. And as a result — because the matter has been made public — all Indians are now being treated in the same way by a community that is justifiably hostile to certain revelations which are coming to them in the market place.

Mr. Chairman, it should not be that anybody in Barbados could feel that he or she is such a high influence better that he or she, rightly or wrongly, can lead other people from outside of Barbados to believe that they can reach up to the highest levels — and let us say not the highest levels because I would not wish anyone to believe I mean the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister — I do not at this point mean the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister — I am saying that there are people who feel that they can reach at all level in this society and get things done illegally for a price. There are people who have been led to believe that.

I am saying to the Hon. Minister responsible for Immigration that the time has come for us as a country to draw a very sharp line. I do not wish to hear who came in illegally under the Democratic Labour Party, because if I knew about that then, my attitude would have been the same as I have now. I am saying that any time there is a racket concerning either dope or immigration, that the whole country stands to lose, and so it does not matter to me whether it happens to be the present Government in power or this Government in power. I am saying that it is the duty of the Government to insist on a rooting out of this problem. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Talk you talk.)

Now, Sir, I am told — and I would expect the Hon. Minister to correct me if I am wrong — that a decision has been made that there would be an imposition of a requirement for visas for persons coming from India. If that is correct, then I wish to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister responsible that there are certain problems arising out of that.

They now have to try and get something done about Bangladesh. (Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Bangladesh was considered and excluded.) But, the point is that when you see an Indian, and he is coming from the United States of America, for example, or he is coming from within the Caribbean where a number of Indians now reside, he may be an Indian from Bangladesh. I mean it is a strange statement, but what I am saying is he may be a natural Indian coming from Bangladesh or a natural Indian coming from the United States or, indeed, here in the Caribbean.

I feel that when you have been forced to make that kind of decision, you are not able to say to people coming from the Caribbean, "You may collect your visa from some place in the Caribbean". You present the country with a particular difficulty where it is only when a man arrives, or a woman arrives, or as happened in the case that was reported to me, a family arrived in Barbados and the airport people say to them, "You have to have a visa" and they asked, "Where should I have got the visa?" They said, "Well, you should have got it in London" when they were in fact coming from a country as far removed from London as can possibly be.

I recognise that the Government must have concluded that some....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member would give way. The requirement of a visa for Indians is not a racial requirement, it is a national requirement applied to persons who are citizens of India and of Pakistan not Bangladesh or persons of Indian ancestry from other parts of the world. It is a national requirement.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, when we as black people went to London, we who were in London or New York did not have a badge carrying on our arm, as the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central can confirm, saying, "Barbadian", "Jamaican", "Down South man". We had one badge which we carried proudly or otherwise. And, when you are an Indian — whether you come from Bangladesh, Timbuktu, Nairobi, New York or India — when you appear, you appear with the physiology of an Indian.

I am saying that there are respectable families who are now Barbadian nationals who are suffering a certain hostility because of the misbehaviour, the illegal behaviour, of other non-Barbadian Indians and those non-Barbadian Indians were assisted in their illegal, worthless behaviour by Barbadian nationals. And I am saying that to the extent that that has been known — and that nothing has been done about it — to the extent that people have been able to hold their status in this community in the face of that information, that we as a community must stand condemned.

We have another class of Indians in this community. That that class does not give a damn if Barbadians sink or swim. We have a class of Indians in this community that are interested only in making more and more money at the behest, the bequest and of the sweat, blood and tears of ordinary citizens of this country.

That class of Indian is able, apparently, to buy influence in this country. That class of Indian is able to buy almost every piece of real estate which becomes available in the market arising out of the depressed conditions of the current economy. That class of Indian is driving the body politic of this community into more division than is necessary.

And I am saying that it is important, Mr. Chairman, that when we are looking at an immigration policy, that we should deal with that immigration policy in such a manner as to reduce as much as possible the upsurge of this class of person who is doing no good to the body politic in Barbados.

When, for example, a poor, old lady living in the Cave Hill area decides that she wishes to sell her house and a Barbadian national wishes to buy that house for what is now an inflated price of \$200 000 — the house is worth approximately \$100 000 to \$120 000 — and an Indian who is a bag man — a collector of ill-gotten gains, is able to go and offer her \$200 000 cash, it means that no Barbadian will be able to buy a house in Cave Hill. It means that the Barbadians who cannot buy a house in Cave Hill would become prejudiced against all Indians on sight, and it means that for us who believe in a certain way of life in this country that that will be yet another area of friction, confusion and danger.

The immigration policies of this country have got to be such that everybody knows what they are. The discretionary powers that are given to the people with discretionary power should be exercised within the framework of the law. No one can tell a man who has exercised his discretion how to exercise it. Once he is given a discretionary power, he can exercise it. But as soon as it becomes known that that discretion is available for sale, if it ever becomes known that such discretion is available for sale, then the discretionary power ceases to be the power that was given and it becomes a saleable commodity.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that by the few remarks I have made in this regard, I would have indicated, by firing a shot across the bow, that there is certain information which is available, some of which I will make available to the relevant authorities. And I have every reason to believe that the honourable gentlemen and lady on the other side would wish that some of those persons would be rooted out and brought into the public domain. I would hope that they would not continue to contaminate the body politic, to contaminate the politics in this country by their continuous quest for ill gotten gains.

The only difference between the immigration racket and the dope racket is one of size, and when we come to the appropriate Head I will speak in a similar vein about the dope racket.

Hon. H. B. St., JOHN: Mr. Chairman, no Government that has been in power in Barbados since Barbados became independent has been more open with respect to its immigration policy than this Government. From the very beginning, in our Manifesto, we told the public that it was our intention to bring a new Immigration Act into operation in Barbados, that we would attempt to narrow the area of discretion which was granted to any certifying authority, that we believe that an immigration policy in the context of Barbados to be in the national interest would have to relate to those categories of skills and areas and avenues which were deficient in Barbados.

We always recognised that in Barbados it was necessary to ensure that first preference for jobs for business opportunities should be given to Barbadians, the second preference to Caribbean citizens, and the rest must come after.

We brought amendments to the Immigration Act in this House. In addition to that, and most important, for the first time an attempt was made to ensure that there was maximum consultation pending an exhaustive examination of the requirements for skills in Barbados by an Immigration Advisory Committee that all departments affected would be consulted.

The Immigration Advisory Committee has been set up. It is a widely representative body. So open and public has been its preliminary conclusions, that they have been published in the newspaper for every citizen in Barbados to come forward and make their views known as to the categories of employment for which work permits would be granted. Nothing so ever occurred before, but this modern Immigration Statute that we have established is a statute which is based upon the most up-to-date precedents one can find in any part of the world — category preference.

Now, Sir, I periodically act as Prime Minister, and as such I would have views on some matters relating to immigration. Barbados, like any other part of the world, has been the victim of attempts by a group of people — I do not want to use racial connotations — whose be all and end all in life seem to be to try to beat the Immigration Laws in other countries. It is well known that citizens from certain parts of Asia specialise in this. Who can recall some of the problems that many other Commonwealth countries have had to deal with the devious devices that they invent?

I well recall that it took great ingenuity on the part of the British Government to devise the Virginity Test as one of the means of ensuring whether applications for marriage to genuine British citizens of a certain type were authentic. The British devised that test so as to check out really and truly whether they were fraudulent or counterfeit. This is important. If you read any books on human rights or Immigration Law, you will see that the Virginity Test was devised specifically to weed out genuine from non-genuine applications.

So, it is not surprising to me to hear that our Immigration is under pressure in this respect, but something has been done about it. Because of facts coming to the attention of Cabinet, steps have been taken to ensure that visas from certain Commonwealth countries now have to be produced before there is entry into Barbados. Now, the magnitude of this step is great, because it does not apply to other parts of the Commonwealth.

The Prime Minister has given the details of the countries from which this is a requirement. But the honourable Member must understand that he is not privy to any further sources of information on this that some of us have not been privy to, because I have heard some of the very words the honourable Member uses. When I was acting, people would ring me up, write letters and tell me that, "we, the honest Indians in Barbados, are very concerned about the fact that some newly coming ones" — and some of them cannot even write English properly, by the way — I am sure the honourable Member's letters have been that way — they even name the people who are allegedly responsible.

The Chief Immigration Officer has been brought fully up-to-date on more than one occasion. Every bit of information I have that people write to me, I sent to him and say, "Check this out, these people are persistently telling me these things." But let us not fool ourselves — one of the great characteristics of certain countries in Asia is that they produce people who specialise in forging passports, who because of the pressure in population specialise in trying to provide outlets to other parts of the world. They are immigration specialists.

It is not only India — I have been reading in other cases that the Americans have the same problem in relation to the Philipinos. But we are taking steps, so when we ask the honourable Member if he has specific information to pass it on, it is in this spirit of trying to use our brains in the best way of how to get around these people, because they are past masters at this art of trying to beat the immigration system.

I am sure that the Prime Minister will have a few other facts in relation to matters of passports that he will disclose to the House. The Government has nothing to hide on this. I am interested in ferreting out each and every one of them, because I believe that the business of retail trade in Barbados is a business where we have enough people who have the competence and the capacity to carry that on. I believe that.

3.40 p.m.

All immigration permissions in relation to tourism come to our Ministry, and we object strenuously to anybody getting immigration permission to carry on a number of activities in the area. We are very open on this. We are bringing down a Travel Service Bill in Barbados to ensure that certain jobs are reserved for nationals.

We feel strongly about this, so the honourable Member is only preaching to the converted. I feel very strongly about this, so I want to know the facts that the honourable Member has. Let him disclose the facts. I want to hear them. I want to know about them because we have been having this battle consistently. It was in our Manifesto and we intend to see that it is carried out, and the Cabinet of Barbados has taken steps in this direction, so that the public at large can make their great inputs into categories of jobs. *(Asides)*

Well you see you have a complaint against the Minister and you want to keep it up. Bring it out in the open so that we can all hear and let us answer it. I do not believe in this smear campaign. Bring it out. If you have the facts, bring them out, cough them out, throw them out and let us hear them. I want to hear them, because I know in this country that there are some people who are past masters at just throwing out a little bit so that the rumour-mongers can take over. That is standard Democratic Labour Party technique. I know that

technique. It is a technique of assassination by the rumour mongers. It is a technique by suggestion so that the Press picks it up.

Let me tell you this: In this country there are sufficient people who know that if you are bold enough and man enough to start something, you should finish it. Give the public the information; bring it out in the open. We have nothing to hide. I want to hear the names of the people whom you are accusing of taking money. Call them now and let us get the facts. This is a public place. This technique of insinuation has got to be eradicated in this country. If we have to deal with matters, we will deal with them.

Mr. Chairman, when the Judiciary comes up here, we will tell the public the facts. I want you to tell the public the facts. You want to start it off? Let us go. I am willing. I have signed very often on any file that comes to me "No", "Unfit", "Reserved for nationals". My name is clear on that, and I want you to understand that we want the names called, otherwise the honourable Member will be regarded as being irresponsible, as being a panderer to the rumour technique and a supporter of that. So I want the names.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member is asking for names. When I called names before in this Hon. House about the people who brought in the one-arm bandits illegally, they said they did not want to hear the names, and then the Hon. Minister went and drew a veil. Do you wish to hear the names of who brought in the one-arm bandits illegally?

Mr. CHAIRMAN directed that certain remarks be struck from the records.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining this matter any more, please. You were speaking and you were interrupted. If you wish to continue you may do so.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sorry, Parliamentary assemblies are places of privilege, and things that are said in Parliamentary Assemblies cannot be said elsewhere — and I will defend that to my dying day. I defended it when it was thought to curb free speech in here and I still defend it now. But if that is to be accepted, Parliament must discipline itself and where honourable Members make outrageous statements calculated to shock the House and the public, they must be prepared to justify them.

An honourable Member who knows that there is corruption in the Immigration Department, and who knows that certain people receive money in return for immigration permission, and that persons who have never

been to Barbados arrive at the airport with papers entitling them to enter Barbados.....

It is perfectly possible, Mr. Chairman, for somebody who has never been to Barbados to have citizenship papers. It is perfectly possible. If you are a child born abroad, you can apply for citizenship through a Barbados Embassy abroad, and you may be entitled to a grant of citizenship even though you have never been here. So that by itself is neither really here or there. It is a mere pejorative praise.

But if the honourable Member has evidence against anybody, he should lay it before me and I will transmit it to the Minister of Immigration, and, indeed as far as I am concerned, he can lay it in here in the House (*Asides*).

You know when Leo Leacock gave him the \$60,000 for the Cement Licences we really should have come in here and said it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: From Casa Marina? You want me to talk about who gets money for what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All honourable Members take your seats.

Rt. J. M. G. M. ADAMS stands

On what does the honourable Member rise?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You had better tell me who it is so I can write to them if they owe me money. I never heard of them before in my life. You got in here and said that Leo Leacock was your friend and you will not deny that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He is my friend and he will always be my friend.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He does not have any money to bribe you with now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two honourable Members are on their feet please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He never had any one-armed bandits and he never got any money from the one-armed bandits, and I want you to get up and say so too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! You may continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The allegation of corruption at the Immigration Department is not new. It has continued over two Governments. It existed when Immigration was in the hands of the police and it

probably still exists now with Immigration in the hands of civilians.

It relates very generally to foreign persons of Eastern extraction. At one time there were allegations made that the Syrian and Lebanese communities were corruptly engaged with the police. When we came into power, we found some evidence that two visas had been issued to persons of Syrian and Lebanese origin without the knowledge of the ministerial structure — documents, indeed, which may have been valid under the old police Act of 1909 but which ceased to be valid under the modern Police Act.

The Government went to some trouble to play up the entire situation. It appeared to us that the Syrians and Lebanese who were here, and who were involved in the non payment of tax and breaches of the Immigration Regulations as a community, made an effort to bring themselves within the law. Those who had bank accounts overseas declared them to the Central Bank. They made payment of several years Income Tax to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, in some cases they paid seven and eight years arrears Trading Tax and they made applications, based on their residence in the island, for work permits or whatever status. One or two of them, citizens of other Caribbean countries, qualified for amnesty, and I am glad to say that since the early part of 1977 we have had no complaints nor do I hear remarks of misbehaviour in that department.

I cannot say that I have heard any particular rumour about immigrants from Britain. Immigrants from Britain represents one of the largest numbers that come to Barbados. It is St. Lucia first and Britain and St. Vincent second, but on the whole those three places. The St. Lucians and the Vincentians, presumably, because they might not be wealthy enough ever to think of that sort of consideration to help them break the Immigration Laws in Barbados. The British possibly because they have different attitudes.

We hear abundant rumours of previous dealings — not at police level — between North American and authorities responsible for Immigration. I have had little or no complaints. There have been one or two cases where one got the feeling that persons from, I think mainly the United States, expected that they would have been shaken down when applying for immigration permission. I am satisfied that we were able to, in all of these cases, convince the intended immigrant, or attivant, or whatever, that permission in Barbados did not go by favour or corruption, but it went by rules and regulations.

Immigrants from other Caribbean Islands generally give no trouble except in the case of Guyana where, undoubtedly, there were some difficulties in the past. Some very severe accusations have been made here today,

a lot of smearing, so things that normally I do not talk about perhaps I will talk about.

One immigrant from Guyana whose foundation for residence in Barbados was found to be of the shadiest nature was interviewed and subsequent to the interview, his papers were turned to and it transpired that he had been interviewed by the previous Attorney General who was then in charge of Immigration and a shorthand transcript happened to have been taken of that interview. The previous Attorney General — I am referring to Mr. George Moe — asked the immigrant from Guyana why he had ceased paying the male person — a taxi driver from Holder's Hill, St. James — the sum of \$150 a week. There was a clear indication, and it was supported by a statement made by the man that he understood he had to pay this man in St. James \$150 a week to get permission to stay in Barbados. And when he ceased paying it, he was called by the Minister and it was explained to him that the permission had expired.

If you want facts and figures on matter specifically raised, that is on record, and the files can be shown to the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition — including the shorthand transcript between Mr. Moe and this person.

I mentioned that, and we have had other difficulties with persons from Guyana, but on the whole I cannot say that these difficulties continue.

We have had, Sir, a more recent difficulty. Simultaneously at the Barbados High Commission in London and in Barbados, certain suspicious circumstances came to the notice of persons responsible for, in the case of Britain, dealing with an intended immigrant, and in the case of Barbados dealing with persons who had come here. 4.00 p.m.

In the case of Barbados dealing with a person, an Indian person of Pakistan origin approached a junior Immigration Officer and offered him a sum of \$200 to destroy the files of three immigrants. The junior officer who was a former member of the Defence Force, who I can safely say is a young man of integrity, made this known to his superiors and was instructed to obtain the names on the three files which were being sought out for destruction. He got the names, and the three immigrants in question were asked to bring in their passports. When the passports came in, it was discovered that they had forged residence stamps in them signed by a former senior Police Officer engaged in the Immigration Department.

There is no doubt that the stamps were forged. I have seen the passports, and the senior officer forged and signed his name. One of them is not in existence on the date it purported to bear, one has been issued saying the holder of this passport is a resident of Barbados for the

past number of years when, in fact, he had been a schoolboy in India at the time when he was supposed to be a resident in Barbados. That was the one that was traced through the British High Commission.

The Police Officer in question had retired from the Force before the change-over, and the matter was drawn to the attention of the Commissioner of Police. This is since last year, and I am unaware of any information sent to the Director of Public Prosecution or not. It is open to the Commissioner of Police to send them to court or not. We in the Immigration Department do not intend to pursue that aspect of it.

It happened very close to election time last year and there were abundant reasons why the government did not want to give reasons for victimizing anyone at that time. But subsequently to that some framing was done and perhaps other people were dealt with in an appropriate manner.

I know of one other case which has been reported of a Vincentian girl who, upon being served with a deportation order, alleged that she had given \$200 to save her from being deported. The Immigration Officer was questioned and he admitted receipt of the \$200. He said that it was received in order to buy a ticket for the person. This story did not appear to hold water and, in any case, no immigration officer has any right having any financial transaction with an immigrant on the island. The appointment of that Immigration Officer was terminated.

I hear rumours just like anybody else and they nearly all now seem to be concentrated on the Sindi community, that is Hindus originally from Hidrobad Sin who now come from India and other parts of the world, persons with names ending in "Ani", and a smaller number of Muslims most of whom come from India.

I have tried my best to identify even one truthful report. I have begged. I have tried to offer inducements to people who will come and admit to the payment of even one dollar. The only admission that has ever been obtained for payment relates to the senior Police Officer who has retired from the Police Force. I remember we were told that he did not even ask for very much money. All he wanted was to come into his store and not have to pay for anything.

That sort of statement was made from more than one source, and I believe that although there may very well have been other corrupt activities, that the only one we got any information about was that Police Officer because it was known in the community that we knew he had been up to something, and so it would do no harm to tell us that he had been on the take. The community is a tightly-knit community, and there are times when I think it is as adept at starting rumours as concealing the

facts of past corruption. Sufficient to say that I know that the Minister of Immigration merely has to hear a hint of corrupt bargaining in respect to this particular community to place the most surveillance on the immigrants in question.

We hold ourselves out in the Government as ready to administer our rules and regulations without any sort of favour. And you do not have to pay, and if we can pin it down you will not have to pay any officer, at any level of Government, to get something which a person is entitled to — whether entitlement is a matter of law or within the regulations which govern the Immigration Service.

Honourable Members who make these accusations of corruption to obtain headlines without facts, upon which an investigation can be carried out, should be thoroughly and deeply ashamed of themselves. And I have nothing but contempt for such an honourable Member, who I am obliged to call an honourable Member because the Rules of the House so dictate, although I cannot regard him as an honourable Member if he wants to make, in such a sensitive area as this, accusations that he is unable to substantiate.

I use to follow a practice, Mr. Chairman, — even if something was said at a political meeting — of writing to the speaker, if he was an honourable Member of the House, and asking for the facts so they could be investigated. I wrote twice to Dr. Caddle to ask him to justify some of the lies he was telling. I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition. I don't think that he replied, but he did give me some material which discredited itself and did not require any serious investigation.

I think it is so much more important if the statement is made in the House to tell the Government — you can send it in writing — the facts in which the allegations are made so that the Government can investigate it. There can be no question, Mr. Chairman, of this Government tolerating any element of corruption which it is able to substantiate upon a proper investigation. I can do no more but sit down and hope that the honourable Member for St. Michael West will either withdraw his statements as baseless, or give an assurance that they will be justified — and state the manner in which they will be justified.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution in this debate?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not moved by the emotional attempt on the part of the Prime Minister to indicate that he has contempt for me. Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister has contempt for me is a well known fact, but, Mr. Chairman, I think the record will require me to deal with his having contempt for this

honourable Member. Surely, Mr. Chairman,.....(Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please).....you will allow me the opportunity.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, we are in a debate, and personality issues.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: No it is not personal).....should not be brought in here at all.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the honourable Member says that he only calls me an honourable Member because the Rules require it.
4.10 p.m.

The same Rules require, Sir, that I be given the opportunity, and I am craving the indulgence of the Chair in this matter. It is a privilege which has been demanded for me by the Speaker on the very first day of this session, Sir. The honourable Member says that he has contempt for me. He has always had contempt for me and people like me, Sir. He cannot help it. He cannot help having contempt for people like me. That the opportunity presents itself in this debate is only incidental, but he should know that it is a mutually-shared situation. I feel exactly about him as he feels about me. (*Aside*)

I stand by what I said before, and I am going to go on to say more so that it would not be felt that I was merely uttering words for the sake of uttering them. The Rt. Hon. gentleman who just sat down, stated in explanation of a Ministerial decision he made concerning the department that I intimated that an honourable Member had been involved in something. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with the specific honourable Member, but I am going to draw this to your attention for the sake of the Prime Minister.

The Customs Act makes it clear — there are two signatures as you know, Sir, which you can have on documents for the drawing of materials out of the port or out of the Airport.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not entertain that matter. It has already been dealt with, I have ruled that the remarks be struck from the Record, I see no reason why we should stray to that extent. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Call the names of the people who got money. I want to hear them.) Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I would say, Mr. Chairman, in deference to your ruling, Sir, I would say, Sir, that so far as the Immigration is concerned, the information is not special information. It is information which is available to the honourable Members to some extent. The information on files concerning the corruption in the Immigration area that I was speaking of. The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central got up and substantiated part of what I was talking about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter has already been gone through and I am not prepared to entertain that at all. Come with something new, something different.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: When you say something new, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, do you mean something new on the Immigration Service? (ASIDE: Call names.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The utilities, the rentals — there are a whole lot of items you can talk about.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I was under the impression that the Rules permitted me if I have not completed what I was saying.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Rules do not permit you to repeat or rehash matters that we have dealt with.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not repeating or rehashing. If it is that you do not wish me to go further down that road, Sir, I will not go in deference to you, Sir.

I wish to ask the Minister what size Immigration Department he envisages with these Estimates, bearing in mind the extreme difficulty the Immigration Department has had in finding persons who are alleged to be in this community illegally. I wish to find out from him whether he has made provision in these Estimates, or in another Head, for the stationing of Consular Officers in the Caribbean to permit the issuance of visas so that persons who, for example are working with..... (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:.....international agencies in other Caribbean countries, who may be coming to Barbados, and who would not have had the opportunity to acquire a visa, would not suffer some of the indignities which are bound to flow from the decision made by this Government.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, furthermore, that some instruction would have to go out on the handling of immigration matters when certain persons arrive at the airport. It seems to me that to insist that only the Chief Immigration Officer, himself, can deal with certain entries, is to put a certain difficulty, an administrative difficulty, in the way of the procedures which the action taken is deemed to present, because, Mr. Chairman, failure to do so will result in an unfavourable atmosphere concerning a certain group of people and the rain will fall on the just and the unjust alike.

I also wish to ask the Minister responsible for Immigration whether it is his intention, in the light of all that he has said, to have this Advisory Committee operate as a statutory body or merely an advisory body. I formed the impression from the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister that he is indicating that this will come in the form of a statute, that there is going to be a Bill which will be coming to this House. Can the Minister confirm whether this is so, and if that Bill is coming to this Hon. House, if it is his intention, or if it is the practice at the moment for persons entering Barbados to be treated via the Advisory Committee, or if that is to await the establishment of the Committee in statutory form?

Mr. Chairman, furthermore, Sir, we in Barbados are not requiring persons who come as tourists to have a visa. We believed, sometime ago, that visa abolition was in the interest of the economic development of the country, and, therefore, we have allowed persons, many of them, — possibly of ill-repute — to enter Barbados with a driver's licence.

In the light of that decision, what I wish to know from the Minister is if it is his intention in that Act, or that Bill which he brings down, to have a retroactivity concerning the categories of employment.

There are persons in the community at the moment for whom applications were made for a particular job — the job description was supplied — but those persons are engaged in tourist related activity, and the activity bears no relationship to the job description which accompanied the application for the work permit.

I wish to know if there is a policy of reviewing work permits which have been issued, if there is a policy of inspection to find out whether persons who applied as technicians are in fact working as technicians, as for example is done in the United States. When you go to the United States, and you go in as a student, as you may know, Sir, you are checked periodically to find out if you are attending the institution for which you got the student visa.

We have, for example, persons who enter Barbados, apparently as other employment, but ended up being croupiers. We have never had a satisfactory explanation of how six or 12 persons, non-Barbadians, were able to be employed or described as croupiers when, in fact, there is no evidence either in the record which His Honour says the information can be gleaned from, or by way of ministerial statement, or by way of GIS public relations statement — that croupiers ever came into Barbados.

4.20 p.m.

It would seem that what I am saying is substantiated — that persons were able to get work permits by some other route. Either they applied as technicians or they

applied as investors — only to function as croupiers or trainers of croupiers. I believe that the Minister should be in a position to shed some light on that, and I believe that this is the appropriate time to raise that particular question.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have listened to both sides in what I can only consider a very heated debate with a number of revelations.

Before I ask that the question be put, I am calling, again, on the Member for St. Michael West to make available to this Committee the names of the persons of the political directorate, or those persons he has accused in the Immigration Department, and this Government, of wholesale corruption.

If he does not do that, he stands condemned in my sight, and as from today I will have absolutely no respect for anything he has to say.

Before the question is put, I am still requesting him, for the last time, to make available the names. I want to hear the names of the persons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These allegations have been struck from the record.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am referring to the immigration allegations. I must know, I am a Cabinet Minister, I must know who gets money for passports. I want to know today. You must tell this Committee or you stand condemned in the sight of this Committee and the public.

I must hear the names — the Ministers, the Clerks, the Immigration Officers. I want to hear the names, or you remain condemned — a simple, pure wholesale rumour monger. That is what you would be. You stand condemned. Get up and let me hear the names.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that this sitting be now suspended for 20 minutes, until a quarter to five.

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.
4.25 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.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to traverse any ground that has already been covered under this Head, but I want to deal with one or two important matters in relation to immigration policy.

The broad outlines of the Government's policy, I believe, are generally known, at least in principle. Any deviations from that policy would not be in the best interest of Barbadians, and certainly, Sir, I would feel that immigration is such a sensitive and vital area in a small land mass like ours, that from time to time we should look very carefully at the short term and long term impact of our immigration policy.

The first point I would like to make is that outside in our community there are growing tensions over the question of immigration. Feelings are beginning to manifest themselves in some very strong language that I hear, from time to time, from many persons in relation to different groups coming into Barbados. You hear, Sir, those feelings from the traditional ethnic groups that comprise this population, and you hear those feelings from different sections within the same ethnic groups.

They blame it all on the impact of the recent spate of immigration, and I would like to draw Government's attention to the fact that this is an area which seems to be a concern to the community as a whole outside, and whatever might have been going wrong in the area of immigration certainly needs to be corrected and handled very decisively.

There is another area where we have to look very carefully. We have to look at the potential for change in the demographic profile of Barbados consequential on our immigration policies. This relates to different attitudes towards birth control by various sectors of the community, and it relates to the strength of inter-linkages to families since those linkages differ from group to group.

We also have to look very carefully at the administrative arrangements — I do not want to spell this out

in very great detail, but I think if I say it in summary it will be clearly understood — the administrative arrangements in respect of birth control in Barbados and the impact it might have either in diminishing or accelerating the rate of increase of any particular group within Barbados.

4.55 p.m.

You might find, Sir, in a matter of ten to 15 years that errors made at this point in time can completely change the demographic structure of Barbados in very important ways. So whereas the debate that I have heard so far is symptomatic of a general feeling both within and without Parliament, I am seeking to draw attention to basic approaches to immigration policy which, I can foresee, can have a serious impact on the Barbadian community in the future.

Sir, one of the problems which would create tensions within the society would also be the point of entry in the social scale of any immigrant group, and also the rate of vertical mobility within that society of that particular immigrant group. This is determined, Sir, not only by the initiatives and motivations, generally, of people who leave their homeland to reside elsewhere, but it may be found in situations where systems can exist within financial institutions which might give preference to one particular group in relation to another. And I think, Sir, we are seeing here in Barbados a very complex situation which is following on an immigration policy which, I feel, has not been as tight as it should be, and has not been as carefully examined as it should be in terms of looking down the road into the future.

I believe, Sir, that any immigration policy should be firm, but that policy should also be humane. I believe that as a citizen of a country, which has forced many of our brothers and sisters to emigrate for economic and social reasons, that we have to be concerned about the humanity of our immigration policy. But on the other hand, we have to look in terms of the size of the population, opportunities for our indigenous population — at least those that are left behind — and look at the impact of immigration in relation to the development prospects of Barbados.

I have deliberately set those words in that framework because I believe that if the allegations of corruption which I have been hearing are correct, and if those allegations are substantiated and can be substantiated, then those responsible must realise that they are doing this country a serious dis-service in that, in fact, what they are doing is not merely accepting money, but they are destroying the heritage of many Barbadians.

It is not a simple matter. It is a very fundamental matter to the survival of race and the survival of our children on this land mass, and therefore I think

Government not only should be enunciating the principles of its immigration policy but also should seek to strengthen the administrative framework relating to those policies, so that any problems which arise can be dealt with swiftly, and that the vast majority of those persons who try to beat the system can be quickly deported from Barbados.

One recognises, Sir, the ingenuity with which this can be done — that is, the people who try to beat the immigration system. We realise, Sir, that where we are a tourist oriented community that it makes it even more difficult. But at least we have the advantage of being a relatively small country which makes it a little easier to track down those persons who have sought residence in Barbados illegally, and who are working in Barbados illegally.

So there must be some uniformity in our policy. That policy must apply with the greatest strictness, but at the same time with an element of humanity. And that policy must not relate only to the immediate problems facing the country, but, in particular — and I warn again that from what I have been picking up in the outside community in relation to the feelings of people — I strongly feel that we have to watch carefully all these factors which might eventually lead to a very changing picture of the population of Barbados, not necessarily to the advantage of either of the two main indigenous groups in this country.

I see this in the long term as a major plan. I am concerned about the rumours in relation to access of financing for the acquisition of properties, financing for businesses and so on which seems to operate within and without the traditional banking system in Barbados to the advantage of one particular group. And these fears are expressed by all sectors of the community. How you can avoid that is very difficult, but what I would say is that the apparent vertical mobility of new arrivals in Barbados by contacts of one kind or another is creating a problem and some degree of instability within Barbados.

I am surprised, Sir, when I hear reports made to me from people at all levels in the society. It is not purely a matter of jealousy. I do not think it is. I think that people, sociologists, businessmen, other professional people, politicians and other persons, have certainly brought to my attention different aspects of this problem. I think one of the root causes is that fear, a very real fear, that we might find ourselves in a different Barbados in the not too distant future if we are not a bit more careful about our immigration policy. Thank you very much.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the problems with the new arrivals in Barbados is a very difficult one

as far as I can understand, and I cannot at all be associated with the remarks that are so clouded and so feneral as to cast aspersions on the character of the people who work within the Immigration Department.

I have had some dealings with the Chief Immigration Officer and I believe he is a person of the highest integrity. I have had some dealing with some of the people directly beneath the Chief Immigration Officer and at all times I have always found those persons to act in the best possible manner, to be dignified in their approach and to be fair at all times.

From time to time, I am asked to do a favour for someone as I am sure honourable Members on both sides of the House are asked by virtue of the position which they hold in this House.
5.05 p.m.

You find that a person would call and say they have a friend who was here and who would like to stay, and they would like to get some information about how to go about staying on, and so on and so forth. I normally refer these people to the Chief Immigration Officer or his assistant, and invariably, I have always found him to be a man of the highest integrity and of the highest calibre.

Sir, the problem as I understand it, particularly with Indians, a point which has been expressed by the honourable Member for St. Michael West, is a point which I support.

There are Indians who have been here in Barbados for many years — those who have made a contribution — those who have children and grandchildren that are Barbadian citizens. They are now being subjected to the entire population being suspicious because certain other Indians, who operate illegally, allow people to come into Barbados and stay with them and hideaway so that they cannot be found, so that they in turn can perhaps employ them and exploit their own Indians. The latter are the ones that are giving the Indian population in Barbados a bad name. But it is like anything else — one rotten apple spoils the whole barrel.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of State responsible for Immigration consider the possibility of a bond. I happened to be at the airport a few weeks ago when an Indian doctor — a person whose parents were from India but who was born in Barbados, is married to a Barbadian, has Barbadian children — was at the airport to collect a brother who was passing through Barbados and in transit to Guyana. That family — the brother, his wife and the child — were not permitted to come into Barbados because the Government, in its wisdom, decided that in order to reduce the amount of illegal immigrants coming into Barbados that they would

have to screen people coming in more closely, and these people did not pass the screening process.

Now, this is the situation where Peter must pay for Paul. Now, this is a sort of a situation which was fairly genuine — the brother was just passing through Barbados for 17 days to visit his sister and Barbadian friends, had absolutely no intentions of staying in Barbados and then wanted to go on to Guyana. In a situation like that, Mr. Chairman, it would be very easy. It would ease the Chief Immigration Officer a great deal because my understanding is that the airport would have to call the Chief Immigration Officer and to disturb this gentleman at ungodly hours in the night to get his permission, or for him to state whether or not someone should be admitted into Barbados. This system cannot be correct.

It would be better if, on the other hand, a bond system was instituted whereby the very same doctor who claimed that her brother was coming here to visit her would be prepared to sign the bond. This would be available at the airport for \$10 000 or \$20 000, and would say that her brother and family would leave Barbados by the time stipulated on their passports as given by the Immigration Officer at the airport. Failing to do that, this person who signed the bond would be liable to pay the \$10 000, \$15 000 or \$20 000 or be subjected to six months in jail for hiding away people.

Now, I believe, Sir, that sometimes one has to be extreme in measures in order to protect the population of the country. I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is just or equitable that a society in 1982 should ask Peter to pay for Paul. There are honest and dishonest people in all ethnic groups and the onus would be on the person signing the bond to produce the relevant information on the date that the person for whom they signed the bond has left. The onus would be on that person to take the information down to the Chief Immigration Officer, or office, to ensure or to prove that the person whom they signed the bond for has left, and therefore the bond will be null and void. There is the safety check, Mr. Chairman.

The apparent new mobility with new arrivals as has been pointed out by the last speaker, I believe can be controlled to some extent if such a system is instituted Mr. Chairman. And I would again like to say that in my dealings with the people at the Immigration Department, I have always found them, to be people of the highest integrity — from the Minister back down, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I just have to reply to a few points made by all Members. I think we have had a long debate on this matter and, as I stated at the beginning, the Government's aim in its immigration policy is to set out as clearly as possible in definitive terms the categories of people whom, in the opinion of Government, are desirable, bearing in mind the need in any developing

society for certain skills, and as a contribution to the settlement of families of people in Barbados who are already citizens.

We must have recognised that all countries in the world do have a category within their Immigration Laws to allow a limited number of cases. This is a contribution to humanity.

In small societies, in particular, if the structure of the population becomes disturbed, obviously resentment will arise. Barbadians, of all people, would know and recognise this, because not only have we the experience of living in a small community, we also have the experience of many of our relatives going abroad, settling in foreign communities and seeing and knowing at first hand the impact of new people coming into a community — particularly when people of a different type, in the sense of pigmentation, religious persuasion and cultural attitudes, enter into a foreign community. This is a phenomenon that all of us have to face.

We also have to face the fact that here in Barbados, the machinery that we had in the past, was largely machinery which was derived from the colonial Immigration Laws. I believe the previous Government in their time tried to deal with the modernisation of it. We, ourselves, have been making efforts to make it more sophisticated, but I can say, quite openly, that the Government has not set up on an administrative basis an Immigration Advisory Committee.

We have been trying to have the widest possible publicity to the proposed Regulations to cover the discretion and narrow the basis of decision-making for the granting of immigration permission among all of the categories. This Committee and its report, — when it is completed — will be enshrined into an amendment of the legislation in Barbados. So the Advisory functions that are now operating, by way of preliminary information gathering and administrative regulation suggestions, would become embodied in a statute.

5.10 p.m.

The question of integration of immigrants in a community is a very important one. I have always tried to impress upon anyone who discuss this matter with me, that there is, in my opinion, one fundamental cause of the hostility which develops, as far as I have been able to understand, in a community with respect to immigrants. It is the perceived failure of immigrants in the community to conform with laws and standards which are pre-existing in the community. This is a very, very, important point. Unless the community is sufficiently large as to be able to operate, relatively speaking, in isolation from the rest of the community, then their pattern of behaviour becomes obvious, and

differences become obvious also — and jealousy and resentment build up.

I have absolutely no doubt that given the tightening-up of the rules — not only in existence, administratively — and which will be enshrined in the laws in the very near future, that we need have no fear that the traditional structure of this population, as the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has said, will be disturbed. I agree with him, and it is a matter of concern. We who, in the course of the last 20 years in this country, have developed norms of behaviour and attitudes, with respect to such matters as the need to restrict our families, will view it will be a disturbing feature in this community if significant sections of the newer type of Barbadians do not accept these norms. That is a very, very important point.

I remember in the 1950s when family planning was started in Barbados. It took a long period of time for them to get a consensus about it. I believe there is a general consensus in Barbados about it and, therefore, it would be most disturbing if some of the people who have come here recently do not accept these norms. But this attempt to integrate our needs, from the point of view of skills and development, in a series of rules and regulations, is an attempt that the Immigration Advisory Committee is circulating to all Barbadians now.

I would hope that the professional, economic and political organizations, and religious groups as well, in Barbados, would make their input in this matter. We have also set up an Immigration Appeal Committee. This is subject to the Administrative Law Act of Barbados.

On the question of the croupier....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question of the croupier has been raised in this Chamber and has been dealt with.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, it is a fact we have them in the tourism industry, and I have explained to the honourable Members that our Ministry have been given the responsibility of providing an input into all applications for work permits with respect to categories that fall within tourism.

We have set out our position, and because our position is so well known, people call up the Minister of Tourism on the aviation side and give us the information with respect to people who they believe are not entitled to work. We immediately investigate this by way of established procedure whereby the Chief Immigration Officer is called upon to investigate the case, and we tell them this is the point A, B, C, and sometimes we are able to give them information where they can find out people. Because we all know people are skilled in trying to get

around the Immigration laws in other countries. So people come here and use their brains and are trained to get around the Immigration Law. That is a fact.

Our people abroad in the United States in the Consul General's office, if you ask them what is the greatest amount of work they would tell you the immigration work that they have to do, problems with Barbadians there in relation to immigration. If you ask the new Consul General in Canada what is the greatest problem that he has to deal with there, he will tell you that he is constantly trying to get Barbadians there out of immigration difficulties. In the U.K. now, particularly since the new Nationality Bill, you ask them what are the immigration problems.

Barbadians ought to be familiar and what I don't understand is the lack of understanding here, that just as our people have problems abroad we here in our own administration have problems too. It is a fact that we had to change the format to try and conceal the real nature of jobs, because people were trying to plant people in jobs. We had to change the rules and regulations with respect to that so that we are aware of all the matters and we are taking steps to try to close the gap.

We are taking a positive step in trying to close the gaps. But we also have here — and this is another phenomenon because of our feeling that a woman is entitled to the same rights as a man in respect of immigration — a number of complaints that have been made to us, and when they were investigated by the Immigration Department we saw some people whom the complainants thought were not entitled to work in Barbados, and they tell you that they are married to a Barbadian.

Well if you are a man that believes that a man is entitled to certain rights and a woman is not entitled to those rights, that is a problem. Now if you believe that a man is entitled to bring his wife in here as his wife but a woman is not entitled to bring her husband in here then this must be regarded as a problem.

I believe that in the context of Barbados there are more women than men, and I believe that the Barbadian women as a general rule, the vast majority believe they are equal. So this is the problem. What I don't understand, Mr. Chairman, is that on the one hand you cannot say you are entitled to the same rights as a man, but then when the normal rules apply to a man and you try to apply it to a woman, they say no it cannot apply to us. But that is a dilemma they will have to face. That is a phenomenon that has not quite sunken into the minds of some people here.

Complaints are made and full investigations have been done and it is found that women are genuinely married to men. More of our girls have gone abroad, many

work in hospitals all over, and sometimes with the economic conditions abroad they bring back their husbands. I believe the honourable Member could identify at least six or seven of them in the education system. I am aware of six or seven of them in which full investigations were done and they were entitled to their status. So those are the kinds of problems we have to deal with.

Now the question of being married is another matter, because the Constitution of Barbados — the Immigration Act — does provide for breaking the veil of the Marriage Certificate. You have to do that, because you have marriages of conveniences in the immigration system all over the world. So they are generally investigated.

I believe that our Immigration Department now, is fully aware of all of the devices that are generally used in all countries, and we are trying to train more and more of them in the devices. So as a whole, I would like to assure the honourable Members of the House that every effort is being made. I think the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has already disclosed things in that area.

On the question of abuse of non-visa entry, we hope to computerise the whole thing. A firm has been commissioned to do a computerised immigration entry system in Barbados and I understand that many other countries have a computerised immigration entry system. This makes it easier on a particular day to know all the people who should have left on that particular day, and the tracing is much more effective than the traditional manual system that we have. We are trying to do that. We have commissioned a firm on that. After all the number of tourists that come here per year is about 350 000, 360 000, or 400 000. That is a very small bit of information today to put on a computer, but we are trying that.

So, Mr. Chairman, Sir, we also have the problems. I will surprise honourable Members. This has been my experience — one morning some people were deported from a village in my constituency by the police. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Did you see them in there?)....put on the first LIAT plane and by the evening at 6.00 o'clock they were walking down the main road in the village. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You see that, now. I am grateful to you.) No, no, it can happen, and I can explain to you how it happened. It is very easy. They know that the immigration shift that was on in the morning is not the immigration shift that is on in the afternoon. We traced that one right down to a T. They found that out.

So he knows which Immigration Officer to beat. But when you go now to arrest the person in the village, particularly if he has been in the village for a long time, and particularly if he has struck up a relationship with a young lady or a young man in the village, the very people who do not want you to take him up are the people in the village themselves — except of course if, he has

committed a crime, because if he has ever committed a crime in the village, they are the first to report it.

There is a strong feeling here in Barbados that once you look like them, and you do work among them — they make a little sport at you with the differences in your accent and so — but the Immigration has a lot of problems in trying to deal with these men. They are sheltered.

And I believe that this has been the experience of Barbadians abroad too — that after they get into a community that the Immigration in their country get difficulties too. I believe that. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is a fact.) What we are dealing with are facts of life, this is human nature, so it is not an easy area, it is not a difficult area.

But we are trying to reduce the area of discretion, set out the norms along which the discretion has to be exercised. So when that is made public and made clear, the grounds for all of these allegations and these rumours will be removed.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Head, as amended, do now stand part.

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

The question that Head 17 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 72 — CAPITAL — DEFENCE AND SECURITY AS AMENDED — \$7 640 000

Head 72 — Capital — Defence and Security as amended — was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 72 do now stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head.....

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, Head 72, Subhead 2, Item 2(5), Professional Services. Under this item, Mr. Chairman, I assume that this is the fund whereby professional people coming in for the training of the forces would be paid from. Am I correct in thinking that this is what that Head is for?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Yes, I think it is to do with part of the computer services, too.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Anyhow, the point I want to draw is not a controversial one, so we can deal with it. Only quite recently on a business trip to Trinidad, I took time out to take in the calypsoes that were then going, and I went down to the Seamen and Waterfront tent to hear the Mighty Sparrow.

During the break I was introduced to a senior member of the Trinidad Defence Force, and, during our conversation it came out that this officer was one of the officers that came to Barbados to assist in the training of members of the Defence Force.

He was very annoyed with a grudge since the story, as told by this officer, was that when they, the Trinidadians, came to Barbados, in the true spirit of comradeship they shared the quarters with the Barbadians soldiers of equal rank, and they shared similar facilities. But subsequently, some officers came down from the UK, some of them of inferior rank to the Trinidadian trainers and advisers, and they were very annoyed when preferential treatment was given to these officers from the UK by way of accommodation, allowances, special meals, *et cetera, et cetera*.

As small as that might sound to Members, it has left some bitter taste in that particular officer's mind since he is still of the opinion that we are still colonial in thinking, that because they were fellow West Indians like us, of the same colour, that they were treated in a way inferior in every respect to their English counterparts. I would suggest that it is in small areas like these that we must be very careful.

Earlier today, I heard the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister publicly thank the UK Government for the assistance they have been giving to the Defence Force. No mention was made of the Trinidad Government. I remember on a previous occasion, the honourable Member for St. George North, in connection with the CBI plan, had to state here publicly that we always seem to forget the contribution and the assistance offered to Barbados over the past by Trinidad.

I want to take this occasion to warn all of us that we have to be very careful not to take our neighbours for granted, and certainly in things like these, if they are advisers, they should be all treated in the same way. No special treatment should be given to anyone because he happens to be from the UK, or anything, I feel that this is an area we must be very careful of — this differential treatment meted out to a few people who, because they are a different colour from our West Indian brothers — inferior sometimes in rank — come to the Caribbean and get special treatment.

I am very acquainted with them. Sometimes, you bring them down here as specialist and they are no more

specialist than the fellow around the corner. They come and they pick your brains, and they put together a report and they send it back down here under some very pretty colour saying that they are specialist. So we have to be very careful. I just wanted to draw this particular incident to the appropriate authorities and ask them to be careful in future not to have this type of situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would like to thank the honourable Member for St. Philip North for letting us know that he had taken in some of the tents in Trinidad and Sparrow. Since I know that he is very much involved in the calypso business — the fine art — I think you may refer to it as that in Barbados. I also know the band — what is the name of the band?.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Secret Force.) Secret Force. I know that his involvement really is from the putting up of the gadgets and so on — putting in the plugs and making sure — this type of thing. He is the secret behind the force of the instruments.

But getting to the point where preferential treatment is meted out by a number of these people, I share your view. But sometimes conditions are added on.

For example, if you are making a loan from a man, and you need that loan badly, sometimes you put on conditions on the loan that you follow — you accept it simply because you are in great need of it. It is like that with the specialized training which these officers who may have been at a lower rank here than the ones which you have in Barbados.
5.35 p.m.

I do not think that the Barbados Government would condone any special treatment for a person because of the colour of his skin — not the Government of Barbados, and I do not believe that this should exist in the Defence Force, or any part of Barbados for that matter. I think, as far as I am concerned, gone are those days, but sometimes conditions are added on.

If you need an officer, maybe a Corporal, to come here, the British Government, or the American Government, or whichever Government that is assisting you, may call for special conditions, and since you need this person, though he may be a Corporal, who may have at his disposal technical knowledge which we may not have here, I think that is probably what the officer may be required for.

I remember on one occasion attending a CPA conference in Grenada. Mr. Eyre Hoppin who was a former Speaker of this Chamber was at the conference with me, and we were all travelling in a bus from the hotel to Parliament where the conference was being held. Both the

overseas visitors from the U. K. and Canada, as well as those from the Caribbean territories, were all travelling in the bus.

But when the British High Commissioner came to Grenada on one of his routine visits, he had a car, and he was taking his British colleagues in the car, and the Grenadians started to shout out, "White man in car and black man in bus." All that had happened was that the British High Commissioner, who was on one of his routine visits, was giving them a drop to the conference. So these things can be misconstrued sometimes.

I take the point, and you can rest assured that all we need to do in Barbados — that side, this side and the entire country — is to give the Barbados Defence Force and the Barbados Police Force our wholehearted support in every single aspect. Both Forces, as far as I am concerned, are a credit to the country — one keeping law and order and the other our national defence, and I would sincerely hope that never again would I hear, coming from either side, someone running down of the young Barbados Defence Force or the Barbados Police Force. I think we all should be justly proud of them and I want to salute them and wish them well in the future.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There is just one answer to a technical point raised by the honourable Member for St. Philip North. That is a very valid point, except that in terms of overseas assistance from the United Kingdom, Canada and others, as embodied in an agreement, the agreement provides the specific terms. But within the Caribbean, there is no specific agreement. What we are trying to do now is to get a specific agreement, so that these matters may be covered in accordance with the agreement. With Trinidad there is no agreement yet, but we are working towards a specific agreement.

The question that the sum of \$7 640 000 under Capital Expenditure — Head 72 — Defence and Security — as amended — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 18 — AUDIT OFFICE

Head 18 — Audit Office — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$122 614 under Head 18 — Audit Office — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 19 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$5 560 442 under Head 19 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under Head 19 – Subhead 11 – Central Purchasing, I would like to make a few suggestions which could retain some funds in Barbados that are presently going out.

The honourable Members on the other side would have seen the Customs Officers in their new uniforms, some of them fitting nicely, some of them fitting not so nicely, and when you enquire you will discover that these uniforms were made by an overseas company. I was told that the reason for this is that it is a special type of fabric that takes a lot of wearing, etc. On the other hand, when I enquired further, it is within my knowledge that the Government's contribution to uniforms in the disciplined services in Barbados and otherwise could never total some \$3 million a year.

At a time like this when the garment industry is going through a very difficult period, it would be distressing to think that this type of situation can easily grow – where most of this money is taken out by way of foreign companies making uniforms for the Government. When I looked into the matter a little closer, it is my understanding that there seems to be a little problem with the local companies.

Getting back to the uniforms, I was also told that a local garment factory has to be altering some of these uniforms. A lot of the recipients of these uniforms are not very happy about the way they are fitting, but the point I want to get into is that when I enquired about the reason for this, there seems to be some difficulty under the present tendering system whereby local garment manufacturers have to put in a tender for one year only.

The problem with this is that (1) it does not give the local garment manufacturer enough time to import the fabric if a special fabric is needed; (2) usually for one year the quantum is not that large to make it necessary for him to import in bulk especially, thereby deriving any depreciation of cost by way of bulk purchase; and (3), because it is only a one year contract, it might be difficult to make the necessary banking arrangements.

This has caused some Government institutions to have problems with uniforms. The Sanitation Department

has had a similar problem. I was told that a suggestion had been made to the Central Purchasing Department some time ago by some of the local manufacturers – that they could consider granting a tender for the manufacturing of garments for the Public Service for a three year period, and that at the end of the second year the new tenders would be opened. The advantage of this would be that the person who wins the tender would have three years' work before him which would allow him to do three things – buy material in bulk, arrange the necessary banking facilities, and have some security and guarantee that his staff which might need to be increased would be employed for the next three years. 5.45 p.m.

Secondly, if you have a renewal of tender at the end of the two-year period, if that person does not get the tender again he would have a year to wind up. On the other hand, if he gets it he would be able to order for the second three year period. In the same way, if a new tender gets the contract for the new period, he would have one year in advance in which to make arrangements for material and banking arrangements

I am assured that if this situation existed at the moment that local garment manufacturers would be able to obtain a source of supply for the material that is now being used by the Customs Department, and therefore the excuse by the company that they are the only people with the material would not obtain. It is a big international company and therefore they keep the material in bulk. So you would remove that restriction, and that money would remain in Barbados among the garment manufacturers to employ our workers.

I would really like the appropriate Ministry to have a second look at this because we must keep our people employed, and it is not a good thing for us to go out there and hear the garment workers saying they are on the road and you are bringing in garments from Canada. They would not appreciate the problems involved by the local ones. They are not expected to appreciate it, but I think we as governors, and more particularly the Government as administrators of policy at this time, must look into this and make it possible in future for local garment manufacturers to be able to produce to Government's requirements by changing, if needs be, the tendering system that presently exists.

Now that I am on this department, there seems to be a concerted effort by certain Heads of Department to make it very difficult for the Central Purchasing Department to operate in that they do not co-operate with the Central Purchasing Department.

Everyone knows the reason for the introduction of the Central Purchasing Department. It is a very simple economic situation that if you have a specialist

department buying in bulk — and the Government is the biggest buyer in Barbados — you should be able to have special prices. I can only appeal to the authorities once again to insist on the co-operation of the departments under their particular Ministries with Central Purchasing.

Central Purchasing, like any Government Department, has its problems, but I think it is a good idea and we should, if needs be, try to iron out the problems inside Central Purchasing Department. But do not allow individual departments to get around Central Purchasing by claiming that they are inefficient and they keep back their stuff etc. This is a way of breaking the situation as it is, and I think it would be a wrong direction to go in. Thank you.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, Barbados has had a tremendous development over the last ten years, particularly in the area of tourism and manufacturing. I am speaking under Head 19, sub-head 6 — Energy and Natural Resources. Manufacturing in 1981 reached a level of \$243 million and tourism reached a level last year of \$505 million, and the total retained imports of Barbados exceeded 1.3 per cent.

As a result of all of this, Barbados has become more and more dependent upon imported oil, and I think that in order for us to capitalise on the economic gains which this country has made over the last ten years, we must, and very soon, arrest the situation in order to reduce our oil import bill. The seismic studies which have already been done indicate that Barbados is almost self-sufficient in oil. Government proposes as a result of that study.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, I believe the honourable Member has every good intention, but I think he is misleading the House. To say that any seismic report states that Barbados is almost self-sufficient in oil is a non-statement. It does not make sense. I am not trying to be pejorative, but the seismic reports are probability statements.... Mr. Chairman, you are familiar with the physical data that is required, how it is analysed and how conclusions are reached on the probability that if drilling is done at a certain depth the possibility exists that oil or natural gas may be found. So I think the honourable Member has nothing to make the statement on. I am just explaining so that he would not continue down that road.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that the honourable Member would not let me finish. I have my own methodology, he has his. I understand only too well what I am saying. He does too, but what he is trying to do is put a spoke in my wheel. He cannot do that. The point is that as a result of information available to Government, the information indicates that the Government of Barbados can be self-sufficient in oil. That is the point I am making.

The Government therefore proposes a package to encourage other oil companies to come to Barbados and get involved in off-shore and on-shore drilling, or both, in an effort to try to stimulate oil production in Barbados, in an effort to reduce oil imports from overseas.

Sir, the oil import bill in 1970 was \$4.3 million or 2.1 per cent of the foreign exchange earnings. By 1980 the oil import bill had grown to \$71.7 million or 6 per cent of the foreign exchange earnings, and last year the oil import bill had grown to \$92.5 million or just about 8.5 per cent of the foreign exchange earnings.

If we as a country are expected to continue with the economic gains which we have made over the last ten years, it is imperative that Government take a serious look at how it can go about to redress the imbalance by reducing imported oil into the shores of Barbados.

Sir, alternative sources of energy are capital intensive — there are long delays in terms of development and it is a long term proposition. The only short term proposition that would satisfy Barbados immediately is energy conservation.

My contribution, Sir, is to urge Government to ensure that it pays some attention to this particular area of energy conservation during the next year, because it is a very important area.

In my view you must implement the national energy efficiency programme which will publish details on how the public, private enterprise as well as manufacturing industry and the tourist industry can go about conserving energy in an effort to reduce the oil import bill. Every effort should be made to encourage the Barbados Light and Power Company to become involved in this energy conservation promotion.

I go even further to say that a major public relations programme, as well as a major educational programme as to how Barbadians should go about in their own way in their own homes to conserve energy, should be implemented by this Government — and not too soon.

The Government has to go a step further and set up an energy task force that would comprise not only of Government, but of private enterprise. People from the Barbados Manufacturing Association, people from the Barbados Hotel Association, as well as other organisations, must be involved not in an economic task force, but in an energy task force.

If the other side had called for an energy task force, I would have supported that, but we need no help in the area of economics. We need some help in the area of conservation of energy.

Sir, Government should do as much as it can to offer concessionary terms to businesses, to the tourist sector, and to the manufacturing sector in particular, to encourage them by way of offering to them soft loans so that they can switch from traditional fossil fuel type of machinery to other resource type of machinery and equipment. And in order to accomplish that, the Government has to sit down with the Central Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Barbados Development Bank and the Caribbean Development Bank in order to work out some sort of financing arrangements to ensure that businesses in Barbados can get some concessionary financing in order to promote their own innovations for energy conservation.

5.55 p.m.

I am again calling upon Government, Sir, to take a serious look at the hotel industry. A tourist industry that is recognised under the Fiscal Incentives Act, is entitled to bring into Barbados duty free water heaters that will use traditional fossil fuel. I am saying that in order to encourage solar water heating that this particular item should be removed from the Fiscal Incentives in order to encourage the growth of the three manufacturers who are involved in solar manufacturing, and to encourage the hotel industry, therefore, to go the route of solar energy rather than have the hotel industry import water heaters that work off other fossil fuel, as well as electricity.

Government, Sir, as you are probably aware, has been examining various forms of energy including wave energy, wind energy, biomass and solar energy but alternate sources of energy, Mr. Chairman, has its problems. There are serious problems attached to it. Nothing can be gained in the short term. It is a long term proposition, and therefore even in the long term interest for Barbados this may be an indication to some of the answers to reducing the oil import bill. I think that right now the question of conservation really is most important.

Sir, conservation, companion with fuel substitution, reduces oil imports. Conservation, Sir, in terms of action or reaction of Government, does not take as much time to conserve the importation of oil as it would in development action. It takes a longer time to satisfy the demands if you have to import oil from overseas but a shorter time if one, by conserving energy, can reduce the demand, Mr. Chairman. And conservation has a cumulative effect. It has the effect that in the short-term it satisfies an immediate decrease in the import bill, and in the long-term, if the policy continues, it has a cumulative effect.

In terms, Sir, of years of alternative energy resources, it has already been pointed out that the Government has been experimenting with wind resources. Through three stages that have already been established in Barbados — namely the airport,

Codrington Agricultural Centre and the Caribbean Met. Office here in Barbados — it has been established that the wind can be sustained at eight meters per second at a minimum to a maximum of nine and a half meters per second, and in certain parts of the island, Sir, 24 percent of the time the wind exceeds 10 meters per second.

So there is a lot of potential involved in terms of wind power. But the pitfalls are also there, Mr. Chairman, that if a hurricane can come in force, this wind project could be blown away. Millions of dollars could be blown down the drain. This is one of the major problems involved.

The other problem is the corrosive problem, as a result of the salt spray, which would affect the mechanism that would drive these large windmills that would generate the electricity. The third and fourth problems, which are the lack of real capital and the lack of skilled technicians in Barbados, are the sort of problems that affect all sorts of alternative energy resource programmes in Barbados — and not only in Barbados, but all over the world, because it is relatively very, very new.

Solar energy is already fairly common in Barbados in the area of hot water. Solar airconditioning is another area of interest to this Government. We already have two demonstration models of solar airconditioning operating in Barbados and the new Agronomic Laboratory at Graeme Hall will carry a third solar powered airconditioning system.

Mr. Chairman, there is also a new area which Government has been investigating and some studies have been done, and that is the area of photovoltaic or T.V. electrification.

Recently, Sir, in Britain they have devised a system of T.V. electrification that is attached to the roofs of cars. This electrification system, Sir, absorbs all the sunlight and operates all electrical systems within the car. It therefore improves the efficiency of running the car by 10 percent because you no longer need gas to do that the T.V. photovoltaic can handle that. This is the generation of electricity by exposure of various types of materials to sunlight.

Sir, solar ponds is an area that Government has already begun to investigate. It would take the whole of Christ Church to be converted into a solar pond to generate sufficient electricity to satisfy the Grantley Adams International Airport, the whole of Christ Church, so it is not at all a practical system for Barbados. In Israel it is used, and basically a solar pond uses the differentials in the temperature of the water that is captured, as against the outside of that water, to generate electricity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, solar ponds are not at all practical in Barbados. If I may wind up with one minute, the recent introduction of bagasse as an alternate source of energy has been experimented with by the Government. This has tremendous potential for Barbadians.

The average surplus of bagasse over the last 12 years from 1968 to 1980 was about 21 000 tonnes and 21 000 tonnes of bagasse can generate 3 to 7 percent of the total requirement of the electricity needed by Barbados or generated by the Barbados Light and Power. In this particular area of bagasse there is a tremendous amount of hope. I am sorry I do not have enough time.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am glad you don't.....Mr. Chairman, as a scientist yourself, I am sure you will agree that all that the honourable Member just said could, if it could be gathered together, produce some methane gas for us. I am sure that you appreciate the matter.... (Asides). Another scientist? The fact is, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear what the honourable Member said.....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of explanation, if the honourable Member would give way. Methane gas never comes from that source, it comes from other sources. (Asides) Methane gas.
6.05 p.m.

You are replying to what the other Member just said and what he has said has absolutely nothing to do with the generation of methane gas. Please don't mislead the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On the contrary, Sir, now that the honourable Member has risen on the matter — and you are a scientist — and you know from where methane gas comes — I would give you an example.

In Jamaica they have a methane gas project. They have been able to acquire all the droppings of the pigs in the area, and when they have compressed it they have been able to produce methane gas. A perfect straightforward thing, Sir. Methane gas does come from droppings, so I am not sure what the honourable Member from St. Andrew was complaining about.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The hon. Member has said nothing at all about methane gas, Sir, or what it is derived from. He has been dealing with solar energy and other things like that. He never said anything about methane gas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have this cross talk resumed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The honourable Member for St. Andrew does not understand what I was saying. I was saying that all that have gone before, if it could be collected, would produce methane gas. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the honourable Member who just sat down (*Laughter*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please! Would the honourable Member for St. Michael West continue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that my friend the honourable Member for St. Michael Central who is an immaculate gentleman in his own right, and who does immaculate research. I have a lot of respect for the research in which he does. If he could only get that research channelled in such a manner that it would be useful to the discussion which is going on, I believe it would be much more interesting for us. The honourable Member told us — as we have heard from *Science International* which is the programme on television that children watch — and I think a part of it obtained from *Evolution* another TV programme — a number of facts, but they are totally irrelevant except for relating to solar energy. He discussed electrification via the disclosure of motor cars but I don't like the idea of his suggesting that in the Ministry responsible for Energy there is some information.....he said information available to the Government. Now the Minister who is responsible has a duty to come to this House and tell us this information. He has said that in Barbados we are already assured that we are almost self-sufficient in the production of oil. That is what he said.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I said reports indicated that Barbados can be self-sufficient in oil.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Even that amendment, Sir, makes it extremely difficult for us as a country spending in excess of \$90 million in the importation of oil. We cannot hold out false hope for the people of Barbados in this question of energy.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the people who are now running the oil rigs in Barbados, the Mobil people, have only recently indicated that the drilling exercise has not been as successful as they intended, or hoped it would have been, based on reports which were done when I had responsibility for Energy. I am not trying to criticise the honourable Member, because this is the reality of the situation.

I feel it is my duty Sir, because of the information I have to put this matter straight — and let us say this is

not information honourable Members will take in stride, because one has to be involved on a continuous basis in order to be able to appreciate what the people are talking about.

Now, Sir, in Barbados we have a series of pockets. In those pockets, as a result of the geological formations over centuries, we have little basins of oil. Those basins of oil have been tapped by way of shallow drilling and we continue to get a relatively small amount of oil from those drillings.

Some time ago, the General Crude people anticipated based on soundings — because of the advancement in technology they were able to make certain soundings — that if they tried deep drilling in a few places like St. Philip, for example, and another in the vicinity of Gregg Farm, that they might possibly find oil.

It is clear from the reports that they have not been successful, and only a couple of weeks ago one got the impression that Mobil intend to return to shallow drilling. It is therefore irresponsible for anyone who gathers bits of information to seek to assure this Hon. House that there are any reports indicating that Barbados could be self-sufficient in oil.

I would like the Minister to indicate what progress, if any, has been made on off-shore exploration for which there was a substantial arrangement with the previous holders of the licence in Barbados. I should like to know to what extent, if any, have the results from the soundings which were done some three, four or seven years ago, been carried out. I was given to understand from the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, on the last occasion in this House, that those soundings were being evaluated and Government would indicate the findings.

It is necessary for us, if we are going to go into off-shore drilling, to start as quickly as possible. I have never gotten an answer from anyone on that side as to whether, as required by an agreement signed between the predecessors of Mobil and the Barbados Government, there is also a penalty as to the amount of money that should, in any one year, be spent in the exploration. Has it been paid?

It was, for example, in excess of \$12 million per annum which was supposed to be spent, and failure to explore would result in a cash amount — a substantial amount — as a penalty for not engaging the high level of activity required under that agreement, because on that agreement we had agreed to issue licences to this particular exploration group, and, indeed, those likewise did not include drilling. I see they have done drilling, but I have no indication that funds have come to Barbados as a result of that particular agreement.

I feel that I should draw to the Minister's attention the petroleum dealers are in a substantially depressed state. It has been some time since the petroleum dealers have been given the kind of assistance to which they had become accustomed. The marketers continue to erode whatever little profits were available to the dealers. Perhaps, I should explain, Sir, that the marketers are those persons who have the agencies for the names such as Mobil, Esso, Shell, et cetera. They are the ones who purchase the oil imported from Venezuela — the cocktail mix — and they are the ones who then wholesale the products to the small dealers at the gas stations. Mr. Chairman, Mobil, in fact, purchases the cocktail mix from itself and then it sells it to the marketers in an exchange arrangement. I do not wish to go into any detail in that.

6.15 p.m.

But, the small proprietors who are the dealers are having extreme difficulty because they, too, are suffering the economic problems of all small businesses, and it has been some considerable time since they have been given any consideration by the Ministry responsible for Consumer Affairs.

I believe it is the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs, the honourable Member for Christ Church East, whose responsibility it is to deal with the marketers, and to deal with the dealers. Perhaps the Minister can explain why it is that the margins allowed to the dealers — the small gasoline dealers — and the margins allowed to the marketers, have been allowed to again bring about a chasm between the allowances given to the respective groups.

Usually, Sir, where those small people have a contract of arrangement with the marketers, the contract is a very tight contract, and the marketers charge them — not only rent, but a number of other additional charges — including the cost of any shortages.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in recent times, they have reported to me that there are shortages between the time the truck leaves the MOBIL station and the time it arrives at the gas station where the consumer purchases the gas, and that the marketers have insisted that once the measurement of the tank when it leaves MOBIL is reported at a certain level, the distributors — or dealers as they are called — are responsible for any shortages. Now, in a small gas station of say 12 000 gallons where the shortage is as high as two and a half percent, that can, in fact, be the entire profits of that gas station.

And, I make bold to suggest to the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs that unless something is done about this shortly, there is going to be a gas crisis in Barbados because a number of the gasoline stations

will close their doors. They will close their doors and refuse to sell gasoline and other similar products to the consuming public of Barbados.

The Government is in a position to make the adjustment, because a substantial part of the price of gasoline falls to Road Tax. And since the Government has now initiated a levy which is supposed to go towards building of roads, it would seem to me that the Government should be in a position, without creating a problem for the marketers — who, after all, are the class that they represent the best — the Government should be in a position to make an adjustment to allow the dealers to do a little better than they have been doing, especially in these hard economic times.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that it is necessary for me to make any further point. I have already called in this Hon. House for an energy conservation programme of the kind which will be meaningful to Barbadians and I do not believe it is necessary for me to repeat that call — except to say that the Ministry responsible for Energy is the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister's Ministry, as far as I understand, and the young, energetic — that is what he always says — the young, energetic Parliamentary Secretary who is responsible for Energy has got to come with a programme which makes some kind of sense rather than merely announce words to the effect that there will be a programme.

We are now nine or ten months into the Parliamentary year, Sir, and so far we have not seen any indication other than the occasional trip of the Prime Minister in his hard hat going to Light and Power, or the Parliamentary Secretary, in his hard hat, looking at some oil droppings somewhere in St. Andrew. One has seen no evidence of any specific programme for the conservation of energy in Barbados.

The question of the rates of electricity is a matter that has been ruled in this Hon. Chamber to be *sub judice*, which to my mind, Sir, is questionable — but I have to abide by the ruling. But I do not believe that that ruling precludes my saying that the Light and Power, as a responsive organisation to consumers, has a responsibility to explain to those consumers who have been carried from two months to one month.....(Aside).....I am not talking about the rates. (Aside: You are dealing with the whole aspect of it.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You are dealing with the whole aspect of the Barbados Light and Power and the Utilities Board. I mean, you will do that eventually. I know those old tricks well enough.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have not got there yet. When I get there, I am sure you will stop me,

Sir, I really was not planning to slip into anything. I am just making a point. They have moved from two months to one month billing. I am finishing now, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: One minute. They have moved from two months billing to one month billing. There are persons whose bills for one month appear to be approximately the same as they were for two months and when they seek explanation at the counter, they are being given short shrift.

As a matter of fact, I, myself, have found that my electricity rate for the so-called one month period is higher than it was for a two month period which leads me to conclude that the meter is not being read — it is being averaged for the first month.

If that is the case, Light and Power at least has a responsibility to the consumers of electricity to explain in some detail what is going on so that people cannot feel — not only frustrated, but feel absolutely depressed at the high cost without any assistance.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, in response to the question posed by the honourable Member for St. Philip North, in relation to uniforms, I have been informed that Mapps Garment Industry were given the contract to produce these uniforms — I am given the information — but they in turn took the measurements and sent them off to this company in Canada for the purpose of producing the first set of uniforms to get them on time. As from now on, Mapp's will be doing the uniforms.

This is the information which I have received. It is not that we are trying to avoid manufacturers in Barbados in the garment industry and not let them produce the uniforms. But apparently, Mapps who got the tender could not really handle them at the time. They took the measurements and sent them on to this Canadian firm which was producing the material, and they in turn also made the uniforms and sent them down — the first set.

This is the information from the officers in charge. If you have information outside of that, I can only give information as given to me by people involved. Sometimes information can be misleading, maybe, to us, and sometimes it can be misleading to you. However, that is the information given to me.

On the other point raised about the technical stuff, I am not in any position to discuss technical matters in relation to energy but all I can say about the Light and Power bills is that I am told there is a changeover where they have now put these on the computer and you are getting these problems.

I, myself, am concerned. I have had a similar problem, and I think there should be a little public relations at the front desk. It is true that the Government has 51% shares in Light and Power, but what can you do if, for example, a young lady comes to work the morning after having a quarrel with her boyfriend the night before? She might be angry and they may be problems, but it is nothing that I myself would like to get, these short answers, but I get these answers. It is only a matter of public relations.

6.25 p.m.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, just two other things under this Head. Before I move off the point, my information, for the Leader of the House, which I think is fairly accurate, is that Mapps Garment Factory previously provided some sample uniforms for the Customs, but they were never able to sell the Customs the idea.

This company came, and by high powered salesmanship, sold the Customs the idea, and one of the conditions, I understand, why the offer was made to them was that they should carry along a Barbadian company.

In this connection, they engaged Mapps Garment Factory to do the measuring of the people on the sub-contract with the understanding that in the second year of operation they would be co-operating with Mapps Garment Factory of Barbados.

Up to now this is just a verbal arrangement, no written document or agreement has been made. My further understanding is that the company now seeks to establish, on its own accord, a company in Barbados.

The people are very worried about the arrangement, since nothing has been done formalising the arrangement which is still very much verbal. It is only a gentleman's agreement at the moment, and I would implore the Minister to watch that very carefully to make sure that that verbal arrangement is kept.

While I am on my feet, there are just two other things under this Head. I see that one of the functions of the Land Valuation Department is to advise the Government on a number of matters. I will deal with this when we come to the Ministry of Lands, particularly dealing with land acquisition, but under Subhead 15 — and this is a matter I am always being asked about — some of my constituents who had paid in quite a lot of money to First Federation Life are always asking me what is the position with the assets of First Federation Life and if they are likely to get anything at all. I just want an answer so I can go back to them and tell them what is the latest position vis-a-vis the assets that they had in

Barbados — if these assets have been liquidated or what is the position with them.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if I am not mistaken, this matter was aired in here some time ago. I think it was the former Member for St. Lucy who had raised this matter in here. I think that was the time when he brought questions in here about trees falling down in somebody's gutter and so on, trying to catch what you call "the eyes of the judges". He brought in that same type of question, and if I am not mistaken — I speak subject to correction — the Minister of Finance had given a satisfactory answer to which there were a number of supplementaries.

I am told that First Federation Life no longer operates in Barbados and that whatever assets there were at that time were held for debts. I can give you no further information on this, but you can rest assured that when I have the necessary information at my disposal I am going to make it available to the Committee.

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

The question that the sum of \$5 560 442 under Head 19 — Ministry of Finance and Planning — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 20 — REVENUE COLLECTION

Head 20 — Revenue Collection — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$2 163 315 under Head 20 — Revenue Collection — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, one little question. I saw in the Press that the Rates and Taxes Department is to move into the Inland Revenue Department, and I have no doubt that that is toward a more efficient administration.

But some time ago there was a fire in the vicinity of Rates and Taxes, or in Rates and Taxes, and I also formed the impression that certain records were destroyed.

There are a number of persons who have been sent notices for taxes on property going back some considerable time. I know of one person in my constituency who has raised this matter with me. The taxes were paid many years ago and now she is being assailed for payment of those taxes again. Because she lives in a chattel situation, she does not have meticulous records as, say, perhaps you or I might have, and the

whole question as to whether there is evidence concerning those persons who may have paid taxes, and that evidence having been destroyed by fire, I would like to know what the Government proposes to do about it.

Also, there are a number of persons, that I know of, who have not yet received tax bills and who do not know what to do about them, because when they call the various departments they are being told that that matter does not now concern them.

I think it would be useful if the Minister could make a short statement during these Estimates to let us know what is the position with those persons who have not yet received a tax bill.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the tax bill has a certain specific date for the so-called discount, but if you receive a bill after the discount date has passed, it stands to reason that you ought to be able to have the same three months grace that persons who get their tax bills on time have.

I would like to know if this is a discretionary matter in the mind of the substantive Minister, or if it is a rigid situation where when a person has not received a tax bill and he subsequently gets the tax bill, if he pays it within the specified three months' time if he is entitled to the tax rebate, or the discount as it is called.

These matters may not seem to be very important on the face of it, but for the people who have to actually pay the money it is of significance, and sometimes grave significance.

I would be grateful for a response. I do not know if the leader of the House is able to give the information on this, or if the Minister is going to come, but I would be grateful for the information.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have a related question in relation to the Rates and Taxes Department. I too have read where it is intended to integrate the Rates and Taxes Department into Inland Revenue, and it was my understanding — I do not know if it is correct — but I would really want the Government, or the person responsible for answering these questions, to at least make the air clear on this.

The impression being given is that the sub-offices in the various parishes are being closed, and I do not know if that is the case, but that is the impression that has been given, and I think that the Minister should make a statement on this aspect of it — firstly, as to whether it is a fact that the sub-offices located in the respective parishes are closed.

It is inconvenient for the people who are living in the parishes not to be able to pay their taxes there, and it is also inconvenient for persons living far away to have to travel to the centre, that is Bridgetown, to the Inland Revenue Department to pay their taxes. I would be glad if the Government could clear the air on this aspect of it as well.

6.35 p.m.

I too support the honourable Member for St. Michael West on the question of persons who may already have paid their taxes being billed a second time, and the reason, of course, as he quite rightly said, was because there was a fire that destroyed some of the records. It seems to me that the department is putting people to prove that they have paid their taxes, so that a second demand notice is being sent to property owners and it is for them, then, to satisfy the department that they have paid their taxes. I think that is an unnecessary hardship on people, and I too would like to hear what the Minister would have to say on these two points.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, yesterday on Subhead 2, we dealt with the Establishments Division, and this subhead gives me an opportunity to have a look at the staffing structure of the Customs Department. It has always bothered me, Mr. Chairman.

If you look at the revenue, you will see that the Inland Revenue Department, on incomes and profits, is going to be bringing something like \$175 million, and then taxes on goods and services and international trade collectively bring in about \$170 million. I quote these two Mr. Chairman, to draw to your attention the importance of the Customs Department.

But if you had a close look at the structure of the staffing of the Customs Department, vis-a-vis the Inland Revenue Department, it would shock you. In the Inland Revenue Department, you have one Commissioner, you have a Deputy, and you have three Assistant Commissioners. Let us stop there. In the Customs Department, you have a Controller, you have a Deputy and you have one Assistant Controller.

What happens is that after the first three people in the department responsible for nearly \$180 million with a staffing structure of 211, immediately you drop down to Customs Officer I on a salary scale of Z9 — 6 and there are only five of those. If you look at the Inland Revenue Department, you have 12 Senior Inspectors on a salary scale Z9 — 3 and if you go below the first eight people, the ninth senior person there is a Customs Officer II at Z15—10, and if you take the Inland Revenue Department, you get 19 Inspectors at Z15—10.

The staff structure is so ridiculous. How the Establishments Division and the National Union of Public Workers could have allowed the Customs to operate with that type of staff structure bringing in a revenue of \$180 million is beyond me. The structure does not allow for mobility of the people who are career civil servants. There is no incentive because there are only three top post in a staff of 211 people.

Do you know what you are opening all these officers to? It has been said that money would not stop one whose character has a little quirk in it from accepting bribery, etc. but let us be very factual. Times are hard. These officers deal with money every day, the promotional opportunities are very limited, they are stymied in their professional career, and I think that as a matter of urgency, even if the National Union of Public Workers does not see fit, it is to the benefit of this Government in the Establishments Division to have a look at the restructuring of the Customs Department.

Only recently it was reported that one of the officers was actually threatened on his way to work as a result of querying some baggage that was on its way out. He was threatened and physically assaulted. Think of the hours they work. The Inland Revenue Department Officers do not work those hours, but the Customs Officers work around the clock.

The conditions under which they work point to at least parity with the Inland Revenue Department if not having some superiority in staff and remuneration conditions — and I would invite the Minister of Establishments to have a serious look at the structure of the Customs Department staff in an effort to provide better mobility and make them a little more contented than they are at the moment.

The question that the sum of \$2 163 315 under Head 20 — Revenue Collection — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 21 — STATISTICS

Head 21 — Statistics — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$228 396 under Head 21 — Statistics — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, we have gone so well all day, I really wish us to finish well. The Hon. Leader of the House has been so nice. Even his arthritis has not been bothering him. We asked serious questions.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member for St. Michael West would give way for a moment, he can rest assured that with his years of experience in here, and his skill in debate, and recognising as a former Minister of Government that the officers who should really be in a position to give this information are not now in their places, with his skill and tact he will get in all the questions which he asked under another Head, and he can rest assured he will have the information at his disposal.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before moving the suspension of today's sitting. I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention to an edition of the Advocate Newspaper for Wednesday, March 24, 1982 where you will see on the front page "New Rules to be posted at Parliament Entrance". The first paragraph reads as follows —

"Within a few days after the completion of the five-day debate on the 1982-83 Estimates, a new set of printed regulations covering the entry of members of the public to Parliament will be posted at the entrance."

I am not one of those people who suffer from "Pressitis" or "Newsitis". It is immaterial to me what is written in the Press by some of the columnists. It is immaterial to me if the Press reports what I say on the Floor of the House. It is immaterial to me if three minutes are given on CBC Television to the Prime Minister in introducing the Appropriation Bill and ten minutes are given to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central whose contribution was nil. All of these things are really unimportant to me as an individual. 6.45 p.m.

But what I am prepared to say, Sir, is that I am not going to sit here and have something printed, put into the Press, contrary to what I have said on the Floor of the House.

I recall, very well, Mr. Speaker, sometime in July in 1978, I think it was, when I made what was referred to as the "infamous starve speech." All I said at the time was that they should not eat. The Member for St. Michael West got up and said, "So you are prepared to starve them" and the following day the papers carried the headline, "Let them starve — Craig." I was subjected to all of

the hostility by a number of organisations, subjected to telephone calls and threats to my life.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid of any man on the face of the earth as long as I see him walking with four hands and four legs. If he has not got four hands or four legs, I am not afraid of anything on the face of the earth, furthermore a few Press Reports.

I cannot understand how reporters can come in here and sit down and take notes and have something put into print contrary to what is said on the Floor of the House by all Members. I have a report, Sir, the Official Report of my speech, and no where Mr. Speaker, in my speech did I make any reference of having any new rules, because the new rules can only be made by the Standing Orders Committee that is responsible for the Rules of Parliament — no way — but here is the headline in "New Rules".

What is going to be conveyed is that, all of a sudden, the Leader of the House set out to get new rules to stop people from coming into the Gallery, and that is what I object to — the mischief, the ignorance of some of the Reporters who sit down at the Press boxes.

I do not attack them, because they do not even exist for me, but rather than listening to the debates and making sure that the reports are taken down correctly, many of them come in and lie down and sleep in the Press box, yawn, laugh when Members are attacking each other across the floor, involve in conversation with the Member for St. Michael West who is much closer to the Press box — all of these things, Sir, and that is why they find it difficult to put down what is really and truly said on the Floor of the House.

I have the Official Report, Hansard. This is what I said — I am going to start from the top "I conclude therefore, Sir, that persons wearing black arm bands today in the Public Gallery are demonstrating in Parliament and the only person who has the power to stop that is you, Mr. Chairman, or the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, you are not supposed to see anybody in the Gallery at all. You do not see strangers at all. You are to see Members as they catch your eyes. It is the Members who have to draw these things to your attention.

But I just want to make this very, very clear, the reason why I am bringing this about is because, I believe, it is also unfair for Members of the public who come into the Gallery who are not *au fait* with the Rules of Parliament.

I have discussed this matter sometime ago, that there should be outside of the entrance or somewhere in

the building before they enter into the Gallery, regulations as to what members of the Public should or should not do."

The *Advocate* newspaper, with a bunch of confused reporters who get themselves involved with matters contrary to what they should really get themselves involved in, and rather than trying to improve their ability and make journalism a real and true career that all Barbadians can be proud of them, get involved in things that they should not get involved in — and that is why Mr. Speaker, I am drawing this to your attention.

I am going to ask, Sir, that this be sent to the Committee of Privileges, and the person or persons who is responsible for this report should be brought before you, Mr. Speaker, or have an apology sent to you, Mr. Speaker, and the entire House.

It is time, Sir, that the Press act in a responsible way. That is all I am concerned with. If I call an Honourable Member in here a clown and it is unparliamentary and they are going to report it, report it in its true entirety. That is all I am concerned with. The same way the Official Reporters can take down what is correct — the Nation on this occasion carries the report of what is in *Hansard*, but the *Advocate* on this occasion — "New Rules," "New Rules". I have no power to have any new rules introduced into Parliament and put on the entrance outside, "New Rules".

Sir, that is my submission, I make this a document of the House and I move, Sir, with your pleasure — Sir, you may direct me on this — that this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and whatever, the harshest discipline be used against the *Advocate* or any newspaper. (*Asides*).

I said earlier today, "I am black and proud," and the party in which I sit, I am proud of, and I am going to do everything that is within my power to help raise the standard of it. That is what I am prepared to move.

At this point I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, (*Asides*) Mr. Speaker will give his ruling after I have moved the suspension. I beg to move that this House be now suspended. (*Asides*). I know them — full of dope, drunk.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

I have heard the complaint of the Hon. Minister respecting the article appearing in today's edition of the *Advocate* newspaper on page 1. I will give a ruling on the matter tomorrow.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.00 p.m. tomorrow, March 25, 1982.

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

The question that the House be suspended until 2 p.m. on March 25, 1982 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

6.55 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Last evening the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, the Honourable Member for St. James North and Leader of this Hon. House, by motion raised a complaint about a breach of privilege under Standing Order 76.

The complaint concerned the subject matter contained in a copy of the Advocate News at page one under the caption "New Rules to be posted at Parliament Entrance" and made a document of this Hon. House by the same hon. member.

Upon formal motion that I refer the matter complained of to the Committee of Privileges, I informed this Hon. House that I would consider the matter and make a statement on the matter today.

Upon hearing the complaint of the Hon. Minister as to the subject matter herein, I am indeed afforded opportunity firstly to lend assistance to some sections of the media as far as their performances at the Press Table of this Hon. House are concerned.

Judging from the tardiness of some reporters, it would appear as if their Editors should provide more broad based instructions before sending reporters to this Hon. House on assignments and those reporters must learn and display quickly, and I want to lay emphasis on quickly, and I am particularly concerned only with such reporters as come to this Hon. House. They must learn that truthfulness in reporting an assignment and accuracy in gleaning the minutest detail in perfecting that assignment, together can go to make for the power of which the pen has been famous down through the ages.

It is patently dishonest of any journalist, and a contempt of the dignity of this Hon. House, to report an extract from a speech of any honourable Member of this House, when the reporter himself or herself knows that

what is being reported and published for the public's knowledge is not a fair and accurate report of the totality of what the honourable Member did say at the time. Remember, every Member of this Hon. House is very happy to be reported by the media, but honourable Members want to be reported accurately all the time.

I observe from the Chair, daily breaches by the reportorial staff of the media who come to this Hon. House to conduct business on behalf of the sources that they represent. I have observed that some members sit and they conduct a running commentary amongst themselves during the proceedings of this Hon. House. I am serving a warning now — it must be stopped forthwith. Some seem to have been growing tired after sitting and doing nothing but talking, then turning and standing and further desecrating Parliament by placing their hands on the railings of this Hon. House and leaning over their colleagues carrying on their conversations. I have witnessed all of this from this Chair where I now sit.

This is detestable, to say the least, but all I want to say is this; let yesterday be but a reminder of all of this. In other words, it will not be allowed to continue in this Hon. House, beginning today.

2 15. p.m.

There is a matter which concerns honourable Members, and I regret to have to say it at a time such as this, but I approach it in this light. Any reporter who wants to enjoy the privilege of earning his or here living by sitting at this Press Table and is found whispering or beckoning, making signals from the Press Table to any honourable Member in this House, don't wait, make the signal and bid goodbye to the Press Table. That is a warning, and I invite honourable Members to act in a manner that would place no reporter or his job in danger.

The Marshal is here and is on call to each and every honourable Member, an honourable Member requiring the services of a reporter should ask word through the Marshal, and the same honourable Member can make an appointment for an interview with the Reporter in the Member's lobby at the Member's request. No hissing, beckoning and signalling from the Press Table, nor must it be seen going from the House to the Press Table to anyone. Let yesterday be the last of all of this.

I observe further that we can hardly tell ourselves now whether or not we have what is known as a Speaker's Gallery or a distinguished visitors Gallery. Through the week, the Press invaded — they came, they saw and they conquered — they took over. We do not want to embarrass anybody. We welcome the Press, but I had given certain instructions to be conveyed to the media for regulating the numbers that we could

accommodate, and quite comfortably accommodate in our limited space. I say no more on this score.

On the question of attire, I am dealing with journalists, whoever else might have something to say, my only answer to that is, leave the rest to the Chair. I want to see an improvement in the attire of journalists who come here to represent the media from time to time. I am calling for such an improvement. We will no longer tolerate, as the Hon. Leader of the House made mention yesterday, some reporters coming here. How they manage, I do not know. While some are talking, others are sleeping during the course of the proceedings of this Hon. House. An end must be put to this type of behaviour. Journalists to whom we extend every consideration must understand, and the Marshal will see to it, that there must be no placing of hands on, and elbowing of, the rails of Parliament. They are for us sacred. This is our Parliament and we are very concerned about this.

As for the complaint of the Hon. Leader of the House, I am satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been made out, and accordingly, I will refer the matter for the consideration of the Committee of Privileges.

When the sitting was suspended.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, since I was the person involved in drawing to Your Honour's attention what I considered an inaccuracy in the papers — and out of my contribution here yesterday afternoon you have given your ruling this afternoon — I would just like to say for the benefit of those Members on this side who are not now in their places that I shall make sure that I draw the feeling of Your Honour the Speaker to their attention because I know all that you have said can only be for the good of Parliament.

I believe my colleagues on the other side share much of your sentiments, and I would sincerely hope that either the acting Leader of the Opposition, whom I do not see in his place, or one of the senior Members on that side will also convey your sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am in order to suggest that you can have a letter directed — I just do not know — to the various media so as to draw certain regulations to their attention which many young journalists in particular may not be *au fait* with. I think this would help the situation. I know we all would like to see this Parliament of ours as really a Parliament that we can be justly proud of. Those are the comments I would like to make, and I sincerely thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.
2.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hear the Hon. Leader of the House but putting ourselves in the position of a Court, no

Judge would ever direct or attempt to direct that young barristers in the profession be provided with all the rules to help them. They have got to learn the ropes, learn the rules if not they are out of Court. That is all.

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply, to that it now resumes.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

HEAD 23 — LOANS AND ADVANCES —

Head 23 — Loans and Advances — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 23 stand part.

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

The question that the sum of \$1,810 000 under Head 23 — Loans and Advances — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 24 — PENSIONS

Head 24 — Pensions — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 24 stand part.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under this Head, I would like the Minister responsible for this Head to take note. I think Mr. Chairman, that this is really an unkind thing to do. Here is a letter written to a man who had worked for 15 years continuously in the Government Service as a Tractor Operator. In the third paragraph it reads as follows:—

“The Ministry therefore wishes to thank you for the services which you have rendered during the period of your employment.”

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a little bit too much for a fellow who has worked for 15 years continuously, and all he is leaving the Ministry with is a “thank you”, and when he enquired about his situation from the Personnel Officer, not even a little hope is held out that the possibility of an *ex gratia* payment might be in train etc.

I would sincerely hope that under this particular Heading — Pensions — that the Minister can take a careful look at this particular occasion and see if anything can be done for the Officer.

2.35 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Am I to understand from the honourable Member for St. Philip North that he is complaining that the letter thanking the man was not long enough and did not extend all the niceties that can go into a love letter, or are you saying that the man should get a pension or gratuity? I am not clear on that. Well is he entitled to a gratuity by law? This is what I want to find out first.

Some time ago there were a number of people who worked for the Ministry of Communications and Works — now known as MTW — with the cart and horse, or the donkey drawing, and when they were ready to go home — many years ago — I think it has been changed now — the men were not paid anything, because it was said that the Government had rented the horse and cart so you had to pay a pension or gratuity to the horse or cart and not to the person. That has been rectified.

So what is the honourable Member complaining about? Is the letter not long enough? Should it have said thank you for all you have done to help build your country? Sir, what is your real complaint? Are you complaining that the man should be given a gratuity? Is he entitled first of all?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I started by saying that the man is not legally entitled to a gratuity, but I am certain that your government, like our government would give some type of *ex gratia* payment on this particular matter where there are people who have been in the Tractor Scheme for 15 to 20 years. It would make for very good relationships with people who are working into this situation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it does not say how long the man was working there. It simply stated that according to our records you are not eligible for any vacation leave. I do not know whether the man was working part time. (Asides) What is the policy of the Government on this? You would have to come to Cabinet to give the man *ex gratia* payment. I just don't think that this is something that we can just automatically decide to do. The man has been paying National Insurance premiums and he is entitled to his National Insurance pension. This is all I can say about this matter and I don't know what can be done. Let me hear what your policy was and would have been.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of what our policy would have been. As far as I

recall — and I believe if the honourable Member refreshes his memory he would probably find that it is continuing with persons like these who did not have any legal claim, there was a rule of thumb, which had been worked out over a period of time, where they were given an *ex gratia* payment which had to be authorized on each occasion by the Cabinet. But there was some kind of rule of thumb which the Establishments Division had worked out and most of these persons, when they were going home, were given some kind of *ex gratia* payment which was worked out on a formula which the Establishments Division used to have.

That was our policy, that was what I found and I suppose that it is probably still there. But the department usually has to refer to the Establishments Division, and each case has to be authorized by the Cabinet since these persons are not normally entitled to a pension or gratuity because they are caught by some particular Act. I believe what my colleague is saying is that the particular Ministry can be more humane in dealing with those persons when they have come to the end of their work. I don't think there is any difficulty or controversy on this.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I think we can get this out of the way. The letter was written on March 16. Now this letter, as I understand it, is terminating the services of the gentleman. I believe, as you said, there is a policy there, but it has to be dealt with and drawn to the attention of the appropriate persons to find out how many days he worked, how much money should be given to him or what ever we are going to do, and submit it for some form of recognition. But could dear, it was written on March 16, and today is the 25th. Because we see here "we thank you very much" you rush in here with it. You are too light.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This here has to do with pensions.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Fine, I agree with the Minister but it is just the attitude of the Personnel Department. When the man enquired and was bluntly told he was not entitled to anything and that was the end of it. If the personnel relationship could have been a little better it would have helped.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What you are saying is that he should have been given softer words by the officer. And as he is from the Home Agricultural Station in St. Philip North or St. Philip South you have brought this to the House to get a little credit. I am with you, I can appreciate your position.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I would just like to advise the Hon. Minister that there is a gentleman in St. Martin

whose name is Alonza Brathwaite who got a letter last year. He was a watchman at Transport for 24 years, and when he asked them for money, he was told that he was never appointed and there was no money for him. That is a fact.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: At least out of 24 years he would have had 19 with you and five with us, you could really have appointed the man during that time..... (Laughter), you took advantage of him.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two brief observations under this Head — 24 which relates to pensions. Sir, I believe that I have an obligation to bring the attention of this Hon. House the plight of many pensioners in Barbados who would be beneficiaries of pensions under this Head.

Many of those persons are finding it difficult to make ends meet. Many of them, Sir, when they are faced with the cost of utilities such as electricity, water and gas, those who do not have homes have to pay rent, and those who have homes have to pay taxes and meet the cost of maintenance, when they have finished paying their bills they hardly have enough left over to buy food.

We must be concerned when we see persons who have served as teachers, for example, in Barbados, and who have given many, many years of service to several thousand children in this country in a situation where they can hardly afford one balanced meal per day. Many of us would be surprised to see the levels in this society at which that is happening.

Much of our attention over the years has been concentrated, and rightly so, on old age pensioners as such. 2.45 p.m.

But there are many recipients of pensions, say from Local Government, in the past or teachers' pensions and so on, many of these persons are finding it extremely difficult to make ends meet. Their standards of living are falling from year to year.

One does not expect a pensioner necessarily to be able to maintain the same standard of living which he or she enjoyed during his working years. But we must be very careful that we do not find ourselves in a situation where as people live longer and longer, that the pensions to which they are entitled become gradually eroded by increases in the cost of living to the point where they are finding it very difficult to have one balanced meal a day.

This is a very disturbing matter, Sir, because, very often, these same persons find it extremely difficult, from a psychological point of view, to seek assistance from the other welfare props within the society. And, I would say that there is many a retired school teacher, there is many

a retired Local Government officer in Barbados today who is living at or just above the level of starvation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, if the honourable Member would give way. I would just like him, in putting his case, to also draw to the attention of the Committee that as we examine the cost of living we have raised pensions for these persons. Just do not forget that. Just advance your case in that respect. Just do not say that X years from now the person's pension remains at one point and then inflation erodes the pension, thereby making the standard of living relatively low for the person, that they cannot even get one meal.

Advance also, Mr. Chairman, that pensions are raised accordingly, when civil servants get a raise, Members of Parliament, everybody gets a raise. We also raise the pensions accordingly. Please examine that aspect in advancing your case. (Asides)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be instructed by the honourable Member for St. James North as to how I should put my case. He will have the opportunity to put his case. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But I want a balanced case.) The point I am trying to make, Sir, is that whatever increases have been granted, that the rate of inflation and the rate of erosion of the pensions received by those persons have resulted in a declining standard of living.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Not true)..... to the point, Sir, where many of them cannot meet the basic needs — those basic needs which, Sir, are internationally acceptable for all persons living in a society. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Wrong, Richie.)

It has been my experience — perhaps your experience might be different from mine — but I know of persons who are recipients of pensions under this Head, for example, who would probably not have more than \$30 or \$40, or probably less than that, as a disposable income after meeting the obligations of housing and the obligations of utilities and so on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has been saying the same thing over and over again. Would you please.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have not been saying the same thing over again.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central were ordered to be struck from the Record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, every single person in Barbados can now draw an old age pension. Is that correct? That even the wealth-

iest person in Barbados(Aside).... No, I said every single person in Barbados can now draw a pension, an old age pension from the Government, (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Government pensioners too?) every single person.

The point which you are making — that there is erosion of a person's standard of living — is not a fair way to advance your argument and that is the point which I was making. Just do not say things to talk about increase in pensions today and say you want an increase in pensions. Look, you are going to get headlines whenever you are finished. We know that. Do not worry, he is in business.

I beg to move, Sir, that Head 24 do now stand part.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot move that Head when I am not finished. I would like to ask you a question. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You who?)

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Sir, I would like to ask a question. The honourable Member for St. James North, the distinguished Hon. Leader of the House, the ebullient champion of all lost causes for the Barbados Labour Party, has certainly sent out a signal and an impression that Government pensioners can also draw old age pensions. I would like to get a clarification on that matter because it is my understanding that Government pensioners cannot draw old age pensions, and I am talking here about Government pensioners. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question, Sir.)

The question that Head 24 for \$18 million stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 73 AS AMENDED — CAPITAL — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING — \$18 528 500

Head 73 as amended — Ministry of Finance and Planning — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 73 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that.....The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I would just like some information, Mr. Chairman, on Head 73, Subhead 3, "Capital Investments and Contributions to Financing

Agencies". I wonder if the appropriate Minister would be so kind as to inform this House what portion of that vote is going towards the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation.

It is an englobal Vote of \$10 million. Some goes to the Cement Plant, some to the Food Corporation, *et cetera, et cetera*, and there is some contribution to Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation. If the appropriate Minister would be so kind as to say what section. (Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: One million dollars.) One million. Thank you.

Under Subhead 4, Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of information to this House, what feasibility studies would be covered by that vote of \$3.2 million? (Asides). Look at Subhead 4 — Feasibility Study — and you will see that there is a total under Subhead 4 of \$3. 26 million for Professional Services. The Note says, "Provides for studies of the feasibility of a number of projects". Can you give us, just roughly, the major projects that feasibilities will be carried out on under this subhead?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Mortgage Finance Company is getting \$1 million. They get \$1 million every year for three years. I perhaps should also let the House know that there is a prospect of considerably enhanced funds for mortgage financing and other housing development in Barbados about which an announcement may very shortly be made, funds coming from an overseas source. I would not go into it in any depth now because I should await a more formal occasion and, indeed, a full agreement.

The feasibility vote is a back-up vote, so to speak, for projects which come up from time to time and which cannot always be predicted in advance. I think this may very well include the vote for the South Coast Sewerage Scheme.
2.55 p.m.

I have not got the list, I cannot remember all the projects. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You do not know). The honourable Member says I do not know. I do not know everything, I am not like the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, he knows everything.

The road connecting the industrial estates, the IADB project, the road from Chapel Gap to Warrens — all of these are overseas funded projects. You do not often find me not remembering, Mr. Chairman, so do not make styles on the occasion when you remember. When I do not remember I will ask honourable Members opposite. You are always engaged in negotiations with overseas agencies, and when the negotiations reach a point where you get an agreement for a feasibility study, this is the vote from which it is satisfied.

I could tell you all the projects in the past which have been financed through this. The Broiler Breeder Project, the East Coast Wave Study Project — that is certainly one that is being financed through this.

It is not quite so chimerical a project as honourable Members may think, but since we are talking about sabotage, it appears that somebody has gone out there and removed the scientific equipment for the East Coast Wave Project. (Aside).

If you want, I can get a list of all the projects. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: There is no need, we are satisfied). I heard so much about lists today, I heard the honourable Member for St. Michael West has found a list.

The question that the sum of \$25 010 239 under Capital Expenditure — Head 73 — Ministry of Finance and Planning — stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 28—MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Head 28 — Ministry of the Attorney General — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General's Chambers continue in the face of increasing demand and the professional officers, because of the increasing number of law suits against the Government and the specialised services that are required by legal officers in those Chambers for Government offices like the Inland Revenue Department and other specialised Government agencies, will continue to give a great deal of work with the limited resources available.

There is a lot of work being done on law reform and also on law revision, and we have also a lot of work going on compiling a lot of the supplementary legal drafting that has come to the department over the last two or three years.

The Head not only covers the Ministry of the Attorney General, but also the ancillary offices, the Registration Office and so on, and I will be quite willing to answer any questions raised by honourable Members on the other side on any aspect of Head 28.

I beg to move that the sum of \$1 091 228 under Head 28 — Ministry of the Attorney General — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there is not much I want to raise under this Head, but there are one or two small matters of concern which I would like to spend just a little time on.

The Attorney General made the point just now that the department was concerned with a lot of this work on law revision and law reform.

A lot of legislation has come out from the department in recent time, and this year there has been publication of new Divorce Rules, new Supreme Court Rules, and I believe that there may be other rules relating to the practice and procedure of the Supreme Court which will shortly be published.

The publication of the new Divorce Rules earlier this year seemed to have caused a little havoc in the profession, from the point of view that the profession did not seem to be aware of the publication of the rules and of the fact that the Divorce Rules came into effect on a particular date, with the result that there was some confusion in relation to divorce and matrimonial proceedings which came before the courts. Indeed, for some time, all proceedings on divorce were not dealt with because of what was conceived to be some uncertainty in the way to proceed.

Now there may be, indeed, no great confusion in essence as a result of the law of the new revised rules themselves, but the problem I believe which the profession had was an absence of notification that the rules had in fact been passed. I happened to have been aware that the rules did come into effect because of the recent early publication of the Official Gazette and the supplements thereto. I had some early knowledge of it, but most of the profession, as I said, had been unaware that the rules were in force.

They did make some substantial change to the procedure and practice in matrimonial causes, and I would think that some step, perhaps, could be taken by the Ministry of the Attorney General to ensure that all the departments within his purview became aware of the fact that new rules came into effect, because I believe the Registration Department, which is one of the departments for which the Attorney General has responsibility, was not itself aware that the new Divorce Rules, the new Matrimonial Rules — I think they are called the Family Law Rules — had come into effect.

The Supreme Court Rules have just been published, I do not know if there has been any general circulation yet, but I understand that they come into effect from April 1. In fact, the rules themselves contain a clause which states that they come into force on April 1 this year. I know that a number of copies have been circulated among Members of Parliament, but I wonder if the Registry and all the departments concerned with the administration of the new Supreme Court Rules are, in fact, aware that these rules will come into effect on April 1, 1982.
3.05 p.m.

The other ancillary question to that is whether, in fact, the departments, and all the bodies concerned, have access to the new Supreme Court Rules. The question, in fact, is whether they have been available to public access as at this time. These rules are quite bulky — in fact about three times the size of the existing rules, and the question is whether persons have enough advanced knowledge of the existence of the publication of these rules and of the fact that they will come into force very shortly so that all the problems and complications which can arise from the new requirements can be obviated.

I know there are one or two lawyers now, who have advanced knowledge of the rules, who are boasting that they are going to strike out so many people in proceedings once the new rules have been promulgated. It is certainly likely that there will be a lot of persons who will be totally unfamiliar with them, and I know that there are a lot of lawyers waiting in the slips to catch others, in relation to traps which they might fall into, by virtue of the fact that the new rules may not have had the publicity which one would normally expect.

On the question of rules, I note that there has been no publication of the new set of rules for the Magistrates Courts. I think that this must be an area in respect of which there is some urgency for revised rules. Certainly, in the case of the Supreme Court, one can always fall back on the very modern and revised procedures following in the English Courts, but in relation to the Magistrates Court Rules, the residual position is in relation to the County Court practice in England which is not all that easy to grapple with, sometimes. It would seem to me that a revision and publication of new rules governing the procedure and the practice in Magistrates Courts are terribly important, because when we consider that the Magistrates in the country are concerned with a very high percentage, perhaps more than 80 per cent of all the litigation that takes place in the country, it is all the more reason that the rules governing the practice of the Magistrates Courts should be published and promulgated as soon as possible.

I would like also to ask the Attorney General if he could perhaps give this Hon. House some indication as to when the country's subsidiary legislation is likely to be available for public consumption. This is an area of the law which it is extremely difficult to locate when necessary, and I know that attempts have been made to get the subsidiary legislation up to date. The process of revising it has actually been started, but it seems to me that getting the subsidiary legislation available to use is a process which has taken far too long, and steps should be taken to expedite getting that legislation published and available. Mr. Chairman, I think those are all the remarks I wish to address at this time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I really thank the honourable Member for bringing to focus a number of the problems in relation to the new rules in the Supreme Court and so on. Everyone is aware that over the past two or three years there has been a welter of legislation passing through this Chamber. It has caused a great deal of confusion and indeed has revealed some degree of ignorance of certain aspects of the law among the profession. We are trying to upgrade the tools by which lawyers have to carry out their practice.

I have practised law for many years in this country and I have never been able to get my hands on a copy of the Supreme Court Rules. I have also done work in the law courts of Barbados and argue cases in relation to the old Prison Rules without ever having seen a copy of the Prison Rules in my whole life — because they had not been available to the profession. I understand that one or two lawyers were privileged enough to have these rules in their hands and guarded them jealously with their lives, and they would never make them available to younger and newer members of the Bar for some reason best known to themselves. (*Asides*) I do not know who is the one lawyer. I know there were one or two copies around that I had never seen.

We are trying to upgrade the laws and make it better both for practitioners and for their clients to have standard justice before the law courts of this country.

With respect to the question raised on the Divorce Rules, any lack of knowledge of what was contained in the Divorce Rules before the time when they were published should perhaps, coming from the honourable Member who is a member of the Bar, be directed towards the Bar Association, because the Bar Association was invited to have representatives on the body that drafted the rules, and if the members of the Bar Association who were appointed to do that did not report back to the Association, that is a little bit unfortunate.

I think it is asking too much of Government after it has published in the Official Gazette publications of the Supreme Court Rules and Divorce Rules to ask the Attorney General's Chambers to publish information on them. Lawyers are the last people who should ask this because they are the ones who know where to look for the law, and any lawyer who is practising and worth his salt would not allow a single issue of the Official Gazette to go by unnoticed. All these things are published in the Official Gazette.

Now in respect of the Supreme Court Rules, I would wish that the honourable Member was not trying to lay any burden or blame at the door of the Attorney General, because he should well know that under the law,

the Judiciary Advisory Council is empowered to make regulations, to make rules for the operation of the Supreme Court and the Attorney General is not a member of the Judiciary Advisory Council.

The Chief Justice is the Chairman, the Judges of the Supreme Court are members, the Registrar is a member, the Solicitor General is a member, the President of the Bar Association to my certain knowledge is a member and perhaps one other member of the Bar Association, and the Attorney General has no power in law to direct the Judicial Advisory Council as to how it should carry out its duties and its powers given to it under the law.

The Judicial Advisory Council put together the Supreme Court Rules and they were signed by all the members, and they were laid by me in Parliament some two weeks ago. If the effective date for their implementation and use — April 1, 1982 — is unsuitable to the profession, well all I am asking is that it not be laid by my door, because I had no substantial input into those rules and indeed had no power in law to say when they should become effective.

The honourable Member also raised the question of the rules of the Magistrates Courts.

Now again the honourable Member should well know that long ago — not a year or two ago — perhaps early in the Seventies — a Committee was set up to review the existing Magistrates Courts Rules, I do not remember the membership of it — I know that Peter Williams is a member — and they were supposed to do the research on the draft and again put up the rules. So far the work has not been completed.

But I do agree with the honourable member that it is necessary for these rules to be ready before it gets too late. Most of the work that is done in the Courts of Barbados is done in the Magistrates Courts — I agree with that — and therefore it is out of order that the rules that should be operative in these courts should be taking such a long gestation period, and I am looking forward, before very long, to have the final draft so that we can get them to lay in this Parliament, and have them operating in the law courts of this Island.

3.15 p.m.

In respect of the subsidiary legislation raised by the honourable Member, we are now at an advanced stage of preparation in the subsidiary legislation. Indeed, I am of the view that the subsidiary legislation has now been completed and has been forwarded to the printers in England — Eyre and Spottiswoode — the legal printers — and they were awaiting the foreword to the subsidiary legislation and the foreword passed my desk and was approved by me and by the Consultant Wilfred Fergusson who was

working on them. It passed my desk sometime last week, so I believe that by now the foreword would have been sent on to London and expect that by the middle of summer we would have the subsidiary legislation in our hands.

Now I think those were the only points raised by the honourable Member. If there is anything that I did not recall, the honourable Member can raise them now and I will be glad to answer them if I can.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, there was just one aspect to the Attorney General's response which I did not quite grasp. I was not asking his department to publish anything. What I was suggesting was he would want to ensure that departments over which he has control, like the Registration Office for instance — if no other department — was aware that the rules came into effect and after all he must have some responsibility for the departments under his portfolio.

The impression I had certainly got was that the Registration Department of Barbados was not aware that the new rules had come into force as was the position with other lawyers. And all I am saying, is that at the least the Attorney-General should be concerned to see that a department over which he has jurisdiction, at least in his own department, would know that the rules were in effect.

The second point which the Attorney-General made was he said that if the date for the publication of the new Supreme Court Rules proved unsuitable, he had no control over that. I was not for one single moment suggesting that the new Supreme Court Rules should not come into effect on the date on which they were coming into effect, because I think the whole profession welcomes the publications of the new rules.

The only point I am making in relation to publication of the rules of this sort — and the problem perhaps is not as acute now that the Official Reports of Parliament are being published early — but what would have happened in the days when you had long delays in the publication of the *Official Gazette* is, for example, that you might have had the *Gazette* and the legislation which formed the supplement to it not being available to the public before the actual date of the rules come into effect.

All I am concerned about is making a plea that at least where the system is required to work, that every attempt be made to smoothen that, because it is an inconvenience — and a gross inconvenience to the public — when they have matters in the court and they have proceedings going on on the basis that are following a set rules to be notified at some later date that what has gone before has been changed. Whether it is right or wrong is not important at this stage.

All I am concerned about is that for the convenience of the public in relation to the filing of documents and things of that sort, that the public is not too inconvenienced by having to return to the Registration Office to get things done as required by the new rules, and that advance knowledge and the Registration Department at least, if no other — forget everybody else — forget the lawyers, forget the whole profession — which is within your responsibility, should be well aware that the new rules are in effect and govern all its actions in relation to the existence of the new rules.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I really am a little bit non-plussed by the comments of the honourable Member. To my recollection, the Registrar was a member of the committee that put together the Divorce Rules and recommended the date by which they could come into effect yet the honourable Member is asking me to tell the same Registration Office what is the position.

Now I feel, Mr. Chairman, that what is happening in relation to these things — and I am going to be charitable, Sir — is that the lawyers are so busy that they do not have time to keep up on the new laws and when they come into effect. That is the only conclusion I can come to — I will be generous in that regard — because it has never been the practice in Barbados from time immemorial for the Attorney General's Chambers to inform the legal profession, whether the public side or the private side, as to when legislation has been passed or when it comes into operation.

What in fact the honourable Member — in goodwill, I am sure — is asking me to do now, is to get on the telephone or write letters to people involved in the legal profession and say, "Keep your eyes open, there is new legislation and it come into effect on a certain date." Well I cannot promise to do that. I really cannot promise to do that.

The normal procedure that is followed — and has been followed for decades and centuries — in relation to passed legislation that is being brought to the knowledge of the public, both the clients and the lawyers, is being followed. And although I would not pass up the commendation made by the honourable Member, I must tell him that I am very reluctant, at this stage, to undertake a further burden which really forms no part of my substantial work.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, there are two sections under Subhead 3 on which I wanted to get a few answers from the Minister responsible for Legal Affairs — Subhead 3(c) — negotiating the purchase of land on behalf of Government, including advising on values, goodwill and depreciation, as well as Subhead 3(e) — acquisition of land under the Land Acquisition Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to start with (e). The final responsibility for acquisition of land under the Land Acquisition Act falls to the Legal Service Division and the officer that deals with it is the Deputy Solicitor General — Conveyancing, Mr. Haynes. (*Asides*) I think an unfair burden is being placed on that particular officer, and we should look at it, this whole procedure which needs some stream lining.

Presently there are four divisions of Government caught up with acquisitions. There is the section with the Ministry of Lands that I think act as a type of secretariat for it. There is the Deputy Solicitor General, I think, Conveyancing, whose responsibility is to do the legal work. There is the Commissioner of the Valuation who acts as a consultant to the matter and there is also something called the Standing Valuation Committee.

On this particular one, Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a little time and share my thoughts on this, because it is a very important area.
3.25 p.m.

Time and time again we come to this House with acquisitions and the Ministry of Lands has been bitterly complaining about the fact that the procedures are necessarily slow. He has also said that there are claims for acquisitions outstanding to the tune of \$10 million. So it is a subject that we must pay attention to.

Acquisition, particularly compulsory acquisition of land, is special in that this is an occasion where one is asked to part with his land, not of his own free will or consent, and sometimes rather reluctantly because there might be emotional ties, and in most cases at a big disadvantage to the person whose property is being taken for obvious reasons. The main reasons lie in the fact that the Act under which we are operating needs some revision and I would like to suggest on the lines where this is needed. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for these acquisitions to be done as quickly as possible.

The problem, as it stands now is very difficult, if you, as a private person acting on behalf of one of the land owners, want to negotiate with the Government agency over the table to get a settlement. You don't seem to know who to negotiate with. If you start to negotiate with the Deputy Solicitor General, he has to refer on the matters of values to the Commissioner of Valuation. If your evaluation disagrees with both of them, it is then referred to the Valuation Committee.

I think this is a downright insult to the Commissioner of Valuation, whose Department is the technical and professional body in Government to advise the Minister on matters of valuation in this type of stuff, to have

his findings and recommendations passed superseded by a supposed Valuation Committee. I don't even know the composition of the Valuation Committee, but it is within my knowledge that the Valuation Committee people do not have the expertise that is available to the Commissioner of Valuation.

It is a slap to the Commissioner of Valuation and his office to have a matter of value referred to the Valuation Committee and I would advise the Minister that he should remove this Valuation Committee. It is just another chain that bogs up the work. They too have to refer to the Commissioner of Valuation to be advised before they come to a decision on a procedure.

I would like to suggest that arrangements can be curtailed and shortened with the cutting out of Valuation Committee and that the Commissioner of Valuation or his nominee, be authorized to negotiate over the table with any competent person authorized to negotiate on behalf of the owners of the land. At such time that an agreement is reached, or in the absence of an agreement, both sides of the case should be forwarded to the Ministry with the appropriate recommendation for the final word, because it is my understanding that the Minister of Lands has the final word on compulsory acquisition for Government, therefore he must be involved.

The officer of the legal department of course is needed for the legal work, but at the moment they are using that high appointed person as a messenger. If you send a case to him, he then has to send the files to the appropriate section of the Ministry of Lands, he then has to send the files to the Commissioner of Valuation for consultation. And if they come back to him, if there is a disagreement on the value between the Commissioner of Valuation and person acting on behalf of the owner, he then has to send it to the standing Valuation Committee.

He is being used — this high powered officer — as a messenger passing files from section to section. It is not fair to use that type of person. It is my contention that this officer should be brought into play when the level of compensation has been agreed on and necessary legal documentation is to be done. I am saying that this can be easily speeded up if the direct responsibility for deciding at the level of compensation be placed in the hands of the agency that have the most competent and professional personnel available to it — the Commissioner of the Valuation office. Naturally there are procedures if there is a breakdown and no agreement is reached — the procedures of carrying it to arbitration or to the courts. There are ample procedures for that.

So I would like to suggest to the Minister of lands in consultation with the Minister responsible for this

particular division that they soon try and get together and straighten out this procedural arrangement to speed it up.

As far as the legal services and the Attorney General is concerned, I would think that the Act needs some urgent amendment. I would like to turn his attention to a few of the areas I think he should pay some attention to.

The first one is the matter of payment of interest. Under the present Act interest can only be paid after compensation has been decided by the Judge. The Judge is then in the position to put out an interest — and the Act says 6 per cent — from the time that decision is given until the money is paid. If, in the absence of that, compensation is agreed between the vendor and the legal office no interest is paid on that compensation in regard to what time it is reached until the time it is paid. I would be very grateful if the Minister would draw to my attention if the procedure is different but my understanding is that under the Act, interest is only payable if the compensation is decided on by the Judge. I stand corrected on that and I would be very happy if that is not true because it is a disadvantage. I would be very happy if that is not true.

As far as compensation is concerned the Act is very specific on the method to be used for compensation, and quite rightly the Act states that compensation should be placed on market value. Now I know that in practice this might not be happening, because there are certain things that you can get under the Disturbance Clause that makes it very difficult, because there is a lot of area of disagreement under the Disturbance Head and what is allowed under disturbance. Up to now there is no formal agreement between the legal section of the Ministry and people negotiating on behalf of owners.

I think in considering the situation that you should give very serious consideration to replacing that section of the Act by equivalent replacement cost. Mr. Chairman, by equivalent replacement cost I mean that compensation should be based on the present cost of putting up a building of similar material, similar sizes, with similar workmanship and finishes as the building that was purchased.

I am certain that a lot of people would contend that this would put the person in a better position than they were in before. I agree. But it is my contention that the circumstances are such that if this has to be done, I see nothing wrong in doing it. The circumstances are: (1) that in most cases the person is not a willing vendor, (2) there is a lot of inconvenience, sentimental, financial and otherwise that the person has to go through; (3) and this is most important — in most cases the amount of money which is paid does not allow the people to reinstate themselves in a position similar to what they were in before.

3.35 p.m.

In most cases, the people are left having to buy land and rebuild new accommodation and they find themselves in very serious positions, because the moment that they have to rebuild comparable accommodation, it is going to cost them more, and it means sometimes that people in their advanced age find themselves having to go into new mortgages in order to provide those additional funds that have to be put with the compensation to replace themselves in a similar position.

This is not quite fair, because the canon of compensation is that one should not be put in a worse position than he was in before. If one is in a slightly better position only by way of having a newer edifice, the disadvantages and all the other things that they have to go through are quite enough to compensate for the slight improvement in the edifice.

It would be easier, a lot easier, for you to arrive at compensation, and it would therefore speed up the whole procedure, because equivalent replacement cost is a lot easier to arrive at than market value plus disturbances where there are lots of areas of disagreement about disturbances.

So I would like the appropriate Minister or Ministries to take this into consideration and give some very serious thought to this particular section.

There is another area that I think you should give some attention to. It is within my knowledge that the vendors under compulsory acquisition are still asked to pay the Property Transfer Tax. I have been advised that the Ministry takes out the Property Transfer Tax before the compensation money is paid out.

I would like to recommend that the Government foregoes this Property Transfer Tax because, once again, I am saying that you have to consider that it is not a willing vendor to a willing buyer. It is due to the fact that in order to provide some type of public or infrastructural works, or for the use of it for the wider public, that the individual is deprived of the use of that particular property. I think that this is an area that the Government could easily see to the removal of the paying of the Transfer Tax by the vendors on compulsory acquisition.

Under section (c) I would like the appropriate Minister, the Attorney General, to consider if this is not a responsibility that could justifiably be removed from his Ministry and be placed under the Ministry of Finance, more particularly the Commissioner of Valuation. That is the function which states "on negotiating the purchase of land on behalf of Government, including advising on values, goodwill and depreciation".

Goodwill is a very technical and difficult thing to calculate. As far as I know, I might be wrong, one's legal

training does not allow you to appreciate and calculate goodwill easily. The calculation of goodwill is an area that I think the professionals in the Valuation Department are in a much better position to negotiate, as well as depreciation.

In quite a lot of places, it is usual for the Commissioner of Valuation to do the negotiation for acquisition on behalf of the Government and there are a lot of places where this can be done. You can see that this is done in a lot of places. So, I think that the Attorney-General can consider this area and he might be able to release his officer in this particular area from that function.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the views of the appropriate Minister or Ministries on these, and I would be very grateful if they can consider these submissions which I think would go a long way in easing the burden and the problems of the private people dealing with compulsory acquisition.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is probably the third time that the honourable Member has raised this question, and on each occasion, it is necessary for us to remind the honourable Member that the principles of valuation on compulsory acquisition are set out in the Laws of Barbados, Cap.228 and Section II which embodies these rules which were specifically brought into the Laws of Barbados by an amendment in 1963.

It has always been a cardinal principle of the Democratic Labour Party that compensation for lands should be on the basis of the use of the land at the time of acquisition.

As a matter of fact, Sir, by Section II, subsection 6, it states specifically:

"No allowance shall be made on account of —

- (a) the acquisition being compulsory or the degree or urgency which has led to the acquisition;
- (b) any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;
- (e) any increase in the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which the land will be put."

In short, potential value cannot be taken into account.

But this is your philosophy. Am I to understand the Democratic Labour Party has changed its philosophy that it has embodied in this Act? It is alright for us to sit here and say that we agree with the fundamental premise

being put forward by the honourable Member — that the basis of valuation should be on replacement value. That is a very interesting concept.

You mean to tell me that the honourable Member would advocate that in relation to the acquisition or the purchase of land, and fail to recognise that as soon as you accept the principle of replacement value in one section of the law in relation to one aspect, then you must recognise that throughout the whole of the body of law in your country? Income Tax..... (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Public utilities.).....public utilities. (Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You have argued that.) Right, so what am I hearing now?

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has always argued against it. But I want to know now what he is going to say to his friend on the other side. I know the Democratic Labour Party is not in favour of this, I know it.

But there is something else that the honourable Member has not taken into account. Even where you have replacement value as the basis of valuation, in every jurisdiction you have to discount from replacement value a percentage for depreciation, otherwise you would be compensating the man too much.

If I am going to replace a two bedroom house and you are going to replace it with another two bedroom house but with more modern conveniences, that is the replacement value. So there must be some kind of limitations on the straight principle of replacement value — there must be.

Now the accountants in the world are going through this problem. I agree that this is a problem. We have tried for depreciation purposes — Income Tax wise — to encourage some discussion in the community as to a new basis. The accountants cannot agree among themselves on what is a fair element of depreciation to take into account when you bring in replacement value into your consideration.

It is a very serious thing. It is not a simple thing. It is not a simple thing to introduce the basis of the change. Only today we were dealing and grappling with this problem in relation to other matters.
3.45 p.m.

It is very easy to put it forward and say it is the fairest measure of compensation, but what about the implications for Government revenue? And the honourable Member will know that our law, at the present moment, does not even in our taxation basis accept the concept of depreciation for land, or indeed for buildings. That is a very serious thing — we do not. This is probably one of the few countries left in the world where when

you get an accountant's statement and you depreciate the buildings at 2 per cent per year, if you are a property company in Barbados, and you are not a hotel or an industrial building, that no deduction from the income can be allowed for the purpose of depreciation. Only the actual *de facto* maintenance expenses are allowed. So once we introduce this, a whole new ball game opens. It is not easy.

I have already tried to explain to the honourable Member that I know that settlements are taking place because of the pressures that you get, because of the feeling of trying to adjust the hardship, but an element under severance is taking place. I am sure that if he analyses the last 20 or 30 settlements that have occurred, he will see that the Valuation Department, who are really the principal people in this — the lawyers only sign the documents, the lawyers only draw up the conveyances, the method of compensation is determined in the Ministry of Housing and Lands, the guiding factor is the Valuation Department and a Valuation Committee after the Valuation Department.

We have that, so it is not an easy thing to say that we can change this very easily. We have to get a more refined method, get the accountants and the professional valuers in Barbados to think out the implications and put up the submission. But it is not easy just to amend one law.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the honourable Member for St. Philip North in relation to the whole question of land acquisitions and valuation — whether the criteria should be existing use, potential use, or whether actual use or replacement use for the vendor — is a matter that has been debated at some length and with a great deal of vigour on three separate occasions over the last four or five months.

The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister has yet again, because he has participated in the past three debates, reiterated the position of the Land Acquisition Act in relation to compensation. May I add that the principle of compensation in the Land Acquisition Act is part of the general canons of compensation according to the common law and the law of Barbados.

If you go out there and get into a car accident — if you look at the law of tort — and your car is written off in the accident, you do not get the value to replace your car by buying a new one. If the car was worth \$1 000 when it got written off, that is what you are paid. That is the common law and the principle by which we operate in this country.

I do not think I need to go into this any more, because we keep saying this over and over again. And the honourable Member well knows, as the Deputy Prime

Minister has pointed out, that the Land Acquisition Act was supported from its inception by the Democratic Labour Party, and I have heard the Leader of the Opposition, the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John, less than six weeks ago support the principle of compensation in this Act.

I understand the honourable Member to be saying that that is not the law, but he is putting now as his own submission that it is about time that the Government review the law and bring about such amendments as would take into consideration the replacement value of land acquisitions, particularly because, as the honourable Member has pointed out, it usually is not a willing vendor in land acquisitions — I do not know if that is true, but there are times when there are not willing vendors — I accept that — and secondly, because usually land is acquired by Government for the construction of some social amenity or some infrastructural development.

It is difficult, however, with the canons that operate in our law — not in 1982, Sir, but for hundreds of years — that we can make a fundamental change in the jurisprudence of this country over what the honourable Member puts out as a principle that is based more on charity than sound legal reasoning.

The honourable Member raised another point, Sir. He said that the officer in the Ministry of the Attorney General who deals with land acquisition is doing a lot of messenger work in relation to the passing of documentation between the Ministry of Housing and Lands and the Valuation Committee and the Commissioner of Valuations.

It is somewhat difficult to know where to draw the distinction between these things. The Attorney General's Chamber advises all Government departments in relation to the law. There is a very fine distinction between the legal advice given and the administrative work required on which a legal opinion is based. I am not as *au fait* as the honourable Member for St. Philip North who deals with things as a professional land surveyor and so, a real estate agent.

I do not really get into these routine matters in relation to the work done by the lawyers in my Ministry. (*Aside*). Yes, that is a good word — the *minutiae* — I never get involved in that, Sir. But what I do know is that I see all the opinions that are done by all the lawyers in my Chambers on a regular basis, every week, and I know that a lot of the work that is done by the lawyers — the residual people from the Crown Solicitor's Office — particularly Mr. Haynes — but there are two others who work in that particular section — I know that a lot of the work they do in relation to acquisition of land is routine work, it is repetitive work.

Most land acquisitions are not controversial. It is a matter of the lawyer sending out the necessary notices, and they write the same *pro forma* letter and send all the time, and when it is a question of negotiation there are principles that impinge not only on real estate valuation, but indeed impinge on law.

You would know, Mr. Chairman, that when there is an appeal against the offer that has been made by the Valuation Committee to a prospective vendor in a land acquisition, the appeal can go all the way to the Supreme Court — the Dowells case is the most recent one — and the Judges of the Supreme Court make decisions and give judgments on the basis of fixed legal principles.

I only say that to caution the honourable Member against believing that the only principles that come into play in negotiation for the price of land or property under the Land Acquisition Act are real estate principles. He is very wrong if he thinks that that is the case.
3.55 p.m.

I do however, although I joined in the debate, have to tell the honourable Member that the questions he raised are questions that would most properly be directed to the Minister of Housing and Lands, because his Ministry is the executive Ministry for land acquisition. All we do in our department is to give legal advice.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one very brief comment. Almost every day I receive a telephone call or have some representation made to me to see whether I can do anything on behalf of people whose lands have been acquired by Government, and who have not been paid. This Chamber has recently appropriated a significant sum of money for the purpose of paying some of those persons whom the Government owed money to over the years, and I would like to assist, Sir, since you cannot participate in this debate, the representative for St. George North. There are many persons whose properties have been acquired in relation to the Pulverisation Plant.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, whatever the honourable Member is saying may be perfectly correct, but it has absolutely nothing to do with Head 28 — Ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take note of that.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the consequence of land acquisition. It is down here in the notes. One of the consequences of land acquisition in Barbados is that there are many poor people up there in Workmans whose lands have been acquired. The Pulverisation Plant has been completed and these people still have not been paid. I can call the names. There are

Burrowes, Watson, a whole lot of them, because they come to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: First of all the honourable Member mentioned the constituency of St. George North where the Pulverisation Plant is.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: North and South, Sir. The lands pass through the two. Some lands have been acquired on the other side, and I do not want to mention St. George South anyhow. I do not talk about St. George South.

I know that land because it belonged to my great-grandfather, Mr. Carter, years ago. He sold it off to other people, and if you look through the names, you will see the same names recurring in Delamere Land, Halls Road, Carrington Village, all down the line. I know what I am talking about, but I am not pleading any special interest because the owners are not related to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, I now understand why the honourable Member is such a great cutter-up of land. It has been in the family for many generations.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I really feel the time has come when something should be done about meeting the settlements with regard to these people because it is causing a lot of inconvenience, not only the parish of St. George but throughout the entire island of Barbados.

I appreciate that the Government has to acquire land, but I feel that at least when you have reached a settlement that years should not elapse between reaching that settlement, occupying people's territory and people's land, and then not paying them for it. By the time you get around to doing it, and at the rate at which land values have risen in Barbados over the years, if you wait for five years, three years or four years to pay some person for land at an agreed price, then you must recognise that with inflation, when you pay them say \$10 000 agreed on three years ago, that \$10 000 would not represent the value of the land if it had been paid for at the time at which it was acquired.

You have to do something about getting rid of these delays, because it is not fair to the poor people of this country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, I appreciate that if you have something to say you find some Head to say it under, but it must be against all the Rules of Order to anticipate a matter that has not come before the House.

The vote for land acquisition and payment for land acquisitions are made under the Head of the Ministry of Housing. It cannot be proper to allow them to be made in advance of discussion of that Head, and I submit that the honourable Member's remarks are totally out of order and should be struck from the record as completely irrelevant.

He should not be allowed to speak when you are speaking. I stayed in another room in the House and heard both your voices at the same time, and I submit he is quite out of order and should be asked to discontinue this aspect of his speech.

If he wants Housing called, perhaps we can reach it, but this is not any Head that has to do with payment for land acquisition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take note of the point of order just raised and I am in agreement with this aspect of it, namely, that what the honourable Member is seeking to discuss now can be better dealt with under another Head. I will not entertain this any further.

The question that the sum of \$1 091 228 under Head 28 – Ministry of the Attorney General – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 29 – PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Head 29 – Public Prosecutions – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$68 073 under Head 29 – Public Prosecutions – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 30 – POLICE

Head 30 – Police – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, over the last year or so there have been a number of debates in this Chamber on the Police and its operations, and I believe it is necessary for me to use this opportunity to make a few references to some of the things that have been happening in this country.

There has been a common view that there has been an increase in crime in Barbados, and I certainly have no intention as Minister responsible for Police of shying away from that question. We found in 1980 that there was an increase of 9.4 percent over the offences of 1979 in the

areas of house-breaking, larceny, from the person, robbery and drugs, and in 1981 there was an increase further of 10.9 percent over the figures of 1980.

I do not intend to give a detailed breakdown of the increase in reported crimes, but I do want to state, Sir, that in recent months there has been a noticeable decrease in the amount of reported crimes in this country. We know, for instance, that in the month of December 1981, and in the months of January and February 1982, there was a decrease in the total number of crimes committed as compared with the preceding periods.

We believe that during 1982 this downward trend in the commission of crimes will continue and there are a number of reasons why we project that. We have increased the number of policemen in Barbados by a fairly considerable number. In 1979 we had about 880 policemen. We have increased the establishment of the Police Force in the last two years by something in the region of 200 police officers.

We have also given a far wider range and better training to police officers. Never in the history of Barbados have more police officers been exposed to more training, and more specialised training, than they have been over the past two to three years, and indeed we have increased to a very large extent our vehicular patrol, particularly in areas where there was a high incidence of crime.

We have also as a very positive sign, the fact that the detection rate of real crimes — I am not talking about things like licensing and things of that sort — is around 34 percent in 1981, and that is a figure that compares more than favourably with the detection rate in many developed countries.

4.05 p.m.

Only last year, Sir — more recently than that, perhaps it was only last month — a report emanated out of the U.K. with a great deal of euphoria over the fact that the detection rate of crime in Britain had increased to a figure of about 33 percent.

Now the increase in the establishment of the Police Force, Sir, has enabled the Commissioner of Police to set up a number of support services inside the Force itself. During the past year we sought and obtained membership in Interpol, and we have set up in the Royal Barbados Police Force the beginnings of a National Central Bureau — an Inspector and a Sergeant in charge of it — and their job would be to maintain contact with Interpol Headquarters in Paris, to answer any queries directed from that source and also, indeed, to solicit information from that very source.

In these days when the range of crime is taking on a very broad nature and becoming more internationalised in relation to crimes of fraud and related incidences, Sir, it is important that the Royal Barbados Police Force join Police Forces throughout this region — the Caribbean — and in the wider world, and work in collaboration towards seeking to reduce or minimize the incidence of crime in this country.

We have also, in the last year, set up a Crime Prevention Section of the Force, and the function of that panel is to gather information, to classify it, and to make it available to those who are concerned with these matters. Those who have been observing what has been happening in the media in the last few months with the Police, would see the outreach programme the Force is presenting to the community in an effort to solicit the co-operation of the people in meeting head-on, the question of crime in this community.

We also have, Sir, a Public Relations and Welfare Section in the Police Force and this, too, was set up in 1981. And to answer a number of the charges that are made constantly by members of the public about police officers and the way in which they carry out their jobs in relation to the public, we have also set up a Discipline Section within the Police Force. This was set up in 1980 and is controlled by a Superintendent of Police and he deals with all complaints made by the public against the police.

All these support services, Mr. Chairman, have been very helpful. We have seen the impact that they are all making in the relations between the Police and the public, and indeed, as I have said a few moments ago, in reducing crime of a certain colouration in certain parts of this community.

Now we have managed to increase our establishment by bringing up a large number of new recruits. We have also released police officers from a number of non-police duties to make them available to carry out police work so necessary in this community and also for which they were trained. For instance, you will recall that we took away the Writ Department from the Police and brought it under the Registrar of the Supreme Court. All the police officers who held posts in that department were then released to the Commissioner of Police to have men to go out there and patrol and fight crime.

Only a month or two ago — I think it was in December last year — I had a complaint from the Deputy Commissioner of Police that the police officers at District "A" Station were experiencing great difficulties in meeting the necessities of living on the compound in Station Hill.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you would have heard, if you did not read, of the disappearance of a building at West Terrace. That building, Sir, is now sited at District "A" Police Station at Station Hill in St. Michael, and it is serving the needs of the police and the public.

We have now transferred motor licences and applications for drivers licences from Central Police Station in Bridgetown to District "A" Police Station and there are large numbers of the public up there, particularly early in the morning during the week. So we are using that facility to provide services for the public as they file applications for driving tests examinations and so on, and we are also providing facilities in the same building for the police canteen and dining room facilities. *(Asides)*. We will deal with the one in Christ Church. The police are now satisfied that the accommodation at District "A" has met the needs of the officers in that area.

Now the Deputy Prime Minister made reference to the Police Station at Oistins. I do not know whether to be critical of it or not, Sir, but certainly the Police Station that has been built at Oistins is a monument to the Police Force. When I drive past and I see the building — and I was driving past for a long time wondering what the building was about — I thought it was a Central Bank. The windows are pointed, Sir, the sides of it and so on, and I took a long time before I realised that that was where they were building the Police Station.

The only difficulty that I believe I will experience in relation to that new station in Oistins is that perhaps most of the policemen in the Police Force will be putting pressure on the Police Commissioner to transfer them to the Southern Division so that they can live in the luxury of a Police Station for them in Oistins.

We will continue, Mr. Chairman, to provide facilities for the policemen so that they would be able to feel that they too are not left out of the mainstream of the Government services in Barbados.

The Police Force is usually subject to a lot of attacks by unthinking and insensitive members of the public — a lot of them who are highly placed in this community and who should know better. I am not trying to say, Sir, that there is nothing wrong in the Police Force. I would be a hypocrite to stand up here and say so.

I know one thing that is wrong. I know that when a new Minister goes and tries to address the Police Association, and starts out on the basis of goodwill, that he is only wrongly abused by one officer who felt that if he got on that way he would be personality of the

week. But I do not believe, Sir, that he is representative of the thinking of the Police Force, I do not think he is.

I will only caution honourable Members that the Police Force has really took a lot of attacks from many sources during the past few months and the Minister of Police will be using a great deal of forbearance in joining in any debate on the Police that would cause feelings to run too high, or cause an already bad situation to be exacerbated.

The Minister of Police is serving notice that he will be defending the police to the hilt whenever any unfair criticisms are made against them. A word to the wise is enough.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 30 stand part.
4.15 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Attorney General always answers me so I can answer him. Sir, I just want to say very briefly that I am very tired as Minister of Defence and Security of hearing how we must do more for the Police and less for the Defence Force. We have done more for the Police in the six years that we have been in power than all of administrations in Barbados put together, have done for the Police — the Oistins Station not being the least of the achievements.

The previous Prime Minister was on record as saying that the police should not get a duty allowance — we gave them an allowance. He was on record as saying that if we gave them motor cars, they only smash them up. We have given them an abundance of motor cars and the honourable Member for St. Michael West said "and they have smashed them up!"

The Police Vote is a total of over \$19 million on Current Account alone which is more than the \$9.7 million for the Defence Force and the \$7.5 million of renovations are being carried out at St. Ann's Barracks. And the Police Capital Vote does not even include some of the works which are actually being done for the Police at this time.

To match what is being done by way of provision of a Coast Guard base and the Defence Force Headquarters, the Police will, as soon as funds become available — all of the preliminary works has been done — be provided with a new Police Headquarters. The site has been selected in the Wilkey area along one of the new bypass roads that is being built.

It is intended that the Police Training Centre will be upgraded into a regional Police Training College that will give staff training as well as recruit training and will be

located in the same area. There is some debate, Sir, whether the new Regional Police Training College should be located by the Police Headquarters, or elsewhere, but at the moment the Government's decision to locate them together in the Wildey area remains.

The numbers in the Police Force has been expanded by 25 per cent since we have been in power and promotion opportunities have virtually been trebled, doubled in the senior ranks and trebled when you take into account the increase of the number of sergeants. Perhaps there are something like 300 promotional ranks in all in the Police Force and probably more than that. Police pay has been improved, and the Duty Allowance was not taken away although the police initially agreed that it should be taken away when the numbers of the Force were increased.

It is very difficult for the Government to see when virtually every request made by the Police has been agreed to why there should be attacks in politics — politically motivated attacks and attacks by the radicals in the ranks of the Police Force itself. If it is one thing I regret, it is that into the Police Force should have crept some of the thinking that you cannot represent people unless you loud-mouthed, aggressive, and radical, and unless you are prepared to insult a new Minister taking over the Force for the first time.

Members of the Government have had to put up with an attack on their economic competence by a Station Sergeant whose training, so far as I know, was adequate for the performance of his duties in that position, but to the best of my knowledge did not include either any practical experience in Economics or theoretical training therein. Members of the Government have had their good faith impugned — people who have had to deal with the administration of the Police — and we come under attacks from all sides. The Opposition tell us, on one hand, that we are unfair to the Police Force and, on the other hand, that we cover up for the wrong doings of the Police Force.

The Police Force of Barbados consist of ordinary people just like you and me, Mr. Chairman, — like you, me and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the honourable Member for St. Michael West. In other words, they have their angels and they have their devils. In the great debate in which that question was asked, Sir, the Prime Minister of the day said, "I am on the side of the angels." I am glad that the honourable Member for St. Michael West has given me the opportunity to repeat the words of Benjamin Disraeli.

I don't think that anybody could expect that in a Police Force of 1 000 members that you would not have an occasion where things that are not for the best are

not done. On the other hand, irrespective of the perhaps, somewhat jaundiced belief of lawyers who have ever practised the criminal bar, I do not think that anybody can seriously say that our Police Force is a brutal Police Force.

In my experience our Police Force does not frame people. Evidence is not invented and witnesses suborned in order to obtain false convictions. If anything, Mr. Chairman, they go too much in the other direction, they give more breaks if anything — if anything — and they may be over cautious in certain matters. Our Police Force can, in general, be regarded by dishonest and honest citizens alike, as a Force with deep stream of fairness going through it.

Very generally, you get more false accusations, if you are a lawyer in criminal practise, that a policeman beat you than you would get accusations that he tricked you or was unfair to you. They may tell you, truthfully or falsely, that they were beaten — they very seldom say that they were tricked or fooled, and that the police promised them something and put one over on them. They are more often accused of bad behaviour than of bad faith.

I think that we have to look at the moral of the Force. The Police Association should take a very serious look at itself and its officers, and the body of the Force should look at who they put into those positions, because I would like the Police Force to be absolutely assured — let them have no doubt in their minds — that it is a lot more difficult to get concessions from people that you are negotiating with when you set their backs up than when you negotiate from a point of view of realism and reason.

The honourable Member for St. George South is only human. The honourable Member, I know, is going to go to a lot of trouble to put the Police case in Parliament and in the country. I have been surprised in the last few months to see the extent to which he has been captured by the necessity of maintaining the image of the Force in the country. As I said he is only human. If the Police Association try to treat the honourable Member like a boy in the yard, they can only blame themselves if, at some point, the well of sympathy runs dry.

If the Police Association wants to earn the respect of the public they should ensure that they earn that respect by the choice of representatives and negotiations whom they put forward. I myself, tend to think that those that have to negotiate with the Police Association look with more favour on a good policeman, who is sitting across the table from them, than a bad policeman.

4.25 p.m.

I imagine that a policeman who has been before the courts several times and been acquitted — no doubt he was not guilty — for beating women, been criticised by judges for dragging young girls through Broad Street, and dragging old ladies into the Police Yard, and then no charge is made, I imagine he will command less respect as a representative of the Association than a policeman about whom it would be impossible for anybody to say, as a former Commissioner said, "he is the worst policeman in the Force." I just throw that out as a matter of interest.

I find it hard to understand how the Police can wish to be represented by somebody who when the Commissioner of Police sent for him to answer a disciplinary charge sent back the message, "If George Reid wants me, let him come and get me."

I just mention this in passing. With good fortune, perhaps the words will fall upon ears receptive to them. I do not think that honourable Members opposite feel that that is anything other than a word of advice to the quarters where it most matters.

The Royal Barbados Police Force has a high reputation to protect and maintain. The Government is taking steps to ensure that recruits are kept at the recent high level. Provision is being made to facilitate the recruitment into the Police Force of retired members of the Defence Force — persons whose contracts come to an end, and already, I think six members of the Defence Force have applied for transfers and been transferred to the membership of the Royal Barbados Police Force.

I think this is a good trend. I am sure that any Commissioner of Police would welcome into his ranks police recruits who have already been through the rigours of a disciplined service and understand the importance of orders, obedience to orders, and also understand the capacity to give orders in the case of those who have been promoted in the Defence Force and in the *esprit de corps* that any uniformed service expects its members to share.

It is certainly a trend that I welcome and I hope that soldiers whose term of service comes to an end will see the Police Force as an organisation in which they can continue their disciplined service to the people of Barbados.

At the top, Mr. Chairman, the ranks of the Police Force have been encouraged, I think, by the regrading of the salaries for senior officers and, at the moment, I am undertaking an exercise to determine the feasibility of relating the senior ranks to pay scales directly in the Public Service, starting with the Commissioner of Police who is now at the rank of a Permanent Secretary, and

going right down through the senior ranks so that there can be a fairly immediate equation.

Senior police officers have filled places in the Defence and Security Division, the Chief Immigration Officer is a former senior policeman and the Special Assignments Officer responsible for training the security guards and advising — effectively the Chief Security Officer is also a former police officer.

I look forward, indeed, to the transfer of qualified police officers from the Police Service into the general service where it is appropriate, and where the officer wishes to offer his abilities in an area wider than the Police Service after many years of service therein.

I can only say once again, Sir, that I think we should all be proud of our Police Force and I really regret the misfortunes and infelicities in recent days which have cast a cloud over it. You only have to look at Police Forces in developed countries to see the nest into which a mismanaged law and order body can get to realise how fortunate we are in Barbados.

I thank you, Sir, and the House for your tolerance if I have conceded my time.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, Sir, there are some amendments which have been circulated in relation to this, Sir. I would want to move the head with amendments.

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

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

HEAD 31 — PRISONS — \$975 178

Head 31 — Prisons — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Head 31 deals with Prisons and I beg to move that that Head stands part.

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

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

HEAD 32 — FIRE SERVICE — \$625 776

Head 32 — Fire Service — was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Head, Sir, there are one or two things I would like to put on the Record.

The first one deals, Mr. Chairman, with the fact that over the past few months, a new 72 hour week has been instituted in the Fire Department. Now, for many years, the Fire Officers were working 84 hours a week and this was up until September, I think of last year, or December, when the change came about, and we are making such changes in the reorganisation of the department as would indeed enable us without any increase in staff to reduce the hours of work even below the 72 hours a week.

The other point I want to make, Sir, relates to the cane fire disasters that we have been experiencing this year. I have had discussions with the Chief Fire Officer only last week, Sir, and I remember at the time at which I spoke to him he told me he had received calls for I think he said 21 cane fires already for that day and that is before he came to see me, Sir.

This has been a very bad year for cane fires and the Fire Service has been called on, Sir, to work far beyond the call of duty. We have had Fire Officers who have used up some of their own time in helping to combat the destruction wrought by fire in the sugar cane industry over the past few weeks, Sir.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what and where we are going to go from here. Only recently, I mentioned in this Hon. Chamber the workings of the Cane Fire Prevention Panel, a broad-based panel that seeks to look at the problems that give rise to cane fires and sociological problems and so on, and indeed, advise the Government on the best means whereby they may confront this menace in the society.

I want, Sir, in moving this Head, to put on Record my appreciation for the very tireless and conscientious job the Fire Department has been doing over the past few weeks, and also to record my thanks to the Cane Fire Prevention Panel that has been assisting us in this effort.

I beg to move, Sir, that Head 32 now stand part.

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

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

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to say a few words under this Head on the spate of cane fires.

Mr. Chairman, you are from St. George, I believe, myself and my colleague on my left are from St. Philip and the Hon. Minister is from St. George so, we know what we are talking about when we say that the cane fires are on the increase.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that not since 1974 have I seen such proliferation in the incidence of cane fires, and this is of grave concern to me.

The Head of the Fire Service spoke, I think it was last week, or week before, and said that it was causing a great strain on the Fire Service and he also said, I think his words were that if Barbadians continue like this, they will be turning Barbados into a desert. I would like to concur with this statement of the Chief Fire Officer.

The main reason I stand here today, Mr. Chairman, is to reiterate the position of the Democratic Labour Party as far as cane fires are concerned. The Democratic Labour Party is unalterably opposed to the burning of canes in Barbados, and I want that to be known.
4.35 p.m.

I go further. In a year like this, when the economic situation is as it is, I would like to say that for anyone to burn canes is asking for trouble, because you only have to imagine the consequences of a reduction in our foreign exchange to the community at large. So I would like to say that we on this side are opposed to the burning of canes.

One more thing I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, and it is that throughout last year, and especially around election time, there was much talk of a Fire Station being built at Six Cross Roads.

I believe that about three or four weeks before the General Elections, I think the Hon. Minister, the Chief Fire Officer and other high Government officials went to Six Cross Roads and they surveyed the scene and all this sort of thing.

I would like to know what is the position with this Fire Station at Six Cross Roads, because with the increase of cane fires that we are getting this year I think a fire station at Six Cross Roads is more necessary than ever. So I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister what is the position with respect to this Fire Station at Six Cross Roads.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, on this matter, the problem of fires, quite rightly, is worrying everybody in Barbados at this time, I have been turning my attention to it and have been giving a lot of thought to the possible causes and action, and I would like to suggest to the appropriate Ministry that they might look into something that has been drawn to my attention.

In this present crop, the sugar Factories Limited is paying \$48 on account for a tonne of cane, and the present cost of reaping is varying between \$28 a tonne and \$32 a tonne. So on the up front price the cane producers are coming out with something like \$16.

I have also been told that the Sugar Factories Limited anticipates that a final payment may be in the vicinity of something like \$60 and \$62 per tonne. It means that even on the final payment, when you subtract the cost of reaping from the final payment of \$62 a tonne, the growers will be getting something like \$34 a tonne.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if there is not a moral hazard being created by the insurance companies of this land paying at the moment — and my information is that they are paying \$40 per tonne for total destruction.

I see a very serious moral hazard being created by this situation, since if you get \$40 a tonne for total destruction up front, it therefore means that it would be possible, if there were any overdrafts at the banks, for you to have this money up front to reduce your overdrafts without the problems and cost of reaping, and the strong possibility of being better off financially than even at the final payment.

This is creating a tremendous strain on people not to consider the possibility of being beneficiaries in this way. I would hate to believe that this is the case, and it is such a serious problem that we must examine every possible element and have a look to see if there is not the creation of a moral hazard by the situation that now exists between payment up front, the possible final payment, and payment for total loss in the sugar industry.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have the responsibility like the honourable Member for St. Michael West, I believe, had for a couple of years — trying to negotiate international prices for sugar in Barbados.

I think that the sugar industry in Barbados should not be a political football. We in Barbados all recognise that the scientists have told us that they know of no alternative crop, given our soil conditions in Barbados, which is more suitable at the present time for growing in Barbados than sugar.

I feel so serious about this, that I am one of those who is not afraid to say that in view of the experience we have had in the course of the last ten years, that from the very outset the Government and the Opposition, the trade unions and the Sugar Producers should agree that a very large sum of money, as a reward system, should be offered to people who give information of people who are responsible for the burning of canes.

I think it is time that we stop pussyfooting with this matter. I am also one of those who believes that a combined private citizen, Police and Defence Force patrol should be in existence all during the crop season in Bar-

bados from the very outset. I have no fear at all of any criticism that would come in this country against anyone who advocates the use of joint patrols in order to save the economy of Barbados.

Barbados cannot afford to do without the foreign exchange earnings it derives from sugar. That is a fact of life that we must accept. The year you do not get the foreign exchange earnings, it has its impact right through the economy, and this year, in particular, the situation is even graver, because my last check with the world price of sugar shows that it is somewhere in the vicinity of only U.S. 11.3 cents a pound.

Every bit of money that you lose by not reaping the canes that are burnt within the time cycle that is necessary when they are burnt, means that we are even losing more, so that this whole community, as a community, must look on this as an act which injures the heart of the economic welfare of the whole of Barbados.

I am very glad that the other side has made its position clear. I have talked to a number of people who are concerned with the reaping of canes, and I genuinely believe that the vast majority, 99 per cent of the people who have to earn their living by reaping canes, genuinely do not like to reap burnt canes because of the nasty and dusty conditions in which they are involved.

So I find it hard to understand that in a community like this, if you make a combined effort, a joint political, social, religious — I do not hear the Lord Bishop, or the Chairman of the Christian Council, or the Head of the Moravian Church pontificating on these matters, this is a matter that they should pontificate on too. These people must pontificate on these matters because the economic welfare of Barbados is dependent upon the gross receipts that we receive from the sugar industry.
4.45 p.m.

I understand that patrols have been reintroduced, but we must stop being afraid. We must have the island patrolled. We need to have a reward system that anybody will feel that they, themselves, will be contributing to the Welfare of the country if they have given information leading to the conviction of people. This is how you must see it — as a national disaster, and we cannot get away from this at all.

Now on the question of insurance, I understand that there are new policy conditions. I always understood that it is a fundamental principle of Insurance Law that it is an indemnity and that if you have property that is insured you must make the best efforts to try and reduce the loss to the insurance company.

If the honourable Member for St. Philip North had been checking the insurance policies, he would find

that they are under obligation to reap the canes when they are burnt, and they must demonstrate that they have used their best efforts to get in as much of the burnt canes as possible — so it cannot be profitable to do it.

If you examine the system, you will note that when there are canes being burnt, every effort is made by small farmers and large farmers to try and get in the canes, because otherwise the insurance companies can legitimately disown payment. So I do not feel there is much in that.

On the question of price, Barbados is really a remarkable country. We, for years in Barbados, have been operating on an agreed system of distribution of the gross receipts. Since Professor Shepherd came down here in the 1940s they established a formula for the processing cost and distribution to growers.

The cane payments to cane growers in Barbados are higher than in any other country in the Caribbean. I believe it is higher than in any other country in the Commonwealth, but this year we are really in difficulty — the on account payment has to be low this year because the world price of sugar is 11.3 per cent. When you take out the Lome percentage.

This is another heresy that people sometimes speak of. We sell under Lome only something like 50 000 tons of our crop, so it is only roughly between 50 per cent and 40 per cent depending on the state of the crop. The rest has to go at the world price. We do not have anybody else. We have to deduct local consumption of course, but the rest has to go on the world price, and that is 11 cents US well below the cost of production.

I anticipate that other than the Lome shipments, there is going to be a lot of sugar stored in Barbados for a long period of time this year. Remember last year we had to carry over from that calendar year into the beginning of this year 17 000 tonnes because it could not pay us to have sold it at that ridiculously low price.

We straddled the Lome quota so that we are really facing — and it is before our eyes and everybody should know it — a drastic loss of foreign exchange earnings this year because of the low price of sugar, and I do not see why anybody should compound the loss, not only this year by burning the canes, but it has now been scientifically proven beyond all doubt now that Barbadian soils cannot take burning.

I understand that one of the technologists has just published a paper in which he traced the rainfall statistics for up to about 80 years and he can correlate the production year by year depending upon the amount of canes with the rainfall. We went through this exercise

when I believe in the early 1970s a proposal was put up, because of the shortage of labour, to have controlled burning, and it had to be discontinued when my predecessor from Christ Church South Central was in office.

The medical profession has been raising the point that there are certain medical conditions in Barbados which are aggravated by the amount of ash that you have in the atmosphere. I remember there was a doctor here, Dr. Bailey, who was very concerned about it when we had controlled burning. I believe he was an ENT specialist, and this is known.

So bearing in mind the environmental damage, bearing in mind the financial damage and the general economic damage, I think that the community as well should decide in its mind that we need drastic action in this respect.

The question that the sum of \$625 776 under Head 32 — Fire Service — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see what beautiful debating skills my colleague on my left has, because he was able to debate sugar, the reaping of canes and the Lome Convention under Fire Service.

I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, 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 5.15 p.m. today.

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.
4.55 p.m.

On Resumption

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

HEAD 33 – PROBATION DEPARTMENT – \$62 983

Head 33 – Probation Department – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in moving this Head, I would like to make a few comments on the Probation Service.

The Probation Service is one of those departments of Government that does not too often feature prominently in the public eye. Nevertheless it is carrying out a very important service to this community. As juvenile crime increases, so to do the activities of the officers of the Probation Department.

I have been taking a look recently, after discussion with the Chief Probation Officer, with some of the statistics of that department. One that stands out, and which I believe, should be made public in this House of Assembly, Sir, is the success rate of probationers in the Probation Department.

These are people who are placed under the direction and care of the Probation Office, and who eventually either revert to type – that is to the commission of crime or go straight or indeed do not break the probation orders. I have a figure of about 85 per cent success rate with all probationers that are placed before the probation office.

There is one other point I will wish to mention in moving this Head, it concerns what was published recently about a Juvenile Liaison Scheme by the Deputy Commissioner of Police.

This Juvenile Liaison Scheme is a scheme whereby the Police Department is seeking permission – and it will have to be done necessarily by legislation and so on – for them to handle certain offences committed by juveniles out of courts. Where young people commit minor offences for the first time the police will seek to be in a position to handle these matters by themselves without bringing them before the court.

This would mean a lot, Sir. It would mean that the Police Force in conjunction with the Probation Office and the Welfare Department would be in a position of *in loco parentis* and will discharge the duties of a parent where children are a little bit wayward and there is an absence of parental direction and the police will look after the general welfare, education and guidance and so on in conjunction with these other services.

In the United Kingdom, such a scheme has been tried and has achieved a moderate success. I believe the reason why the success has not been greater is because the Probation Department in the United Kingdom did not agree to co-operate with the Police.

Now, if after a formal submission is made to me, and subsequently to the Cabinet, as to the detailed proposals of this scheme, and we find that it is acceptable and suitable, we will be able to implement it and hope that it will make a beneficial impact on crime prevention among juvenile offenders in this country.

I have discussed the matter with the Chief Probation Officer and he is inclined to go along with the proposals, but like me, he is willing to have a close look at the detailed proposals and to work out a *modus operandi* for the operation of the scheme.

I beg to move that Head 33 stand part.

The question that the sum of \$62 983 under Head 33 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 75 – CAPITAL

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL—
—AS AMENDED – \$1 055 330

Hon. L. R. TULL: During the contribution of the honourable Member for St. Philip South, the question was raised as to the siting of a new Fire Station at Six Cross Roads. It is not possible to start construction of any new Fire Station during the coming Financial Year, but at the same time I am myself, reviewing the whole question of where the Fire Station should be located.

The Government has made plans for the construction of a new Police Station in central St. George. I do not know when that will come on stream, Sir, but we know that when it comes on stream and the transfer is affected from District "B" Police Station at Boarded Hall, that the compound at Boarded Hall will become available for other Government use. I am trying to evaluate the desirability of the location of a Fire Station at Six Cross Roads as against Boarded Hall.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the site at Boarded Hall is very well appointed, and it overlooks the beautiful St. George Valley where there are vast acreages of canes, you can see all the way to St. Philip. It reminds me of a quotation, I think it is from Keats, "The canes in the St. George Valley and beyond are as thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks of Nallam Brosa," Sir and when you see the St. George Valley burnt out, it is a terrible sight, Sir. (*Asides*)

You cannot see anything from Six Cross Roads, Sir. The firemen at Six Cross Roads, will have to wait until they get a telephone call that there is a fire. But if you are at Boarded Hall, the Fire Officer can lie down in his bed, in the barracks and see a start anywhere in the whole of the St. George Valley and a considerable part of St. Philip. In addition to that, as the honourable Member for St. Philip South well know, Six Cross Roads is just a few minutes away from Boarded Hall.

I am not making any points for St. George South, Sir, because I do not think it makes the slightest difference in terms of electoral success in St. George South where there is a Fire Station or not. I just feel that if I have a responsibility for this particular department, that I should seek, to the best of my ability, the best area in which Government money should be spent, and the best location, taking all the circumstances into consideration, Sir.

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

The question that Head 75, as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 34 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AS AMENDED – \$62 241 824

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make a long speech of introduction in this matter. Education is a Head which gets debated quite often in the Estimates. I am quite prepared to answer questions, or queries, or criticisms or whatever, in respect of individual subheads.

Looking at Head 34 in a very general fashion, we will see that in education there are no major increases and, in fact, there is no overall increase in respect of this year's expenditure. The fact is – and I think that it has been mentioned already tonight – is that in every country in the world as financial restraint is practised, education feels the pinch as much as any other sector.
5.25 p.m.

Traditionally, over the years we have spent the largest chunk of our national budget on education, but we see this year that other Ministries come before us. Over the past few years, a great deal of capital investment has been made in education, much infrastructure has been provided and not only physical infrastructure, but manpower and other aspects of infrastructure, generally speaking.

We have invested millions and millions of dollars and the attitude which I propose to take to the financial restraint that has been imposed on us in Education and everybody else, is that we should take a positive view of

if and use this period of restraint for good housekeeping, as a period for pruning fat where it exists and it does exist, as a period for correcting certain inefficiencies, as a period of cutting back on wastage, while, at the same time, proceeding as far as we can, within the confines of, restraint, with the Government's policy. The Government's policy it so happens does not necessarily conflict with the fact of the financial restraint that is upon us.

So, for instance, Mr. Chairman, it is possible to point out to the Hon. House in the Head dealing with teacher training – Subhead 3 – that as recent as today the Cabinet has approved a proposal from the Ministry of Education that we should close the boarding establishment of the Erdiston College. This might be used as an illustration of how we can cut fat and avoid wastage and be more cost effective – not cost effects – and this is for the benefit of the Press. The survey shows us, Mr. Chairman, that with an enrollment of 260 at the Erdiston College we have no more than 46 residents at this time and in fact over recent years the residential component of the Erdiston College has been falling steadily. The survey also shows us, Mr. Chairman, that the per capita costs for the residents at the Erdiston College far outweighs whatever benefits are thought to accrue to those who have a residential rather than a non-residential status.

In fact, we are also proposing to save something in the region of \$98 000 by this simple move. The proposal is that we should use some of the facilities now occupied by the residents of the College to provide a canteen facility so that meals may be available to the students at the college. That is just an illustration to show you how we can cut fat, how we can avoid waste and be more efficient and cost effective.

Mr. Chairman, if we continue to move through the subheads in Head 34 – Pre-Primary and Special Education – I don't think that I need to add more to the debate on zoning which seems to be the most important topic in respect of primary and secondary education at the moment. The special schools still continue to enjoy the benefit of subventions from Government and I have reason to believe that this category may well expand in coming years.

The thoughts for the restructuring of the University of the West Indies are now gathering a certain momentum. I do not believe there is much to report on that subhead except to say, Mr. Chairman, that one does hear on the wireless and read in the news papers certain historical comments about the proposals for the restructuring of the University of the West Indies. One seems to get the impression that there are persons who would want to stand in the way of the expansion and growth of the University of the West Indies.

The University of the West Indies is over 30 years old now and we have three campuses. The restructuring is really an exercise to graduate the three campuses into three colleges with greater autonomy, naturally, than campuses would enjoy.

That, in my view, is an advancement and a step forward. It is a part of the natural growth of the university and I am appalled that people who would describe themselves as learned, some of those people within the university itself, would want to stifle this natural growth of one of the two institutions which has survived the federal experiment.

The Barbados Community College has a recent..... The Opposition is pressing upon me to put the Head. If people are in such a hurry, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 34 stand part.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That is correct. You are only here to put the Head and allow us to ask some questions.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry, Sir, I am sure I have seen the Deputy Prime Minister nod his head with approval.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the Minister for succumbing to the protestations, however silent, and allowing us the opportunity to ask a few questions concerning this Ministry of Education.

The first thing I want to get an assurance on is the attitudinal spirit in the Government concerning education arising out of the speech, as reported, which the Prime Minister gave recently at the Alexandra School. I know that there is a specific Head dealing with secondary education, but it seems to me that the whole philosophy of the Government was adumbrated in the Prime Minister's statement, which seems to suggest to me that he is not allowing a very important aspect of the holistic development of education.

I thought that the question of co-educational development was a matter that had been settled and therefore it was only a question of implementation and would not lead to any procrastination to any question, since this is a matter that had been settled on all sides. Where the Prime Minister indicates that because of economic pressures that Government is unable to provide the facilities which would transform Alexandra into a co-educational institution.

5.35 p.m.

And when one examines what is involved in the facilities for such co-educational development, one has to

come to the conclusion that what is reported, as having been said by him, cannot be the position. It cannot be that the Hon. Prime Minister wishes the population to accept that the economic situation is such that he is unable to implement a policy which has been settled for some time, and which it is necessary to implement in all of its aspects, if it is to have the desired effect. To put off the co-educational facilities for one of the oldest secondary schools in this country at the same time you are advocating the concept of zoning, is to demonstrate either total confusion in the thinking of the directorate, misunderstanding on the part of the Minister's capability *per se* as related to the Prime Minister's power, or obfuscation of an issue which has not yet emerged. You cannot say to the people of this country, on the one hand that you are attempting a zoning approach to the allocation of educational facilities and, on the other hand, say to one of the more desirable institutions in the North that you cannot afford the resources to make that institution available to male and female students.

When one examines the actual cost, one has to conclude that it cannot be the money, because — and I expect the Minister would be able to provide the information — perhaps the greatest cost of any one of the schools in Barbados to go co-education would have been Harrison College. I would like to know what was the cost of making Harrison College co-educational, since that is one of the larger secondary schools, and since when the previous Minister was Minister, he decided that he would include a fairly substantial building as part of the facilities before going co-educational. I would like to know what is the cost for making Harrison College co-educational. I believe that when I have that information, I, and the rest of the population, would be better able to assess what appears to be the arrant nonsense reported as having emanated from the Prime Minister's lips. (ASIDES). I am therefore serving notice, Mr. Chairman, that I would reserve the right, after getting that information to come back to that particular subject. It just seems to me not to make sense.

That notwithstanding, I wish to draw to the Minister's attention that the whole question of zoning, while it might be seen by the Minister and the Ministry as a matter that is settled, is occasioning a substantial amount of stress on the part of parents, and therefore children widely across this community. The Democratic Labour Party's position on zoning is well known, but some persons have sought to have difficulty with understanding the position and so I would seek to put it in the record of this Honourable Chamber. No one who is interested in the development of education in any country could be against zoning *per se*. But zoning pre-supposes a modicum of equality, and we are

contending that the facilities available in Barbados at the moment, cannot, in any way be described as equal.

You are aware, Mr. Chairman, that there was a certain philosophy which existed in the United States for a long time. For over 100 years, they had a philosophy which has been described as 'separate but equal'. We are saying that we must take every step in Barbados to ensure that we do not subscribe to that philosophy of separate but equal.

When we speak of equal facilities, we do not mean equal in a mathematical sense, for if that was all, education, itself, might not be worthwhile. We are dealing with the total attitude towards the particular institution, and we are contending that if you use the older secondary schools as your norm — notwithstanding the ability to point out that facilities of a different kind, or even a better kind, might reside in a particular school — the fact is that equality is related to the general availability of an education of a certain quality in a particular institution.

The Democratic Labour Party does not believe that the older institutions ought to be reduced. It believes that the newer institutions ought to be brought to the same level, or beyond that, of the older institutions. But we are contending that there are a number of ancillary requirements beyond the mere delineation of classroom facilities, or laboratory facilities, or what other facilities there may be.

We are saying that before one reaches the stage where zoning could be acceptable, there is a lot of work still required to be done. We are therefore saying that we oppose the zoning concept which we have seen outlined by the Government. That is the position of the Democratic Labour Party. When we say we are opposed to zoning, we are saying we are opposed to the zoning which has been announced by the Government.

We believe that where the facilities — by "facilities" we mean the totality of facility required for the proper secondary education of an enlightened community in the 1980's and 1990's when and where the facilities have been brought to the required level, zoning will become almost automatic. Persons will wish to send their children to the school of their choice, and if one can use a scale of 10 in the deliberations for choosing a school, obviously transportation will have to form a part of that scale of 10.

In the same way that persons in St. Lucy may now, for sentimental reasons, wish a child to go to Foundation — vice versa with regard to St. Philip people and Coleridge Parry — and for the reasons that people in Barbados have every reason to accept that Queen's College and Harrison College are schools of tradition

and schools desirable for their children, then we are saying that when you are assessing a school, a parent has a right to be able to take into account all of the facilities, and that when such a parent takes into account all of those facilities a parent will choose a school that is the most sensible for their child to go to.

No person who lives in St. George, all things being equal, would prefer to send their child into Bridgetown on a daily basis, if that child could go to St. George Secondary and receive an approximation, even an approximation, of the quality education which the parents now believe that child would get if it comes into Bridgetown. 5.45 p.m.

It is really a non-argument, Mr. Chairman, to attack the position of those who say they are against the zoning announced by offering them as a palliative the fact that you can demonstrate equal facilities in St. George Secondary with those at Combermere or Harrison College or St. Michael.

I have already said in this Chamber that added to the zoning of the institutions must be the zoning of the people. If you must proceed with zoning, the people who are going into the northern zone or the central zone, or zone No. 3, must feel that the good French teacher is going to be available to them whichever zone they go to, the good Spanish teacher, the good Physics teacher, etc. etc., and so provision has to be made for the allocation of the teaching staff in such a manner as would allow persons to develop the mental attitude required.

Mr. Chairman, the information which I have asked for is coming to hand, but my time is running out on this round, and I will crave your indulgence and that of the Minister to speak again.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to ask the Minister whether she could expand in a few words on her recently announced concept about a Visual Arts School, I believe it was, for Barbados — if she could tell us exactly what she has in mind.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I may give an interim reply. The honourable Member for St. Michael West talks about the Prime Minister's speech made last night at the Alexandra's Speech Day.

I am afraid the Prime Minister has either been misinterpreted or misquoted. I happen to have the speech before me, and the Prime Minister makes the point, which apparently is so easily missed, that the concept of zoning has built into it another concept which has to do with cost effectiveness and a more rational use of our manpower and our equipment.

We cannot continue in a situation in a country such as ours, Mr. Chairman, where we are trying to duplicate the same facilities in every single school. Within each zone we want to have a certain complement of facilities, so what the Prime Minister actually did say, and I can quote it if necessary, is that the Alexandra school must complement the Coleridge-Parry, the St. James Secondary and the St. Lucy Secondary Schools within Zone 1.

The fact is that the Alexandra School has been slated for expansion under the World Bank project, and as part of the financial restraint we have had to pick and choose. If you look at the Capital, you will see which schools we are going to be dealing with in this financial year. We are hoping that the Alexandra will get its turn in the next financial year.

But the fact is that when you recognise a school to accommodate co-education, it is not just a matter of changing the toilet system or putting in additional toilets. Opportunity has always been taken to do a general expansion. It is not just a matter of a physical expansion. The expansion now has to take place within the context of certain facilities that a school will offer.

The honourable Member talks about zoning. For the first time ever parents of children who are going to take the 11 plus examination, the Common Entrance Examination, in May this year have had some kind of booklet showing them what the facilities are and what the staff complement looks like in every single secondary school. They had never known that before. Perhaps the honourable Member does not have a child taking the 11 plus this year, and has not been aware that one exists, but that is a fact of life. For the first time a parent is in a position to know what there is available by way of facilities, both academic and otherwise, at every secondary school in Barbados. That has never been the case — you guessed as far as you could do.

You might have an idea of what happens at one or two of the secondary schools — you may have had some hearsay information. But now for the first time, you are able to look at a school and see what the staff complement is like, how many are trained, how many are graduates, and to see what facilities are available, and this is only the beginning. Zoning is a gradual process, and this is only the beginning.

He tells us that zoning is occasioning great distress. I have had a meeting with all the Head Teachers of the primary schools. Only two weeks ago they invited me to their conference. I went and I addressed them and there was a long period after, well into the night — the darkness fell — when we discussed their problems. They brought forth all sorts of little things that bothered them in the schools.

I was particularly interested in zoning, and the distress that was brought to my attention by the Heads then was the distress which attends every primary school at this time of the year — difficult parents — parents who are going to be difficult, zoning or no zoning — parents who do not want to sign forms, or fill them out incorrectly and will not come to a meeting with the Head to try to make things better.

These parents are persons who must be referred to the psychologist within the Ministry or referred to some other service. Some of these parents maybe do need to be referred to the Probation Service.

But I think, generally speaking, that there seems to be a ready understanding now, and an acceptance of what the zoning does contain, and very few Heads could bring to my attention, certainly in the presence of the Permanent Secretary and the Chief Education Officer, any large areas of distress.

I, therefore, would like to urge the honourable Member for St. Michael West to communicate to us now, now, what these areas of distress are. Point them out to us, tell us the names and places and schools so that we could investigate it. That is the function of the Ministry of Education.

It is all right to throw out this kind of talk. I have been around addressing constituency groups and other groups, here and there, over the past few weeks. The most recent was that of the Member for St. Michael West Central, and I always take the opportunity at Question Time to ask parents what is their experience with zoning and getting the new procedure right, and most people report to me that they have little or no difficulty.

5.55 p.m.

We know that it is a new exercise and, in particular, in the border areas between one zone and another, there are going to be certain discrepancies. The Allocation Committee will have discretion as it always has had. We are taking information and advice from parents, teachers and well-wishers as quickly as it comes to hand, and trying to act upon it as far as we can. If the honourable Member, or any other honourable Member over on that side, knows about a particular instance or instances of distress, I think he is under a duty to communicate it to us and not throw out grand generalisations such as we hear from the honourable Member for St. Michael West.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South asked about a recent reference to a National College for Visual Arts. Again this is one of those matters which is built-in to the whole concept of zoning, and it is part of the cost effectiveness that the Ministry of Education is looking for.

The fact is that in the area of the arts in particular — painting, sculpture, music, the Graphic Arts — there is not sufficient trained manpower to service the 21 secondary schools.

I read a minute some weeks ago which informed me that we would need 27 trained music teachers at this point. You are not going to find them in Barbados, and I do not think that it would be consistent with this concept of zoning that we are trying to develop now.

What I am hoping to see is not only a National College for the Visual Arts, but a National School of Music in this country where those children who have obvious talent and who want to pursue to the advanced level and, perhaps, beyond that — the diploma level — the arts including music, could have recourse to this. We are in a position to pool our best teachers, we hope — I do not want to anticipate what the Advisory Committees will advise us, because we have already put together an Advisory Committee for the proposed National School of music, and I hope quite soon we would be able to do similarly for the Visual Arts. I say visual rather than fine, because the Graphic Arts are intended to be included, and we know that there are tremendous career opportunities for graphic artists in Barbados and the Caribbean at this time.

But you see, Mr. Chairman, we have to get away at the end of the 20th century from the old-fashioned concept that in the secondary school, when you are in the Fifth Form preparing for your O levels, and in the Sixth Form preparing for your A levels, that you go to the same school at 9 o'clock every morning and you leave at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock, or whenever it is that you leave to go home, unless you are engaged in extra-mural activities or extra curriculum activities.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we are moving into a time when a young man or young woman preparing for the Advanced Level may find themselves attending three or four different institutions, may find themselves on Monday going to the National School of Music for instruction at a particular location. It is either that or don't have it all. The fact is that from every secondary school in Barbados there is a direct route into Bridgetown. It is when people want to go from St. Lucy to St. Philip that they are going to have difficulties of more than one bus, and if we centralise some of these services in the way that the Polytechnic is centralised, that problem will be eased. In this day and age, there is no way that Barbados can afford to fully and properly equip an industrial arts wing in every secondary school. There are some pieces of equipment which cost \$10,000 and \$12,000 and by the time they get on the docks in Barbados, they are obsolete. You teach these offerings we have in the secondary school up to a certain level, but at the

advanced level we are going to have to pool and concentrate our resources in service centres. Why have we built a multi-million dollar polytechnic at Wildey if we are going to be duplicating a lot of that in the secondary schools?

I pointed out to the Cabinet months ago that we are teaching technical education from no less than seven different institutions shared between three Ministries in this country. There is a lot of duplication and there is tremendous wastage. We are still not satisfying the market-place demands for these skills and a rationalisation has to be done.

You have the Industrial Arts wings at the secondary schools, some better equipped than others; you have the Polytechnic, you have technical education taught at the Community College, you have the vocational centres where it is taught, you have the Skills Training Programme where it is taught, you have the Defence Force where it is taught, and you have the Training Board with its apprentice programme seeking also to teach technical education.

If we want to be cost effective, Mr. Chairman, if we want to have a rational approach, we must look at this whole question. Something has got to be wrong when children come out of secondary school, having gone through an Industrial Arts programme there, and they are not fit for the work place. Something has got to be wrong if these children then have to fall into a module in the Skills Training Programme or find themselves in the Apprenticeship Scheme under the Training Board.

So what we are embarking upon, in fact what we have embarked upon at the moment, is a rationalisation of the teaching of technical education in this country as a whole, and it is not only confined to technical education. We are seeking to look at it in the area of the arts, and this is where the concept of a National School of Music and of the Visual Arts comes forward.

We have a situation where we are teaching Art to "A" level in most of the schools. Some schools have kilns, some do not. We have not got enough sculptors in Barbados to service all of these schools. Some schools are teaching batik work and there are tremendous career opportunities for that in this country, and for pottery and ceramics. There is an exhibition of the campuses of Queens College, Harrison College and St. Michael School going on now at Queens Park. I opened it last Friday night and I saw their batik work, I saw paintings in water and pen. I saw no sculpture and only a little weaving. The student demand is there, and the opportunities in the market place are there, and we have got to gear our educational system to satisfy these demands. But we are not going to be able to do it if we persist with this now obsolete idea that you are going to equalise all facilities of every kind in every school, because we will never be able to afford to do it even if we could afford the equipment that we have now in some schools.

It is a fact that we have equipment, but no person available to properly use the equipment. We have large pieces of equipment which I am told by the officers in the Ministry are only used for a matter of hours in a given school term or a given school year. Now this has all got to be re-thought and we have got to do careful replanning. All of that was in the Prime Minister's address to the Alexandra School yesterday. You must not listen to one part of the address and not the other. All that is in the address and if members want copies I can make them available, because it is very important that we understand that we are taking, as the honourable member for St. James North has pointed out, a complete approach to this thing. We can no longer go forward in a haphazard fashion, that you have this here and you have that there, and because they have that in other countries, we must have it here. We have to look and see what our work-place is demanding. We cannot continue to overlook what the student demands are, and believe me, Mr. Chairman, the student demands are not far from what the work place demands are. They live in homes where other people work, and they have a very clear idea of what employable skills are, and on the other hand, what we teach them in the school which renders them virtually unemployable when they leave the school. Something has to be wrong, Mr. Chairman, where droves of our children leave the schools in June or July every year with three or four or five certificates at "O" Level. It sounds good, but look at what they have — History, Geography, Religious Knowledge and Home Economics.

6.05 p.m.

Now that combination gears them for what? For what? To think what? It renders them unemployable. That combination does not equip them for any job in the workplace.

Do you know what the workplace is demanding? Somebody with the commercial subjects and some Principles of Accounts and perhaps a working knowledge of a foreign language. People like that will command a greater salary than you or I, in the workplace. But our school system is not turning them out. They are turning out people with a modicum of typing — that is not sufficient. We need well rounded secretaries who understand office procedure and can go straight into office practice. They should not have to leave the schools and go to the Community College for those skills, in my view. We are duplicated in too many of our institutions. We are wasting money, wasting manpower resources by adopting this kind of approach. So the query of the honourable member for St. Michael South can only be partly answered at this time, because as I said, I do not want to anticipate what an Advisory Committee might have to tell us about it. But certainly that is the direction, that is the kind of thinking which is going on in the Ministry of Education today.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe we had better get a few of these things out of the way. It is going to be a fairly long debate, Sir. There are a number of other Members on this side who wish to speak, but I want to deal with some matters which the Minister raised.

The Minister disturbed me profoundly, Sir. She disturbed me profoundly. I wish to make it clear that my interest in this is not only my political interest. I have an interest, as a national, in what kind of education system we provide in this country, and it seems to me that we ought to recognise that an Education policy cannot be what Tom, or Dick or Harry seem to think it ought to be. An educational policy ought to bear some relationship to the community for which it is designed.

Now, I hear some tones in the Minister's comments based on cost effectiveness. The experts in her Ministry can tell her what a disaster it was, back in the 1950s, for countries like the United States in certain areas, and to some extent in Britain, when they have had people come in and talk about cost effectiveness in education.

If a young man takes 20 years to learn how to read and write you cannot determine that that is 20 years money that is wasted if at the end he can read and write. And for us to start looking at education in the same way that we are looking at the purchase of saltfish or running a business you must have at the bottom line some.....

Hon. Miss. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I cannot permit the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to put words in my mouth that I did not say. He cannot say that you are seeking to approximate education with the buying and selling of saltfish. You really cannot say that because they are journalists who will write it down. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I am talking to you and Mr. Chairman) (*Asides*) But you cannot say that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I assume that you are more educated than the journalists. I am talking to the Chairman and you. I have nothing to do with the journalists, the journalists can write what they like.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Please be not provocative in the language you use.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Mr. Chairman. With the greatest respect, Sir. Thank you, Sir. Thank you for your guidance. What I am saying is that the question of education cannot be related primarily to cost effectiveness. Obviously, there has to be some rational approach to education. Obviously, wastage must be cut out. I heard from the Prime Minister's speeches, and I am now hearing from the Minister, this concept of having to look at the cost effectiveness and she is talking about machinery that

has only been used for four hours. What is important is what the machinery has been used for.

The Minister, Sir, is dealing with me at a level which I would like to spend some time with her on, but I cannot operate at that level. I could spend some time with the Minister at that level but.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get ahead with this debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, let me get back serious again. I do not like words such as "cost effectiveness" as they are applied to education.

The honourable Member for St. George South, on another occasion, when discussing Culture, joined me in this concept that you cannot always put a price tag on certain areas of human endeavour. I have been hearing the Prime Minister, on more than one occasion saying, that we have spent too much money on education, or that we are spending more money on education than they do in Russia. These are the kinds of sentiments that are continuing to come from the lips of the Prime Minister, and I am now hearing the Minister, in her essay on the Ministry, giving off the same kind of effervescence.

She talks about a National School of Music in the same breath. Now, I make bold to say that it would be cheaper to have at many of the institutions in Barbados the wherewithal for musical appreciation, and the capacity and ability to participate in the learning of music, than to set up a Music College, as you call it, because a proper functioning Music College will bring a cost which would probably blow the Minister's mind — a proper College of Music.

There are very few in the world, so we in Barbados should not attempt a thing like that unless we are going to enter into it properly. And the Minister must know from her officials that at the moment, it is even more difficult to get a proper Music Teacher in some of the secondary schools. There are secondary schools in this country where there are no proper Music Teachers. To talk about a National School of Music is fine — you can dream. Let us have a National Orchestra and let us give our students something to aim towards like becoming part of a National Orchestra. We could support that. Let us have a professional orchestra that is our National Orchestra if you will, and therefore provide the incentives.

But I am not here for this, and I do not think that this is the right time to go into details of how you must do these things. I will merely say to you that you ought to consult. The Government has a duty to consult as widely as possible on the question of having an educational policy. If you are changing the philosophy as radically as

it sounds to me that you are, then you have a duty and responsibility to consult, so that when we do put the educational philosophy to the test, at least all of the people in Barbados can feel that they have had an input in it or they can understand where you are going.

The mere fact that somebody might have cast a vote for one political party or the other is not sufficient for any political party to make those fundamental decisions about the children of the people of Barbados without further and better consultation and further and better particulars.

You are saying that you cannot have an Industrial Arts Section in every school in Barbados. No one would expect you to have an Industrial Arts Section in each school in Barbados. Nobody could expect that but it seems to me that you equate having an Industrial Arts Section in each school and having equal facilities to mean the same facilities.

6.15 p.m.

You are saying that you want to have Coleridge and Parry and Alexandra complementing each other. You expect that given the distance between those two schools that you can develop other than recreational systems that can be divided between those two schools? Do you really expect that anybody can accept that?

What you wish to have in each school is the capacity to learn Industrial Arts and to teach Industrial Arts. You can do this without spending a large amount of money to equip each school with similar facilities. It has been done in the past in other places and it can be done in Barbados. But it seems that it is you and the Prime Minister who are embarking on this business of reducing this run-away spending which the Democratic Labour Party has allowed these people — they are getting too much, they are going too fast and there seems to be the attitude that they need to be put in their places.

We want some well rounded secretaries. But what you need to do is educate them first. You cannot teach a secretary to be a secretary in a secondary school. You have to give her a general education. You have to let her appreciate and understand what Liberal Arts could be, even if she does not know what they are, because it takes a long time before you have an appreciation of Liberal Arts. You have to expose the people to education and then you can give them specialist training.

You want to start training secondary children at the age of 12, 15 and 17....(Asides) — You didn't say it in those words — you apparently don't listen to yourself, you know you are saying that what we need in this country is to get the education system so streamlined that we can have some well-rounded secretaries. Unless I misunderstand the English Language, and you don't speak it too badly, except you know...you said what you wanted to say and I under-

stood what you said. But I am saying to you that you have to expose the people of Barbados to a fairly broad base education for a fairly long time and then let them specialize.

In the United States, at the university level, there are certain professions which they will not advise anybody to try at undergraduate levels. Take, for instance, Business Administration. There are a few colleges that offer a first degree in Business Administration and a few — very few — maybe one that offers a first degree in Public Administration. But they all recognize in the business schools, and the public administration schools, that you have got to let the individual get a wide Liberal Arts education and expose him to the more specialized training, because they recognize that if you attempt to specialize too early what you produce is a very narrow individual who is incapable of absorbing the people and the ideas around him or her.

That is the problem we have with the 11 Plus system we have in Barbados. It is a practical way to decide how you are going to allocate the places. But one of its big disadvantages is that when they get into Harrison College or Queens College, to take two schools, even though it is said that they do the same courses in the first two years, by the third form they have already determined in the school based on the performance of the children which Sixth Form they will be going in.

You better believe, Mr. Chairman, that by the time you get to third form in these secondary schools, even now where it is alleged that we have a rounded approach, there are certain subjects like Biology, you either are having Human Biology or the other Biology, but you cannot have Biology unless you go into the Sciences. So if you are a Liberal Arts person — which you are not — and I am a scientist — which I am not — we are determined very early in the secondary system in Barbados.

I am not quarreling with that because I know the resources in the country force the community to have that kind of approach, but I am saying that we must not carry it any further.

I do not understand what the Minister is talking about when she says that technical education needs to be taught — like if it is a single subject. Technical education embraces at least 169 different disciplines. The Civil Servants can correct me, I may be off by a few. (*Asides*). My friend is pulling the old trick on me and telling me 168. Well it must be 170. (*Laughter*).

But quite seriously technical education means, in essence, that we could have a better prospect of recruitment for Shorthand Reporters for example. But a Shorthand Reporter who does not understand the English Language at the level at least of "A" Level, is a waste of

time. So there is no point of developing the shorthand skills when a person is 15 or 16 years and leaving that person bereft of a better understanding of relationships, so that when he or she has to deal with the multifarious mentalities which become Members of the House of Assembly, she can at least understand when the discourse is at the level of say the honourable Member for St. Michael East and the honourable Member for Christ Church West, or say the honourable Member for St. James North and the honourable Member for St. Michael Central to take just four examples.

Now if you do not recognize that as desirable, it means that all that I am saying is wasted on the Minister. I believe that the Minister has been infused by a certain enthusiasm on the part of the Prime Minister to keep the Budget within certain limits. Looking at the alleged extravagances of the two previous Ministers of Education.... (*Asides*) Louis and Sleepy (*Laughter*) (*Asides*) He is the third....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that the hon. member is referring to the present Attorney General.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That was an aside Sir. Mr. Chairman, I believe that a lot of rhetoric about the cost of education has been floating around Barbados for a very long time and it has tended to come from Ministers of Finance and it is proper that they should remind Ministers of Education that the bottom of the barrel is not open-ended.

But Ministers of Education have a responsibility to battle with Ministers of Finance. When you become Minister of Education, you have special responsibility because into your hands — have been put or has been put — (*Laughter*) — I have to check with my.. (*ASIDE*: Have been put) — have been put (*ASIDE*: Right, right) the lives of the next two generations. What happens to Barbadians two generations from now is going to be determined by the policy which is set by the present Minister of Education.

If the Minister of Education is guided, or allows herself to be guided only by the fulminations of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance on the question of allocation of resources, if she allows her better judgment to be way-laid when she knows Liberal Arts education is desirable along with technical education, then she is the one who would be found guilty of posterity. The Prime Minister has already been found guilty on another score by posterity — the Minister of Education need not fall in that bracket.

I am saying to you that some of the matters which we are going to raise in more detail seems to suggest that there is a cut-back in the education that will become available to the broad masses of people in Barbados. I am

saying to you in the context of productivity, in the context of economic development and social development, that that is a negative sign which we are beginning to see and I am suggesting that it is a trend which we cannot accept, and which we on this side will not accept.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time...The honourable Member for....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: St. Michael West Central, and for a long time to come.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there seems to be still a great deal of confusion in the minds of some people regarding the legitimate boundaries of education and the legitimate boundaries of occupational training.

Traditionally and historically, the concept of occupational training has emerged, not out of the educational system as we understand it, but out of the work-place and it has taken an awful long time for educationists in today's world, particularly in Barbados, to be able to deal with the distinction that ought, legitimately, to exist between education, as we have understood it, and the new concept, although it is old — the re-emerging concept of occupational training as a mechanism through which we prepare people in relatively short time-spans for career initiatives.

I seem to be gathering the impression that the Ministry of Education is straining at the possibility of swallowing up the National Board as a legitimate extension of its responsibility. I would like to be able to set at rest the misconceptions of all those who seem to be dying because I have heard people say things about technical education and that is meant to encompass the role which is now carried on by the National Training Board.

I know this is not the occasion to debate the National Training Board and I will not attempt, Sir, to amplify on the legitimate perimeters that would be the concern of the National Training Board, I would merely like to suggest that there is ample room for the Ministry of Education to exercise its mind and its resources in the direction of preparing people for careers through the educational system as we now see it constituted.

That might be a provocative statement. I am being prompted by one of my colleagues but I will not take his promptings on this occasion, I will merely say, Sir, that the Ministry of Labour is the place where occupational training is currently done and it will stay there for a long time. (*Aside: Right.*) because, Sir, if you look at the success stories in occupational training, you will see that it does not reside in the Ministry of Education.

The Ministry of Education manages to reduce all forms of learning to book concentration. It always turns out, Sir, to be a theoretical exercise which prepares people for nothing — neither to be good theoreticians or good practitioners of a particular art.

And I believe, Sir, that when we are defining what is education in Barbados, we must not believe that the Tractor Training Scheme, which is currently to be put into training in Barbados, belongs to the Ministry of Education — even though I know that there are some members of that professional category of educators who feel that it should be their responsibility.

I am not now accusing the Minister of being in this group of thinkers. But I know that there are some technocrats in her Ministry who feel that they should be teaching masons how to do their work, and teaching electricians, and teaching all forms of skills which they have tried to teach in the past and have not done very well teaching them.

And, Sir, I would like to commend the Minister for her efforts. I would like to commend the Minister of Education for her labours in the field of education and for her remarkable initiative in implementing a scheme which succeeding Ministers in the past have been afraid to touch.

The Minister responsible for Education during the Democratic Labour Party — the illustrious representative for the constituency of St. Michael South — was afraid to touch it. His successor, the then honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was afraid to touch it. My illustrious colleague on the backbench here now, the honourable Member for St. George South, was afraid to touch it and I commend the Minister responsible for Education, the Member for the City of Bridgetown for her courage in attacking this very difficult concept of zoning in Barbados.

I have always, Sir, put forward the view that zoning ought to be tackled in a slightly different way from the way she has approached it. But at least, Sir, I am extremely gratified to know that she has recognised that it is a tremendous waste of resources, human resources, particularly young human resources, to take a child up from Pie Corner and send him to school in St. John by-passing ten schools along the way. And it is almost a criminal waste of monetary and other resources when we duplicate facilities(*ASIDE*).....merely to accommodate this special breed of snobbish behaviour that we find in the Barbadian society.

I feel, Sir, that education ought to be as nearly as possible made a matter that is equally available to all of

those persons who can benefit from it at all levels. I believe, Sir, that we must start letting people understand that it is not the preserve of a few.

I still have some quarrel with those persons who believe that Harrison's College should remain a sacrosanct institution — whatever the name of it is, Sir — Harrison College — they tell me I must not put an "s" on it — what I would like to put on it, Sir, is my tongue because it has remained a preserve of snobbery of the worst class in Barbados for a long time, and I see some of the ties wrinkling up their brow.

The fact of the matter, Sir, is that too many people feel that it should remain an institution available only to a limited few in Barbados and I feel that all of us who have children, and who would like to see them benefit from the best that education has to offer, should be able to send them to any school, any secondary school in Barbados, with equal confidence that they receive the same quality of education that Harrison College, at the moment, is purported to be able to give. (*Aside*) I come from St. Peter, Sir, I do not know any better.

Sir, I do not mean to prolong this debate, because I really would like to give the Leader of the House the opportunity to call the Agriculture Head. The Minister of Agriculture has gone to a funeral but he has got to come back some time, and I would like him to be able to put that Head soon.

So, Sir, with those very few remarks, I would like to assure the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown that I hold her in very special esteem because of the fact that she has been able to approach this very, very difficult subject with a great measure of competence, and certainly the courage element is not to be understated.

Thank you, Sir.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Michael West Central, speaking from his position on the back bench, seemed to have been quite anxious to get a dig at his colleagues on the front bench. Very early in his statement it seemed to me as if he was warning off the Minister of Education from a preserve which he thought to be his own. Whether in fact there is some problem in that area, it is not for us to know, but it seems to me that he was sounding a warning, just as his colleague — the Member for St. George South — was sounding a warning earlier today — warning off others from his preserve, which was the Police.

It also seemed to me that the Member for St. Michael West Central was anxious to get a dig at the front bench on agriculture as well. I think we on this side too would look forward to that debate.

But I rise, Mr. Chairman, specifically to raise a few questions with the Minister on the policy of the Government in relation to some aspects of its educational policy, and the first question I would raise follows on some of the comments which have been made by the Member for St. Michael West earlier in his contribution.

During the course of the public debate which has taken place on education, I got the impression that the suggestion is made that emphasis should be placed on providing specialist facilities in schools, seemingly with the hope of establishing some schools with a specialist bent. I would like to know, first of all, if it is the policy of the Ministry of Education to move in this direction in the future — the direction of establishing schools with special areas, and if that is the Government's policy, rather than just words being used in that regard, whether the Ministry is making any positive steps at the moment for creating these so-called specialist schools.

The second question which I would like to direct to the Minister is to find out what has been the Ministry's rationalisation in this question of zoning in placing schools like West St. Joseph, for instance, Lodge School, Foundation and Princess Margaret in one zone, because it seems to me that those schools are scattered so far and wide apart that to have them in one zone does not make too much sense, I would like to have some indication as to what was the thought and the rationalism behind them, because certainly in relation to a school like West St. Joseph, for instance, it is clearly evident that persons living in Christ Church need at least two buses to reach there — similarly with the Lodge School and Princess Margaret.

The final question which I would like to enquire of the Minister is in relation to Subhead 18 of Head 34 where, in relation to transport of pupils, I see that there is a considerable reduction in the quantum of monies which have been made available for this subhead.

I wonder if we could have just some explanation on the cause for the very massive reduction in the vote under that Head.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, since my name has been called in vain during the course of this debate, I think it gives me an opportunity to get up and answer some of the points raised by honourable Members. I believe that the Minister of Education is very competent to handle all matters relating to her Ministry, but on the other hand, I feel that I have a duty to take issue with any honourable Member who speaks of any matter that happened in the Ministry of Education while I was in there.

I have not made any notes, so I will not be able to recall all the points raised. Some of them were so supine

that really I do not think it is necessary for me to deal head-on with them.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West made the point about co-education. I believe he was a little confused, Mr. Chairman, because I really cannot see the logical connection between zoning and co-education, but he would make the point that if the Government is committed to co-education then the Minister should stand up to the Minister of Finance and tell him that he cannot cut back money on her, because she needs money at Alexandra School for co-ed facilities.

I do not believe that there is any reason for anybody in here to question the commitment of this Government to co-education. The Democratic Labour Party said they were committed to it, and I accepted that. They made Combermere school a co-ed institution in 1975 or 1976 — I think it was 1976 — and that was the measure of their commitment.

Now they drew me into it, Sir. When I was in the Ministry of Education, Harrison College, Queen's College, Foundation, St. Michael's and Coleridge and Parry became co-educational schools. That is not all, Sir, primary schools were made co-educational. In my own constituency in St. George South we have the St. Luke's Boys' and the St. Luke's Girls' that were made co-educational. So I do not think there is any doubt at all as to the commitment of this Government to co-education.

I do not know what the Prime Minister said at Alexandra School, and at this point I am not even interested in finding out, but what I do know is that it was always contemplated that the Alexandra School and the Coleridge and Parry School should operate in tandem, because the Alexandra School did not have the size of classrooms and the physical facilities to carry a full-fledged boys' school — they need cricket pitches, football fields and that sort of thing — and they are building a major highway along the boundary of Alexandra School that would make it a little difficult for this to be done. Moreover this takes in the very point about cost effectiveness which the Member for St. Michael West is making, except that he is making it in a pejorative sense — he is knocking cost effectiveness. This is the same Opposition that got up in here and attacked the Government left, right and centre about overspending.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. I am not knocking cost effectiveness. I am saying that cost effectiveness must not become the primary consideration in your educational policy.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I accept the point made by the honourable Member, Sir. It is cheaper to buy a mini-bus and give it to the Alexandra School, or two mini-buses, or a whole big Mercedes bus, to get their pupils transported up

the hill to Coleridge and Parry to use the specialist facilities up there than to construct those same facilities again at Alexandra School.

When I was in the Ministry of Education — and the honourable Member made reference to this — Harrison College is not a big school, you know, Harrison College is one of the small schools — unless he is talking about physical plant. When I went into the Ministry of Education there were only 600 boys at Harrison College, but there were 1700 down at Ellerslie, and I met a lot of resistance when I tried to increase the numbers at Harrison College. The resistance came from the same reactionaries in this society who felt that Harrison College should not become too big, because you would dilute what you have to offer there.
6.45 p.m.

Against a lot of opposition I insisted that the numbers at Harrison College be increased. There are over 800 pupils I understand now, and I am still of the view that Harrison College has got enough physical plant and enough grounds that they should increase their numbers to 1 000, and I know the Minister has got the type of grit and determination to bring them to heel. A secondary school of 1 000 is not unmanageable, and in a country like Barbados, in the context of these difficult financial times, 1 000 is a good number to have in a secondary school.

There are one or two other things that I believe the honourable Member mentioned and I would have no part of it. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central spoke of a school I do not know anything about. I never heard about it, Sir. (*Asides*) (Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Which one is that?) Harrison College. (*Laughter*) The honourable Member will continue to make the point that is a little bit worn out and thread-bare — the argument about Harrison College being a snob school.

This has been my experience, Mr. Chairman, and I believe you know about it. I have had a lady from Eastlyn in St. George, a poor hard working women in the fields in St. George whose son was offered a place at Harrison College on the basis of a Common Entrance Exam about three years ago, and the lady came to me and said "Mr. Tull, we can't let the boy go to Harrison College, Sir, that is not for him. He must go to St. George Secondary". My friend and colleague from St. Michael West Central is reflecting the unenlightened view of that woman.

Mr. Chairman, I went to school at Harrison College a long time ago. (*Asides*) I do not know if he is asking me about a contribution to snobbery. What I do know as a fact.....(*Asides*).....He might become a snob after. What I am stating as a fact, I cannot speak for the year 1982 — in fact no Common Entrance Examination has

been written since I left the Ministry of Education — but when I left the Ministry of Education to my certain knowledge over 70 per cent of all the children who were admitted to Harrison College, or at least over the last two to three years that I was in the Ministry, came from the Government primary schools — not from Smale's, not from Miss Carrington, not from St. Cyprians. Over 70 per cent of the children who went into Harrison College in my time in that Ministry, in the last two or three years, were children from the Government primary schools.

You see, Mr. Chairman, they talk. My children, three of them, have all gone to Government primary schools, but the ones who get up and talk about snobbery are the ones whose children have never been through the door of a Government elementary school in this country. I have got to applaud the honourable Member for St. Michael West. He had the good sense to send his children to the good primary schools in Barbados, but a lot of them who talk do not put their children in Government primary schools.

I challenge anybody to get up and tell me I am talking foolishness — that if you pick out the best dozen primary schools in Barbados they are Government primary schools. I am not going to say that all 118 have all got the same quality, but I am willing to wager my meagre salary this month that the top 12 primary schools in Barbados are Government schools.

I am going to come back in this debate if it goes on, because there are a whole lot of things I want to discuss.

A question was raised about educational policy. It is always useful, in the context of an education debate, to start with first principles, and it is useful for us to discuss what we want out of education in Barbados — where we are going to go, — before we start dealing with component parts. That is not my job. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: What do you mean; it is collective responsibility). Where is the Opposition spokesman on education? He got cold feet and he has run and hidden. Where is the Shadow Minister, the honourable Member for St. James South? Sir, I am talking until 7 o'clock and then I will stop there.

I have heard what has been described in here as the occupational training lobby in the Cabinet versus the education lobby in the Cabinet. Since the Barbados Labour Party was running the Government, they are entitled to their own opinions, even inside the Cabinet. We know that that was not the position that obtained before this, but we are entitled to our own points of view.

I was just about to say something commendatory of the honourable Member for St. Michael West and he

put me off. I am perfectly in agreement with the honourable Member when he says that there must be a broad-based general education.

You cannot pick out people from the time they are young and determine that they must paint somebody's house. You cannot make up your mind that little children 10 and 11 years old should spend the rest of their days in a greasy monkey suit under somebody's motorcar.

People must have a broad-based general education and then move on, at a later stage, to a specialist area, and when I hear the honourable Member for St. Michael West — my friend — if he would listen to me now and then, he would not put his foot in his mouth so often.....

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: On a point of elucidation, the honourable Member for St. George South is putting into my mouth an argument which will give him an excellent opportunity to sound very good in rebuttal — an argument which I did not put forward.

I said that there ought to be a distinction which has traditionally maintained itself between education in the established schools, as we understand it, and occupational training. I did not at any point at all suggest that occupational training should begin at age 10 or at age 11.

I believe that the students should pass through the normal process and when, through the process of selection, a man identifies himself, or is identified as having a higher aptitude for occupational training, then that is the direction in which he should go, and I believe that the honourable Member for St. George South knows perfectly well that is what I was saying.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I misrepresented the honourable Member, but this whole question of occupational training vis-a-vis pure education is a very troublesome one, because when you talk about occupational training, it is always a pejorative comment, because occupational training does not mean lawyers, dentists, secretaries or architects. It always means somebody who is going to paint a building or who is going to go and do the plumbing.

This is precisely what is referred to by occupational training. It refers to a certain section of training, and I do not understand why the issue has to come up in an antithetical position. Both are necessary, and I am sorry that it was imported into a general debate on education. The honourable Member for St. Michael East is a very articulate speaker and he can get up and defend the position.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 8 o'clock p.m. today.

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.
6.55 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 of Supply. The Hon. Minister of Education.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Before we broke for dinner we heard from the honourable Member for St. Michael West about our educational policy. I just want to make it clear that in nothing that I have said tonight is there any intention, and I am quite sure that my language has been clear, but I am just saying it again — nothing that I have said, nothing that is to be found in the Government's policy, is meant to make anybody believe that the Government's policy in this country is a one-sided or lopsided one.

The particular aspect of the policy of which I spoke earlier — because, Mr. Chairman, do not believe for a moment that I have covered the whole spectrum of educational policy in this debate at all — but I will say again that we in this country cannot continue any longer to ignore the demands of the market place.

I have heard in this Hon. Chamber, year after year in the past, when the honourable Member for St. Michael South was Minister of Education and we were in

Opposition, you would hear about the thousands who came out every year in June and July and could not find employment, and you still hear people talking about that, and there is still some truth in the fact that a lot of our people come out of the schools — too many of our people come out of the schools quite unemployable, quite inequipped and not prepared for the workplace.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West went on and on about cost benefit and that you must not try to be cost effective in education. He has since gotten up and denied — I am not giving way to any point of interruption. It is a dirty habit that the honourable Member for St. Michael West has.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Nobody interrupted him. He is always jumping up and interrupting. I am not giving way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An honourable Member stands on a point of order. Please sit.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Fraudulent, fraudulent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please indicate the rule that is in the breach?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will indicate the point of order on which I have arisen to. (*Asides*) Man, you are not in the Chair. We are going very well, Billie, Let us go.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Chairman is at liberty after I have made my point of order to determine whether or not it is a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry, Sir. The hon. Minister made a statement that I had said something which is not correct, Sir, and therefore the honourable Member is breaking the rule of the House which says that an honourable Member should not mislead the House. That is the point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman does not find from the remarks of the Minister that there has been any attempt to mislead this Honourable House. There is therefore no point of order. The honourable Member, please take your seat.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The honourable Member for St. Michael West having said and suggested that education was not an area for cost benefit analysis and for cost effectiveness, he then got up and denied that he said it.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Member is misleading this Hon. House. I never said..... Mr. Chairman you cannot allow.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, please. Will the Honourable Member please take his seat.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know that the honourable Member knows that when the Chairman stands that he must take his seat. Now, I will advise the honourable Member that he will have an opportunity later to make another contribution, and at that time he will be quite in order to make the points which he intends to make. I will hear from the Hon. Minister.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You will hear all of the denials now, but you heard a lot in here about education was not to cut, you must not be cost effective and all of that kind of thing. He has since gotten up in here and denied it and said it again now after dinner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue with your....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: But I would like to refer the honourable Member for St. Michael West to the Draft Estimates. Look at Page 3. You see, the honourable Member for St. Michael West speaks for headlines. It would sound as a good headline and they are journalists who will write it. Mr. Chairman, Sir "Taitt said.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not referring to the honourable Member.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not talking about the honourable Member for St. Michael West. I am talking about a headline, Mr. Chairman, Sir.

(Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for the City were expunged from the records by Mr. Chairman.)

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I would like to refer the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to the Draft Estimates — he has a copy in front of him or he should have — for this year — the Estimates that are currently before this Hon. House and let him look at Page 3 at the top and see that in Education, Current Expenditure, we are spending over \$99 million. Education is still enjoying the highest capital expenditure in this country.

All I am saying, is that within this, there is still room for cost effectiveness, there is still room for increased efficiency. There is still room for a cut-down on wastage—both of the manpower variety and the other kind.

You look at Page 3 here and you see that after Education and \$99 million, there is a long way down to \$84 million, before you come to the next highest Head of Current Expenditure of \$84 million — the General Public Service, and then third in line after that is the Economic Services at \$71 million.

We have \$99 million in Current Expenditure — that has nothing to do with Capital, and yet we have this situation.

We are educating fewer children today than we were educating ten years ago. We are spending more per capita on Education, Mr. Chairman, so I do not want any honourable Member to go away from here with any impression that there are any vast and massive cuts in Education. Education has by far, by a wide margin, the highest Head of Current Expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Sir, for this \$99 million in Current Expenditure we have to ask ourselves the question, having invested this kind of money, what are we turning out? It is all right for the honourable Member for St. Michael West to say that if a man takes 20 years to learn to read and write that money is not wasted. Well, that is not my line of argument. There is no good reason in this country why it should take any man, even if he were a handicapped man, 20 years to read and write.

We heard a lot of talk from the same honourable Member about a sound, basic education. I could not agree more. It is our intention in the Ministry of Education that every child should have a sound, basic education. But I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that in 1982 that it should take 16, 17 or 18 years to give a child a sound, basic education. I just do not believe it. I do not know any country in the world where it takes 16, 17 or 18 years to give a child a sound basic education.
8.10 p.m.

I never suggested that we are going to start to specialize the children at the age of 12, but there is a point between the age of 12 and 16 years where the young people in our schools must have the option to choose certain areas of specialty. It is not every child that will know at age 14 or 15 in which direction Mr. Chairman, he wants to go. But we still live in the system where we are subject to the examiners, not only in the Caribbean but of certain other overseas examiners. We have to prepare for these and it is still the yardstick by which we measure certain areas of ability. It is certainly

not a yardstick for other areas, but some areas can be measured by the yardstick of examinations.

It is very easy to make large and general statements without showing us any facts, without attempting, not even for a moment, to address a particular specific. The honourable Member for St. Michael West said that it would take a fairly long time to acquire a basic education — what he calls an appreciation of the Liberal Arts. What is a fairly long time? A fairly long time does not mean anything to me. A fairly long time may mean something to one child and something else to another child. It has to do with the range of abilities. It is impinged upon by all kinds of variables.

So when we get that kind of loose and general statement, Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to address it in any serious and informed manner because I am not sure, at all, what it means and I think that the honourable Member, himself, is not sure what he means when he says a fairly long time for a broad base education to be inculcated in young people. What I would say Bds \$99 million in 1982 can hardly be described as a small sum of money.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central made a point about training. I just want to say very briefly that we regard certain aspects of training as entirely within the province of the Ministry of Labour and there are certain other aspects which we would regard as falling within the province of the Ministry of Education. We are quite satisfied that occupational training, as we know it in Barbados, is in the area of the Ministry of Labour.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central asked about specialist offerings in his zone. He wondered about the rational for Zone 3 which is the southern zone. I can only say that in the business of zoning we followed the outline of the old Local Government districts and in the southern zone we have the group of schools referred to by the honourable Member.

We do take the point in the Ministry of Education that there is some difficulty in communication between some of the schools in that zone. But I think I need to remind that honourable Member that we are working very closely with the Transport Board and that there are going to be school buses travelling cross country roads linking certain schools within zones in a way that was not done before.

Perhaps, the honourable Member does not know that, already in the southern zone, there are in fact, certain bus routes moving across country which accommodates school children moving from one area to a

secondary school in another. So that is not going to be anything new to the southern zone. What will happen there will be an expansion of a special school bus service to accommodate the movement in that rural part of Barbados, although we do realize a certain urban community is growing around Six Cross Roads in St. Philip.

He wondered too about the marked decrease in the subhead dealing with the vote from transport of pupils. There is a very simple explanation. In the Ministry of Education it has long been felt that pupil transport really is not a matter properly falling within the Ministry of Education and we have persuaded the Minister of Finance that the whole business is better managed by the Ministry of Transport and Works, and that is going to be transferred. The pupil transport is a very complicated matter and finds itself being subsidized from three different quarters and there is a lot of difficult arithmetic. All it serves to do is escalate the Education Vote in a way which is really not fair to us. In the future the whole business of pupil transportation is going to be managed by the Ministry of Transport and Works, and if you look under the Ministry of Transport and Works you will see what provision is made for it there.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry to intervene at this point on a matter of privilege but it would appear to me, Sir, that the arrangements for circulation of air are not functioning. It seems to me that this place is suddenly becoming very hot and stuffy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter is being attended to. In the meantime, my eyes have caught the Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is the occasion for any heated or acrimonious debate, but it is certainly an occasion for asking some very fundamental questions. Some of the positions, which I hope are tentatively taken by the Minister, may cause some concern about the philosophy of education and about the ends we are hoping to achieve as far as our young people of a future generation is concerned.

Now, if we look at the broad scope of the education development in this country, I think we can broadly say that it may be divided into two basic periods. (*Asides*) You would hear from the Shadow Minister of Education in due course. The first one I would say is the elitist one of education in which the vast majority of Barbadians could only aspire to a primary school or elementary education and it was in that system that it was only the brighter ones who could get into fifth standard and sixth standard and seventh standard. I would say that this system prevailed in the country for a very long

period of time right down into the 1940s at least, down into the 1940s, I would put it as late as that.
8.20 p.m.

On top of that elementary system, you had a few secondary schools which did not pretend to open themselves up to all talents, but which were restricted on the basis either of colour, class, influence or some other kind of adventitious consideration for admission into those schools.

During the late 1940s and the early 1950s — you see, I am not trying to score any political point, I will put it as early as that — you get a change. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What is the little orchid you have there?) Are you worried about this? I got into one of the Minister's schools this afternoon for the first time since I left the Ministry in 1975. I got an invitation — the first time. (*Asides*) You did not know about it. I could not get there if you knew. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, order.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: But, Mr. Chairman, to be serious, the 1950s, the 1960s, and onwards, saw a gradually accelerating change in approach towards the provision of education from an elitist system to one based on the principles of democratisation, in which the concept was held out that all Barbadians are entitled, not only to a primary, but to a secondary education of such quality and such quantity as the resources of the country could afford and so we started with the.... (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Bring Hansard Debates, same story, same old religion.).....and so we started — you cannot throw me off, man, you cannot throw me off.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: and so we started..... That is an old technique, that cannot work.....and so we started.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: with I believe schools like the two St. Leonard's Schools in the 1950s, and the West St. Joseph School, to begin the modern provision of secondary modern schools in this country. These were then transformed gradually over the years into what we call the comprehensive schools, latterly called the newer secondary schools. (*Asides*) Rolling the wicket, man, rolling the wicket. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Come with something new.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please. Please carry on.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: And in these schools at the secondary level, there was the aim to provide a rounded education to the young people of this country, as well as to provide necessary skills, such as could be provided in the second cycle of secondary education — the last two years of the secondary school. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Cold soup warmed up.) Mr. Chairman,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Man, give that to somebody else.)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in all of this thinking about education, we considered that not only the arts subjects but science subjects, commercial subjects and what was called Industrial Arts education, should be part of that, because if there were one area in which developing countries, including Barbados, showed a distinct weakness as far as education was concerned, it was the almost total absence of any preparation for technical, vocational or Industrial Arts training.

I believe one of the very earliest attempts for that area of education was with the Apprenticeship Act of 1928, now repealed. That went on in the 1940s. We had the first tentative steps, I believe through the Ministry of Works, to get some kind of programme going, then at the Evening Institute and then in the 1950s we had the establishment of the Technical Institute with, I believe, about 50 or 60 students. In the 1960s, we got the move — late 1950s and early 1960s — for the establishment of what was called Industrial Arts education, basically woodwork, metal work and technical drawing.

In the 1960s, a look was taken at technical and vocational education, and as a result of a Resolution passed in this Hon. Chamber — I believe it was introduced by Mr. Frank Walcott — I believe he moved the Resolution calling for the establishment of a trades training centre.

But all of these efforts both at general education, technical education and what is now called occupational or skills training, was based in the Ministry of Education and let me set the heart of the Member for St. Michael West Central and the Member for St. Michael East at rest.

It is not because the Ministry of Education wanted to be the Ministry in which that kind of training was located. It was that the Ministry of Labour was very busy with industrial and labour matters in those times and, therefore, did not have the necessary infrastructure to launch into those areas. But we always made it clear — as soon as the Ministry of Labour was ready for those programmes, they could have them from the Ministry of Education which is overloaded any way. That is the position as far as that is concerned.

But what we are hearing now, and what is giving some cause for concern, is this suggestion — and I hope I got it correctly — that we cannot afford to provide Industrial Arts education in all of our secondary schools, and at the same time you are talking about zoning and forcing children to go to certain schools.

This is certainly going to raise some very fundamental questions, because if we are to put children into schools, and then in those schools, as a deliberate policy, those children would be deprived of the opportunities of getting a rounded education, in all areas, leading to their own development, particularly in the area of Industrial Arts training, there will be questions.

There seems to be some feeling that all you have to do is to go and take up a saw or a hammer, and then you can set yourself out on some kind of module and that is that. You have to provide the adequate base for it and I am with the former Minister of Education, the Member for St. George South who wants the Fire Service possibly at Boarded Hall.

But I do not know — perhaps, we should hear how many units they are in that service. Where are they going to be? Are you going to do repairs up at Sayers Court?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Training? You are talking about training firemen?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Training. Training. Yes, education and training. I understand there is a dire shortage of fire fighting units in the Fire Service and they have to borrow units from Grantley Adams Airport, now. I want to know if that is really so. What has happened to that service? How it has got down to this stage? *(Asides)* Are you going to answer then? *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, no cross talk, please, *(Asides)*.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, you know I was not in here for the Fire Service, so I had to get in a little thing about that.
8.30 p.m.

I do not think we will have time in this Education debate for a full elaboration of this. We are going to give the Minister time to understand what her portfolio is about. Do not jump in too quickly and talk about things like a Visual Arts School and things like that without thinking it through, you have to go and think these things through. Let me give you some advice first — think them through.

You will have to clarify this area of what learning opportunities you will be providing for these children,

because we have this democratised approach to education in which each Barbadian would be entitled to a broad, general education, as well as the beginnings of some kind of specialised training which would lay the base, out of that secondary school, for further skills, or occupational or technical training, as the case may be.

This, as I understand it, is the sound base for education at the secondary level. There seems now to be a change in thinking, but we will have to have it spelt out, because it is pregnant with concerns....*(Asides)*. I am saying the statements of the Minister are pregnant with possibilities.

I would be very grateful if the Minister would direct her mind to this very general point. I am not asking her necessarily now. Go and think about it, because I do not want you to jump in — you have to think it through. That is what we have to do, because we can make changes in education, but we may have to look at the problems that we may be creating down the road.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, under this particular Head, I would like, first of all, to look at the subhead dealing with primary education, because I believe that this is the foundation on which all our youngsters must build their future. I believe my colleague who just sat down said that the Minister of Education should think these things through.

If we were to look at the primary schools at the time, it would seem to me that we need to go back to our basics and look carefully at the three R's, because in 1980, 4500 children took the 11 plus examination and of these only 2000 got 200 out of 280.

I wonder if the Minister of Education could find it possible to have these scores reduced in a percentage of 100, because people are really finding it difficult to convert these figures, and sometimes it gives the best of us problems in understanding exactly what our children are getting in terms of marks. As I understand it — and probably I can be corrected by the Minister — 200 represents something like 10 out of 100.

But as far as the primary schools are concerned, Mr. Chairman, we need to put more emphasis in this area in terms of buildings and repair. If we go to some of these schools they are in a total state of disrepair and the whole atmosphere does not really lend to learning.

With respect to teaching aids, if I look at the Estimates, plant, equipment and furniture has gone from \$25 000 last year to \$10 000 this year — a reduction of \$15 000. This seems to me to indicate that they are getting less for more. In other words, what I am saying is that with the increase in cost of materials, to reduce this by \$15 000 indeed reduces the quality.

There are rumours, whether founded or unfounded, that some children have to take benches to schools, toilet paper to schools.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. May I bring to Your Honour's attention Standing Order 28(1) which makes it quite clear that a Member may not read a speech but may only read from extracts. From my observation it appears to me as if the honourable Member is reading his speech. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, order! I have heard the submission from the honourable Member. The honourable Member is entitled to refer to his notes.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: If it is the intention of the honourable Member to put me off, I can assure him that I have no speech with me. I am looking at the Estimates.

As I was saying, it seems to me that to reduce the amount of money from \$25 000 for plant, equipment and furniture by \$15 000 is to deprive these youngsters of benches, toilet paper, and many parents are indeed concerned in these areas. I have heard of cases where parents have had to send their children to school exceptionally early in order to fight for benches. I hope that this situation is being remedied and that the Minister of Education is doing all within her power to ensure that these changes come about. If children have to go to school at what can be considered ungodly hours, then one cannot expect that they can learn properly.

Another area which gives cause for concern is the surroundings. I myself attended Wesley Hall Boys', and whenever I pass King Street I am absolutely ashamed to see the condition of the surroundings, even the approach to the school. There is garbage at the front of the school, probably brought there by the residents of the area.
8.40 p.m.

I believe that there was a speech on television in which it was said that we are a littering public. I believe it was the Manager of the Sanitation Authority who said that. If the schools are not sanitary, then the children cannot learn. If the children have to inhale these obnoxious scents, then it is impossible for them to concentrate on what is going on, and therefore I would ask the Minister again, in these areas, to ensure that the surroundings of the schools are conducive for children to learn. I believe that when children leave home to go to school, that they have an interest in going there — they want to get there not get out, and this is important.

Another area in the primary schools which gives me cause for concern is the fact that a lot of children are suffering from learning disabilities, and I believe that in the cutback there has been a reduction in the scholarships

given for teachers to go overseas to train in mental retardation.

This is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman, and even in the better secondary schools, some of the teachers will tell you that there are a number of children who are suffering from learning disabilities — disabilities which, as I understand it, can be easily altered only if caught at the correct time. These are matters to which we can pay special attention.

In terms of our secondary education, I believe the Minister mentioned zoning. I would like to say that at this particular time the Democratic Labour Party is opposed to zoning, because we believe it is premature.

It is true that in theory it might sound very well, it might ease the transportation problems, but I do not believe there is a parent inside this Chamber, or outside this Chamber, who would deny a child a bus fare to get to one of the better schools. They talk of better time-keeping. I believe that when the Minister of Transport improves the bus service, as he intends to do, there will be no problems of getting our children to school.

The question of community togetherness, as I understand it, is one of the pluses for zoning. But there can be no doubt in my mind that no one in here or outside having had a child pass for Harrison College or Queens College would prefer his child, or her child, to go to St. James Secondary School at this present time, and I want to indicate this by possibly referring to a booklet which was published by the Ministry of Education, Mr. Chairman. If it is not a document of this House, it can be made a document of the House.

If we look at Harrison College as compared with Parkinson, Harrison College, for example, has ten science labs and Parkinson has two. The number of children on the roll.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. As I understand it, we are talking about zoning and the honourable Member is jumping from one zone to another. I need some help. I thought I heard something about St. James Secondary and now I am at Harrison College and Parkinson. I would be obliged if the honourable Member would repeat, because I am trying to take a note to answer.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: I was saying earlier that if my child were to pass for Harrison College or get a mark for Harrison College, I would not want to send him to St. James Secondary, and I believe the same thing applies to any honourable Member on the opposite side.

I said, as well, that in order for us to implement a proper system of zoning, then the schools must be equal

in everything, and I suggested that one can look at the booklet which was put out by the Ministry of Education not too long ago entitled "Government Secondary Schools of Barbados".

One can see the disparity by looking, for example, at the science laboratories at Harrison College which has ten and at Parkinson which has two. If one were to look at the number of children going to Harrison College you would see it is 800, which means that there is an average of one science lab for eighty children, whereas at Parkinson School there are 1,234 children which means that there is one science lab for every 617 children. Going down the whole page on the facilities, this system is seen quite clearly. Even in terms of playing fields.

I would suggest to the Minister that everything is not correct here because Coleridge Parry, according to this, does not have a playing field, but I believe they have about two. It is probably a typographical error. Even the St. James Secondary School is shown here as not having a playing field, but I believe that playing field has been destroyed since CARIFESTA. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is not true.) It is true they have not got one, but it is time they should have one, and therefore this question of zoning should be re-thought, and that is why I agree with my colleague, who just sat down, who said you should think these things through.

Mr. Chairman, from the various comments made by the Associations, it would seem, as well, that there were not many discussions between associations such as the Barbados Union of Teachers and the National Parent Teachers Association. These things are very important because they affect the lives of our children, and as I understand it, it was only when the Ministry was looking at the mechanics of zoning that the National Parent Teachers Association was brought in.

Even when we look at the so-called zoning as it is, I understand that there are two choices. First of all you can choose three schools and then you come back to your zone. Now it seems to me that this will only aggravate the situation which we are trying to remedy.

As I understand it, as well, if you have to take two buses, then only one bus fare will be paid. Who will suffer? The man or the parent with a car can take his or her child to school, but if the poor man has to pay the extra bus fare — they pay \$4 now, it is a greater burden on him, and therefore he might be encouraged, if that is the word, to send his children to the school nearer home — which is not necessarily the best school for his children. So we have got to think about these things carefully.

Now, the governing bodies. If one were to look at the governing bodies of some of these schools, one would

see that there is a discrimination, if one can put it that way, in the type of people which form the governing bodies of these schools, the older as opposed to the newer secondary schools.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister at this time to take great care and pains. It is not too late at this present time to re-think on the zoning, because if there is not a re-think, I am quite sure that system which we are trying to remedy would only make things worse.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I sat here and listened to — I would not call it a speech — some utterances from the honourable Member who just sat down. I could not really believe what I was hearing. 8.50 p.m.

For the honourable Member to get up in this Honourable Chamber and make a claim, or say something to the effect, that unless children have got proper sanitary surroundings that they would not learn? Am I really to listen to that sort of nonsense?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, all of us in here know — all of us who are in the age group of 35 and over — that the schools at which we attended, most of them had no waterborne toilets. The toilets were in the yard. You had to go outside to urinate. You had to be exposed to the elements, yet those persons attained Barbados Scholarships and have excelled in the field of education.

If the honourable Member is contending that in order to learn you must have proper surroundings, I think the honourable Member should rethink what he has said, because I am sure that he will know that what he is saying is tantamount to foolishness.

On the question of the Common Entrance results — he referred to the very poor level of attainment of some students. I wonder if the honourable Member remembers that in 1974 that they were children who took the Common Entrance Examination that got no marks at all, not one single mark, and the Democratic Labour Party was in power. The honourable Member, now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, was the Minister of Education. Not a single mark.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That happens every year, I am very glad that you said it happens every year. So for, the Honourable Member to get up and make out a case.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. We must consider the reporters, please.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: To make out a case that children getting no marks reflect the sort of educational system, that should be dismissed for what it is. Some children do not have the ability to do well in the academic subjects. Some of them are late developers. Some children will not pass in English Language, History, Scripture or those subjects, but give them an opportunity to take a trade and you will see that those very children will become outstanding students or career persons. It is a question of the opportunity and the question as to whether the child is an early or a late developer.

The honourable Member ought to know that it is sometimes the type of school that one goes to. It is known in Barbados that there are some schools that usually get very good results — Erdiston Model School. Every parent aims at getting his or her child in Erdiston Model School or a top class private school, which I would not wish to mention on this occasion. But it is known that those schools are reputed to have a very good reputation at the level of education and the level of teaching is extremely high.

One of the reasons why students get better results at the Erdiston School is a known fact. It is that teachers who are doing their training usually go to Erdiston and it is there that they give some of their very best experiences, and the children benefit from this. There are some schools which have never had a high rating and that seems to be one of the problems confronting those schools.

The honourable Member must remember that it was during their regime that the 14 year olds were turned out of the schools, because — as his Government said at the time — those children did not have the ability to do well. And further to that, they said that it did not matter what you did, you would have to turn them out of school. They never even gave those 14 year olds the opportunity to learn a trade, and that is one of the reasons why this Government, on coming into office, decided to establish the trades programme or open the trades schools in order to help those children.

We can see that this programme has been a success, because a number of those children who were turned out of school, and who were now given an opportunity to develop their skills, turned out to be very good skills persons indeed. And had it not been for those children and the opportunity given by this Government, I am sure that our situation would be even more desperate and critical.

When the building boom took us, a year or so ago, we were short of electricians, carpenters, masons and plumbers, and with the wisdom and the foresight of the

now Attorney General those children were brought back into the streamline of those schools so as to give them the benefit of an opportunity to display and develop their skills.

I remember that during the past Government's regime, there was a question of the School Meals getting to the schools late and in order to answer this problem, it was suggested by the then Minister of Education, who was then the representative of St. Michael South Central, that in order to correct this situation, he would consider extending the school hours up to 4 p.m. in the evening because the School Meals were reaching the schools late.

It only goes to show you the foolishness and the sort of planning, or lack of planning and understanding, in problems and how to deal with or remedy a situation. One can imagine that the school meals were getting to the school late and rather than trying to investigate why the school meals are getting there late through the School Meals Service, there was a Minister of Education from the Democratic Labour Party saying that in order to correct this that he was going to extend the hours to 4 o'clock.

Now, no wonder that the people in 1976 in their wisdom decided to elect.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A little less talk.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: a Government which would have brought new ideas and new concepts into education.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I have to draw to Your Honour's attention the behaviour of the Ministers on the front bench while a colleague is speaking, Sir. I believe that the colleague who is a Headmaster and who has some contribution to make to this debate ought to be heard in silence according to the rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member is trying to seek favour with me, but I do not need it at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, the point is that whatever is said about Education, we know that there have got to be changes, and it is something which has got to be subject to the changing paces and the economic situation. Education is something that cannot be streamlined in such a way that no changes can be made. It must not be a rigid exercise, and that is why as we go along in education we must effect certain changes so that we will be able to meet the demands that the country is expecting of us. 9.00 p.m.

So the honourable Member who just sat down, and who says that he supports his colleagues in opposing zoning, really does not understand the zoning. He must understand the economic changes and the industrial changes that are going on in Barbados. It is against these backgrounds that zoning become a reality. He may oppose it, but I am sure that if his party were in power it would have considered introducing zoning.

There are numbers of people in the Ministry of Education who have gone into the question of zoning in an in-depth manner, and if we are to take their advice — we would have the very best advice. I feel there are people in there with the necessary expertise who can advise any Minister of any Government. But sometimes for political gain, one gets up and oppose such methods when they are for the good of the people.

To say that zoning is all right but they object to the method, is to say to the people advising the Ministry of Education that you object to what they are saying. They are the very people that, if they were in Government would be giving you advice. What are they saying to those officers now? They would have to take advice of those officers.

They cannot come up with any alternative suggestions because they do not know of any. They are only opposing the question of zoning because they feel the Minister has taken the initiative in introducing the zoning system which they know is the very good thing for Barbados.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Sir, I am certain that my colleague, the Hon. Minister for Lands, certainly does not intend to send the students from the nice houses into an environment which he is creating for them and be kind to the lady Minister and send them to dirty schools in a bad environment. He is a stickler for good environment in the Ministry of Housing and I am sure he would also like to see a good environment at the schools. The former Minister would also like this because he provided the swimming pool facility for the residents at St. Cecelia, proper surroundings. I am certain that in keeping with that standard of surroundings that the shadow Minister has the right to call for improved surroundings at the schools. Let's keep them healthy.

The size of the schools has always been a problem from a management point of view, and it is a fact that the older secondary schools, up until now, are smaller in numbers than the newer secondary schools. I would like to find out from the Lady Minister if it is part of her policy to try within the particular zones over a period of time to equalize the numbers in the schools so that we would not have management problems being introduced.

Secondly, I would have thought that in the last Education Act, if you were going into a situation of zoning you would have used the opportunity to have a common teaching service. By that, I mean that the appointments would be by a common body which would allow the Ministry more flexibility in apportioning these teachers, according to expertise, to the 22 schools which we have.

Presently, it is my understanding that transfers between schools has to be with the permission, or the approval, of the individual teacher. I think that this is a very crucial area in which you have more control over the placement of teachers. You should have a common recruitment service, therefore giving the Ministry the right to distribute the trained expertise better in order to equalize the human resources at the school.

The third thing which I would like to find out from the lady Minister is if it is a fact that she intends to cut the school period at Erdiston from six to five terms, and if so, if this would interfere with Erdiston's programme? I would like to hear the lady Minister on those three things and there may be one of two things depending on the answers that would seek the indulgence of the Minister. Thank you.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, while I listened to the honourable Member for St. Michael South East, I could not believe my ears. First of all, he said that he listened very carefully to what the Member for St. James South has said and then went on to misunderstand, or misinterpret, all that he heard.

As I listened to him, I was reminded of the Biblical injunction which says, "I do not exercise myself in great matters which are too high for me". The Minister pretended to understand but clearly did not. This is not original, but the situation must have existed where in between the two ears he has, he had nothing to block what he heard through one ear. It went straight from one ear through the other — nothing in between there to retain, or analyse, anything which the honourable Member for St. James South had said.

My honourable friend on this side, Sir, says the Minister is much better on Housing than Education but then again, he was a headmaster and had the fortune to provide a clean school, hopefully. But for the Minister to misconceive what the honourable Member for St. James South has said, and to sort of put forward the view that it did not matter if children went to school in clean or sanitary conditions, and him to make that as a point, is utter rubbish. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You cannot defend the defenceless.)

Sir, I would like to raise one brief enquiry of the Minister. On Subhead 3 under Erdiston College in connection with the problems of teacher training, I see there is a substantial reduction in the vote provided for teacher training in relation specifically to Supplies and Materials the reduction is by \$13 000, in respect to Operating Expenses, the reduction is \$83 900, a total reduction of the vote for teacher training is \$102 616.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can inform this House of the areas which would be particularly affected by the reduction in vote which has taken place.

If the reduction in relation to operating expenses and supplies and materials would mean in essence that there is reduction in the availability of materials in respect of aids for training, it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a retrograde step. As in other areas where there has been a reduction in materials and supplies and operating expenses — a point referred to by the honourable Member for St. James South — it would seem that if there is a contemplated cut, in relation to the provision for aids to teaching in this reduction, that this is something which is not, in my view, in the best interest of teaching.

9.10 p.m.

Teacher training is one of those areas where, I think, one cannot over emphasise the need for proper direction and proper organisation. After all, it is in the area of teacher training where, I think, the prime emphasis should be, it is there that you start with the provision of what will, in the ultimate analysis, be the source of direction for those in the primary, secondary and even the tertiary schools. I would be grateful, Mr. Chairman, if we could have clarification on those few issues.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just get in a few points before the Hon. Minister replies. I am very glad that the speaker before me has raised the question of teacher education, because, too often, the importance of teacher education in the total education context is underestimatable.

But I think in raising the points, in relation to expenditure under the Estimates, that one or two things should be borne in mind. I believe, Sir, that the main body of untrained teachers in the system have already been trained, and therefore, the outstanding numbers are not as great as they were over the past ten years of so.

In addition to that, I think it is timely that we should state that the present Government introduced for

the first time teacher training for teachers of technical subjects. I believe it was through an arrangement between the Community College, the School of Education and Erdiston Teachers' Training College that a new teacher training programme was devised for teachers of technical subjects.

It is important too, Mr. Chairman, that it be put on record that this Administration instituted a course at the School of Education in Cave Hill — a Bachelor of Educational Administration and Management and it would be a good thing to speak of it in the context of the large school plants and the large numbers of teachers on some of the staff of what are called the newer secondary schools. We have also introduced a certificate programme in the School of Education at Cave Hill for senior teachers. I just wanted to make that point in relation to the question raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central.

I would like to deviate, Sir. No discussion has so far come on the question of university education, Sir, and I want to make a few points.

The cost of university education is becoming prohibitive. It is important that this society — not only this Government but the whole society — begins to take a look at priorities in education.

We have been taking close looks at what is happening in education at the primary and secondary level, and we have reached a point where we are even looking at things, as marginal as toilet paper and seats for children in primary schools.

But year after year, the university is gobbling up a bigger and bigger share of the Educational Vote in this country and I am not so sure, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting value for money. I am not at all sure about that, Sir. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We are not.)

We are turning out large numbers of graduates in Social Sciences and a lot of them cannot get jobs. I used to sit in the Ministry of Education and have people from Cave Hill with degrees in Social Sciences coming to me begging me to find a job for them — they have been out of university for a year or more and cannot find anything to do.

War has to be declared on the university, all of them, Sir — the administration, the teachers, all of them — because they figure that they have a fancy ivory tower stretching across the Caribbean and that they constitute a law unto themselves and that the agricultural workers in the fields in Brighton, St. George — up by you too, Sir, in Jordan and Applewaite's — must fork out an endless stream of dollars to continue to provide them with a comfortable living.

This is 1982, Sir, and all across the world people are looking at universities. In the United States they are shutting down colleges because they cannot afford to run them, in Britain they are shutting down colleges because they cannot afford to run them, and in universities all across Europe and North America, they are closing departments. They cannot afford to run them — the cost is becoming prohibitive.

Over the past few days I was looking at some figures for university teachers in the University of the West Indies. I have also been looking at the wage demands made by WIGUT, Sir — these are the university teachers at the University of the West Indies and I believe they exhibited a scandalous disregard for the state of the economies in these Caribbean islands.

I remember only too well, when I was in the Ministry of Education, that a group came to see me — the National Parent Teachers' Association — about seven or eight of them came to see me one evening with a list of problems and questions they wanted to raise and they had as their spokesman a university lecturer in Economics.

They started by telling me that you have a school feeding programme in primary schools and when the children get a little bigger and go into secondary schools, they should also be given free, hot school meals. I ticked it off as No. 1 and I answered No. 1 and we moved on. He said that every primary school headteacher in Barbados should have a separate office, so you must build on offices to all the primary schools in Barbados that do not have them.

Number three, Sir, was that play and recreation are vital to the building of character of children in primary schools. I accepted that, Sir. So he said buy a few acres of land and give every primary school proper playing and recreational facilities. And he said, as No. 4, Sir, that every primary school teacher should have a period off each day. I said right on, Sir. He made a fifth one — I do not remember what it is.

But when you explain to this university lecturer in Economics the cost of a new school feeding programme for 30 000 children in secondary schools — I would believe a considerable estimate capital, current and recurrent is something like \$50 million a year; when you explain that if you built — I think at the time they would have to build about seventy odd — offices for headteachers, and given the figure with the cost of building an office, I do not know how many million dollars that would come to; when you say to him to buy acreage for playing facilities for all the primary schools in Barbados, when you get to a school like St. Mary's or St. Ambrose in Bridgetown, you would have to buy up very expensive real estate at perhaps \$100 per square foot, you

know what the man said, Sir? He said, "That is your problem, not mine".

I am not talking about an ill-educated, ill-advised, uninformed parent who does not understand these things. Sir. I am talking about a man who gets up at Cave Hill saying he is teaching people Economics, and that is the kind of proposal that he would seriously make to a Minister of Government.

Now, I will tell you about the university, Sir. I believe that the Government of Barbados must take unilateral action to close down certain departments in the university at Cave Hill. We cannot spend time, Sir, training a lot of people in Sociology any more. Early in this debate I heard they want music teachers. I remember when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, they used to employ people to teach with two O Levels. All that ever resulted in was a lot of industrial chaos, at the time I went to the Ministry of Education, and driving one of the leaders of the BUT into oblivion and semi-madness. That is all it achieved, Sir.

At the moment, the number of people who apply for teaching in the Public Service of Barbados far exceed the number of available teaching spots. I am talking about people with five and six O levels and some with A levels and some with university degrees. That is the situation today, Sir.

In answer to the question raised earlier, I know it is a stated and practised policy of the Ministry of Education that in selecting teachers, you look for people who have special skills over and above the degree or the few O levels — somebody who can teach Music, somebody who can teach Physical Education, somebody who has got some experience in community activity, whether it is the 4-H, the Scouts or the Guides and so on. That is the type of policy being carried out by the right headed people in the Ministry of Education.

9.20 p.m.

I cannot leave out the university, Sir. The university is costing the taxpayers of this country \$20 million a year, I think. I do not know the exact figure, Sir, but it is costing a great amount money in this country, and when you make proposals to the University they do not listen to you.

I have repeatedly suggested to the University that they do an evening course in law, the LL.B., so that Civil Servants and other people who have to work during the day and who could benefit, like the honourable Member for St. Philip North who is one of the leading experts in the Land Acquisition Act in Barbados — and I am not making any sport, I am serious — whose work puts him on the margin of the law, and who would do well by having a certain competence in the law, would be able to make use of it. Put the LL.B. course in the afternoon

part time, and cut out the Sociology, the Economics, the Political Science, and all the other things they teach up there that serve no useful purpose, at this point, in the development of this nation.

You do not get any reply, Sir, you do not get the understanding, the co-operation or any sympathy to your point of view from the people in the University. We will have to bite the bullet, Sir, and it is about time that some of those people at Cave Hill be made redundant. They are really serving no useful purpose, I say so.

We have a situation where you have students going up to take the post 'O' Level course in Science and so on. They are going up to the University at Cave Hill where the economic cost of that course is over \$10 000 a year to do 'A' level work, when the Community College, according to the last figures I heard — which was just a little over a year ago — can give the same training for less than \$3 000 per person.

Now, I am asking whether this is not time for a serious rationalisation of our post secondary educational institutions in this country. I know that you can go to the Community College for two years and then you have to fight the people at Cave Hill to give proper recognition to what is done at the Community College. I know, Sir, that you can go to Erdiston Teachers Training College and spend two years doing a certificate in teacher training, and then the people up Cave Hill put their thumbs in their noses against the course offered at Erdiston College. They have come a little closer, Sir, but they have not got close enough yet.

I am not trying to usurp any of the areas of the Minister, but I can only give her the benefit of my experience of dealing with the university. The University Vote has got to be drastically cut, not only from the administration point of view, but even from the students' point of view. We cannot continue, against the weight of the economic burden that we carry in this country, to pay for education fully, right through, Sir. We cannot afford it. We would like to do it, but we cannot do it any more, and I would also like to urge on the Minister that the Ministry of Education, in allowing teachers to go on leave to study at the University of the West Indies, to be more vigorous in the areas of study that they allow.

The Government of Barbados seems to have a purse as big as the Garrison and bigger. Teachers go on leave to study at Cave Hill and they get full pay while they are on leave. I am not making out the case only against teachers, Sir, Civil Servants too. You pay the cost of the university education which could come in three years to \$30 000 more, and then a number of them, a lot of them — I encouraged it, Sir, I used to be in the Ministry and my heart was a little soft and I encouraged some of them — in areas that, in my opinion — with hind-sight although at

the time I realised it too, so I am blaming myself — now even moreso with hind-sight, which were not either in need or demand, or indeed useful for our educational system.

I will get off the university for the time being, Sir, unless this debate keeps going, and I want to make reference to.....How many more minutes do I have, Sir? All out?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All out.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Stumps drawn, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stumps drawn.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with the honourable Member who just spoke on the university, but I have a great deal to deal with before I get to that.

I really have a lot of difficulty when I see the Housing Minister getting involved in the Education debate. A bad Headmaster, bad Housing Minister, bad Education debater. The honourable Member made his speech and fell asleep. He has not been able to absorb the penetrative insight to incisive questioning of the capacity of the honourable Member, but he fell asleep. Anyhow,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Get ahead with the debate.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, because it does not make sense wasting time on the honourable member.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a few remarks to the Minister again. It is being said that the level of pregnancy in the secondary schools has risen. I have heard from fairly reliable reports that there is a higher level of pregnancy among the young persons in the secondary schools. I hasten to add that it does not seem as if this is a result of co-education, because we have not been co-educational a sufficiently long time to be able to attribute any increase in the level of pregnancy among the female students.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. Member suggesting he does not know what is the reason for it?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that. I have not had anybody pregnant for so long I might not even know how it is done.

The fact is that it is being said — and I am quite serious, Mr. Chairman — that the level has gone up, and I am told that the Headmasters and Headmistresses of the various schools are concerned — but they do not wish to make it public because they fear that it might create a problem. I do not know if this

is true, and I think that the Minister ought to be able to give us some indication as to whether this is a social problem which has arisen in the schools. If it is, a related question I wish to ask is to what extent sex education has been introduced into the curriculum of the schools, to what extent is it being monitored. 9.30 p.m.

What is the result of the preliminary information gathered by those who are monitoring this information? I believe, Sir, that if what is being said is not true, it is very desirable that the Ministry of Education should clear the air on this matter. If, in fact, it is true, then there is a question of what steps are being taken, if steps are considered desirable, to alleviate the problem or to make the problem less dangerous for the development of secondary education in the country. I have every reason to believe that indeed, secondary schools in Barbados need some input outside of the normal curriculum. To put it another way, not all of the training which is being done for teacher education, is necessarily dealing with the new social problems which have invaded Barbados during the last decade or so.

Mr. Chairman, in some of the schools in Barbados, and I am on much firmer ground here now, Sir, the question of the invasion of the very wicked phenomenon of dope, marijuana and other illegal drugs has reared its head. I believe it is necessary for the Minister periodically, especially at the time of the Estimates, to give an indication to the population, through the representatives in this Hon. Chamber, as to what is the status of this activity in the various schools of Barbados, to what extent programmes to educate young people in the schools in Barbados on the dangers of the use of drugs, legal and illegal, are introduced. I know that recently there has been a spate of activity in the area of alcohol and cigarette smoking, I make no value judgment on which of these is more dangerous, but I think that so far as the newer drugs are concerned it is vital that we as a community have the opportunity to approach this problem as a community problem.

Sometimes, when I hear some of the garbage that is spouted by the allegedly educated people, on the television in this country, when discussing some of the problems confronting this society, I feel, not so much ashamed as saddened, that there is not a more enlightened set of information coming to the young people in this country. I should like the Minister to indicate to what extent drugs is a problem in the secondary schools, to what extent there is a programme for drug prevention in the schools or to what extent there is an education programme designed to assist in the eradication of this very serious problem — not only from the schools but from the society. In this connection, I should also like to ask the Minister what

steps have been taken, if any, to introduce consumer education into the curriculum in Barbados at the level of secondary education. While I do not expect that there is going to be an "O" level or "A" level course in consumer education, I presume that the intention of education is to produce a worthy citizen, and I have every reason to believe that many of the people of my generation, and beyond, have not been exposed, and had not been exposed to certain aspects of consumer education which are very vital to a useful life later, when students and pupils have to go out into the real world.

I believe that a number of the practices in Barbados now stem from the fact that when people were exposed to the primary and secondary education they were not schooled in some of these practices. As a result, we hear and see evidence of a lack of understanding of the simple things in the marketplace which, I believe, add to some of the economic difficulties with which the country is faced.

I think that it is important, in the context of our education, that even if we are not doing it now, that some serious thought be given to planning a scheme of education that would include such items as consumer education, so that at the end of the day people are a more whole people than we are accustomed to.

I believe that this is also a time to pay some attention to the specialist areas in our respective constituencies. The overcrowding at St. Leonards School is exemplary in terms of the overcrowding at the new secondary schools and forms part of the thesis which I started this debate with — that these schools need to be upgraded.

I know that the term "upgrade" is becoming worn, but I believe that specific information from the Minister as to what precisely is being done to reduce the overcrowding in places like Ellerslie and St. Leonards, and other secondary schools which do not fall into the category of the older secondary schools, is very necessary if the people are to accept the information which is being published in the public relations effort by the Ministry of Education.

I would say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that when the Minister refers to the publishing of a booklet, and says that this is the first time that it has been done, that that is not to say anything. To say that a booklet has finally been published explaining what the schools are alleged to have is no substitute for providing these schools with what they ought to have.

Mr. Chairman, if one takes a look at this booklet, St. James Secondary School makes no reference to the fact that the playing area has been considerably reduced

by one of the worst decisions ever made by any Government anywhere.

I cannot understand how the people who sat down and planned CARIFESTA, and how the Minister or Ministers who directed CARIFESTA, could have agreed to place in the compound of a secondary school a tent which was incapable of removal except by dynamite. Mr. Chairman, how in the name of Christendom anybody could have agreed to place one of these ungainly tents in St. James Secondary School, and afterwards we discovered that it would take \$250 000 to remove that tent.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: If the honourable Member would give way. If the honourable Member checks with his colleague, the honourable Member for St. James South, he would know that all around the school in St. James there is a lot of open land and this Government is committed to buying land to expand the playing facilities of the school at St. James. I want a CARIFESTA debate. If you want it now I am ready for it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I really find it difficult to understand how the honourable Member can say that his Government is committed to providing playing fields for St. James Secondary School when, first of all, he does not respond to the fact that he put an ungainly, stupid, useless tent right next door to the school itself, and the tent can only be removed, according to the information published by the Government itself, at a cost of \$250 000.
9.40 p.m.

I saw it in the papers — they tell me it is not true — the tent can only be removed at some considerable cost. And he says that all around St. James Secondary School there is a lot of land!

What the Hon. Minister does not know is that around that same secondary school there is nothing but cow itch. Am I correct? All you can find around St. James Secondary School is cow itch and there is, in fact, no playing facilities at St. James Secondary School. I visited it recently. And he is talking about how they are committed to buying land around St. James Secondary School! I am sorry the honourable Member.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. The honourable Member for St. James South.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I will be as brief as possible. Under the Head for Special Schools, I notice that \$55 000 will be granted to the Challenor School for the Mentally Retarded. As I understand it, this amount is only enough to pay half of the salaries of the teachers there.

I want to know if the Government has any intention of subsidizing this school to the fullest, in the sense that the Minister must be aware that these children really take more to educate than the average child.

While on that, I believe that the Honourable Minister for Transport and Works did say, earlier on, that the Government intends to close six of the homes. From my practical experience, I would ask him to go very carefully, because these children have numerous problems which, I am quite sure, those who are going to take them will need more than enough training. I have had experience with them. You may find that it will even create greater problems for the children than you are trying to solve. That is another matter which we could deal with.

The other point for the Minister of Education is relative to the Learning Centre. Here, again, we have a severe problem in this country with children who have severe learning disabilities. I have had a little experience with them and I believe that this is an area in which Government could possibly pay more attention. As I understand it, where they are now accommodated is most inadequate and really not suitable for children who sometimes cannot walk, etc.

As far as the Vocational Training Centres go, as I understand it, these are the back-to-school children. Now, this is a problem of enormous proportions. The centres that I have visited, and there are seven, are most inadequate. The teachers for the most part are not trained for the job. The curriculum is not standard — anything seems to go, and the teachers themselves have got to use their own initiative.

The schools or centres have no security, no security guards like at some of the other schools. There is interference from the outside. Very often classes are stopped, in particular at the Hindsbury Centre. There are fights and abusive language. The teachers are threatened daily and by and large the children are not motivated at all.

I understand, even so, that in some cases, there are children as young as 12 years old attending some of these centres. These are things in which I am most interested because I believe that if we can alleviate these problems, then this society, as a whole, can be improved. I just draw this to the Minister's attention and ask her, if possible, if she can give me some of the answers to these problems.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to beg that the question be now put. Mr. Chairman, I am serious. You have three up there on the Government benches. We are ready to defeat them right now. They are going to be defeated, you know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister may proceed.

Hon. Miss. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, at this hour I am hoping to move with a certain amount of speed. It is so difficult. So many members have spoken.

The honourable Member for St. James South, who I believe is Shadow Minister of Education, came to the debate when it was well half-way through and raised matters to do vandalism at the school. This is not any secret. The level of vandalism which is practised at our schools by our children, is public knowledge. No special devils come up from Hell to break up school benches and school doors. Your children and my children, our children, do it. That is all I have to say on it. The taxpayers pay for it.

He did raise another important matter. But I do not know that, at this hour, I am prepared to go back again to the very basic concept behind zoning and other aspects of the Government's policy. When the honourable Member for St. James South speaks of equalization in all secondary schools — in all secondary schools all facilities must be equal — and begins to look into our booklet and point out what is here and what is not there, I really at this point am not going to go back to the introduction of this debate. I mean, it is just too bad.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North asked questions about the size of schools. The newer secondary schools. The newer secondary schools, he pointed out, are larger than the older secondary schools. I do not know why this is so difficult to understand. The newer secondary schools are built much later and to cope with more sophisticated and more modern facilities than the old grammar schools, and to cope with a population that was greater than the population existing at the time when the older grammar schools, in the Thirties and the Forties, were carrying the whole load of education in this country. So I do not understand why there is this difficulty with it.

What I will try to say about equalization in respect of numbers and facilities, as I have said already, is that this is all within the concept of zoning. We are better able now to apportion places in the schools than when we were operating under a kind of random choice of schools.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North also asked a question to do with a common teaching service. The new Education Act was passed prior to his entering this Hon. Chamber, but I would refer him to the new Education Act and he will see that that Act will permit the Ministry to have a greater freedom now. We will, broadly speaking, be the employer of all of the teachers, and there will be a common teaching service, in the way

that you are suggesting and thinking, when that Act is proclaimed, I hope, in a very short time from now.

I believe he also raised a question about the number of terms or courses at Erdiston. I made a note at the time which simply said that this was not so. I do not fully remember what the question was.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central also raised a query under Subhead 3 in respect of Erdiston. The answer really is that I should refer the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central to the published and circulated amendments at Page 2, referring you to Page 8 of the Draft Estimates, and he will see that errors have been made under Teacher Training — Subhead 3, Erdiston College, and that amendments have also been made.
9.50 p.m.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central also the honourable Member for St. George South made contributions in respect to the University of the West Indies. I would really like at length, to address, Mr. Chairman, the matter of the University of the West Indies, but I do not believe it would be properly received at this time.

But I really feel that I must say that we must remember that whatever the University of the West Indies is today, we have made it so. We have encouraged it to be an ivory tower. We have encouraged it to just grow and grow, and that is what is happening at the University of the West Indies — it gobbles everything you put before it.

I quite agree that the time has come for us to say that the territories own the university, and that we must say what we will require of it with a louder voice. I do support the call for a cutback in certain areas of the university, and certainly for the cutting of certain faculties. Whole faculties need to disappear from the university. Perhaps, some new ones should appear, too.

The fact, is, Mr. Chairman, that I do believe the restructuring process which is on the way at this moment, and which is designed to give greater autonomy to each territory — and we are hoping to complete this sooner rather than later — would give individual territories greater power to order their priorities in the way in which the honourable Member for St. George South is asking. (*Asides*). I really can't go any faster, Mr. Chairman.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West brought a great deal of hearsay to the debate, but I will attempt to answer his questions.

He said he heard something about the increase in pregnancies in the secondary schools. I do believe that

there is an unacceptable incidence of pregnancies in the secondary schools. I am not in any position to say whether it is increasing or not, but what I am in a position to say, is that the Family Life Education Programme, which exists now, cannot be described as a programme designed to alleviate that problem.

I am hoping that within a relatively short time that we will refurbish that entire programme and have a Family Life Education Programme which will really deal with the problems facing teenagers in the secondary schools.

We have a programme now, Mr. Chairman, which is so full of euphemisms it is difficult, even for me as an adult, to properly understand it. I do believe the Minister of Health at this time, or very soon from now, is expected to carry out a survey, and that, perhaps, may give us a clearer indication of the true incidence of pregnancies in the secondary schools.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West also adverted to the problems of drugs in the schools. He is asking for statistics and details. I am not sure that this is the correct forum in which to hand out that kind of information. There is a problem in a few of the schools but I would not like to give it more currency than we need to. I do not want to create a situation where I might be guilty of popularizing it. There is a problem and we are aware of it. Authorities, other than the Education authorities, are monitoring it, and an attempt is being made to contain, if not eliminate, the problem.

The honourable Member referred to the business of consumer education. At the present time, in the Home Economics Course, I suppose it is fair to say that we do offer some consumer education in the secondary schools. The fact is that the kind of consumer education programme which the honourable Member might be thinking of, is not as easily offered as he may want to believe. Mr. Chairman, there are so many subjects which we are being asked to offer. The Minister of Trade and Tourism wants us to add tourism education to our programmes in our schools now. The CRTC has approached us. Everybody wants to have a say in it.

The fact is that all of these things ought to be available in the schools and young people can have their options. It cannot be expected that all of these will be compulsory but they ought to be available.

But even if they are not compulsory and they are available, I cannot see how it can be done within the school structure as we know it today — where we are still going five days a week and the doors close at 3 o'clock, where we are still going to school three terms every year and we have ten or 12 weeks of summer doing nothing.

That old-fashioned frame that Victorian framework, cannot be expected to carry us through the 20th century — it cannot. That framework cannot carry the kind of modern education opportunities and facilities that you would want. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

If we want to offer our children all of these things, and if we want to make more things compulsory, than are compulsory now, the school system will have to expand. I could go on at length on that because it is something about which I feel very strongly. (*Asides*). No, I am not giving way. It is too late in the night.

I come to the next point raised by the Member for St. Michael West — overcrowding. I think I have sufficiently dealt with that. This is one of the things we hope zoning will rationalise. When we were looking at the statistics as we planned the zoning exercise, we saw, for an example, that we had more school places in the parish of St. Michael than we had children. So you have a lot of children in St. Michael going out of St. Michael and people outside of St. Michael coming into St. Michael, without rhyme or reason. I think that zoning, to some extent, will help us to rationalise this problem of overcrowding.

If you look at your booklets you will see that in zone 2 at the St. Leonard's school — I say this for your special benefit — we have permitted children to come from as far as St. Andrew, because of the way certain bus routes run. We have figures in the Ministry of Education in chalk form which will show you, at a glance, how many children there are from each parish in each school, in each form. You will be amazed at the amount of children from St. Andrew who go to St. Leonard's Schools. Well we are hoping that as the whole zoning exercise matures, and as we learn from it, that we can rationalise the problem of overcrowding at some of the schools, particularly the St. Leonard's Schools.

The honourable Member for St. George South very properly answered the question on St. James Secondary School. We are in the process of acquiring additional lands at Trents to provide extra playing field space. They will have their tent and be able to use it to their advantage, and they will have their own field.

10.00 p.m.

It is not entirely fair to make that point about the St. James School and not to make another. If you went down to the St. James Secondary School, you might have observed that they have science laboratories there such as you will find nowhere else in Barbados, including Harrison College.

I just wondered if the honourable Member for St. Michael West observed that. You know, we observe all the negatives, and it is statements like that which go out to influence parents, and influence people like the honourable Member for St. James South. He said that if his child worked to Harrison College that it could not go to St. James. It is that kind of negative attitude which does not help. It does not help.....(Mr. B. M. TAITT: Are you saying that the facilities are equal?) and all you are doing.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am coming to the end, I trust.

Sir, a question was asked by the honourable Member for St. James South about special schools. He wants to know, in effect, when, or if, the subsidy for the Challenor School will be increased.

This is an issue fraught with problems. It is not everybody who opens up a special school in Barbados, or a school for special interest, who can expect that, in due course, if it can be shown to have some proper standing in our community, he can expect the Government to underwrite it. This is how it starts, you see.

They ask you for a little subvention, they ask you for a building, you begin to pay for their staff and then you find you are carrying the whole building. Later at some point, you are expected to take it over.

This *ad hocism* has got to stop at some point. I do not propose to increase the subventions in the very near future. It is part of our financial restraint and people will just have to manage these private schools as we are expected, in the public sector, to manage ours.

The Learning Centre has recently approached with the same sort of question, can we help them with a building? They have trouble paying teachers. What will happen is that five years from now, the Government will be expected to take over the Learning Centre.

And the fact is and the honourable Member for St. Michael South knows — that in the Government schools, we have facilities for all of these special interests. We have the Charles F. Broome, you have Erdiston, you have the School for the Deaf. You know, it has been suggested to us that the services that the Learning Centre offers can very promptly be offered in the Government primary schools by teachers who have had training in special education.

So, when you look at all of these considerations, it would be very difficult for the Government, at this time, to think in terms of encouraging expansion in these pri-

vate sector schools. I do not want to put them down. A place like the Learning Centre has a contribution to make. They are people who are very caring and dedicated to it. But if that is the case, let those who can pay for it afford it. I say that secure in the knowledge that we can offer as good a service in the Government schools.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the amendments circulated in respect of Head 34 have only been partially circulated. I believe we have two more amendments. I hope honourable Members will listen, because you are going to hear afterwards that they did not hear it.

At page 57, on the side of the page dealing with the Explanatory Notes — Subhead 2, we are asking to delete the word, "CINTERFOR" You should have three organisations listed rather than four, and you will have to renumber at that point.

The fact is that this particular subvention and organisation has been transferred to the Ministry of Labour. CINTERFOR will start, later on, in the Explanatory Notes at Labour but can we please delete it at page 57, Subhead 2, under Explanatory Notes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: There is another amendment at page 70, again in the Notes opposite if we would delete.....We are into capital now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I had better not move it at that time. We are into Capital I cannot move it now, in which case, I beg to move that Head 34 as amended do now stand part.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT rises.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain the honourable Member at this time. The Hon. Minister has wound up, and in view of the fact that the honourable Member.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I draw to your.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking. Please, please!..... In view of the fact that the Hon. Minister has wound up, and there is opportunity again for the honourable Member with his skill and tact to raise any matter, I am sure he will be able to bring it to the Floor of the House before the evening is closed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not at this stage. I must call the Head. That is how I rule and that is what I will do. Please take your seat.

The question that Head 34 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, Sir. I was not able to interrupt the Chair while the Chair was making a ruling, Sir. On a matter of privilege concerning the procedure, with regard to the right of an honourable Member in this Chamber, where we have in the Estimates.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The only.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The rules say on a point of privilege I have to be heard, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The matter which the honourable Member seeks to raise bears on a ruling of this Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir, I am merely....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot entertain the honourable Member.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, I believe, Sir, that I have to be guided for the remainder of the debate as to what one might expect. I rise on a matter of privilege and I crave the indulgence of the Chair. As I understand it, on a matter of privilege concerning debate in motion, the Chair is required to hear the honourable Member. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You have to bring a motion.) Do not let him confuse you with that, Mr. Chairman.

The question I am raising with Your Honour, Sir, has to do with the Heads which are coming up. You have already ruled on the Head which has been completed. It has to do with the manner of debate. Where we have Heads with a number of subheads, I wish to know if there is now a new ruling concerning the 15 minute intervention, and if, in fact, there is such a thing as the Minister winding up. I understood that where one is raising a new matter that one is to be heard under the Rules of the House and I wish to be guided by the Chair in this matter. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Take your seat.) I for example,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can explain at this point. Where it is obvious and where there is every indication that the Minister is about to and has wound up, that is it.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no point of order at this time. (ASIDE: No.) There can be no point of order? But there can be a point of order at any time.

What is going on in here now? (ASIDE: You cannot have a point of order. Call the Head.) What is going on here? The honourable Member raised an important.....
10.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would hate to introduce Standing Order 36 — Closure of Debate. You have been ruled out of order, therefore let us continue the debate.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE — HEAD 76

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the following amendment to Head 76 at page 70 in the Explanatory Notes. At Subhead 17, in the first line, delete the words "constructing a new School Meals Centre."

I beg to move that the sum of \$18 560 420 under Capital Expenditure — Head 76 — Ministry of Education — as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, in recent times information has reached this side that a substantial number of the persons employed in the School Meals Department have been asked, or directed, to leave their respective employment, and they have been promised, as I understand it, that employment will resume as soon as the new financial year begins.

I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us, so we may tell our respective constituents, whether those persons who were laid off from the School Meals Department during the months of December and January, or before or after, will be taken back into the Service now that the Estimates would have been completed. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not in charge of that).

I am asking the Minister about the policy concerning the feeding programme. Are you saying you are not in charge of that? Is that what you are not in charge of? You do not even seem to be.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Cross talk is not allowed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Mr. Chairman. It is clear that at this hour the debate has taken on a different tone, and we are perfectly willing to accommodate the Government on this. We wish to know whether, in fact, the School Meals workers who have been laid off will be taken on, if it is contemplated that they will be taken back.

We feel that there must have been sufficient requirement for those workers when they were hired, and I wish to know if the feeding programme has had some measure

of automaticity, or whether the number of hands have been found to be too many, and if, as a result of the cutting back, you are still able to maintain the feeding programme at the respective schools listed here, at the level which was maintained when those persons were employed.

I should also wish to know, Mr. Chairman, if it is intended to tap the World Bank sub-project for the Government Industrial School. You will recall there was a report on the Government Industrial School. I should like, in the interim, to discover whether the Government Industrial School is now functioning normally, whether the former Minister's decision to let some of those people out has operated to the benefit of the operation of the school; to what extent the new change, or the new approach, to the Government Industrial School, if there is a new approach, has assisted in the alleviation of crime at the level of the juniors.

I have read, and heard, of reports where it is suggested that there has been an increase in the level of juvenile crime. I wish to know to what extent the facilities at the Government Industrial School have been designed to assist in the education of children in the community so as to preclude, and to prevent, this increase in crime which, apparently, is now being attributed to the younger members of the community.

I should like to know if it is the intention of the Minister to seek further funds from the World Bank for all of the other primary schools. What is the level of replacement we might anticipate for such schools as those at Deacons, for such primary schools as those at St. Stephen's?

I should also like to know from the Minister if, in light of the fact that the primary school which was planned for the St. Michael area by way of the Roebuck School, has now been replaced and turned into a secondary school, what provisions the Minister will be making to relieve the pressure which now arises out of the decision by the Government to establish such housing areas as Fernihurst, bearing in mind that that entire basin is a catchment for a significant number of the population, and bearing in mind that the age levels in the community are drifting nearer and nearer towards the junior ages?

I should like to know what provision the Minister is making for primary education to capture that entire area surrounding Eagle Hall, surrounding Dodson Corner — that is to say, St. Michael North West, St. Michael West Central, St. Michael West — to replace the Eagle Hall Primary School which, as the Minister must know, has long been in existence and which, indeed, has reached the stage where it can be described as not being modern?

I wish to know, bearing in mind these projects I see here financed by the World Bank sub-project, if it is the intention of the Minister to use some of this financing, during this year, to replace the Eagle Hall Infants School, if it is in fact deemed to be replaceable.

I would like to know to what extent the establishment of a village which some people describe as a modern slum — I myself do not necessarily share that view yet — in Fernihurst, has interfered with the environment surrounding the school area of Eagle Hall Primary?

Is it the intention of the Minister, as has been advocated some time ago, bearing in mind the Deacons Farm situation, to make that extension of the St. Leonard's School, which, as I understand it, is a temporary arrangement subject to the acquisition of funds under the World Bank project?

Is it intended to upgrade that school to a primary school, or is it intended to continue to have the persons living in that area of Deacons Farm, and the St. Michael North West and St. Michael West area, to continue to operate in a school that was designed, more than 50 years ago, for a small coterie of children, in what was only a very sparsely populated area.
10.20 p.m.

We wish to know what provisions are being made by the Ministry of Education. In the context of the planning of education, we wish to know what are the forward plans for educating the very large and intense area of population in that area surrounding Eagle Hall, Tudor Bridge, Fairfield, Black Rock, Alkins, Westbury Road.

We wish to know what are the new plans, if any. We have heard the Minister talking about re-planning and reviewing. We wish to know the Minister's attitude towards primary education in this area.

We take note of the Grace Hill School and we recognise that already the Grace Hill School, just completed and only handed over a few weeks ago, is proving not capable of absorbing the large number of young people who will have need for primary education during the next two decades.

I think that honourable Members, who represent constituencies in that area, will be the first to agree with me that the Grace Hill School, as good as it is and as welcome as it is, is not the answer for those persons, for example, who live in the area surrounding the Bush Hall complex. I wait to hear answers from the Minister before proceeding further.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the Minister attempts to reply, I would like to remind honourable Members that any honourable Member may wish to know any number

of things, but a Minister cannot be compelled to answer questions. I believe that all Ministers, present and past, know that they owe it to the country to give the House such information as the Minister thinks it reasonable to offer.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I will be exceedingly short. I can only say that other Ministries are responsible for the appointment or the non-appointment of School Meals workers and I am not.

In respect of the Government Industrial School, all indicators show that there has been a marked improvement in plant, responsibilities, behaviour and everything at that school, and I would be happy to conduct the honourable Member for St. Michael West on a tour of the Government Industrial School on any date that is convenient to him.

In respect of the Roebuck Primary School, this point has been made so often in here by the former Minister of Education, that I find it difficult to believe that the honourable Member for St. Michael West has been so inattentive that he does not know that the physical building of the Roebuck Primary School has got to go back to the Moravian Church, and that, in fact, we have distributed the enrolment at the Roebuck School between the new Grace Hill School, which is a very beautiful school at Spooners Hill, Hindsbury, and one or two other schools.

It has been a very carefully executed exercise. We have looked with great care at the districts from which the children have come and we have tried to place them as close to home as possible, maintaining the tradition that most primary school children should be able to walk to their school.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 76 as amended stand part.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, before the Head is put, I just wish to record that the Minister's answers are totally unsatisfactory.

If the Minister is incapable of dealing with her Ministry, she should resign, but she can't come here during the Estimates and, when we ask serious questions, get up and say that the former Minister has answered these time and time again.

She is the Minister and we wish to know what are her plans. We are not discussing what the former Minister did. He tried his best, and we wish to know what are your plans.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the honourable Member to know, and I am sure he knows, that it is in

the place of the Chairman to decide whether the Minister is out of order or not.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No. She is not out of order. I never said she is out of order. She is always in order for me. I am saying that she is an incompetent Minister. I am saying that her failure to answer my questions satisfactorily is outside of the conventions of this Hon. House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the Chairman is saying that all that the honourable Member is telling us now is totally irrelevant to this debate on education.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Do you mean whether she is a competent or incompetent Minister? I am guided by the Chair. If the Chair feels an incompetent Minister should be there, I am guided by the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is out of order.

The question that the sum of \$36,258,737 under Capital Head 76 – Ministry of Education – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 35 – FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Head 35 – Foreign Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$8,113,056 under Head 35 – Foreign Affairs – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL

HEAD 77 – FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Capital – Head 77 – Foreign Affairs – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$586,200 under Capital Head 77 – Foreign Affairs – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, the Leader of the House said we have to go until 11 o'clock, so I might as well put in some time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether all the building space that the former Minister of

External Affairs stupidly paid twice for, is now occupied in New York. I should like the Minister to confirm whether all the space at the building, which we paid an extra year for without occupying, is now fully occupied. I will wait for an answer to that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, that question is like asking a man if he is still beating his wife. I do not know of any stupid space that was acquired by any former Minister, so I am incapable of answering the question.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If he says it was not stupid space, let me ask him about the non-stupid space. Will the Minister confirm that all the space which we have acquired in New York for which this House passed money some time ago and for which rents were paid, including an over-lap of one year of which he must be aware -- he being a competent Minister -- is now occupied by the various Barbados offices in New York?

Hon. L. R. TULL: All the space at 800 Second Avenue, I presume that is what you mean, in New York, the whole of the 17th and 18th floors are occupied by the Government of Barbados -- by the United Nations Mission, the Barbados Consulate, the Tourist Board and the Industrial Development Offices.

The question that the sum of \$586,200 under Capital Head 77 -- Foreign Affairs -- as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 27 -- METEOROLOGY

Head 27 -- Meteorology -- was called.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to move that the sum of \$945,238 under Head 27 -- Meteorology -- stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

10.30 p.m.

HEAD 26 -- MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS -- COOPERATIVES

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: I beg to move that Head 26 stand part.

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

The question that Head 26 -- Cooperatives -- in the sum of \$34 543 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 36 -- MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 36, as amended, stand part.

I do not propose to say much under this Head since the whole area of health has been well canvassed recently here in this House. However, if honourable Members need to know anything further, I would be grateful to give explanations.

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

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that we on this side have always had a deep interest in the health of this country and we are committed to the principle of good health care for every citizen in Barbados wherever they can get it and whenever they can. As a result of that, we must be very concerned about the developments in Health as it appears to us in the Estimates as laid out.

When the Democratic Labour Party was in the Government, obviously they found existing services and they did their best to improve them. And it was expected that when the new Government took over, that they would have done, and continued to do, as much justice to improving those health services that were improved up to that time.

But over the years, we have found that the Estimates themselves do reveal that if we have any shortages in staff, in equipment, or in supplies, then the quality of that service must suffer and, as a result, the people, themselves, will surely feel the effects of those disadvantages. Therefore, it is very interesting to note that it will not only effect the quality as such, but it will also bring into play a deterioration that could probably last for a very long time.

In my view, Sir, the health services have suffered as a result of a policy which the present Government seems bent on implementing, and with a hope that this should bring about a new change in the health service itself. It certainly hangs, in my view, as a kind of shadow over the new services and, to some extent, it will, if not bring to a standstill, further cause the services to lack in that kind of interest that will produce what I originally said -- a good health care for every citizen.

I have always expressed the view.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you will excuse me. I did not want to interrupt you, but under what Item are you speaking?

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: I am coming to the Head now. I was just giving a general introduction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And you are taking us to.....

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: It is the background to what we intend to show — that the services themselves have not been living up to the standard as to what we expect them to be. Although the general cost of the service shows an increase, there are some areas in which there is a definite decrease and these decreases, in my view, will tend to militate against the interest of the service itself.

If we take a look at Subhead 5 — Community Services, which deals with, as the Explanatory Note says, ...“the basis of outpatient treatment at the polyclinics and health centres.....”, this Head shows an overall decrease in the cost of services, and it will obviously tend to show that this can be a decrease in the efficiency of that service.

If you look at the Statutory Personal Emoluments, there is a decrease of over \$200,000 and in the area of Plant, Equipment and Furniture, there is also another decrease. Now, I pointed out that if you have shortages in your staff, and if you have any decrease in maintenance in the other areas, certainly the total service will show that deficiency. This brings us obviously to the polyclinics which is part of the overall plan to improve the health service.

These polyclinics, as they are functioning — and I must say that they are not all functioning at the moment because of some sudden directive that most of these clinics will be closed to certain services. Now, the whole purpose of a polyclinic, or a multipurpose clinic, certainly was intended to improve some of the deficiencies as would be expected in any new service you implemented.
10.40 p.m.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was supposed to be relieved of much of its burden because the polyclinics would absorb, or rather, remove, some of the extra burden that would be involved in that hospital.

All of us know what the Casualty was like before and all of us realize that these clinics would have been a great and valuable help towards relieving some of the pressures and at the same time towards encouraging a much more efficient service. These polyclinics will be closed, I understand, from the first of next month. They are also closing the GP clinic, and this GP clinic was, obviously, the one which would take care of the walk-in clinics in the other districts.

To suddenly make that disclosure and cause the clinics not to function in that respect, is now going to produce exactly the same results in the hospital as we were attempting to remove — it will do that. But most of all, the greatest difficulty would be those patients who

have been attending the clinics last week. What would be their position? They would have been under a particular medical officer and, most likely, all the records would be there for that patient. How would that patient benefit by the sudden closure of the clinic?

Sir, it is clearly obvious to me that the Minister will have to give us some explanation why the very same people whom he intended to help have been placed at such a great disadvantage. It also points out that our concept, as we call them multi-purpose clinics, is far different from your concept of a polyclinic. If the idea of a polyclinic is to push, or give, this kind of service to the sick and those who are not well, you are now putting the pressures in another area where it should not be.

This also brings another question. If you have a reduction in staff, how are you going to expect to have a better service? Most of these clinics, in my view, have never been properly satisfied for the last year. People were complaining about not being able to get the kind of service they want, particularly that if they were going to the clinics, they were not sure that they would meet the doctor there. That, in itself, creates a very unworkable situation, and these general minuses that we have in various areas tend to suggest that.

Another area is the Drug Service itself. I am not prepared to go into this at length because we have discussed this as well. But clearly, again, in this service, the vote for this year is very much the vote of last year. I could not believe that you would not expect a service, such as health service in which you are putting so much emphasis, to grow. Furthermore, we realize the vote of \$4 million is very much the same vote which we voted last year and we already sometime this year, have had an increase of over \$1.5 million. So clearly it must be accepted that you may not be ready, or you are not clear in your mind if you want to carry out this Drug Service.

Mr. Chairman, looking at Subhead 9, this is one which from year to year, receives a lot of attention. We have always been talking about the Casualty and I want to point out that this department has shown no significant change over the year. But we were all anticipating that the new approach to health care in this country would have been relieved by that. We still have people complaining very much in that area.

But Sir, there is another area which I want to look at, and I think the Minister would do good to look at this area too. In my opening remarks, I said if there was a shortage of staff, then that particular department would suffer. The nurses at the hospital, to some extent, could be overworked because of the present policy of not increasing the staff, and not making a provision for casual leave. This has caused a lot of temporary staff and

unestablished staff to remain and many of those nurses might have been there for some time but they are very uncertain as to the extent as to whether they would be appointed to that staff.

If as I heard during this debate that we need to re-motivate people, then one of the ways in which you must motivate people is to give them some sense of security and most of these nurses seem to believe that appointments may not be coming too readily for them. Furthermore, the hospital, itself, seems to be expanding in some areas. If you take the Orthopedic Ward, the ward where you get many fractures and so on, that ward has outgrown its size, and I am made to understand that you have both males and females in this ward. Again we see the need to pay special attention to that development.

But, Sir, what can always create a pressure in this service is if you are expanding and you are growing faster than you can accommodate the people. Most of the wards are made to accommodate about 24 patients.
10.50 p.m.

If your ward increases beyond that 24 patients, approximately, then you can see the reason why there could be such absenteeism, and probably much sick leave, in these areas, because when you are overworked, you are naturally not going to produce as much as you should, and it forces you into a position of seeking some kind of relief.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area in which I feel that health services are so important — it has always been, the area in which quite a lot of money has been spent and even though we may not be satisfied in our minds that when people react towards overloading — we may tend to bring pressures on them — this can very well be one of the reasons why we have the problem of people resisting the idea of a reduction in sick leave. It may very well be that the overworking of this group, of the nurses.....(Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: and the expansion of the particular wards may cause this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if we are serious about relieving these problems, then we should pay more attention to them by making the correct adjustments. If you have a School of Nursing where you are producing enough people and as I understand it as now, it is not as before when nurses went to the School of Nursing where they generally go right into the hospital and probably work. The new system seems to be that these nurses are trained but they have no guarantee that they would be absorbed in the nursing profession.

Now, I raise this to say this: you ought not to have a situation where you are short staffed and producing people for that area. I feel, Sir, that most of those nurses who

could be permanently employed on the staff should be given an opportunity to do so. Again, I believe that the Hon Minister might be interested in giving some explanation as to why for Other Personal Emoluments that we have a reduction

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: we have a reduction of half million dollars. Is it that we care no more about this particular service. As I have pointed out, there must be some good reason why you are reducing the service at a time when more people are using it and at a time when you need more assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue, I will speak again on that.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative 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 11 a.m. tomorrow, March 26, 1982.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 11.00 p.m.

11.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. 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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, speaking under this Head, I think this Hon. House should be given some clear statement as to the position in the primary health care services.

We have been hearing certain reports to the effect that there is a complete break-down in one, at least, of the major services which the so-called polyclinics are supposed to provide, and we are wondering if we may have a change of name again from polyclinics back to some term which is less pretentious, because if the services are not being provided there is no point giving it these pretentious comprehensive names.

We would like a clear statement as to exactly what is the position, because one of the theoretical bases for the multi-purpose clinics, later transmuted into polyclinics, was that there would be a General Practitioner Service available to those persons who would wish to make use of those services, that such services would not only be of benefit to those who could not afford the fees for the private practitioners, but that it would also provide a service that is convenient to persons within their neighbourhood, and particularly that it would relieve some of the clinics at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital — particularly the Casualty and related areas, the general clinics, of some of the pressures.

This was the theoretical base behind the establishment of these clinics. Now we are hearing that that particular service is being withdrawn but we are not hearing a clear reason. That is in the polyclinics. We want to know if there is an additional problem also with the General Practice Programme which is supposed to come under the National Health Service.

So what we are asking is, if we cannot afford the current programme under the primary health care polyclinic provision, if there is a breakdown in what you have now — and on top of that you have a vast superstructure involving the National Health Service — how is it going to work? Is this a major breakdown now in the Government's policy and planning provisions? What are the problems?

You know, we do not take pleasure in this. But I recall, I believe it was in 1975, when we were trying to get the multi-purpose clinics established, the Prime Minister, himself, from the Opposition — he was then Leader of the Opposition — was gloating over the fact that there were problems in recruiting general practitioners to participate on a sessional basis to get the multi-purpose clinics going.

He said that our multi-purpose clinics would fail because of the doctors, and we got the feeling that there was not a little glee on his part at the prospect that they might not get off the ground because of this problem.

But you know, the chickens come home to roost, and it was not in our time that this particular problem has occurred, but you have to deal with it now.

I really sympathise with you, Mr. Minister, because I know that your heart is in the right place. But you have taken over a Ministry from your predecessor so riddled with conflicts and problems and different jealousies, some real and some contrived because of this lack of morale, that you would have to use your best endeavours, your well-known capacity, to smooth over these differences in order to try to give Barbados, once again, a health service that would be desirable in these circumstances.

With all these layoffs — and we hear the level of employment is still rising and employment is going down with everybody in all the services, Government, public, private getting laid off — I hope this does not affect the mental health of Barbadians to too great an extent. Do not do too many closures there — there may be problems. Anyhow, we would like some clarificatory statement from you on these matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN directed that certain remarks made by the Member for St. Michael South Central be struck from the record.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, when an honourable Member makes a speech in this House, and when a rumour is spread in a health institution, one should be given an opportunity to deal with it, because it has an important bearing on the impact of contributions made by Members in respect of health services, and if you would give me an opportunity to do so, I am asking your indulgence because it affects each and every one of us.
11.15 a.m.

Now, Sir, I at no time made any statement on the Floor of this House relating to sick leave of any member of staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It was not reported in the Press. I avoided participating in that aspect of the debate, Sir, because I was responsible in a professional capacity, for many years, either directly or indirectly, in the provision of medical care for various categories of staff at the hospital. And I am shocked and upset that a rumour could be started with respect.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, on a point of order, Sir. I would be very grateful if the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would draw to this Committee's attention what he is speaking under, the subhead — all these things I would like to know, Sir.

I know we are dealing with Head 36, I think it is, Sir, but there are a number of subheads and I would like to follow the honourable Member so I can follow the gist of his contribution and to make sure that he does not attempt to make a Second Reading speech in here. I just want to know the subhead you are dealing with and, for the courtesy of this Committee, the item.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please! An honourable Member must be given some chance to develop his argument. Please!

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I have made the point and I just want to make a verification that I made no statement, whatsoever, at any time in this House, with respect to any matter relating to sick leave of anyone at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Now, Sir, under the specific subhead that I wish to speak on at the moment, is the one relating to the Drug Service, Subhead 8 and I want to bring, Sir, particular attention here to certain matters that worry me somewhat.

One of the objects, as I understand it, in certain policy decisions, in respect of certain types of drugs, was to secure a reduction in the cost of those drugs. As I see it, Sir, the Estimates for 1980/81 indicate that there was an actual expenditure of \$4.2 million. Now, this year, Sir, we see a total expenditure in the region of \$8 million, an increase of some \$4.6 million.

Now there are certain areas under that subhead which would seem to me should merit some explanation by the Minister — \$273,416 in respect of certain emoluments. We want to know how that is covered, these non-statutory emoluments, and also I note that there is a vote for some \$4 million for supplies and materials.

The point I am making here is that it would appear that between the conception of this scheme and the point that we would have reached at the end of 1983, in the absence of further supplementaries, that we would probably have spent some \$20 million. I think there was an \$8 million capital grant from the Consolidated Fund. There was approximately \$4 million in 1981/82, that is \$12 million, and now approximately \$8 million.

Now, comparing that with the cost which the honourable Minister recently quoted on drugs, I think it was in 1977 — the year is subject to correction — I think the average cost to Government at that time was about \$3.5 million or somewhere in that region.

But what it seems to me here, Sir, is that we seem to be getting into the area of very significant increases, over 100 percent increase, in the cost of getting drugs to the population if you were to extrapolate a three-year period based on the base year given by the Minister in 1976–1977. I do not recall which year it was — the total amount would be somewhere in the region of \$10 million in that base year. Now it looks as though it will be about \$20 million or so.

This brings me to the question as to whether more people are actually getting more drugs through the Government's distribution system. I know, Sir, it would be very difficult to give accurate statistical information in this area, because one of the problems which Government would face is the fact that many persons who would have received their drugs under the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Vote would now be receiving their drugs under another area, so I realise that there would be a difficulty in an accurate response from the Minister.

But I would just like to draw this trend to his attention, because I think that we are all aware, now, that it is most important when we make policy decisions to look very carefully at the current cost effectiveness of those decisions and the implications for the future.

Now, Sir, that principle of current cost effectiveness and future cost effectiveness, applies with equal validity, and with probably greater force, to the problems facing the polyclinic sector of primary care delivery in Barbados. The capital costs, Sir are high, the recurrent costs are high, and the problem we have to look at is whether, or not, we will ever have available to us the manpower in health care delivery which would be able to make full use of the capital employed in that exercise.

There is little point saying that we cannot get the doctors. There is little point saying that we cannot get doctors of the calibre which we would like to recruit. Those decisions should have been taken in advance of the expenditure.

Therefore, I believe that if we can get an explanation, or an assessment, by the Minister — I know it is very difficult for him at the moment because he has only recently taken over that Ministry — quite clearly the full dimensions of the problem might not be fully apparent to him at the moment — but at least as he perceives them.

We might then be able to make some input and make some suggestions as to how the immediate problems could be alleviated and in what way we can see this aspect of our health service developed in the future, because once the expenditure is already there, once the buildings have been set up, we have a duty to make sure

that that cost redounds to the benefit of the total community.

11.25 a.m.

It cannot be done so by mere words. There is often a big difference between the conceptualisation of a project and its implementation. You may feel within yourself that it will be beneficial, but when you get down to the actual implementation and making that project work, you encounter all sorts of difficulties, difficulties at every level, even at the psychological level in terms of health care delivery. It is such an intimate area of service, and it is shrouded in so many complexities, that it is often very difficult to dissect your way through the problems which you may be facing, and to come up with the answers.

We would like to know what the problems are in that area and we will see whether we on this side have any suggestions to make, because we would like to participate and make a significant contribution in the scrutiny of items of expenditures under this Head in a year where there is an overall cut back, taking into account increase cost in almost every area of health care delivery.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am very shocked and surprised to know that this debate could fall to such a low ebb from the members of the Opposition at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I definitely believe that if the members of the Opposition had come here this morning and commended the last Minister of Health for a good job well done, I think they would have sounded much better. I am very surprised that the three speeches which I heard were of no substance, and have fallen down to the level of what I would call down-right trash.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know that from the 1950s that the Barbados Labour Party started health centres on this island. We all know that Enmore was started by the Barbados Labour Party, Six Roads, Oistins, Speightstown — Barbados Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party came in 1961, found all these things there, have done very little to improve them and they are here this morning complaining. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the honourable Members from that side commended the Minister of Education — I agree with that — and they could have done the very same thing for the Minister of Health for a job well done.

Listen to the work from 1976, because it was blocked from 1961 to 1976 as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned, but now listen — in five year's

time we have gone and build new polyclinics in Speights-town, Black Rock, Wildey and at Warrens.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, a Member from this side was interrupted in his speech on the grounds that he was making what was called a Second Reading speech. Now what the Member for St. Lucy is saying, can definitely be categorized as a Second Reading speech. He is not dealing with the details of the Estimates. If he wants to refer to specific points under the Heads or subheads he should do so, but '76 has nothing to do with the specific thing. I am submitting that he is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member realize the problem which he mentioned is a problem which the Chair deals with and can deal with, and just like all other honourable Members are given some time to get going in this subject, I believe the same courtesy could be extended to the other side of the House.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I would continue to speak. I was saying that at Warrens where they built a crematorium, the Barbados Labour Party had to change it and bring it back to a polyclinic for the good of the country. Mr. Chairman, we can also compare the Oistins section of it.

When we think of the work as far as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is concerned, we know all down the years we heard about people dying in the Casualty at the hospital and, Mr. Chairman, nowadays you do not hear that at all. Everybody seems to be very happy and they agree that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has improved by leaps and bounds.

I heard from the honourable Member for St. Michael North West. He spoke about the changes which will take place in about two or three weeks from now as far as the Health Clinics are concerned. I do not agree that the Hon. Minister should think of what will take place in two or three months. He should take stock and think about now. He cannot predict what is going to happen this time next year, he is not competent to do that. The only person who will know what will happen this time next year is God.

Mr. Chairman, I am very, very surprised to see the stand but I would say that this party is doing a fantastic job as far as health is concerned in this country. I remember a few weeks ago we had a debate in this House on the National Health Service and I was surprised to hear those same Members opposed everything you tried to say and the same thing and the same people come back here now complaining about what we should have done or should not have done, trying their utmost best to stop the progress of this party.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think most of the people can understand, and one of the famous writers said that the job of the Opposition is to oppose. I don't agree with that I think that when you are opposing for the sake of opposing — that is a waste of time. I agree that when any honourable Member says anything for the good of the country, we should stick together and stop wasting time and see this country go forward.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Health, and I believe that this was an error on the part of technical staff of the Health Service, as far as St. Lucy is concerned.

Now a few months ago, I would say, they dug a septic tank in the heart of a district at Hope Road which is causing quite a lot of problems down there. As you know, Mr. Chairman, if you were taking a dinner some Sunday afternoon with friends and a septic tank truck came and opened up and threw all that stuff down into the tank, you would feel very, very embarrassed with your friends. I think you would be very worried about that.

On the line of the Estimates, I am appealing that the Hon. Minister, I know he is a Minister with a difference, one that has succeeded in every department you put him in, and one of the best we have had in Barbados, I am sure he would look into this problem so that the people of Hope Road will not suffer this inconvenience. 11.35 a.m.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Lucy is a man of God and it is obvious that he is not listening to the news or following the hospital any further. People die in Casualty every day, Mr. Chairman, every week, every month — it is a casualty.

Only this morning, Mr. Chairman, on my way to town, I picked up a constituent from Bushy Park who was on his way to the Belmont Funeral Home taking the clothes for his wife who died in the Casualty on Monday morning at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I know, that people will die any place in the world if they are sick and they are ready to die. But I am talking about the negligence, like when people die in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who were there for two consecutive days.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member is not on a point of order.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member was also in the Other Place when I brought a Resolution about a constituent in St. Philip. It was in the newspapers where he was in the Casualty at the side of the walk for two or three days. He knows that. So in his contribution to the hospital, he must not do this kind of thing. He is always trying to pull down the DLP — the DLP did this and the DLP did that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Health. Let us get on.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: There are a few things I would like to draw the Honourable Minister's attention to, Mr. Chairman, and normally, I do these things only because I think it is for the better development of Barbados.

I am a little concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the procedural arrangement at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, *vis a vis* the teams. It is my understanding that in each team, you have your houseman, your registrar and your consultant and a few things reaching me, Mr. Chairman, would suggest to me that there seems to be some breakdown in communication between the houseman right up to the consultant or from the consultant down.

There is only one particular case that I am very familiar with which I would like to draw to the Hon. Minister's attention. There are two other cases, Mr. Chairman, that I would undertake to give the Minister the appropriate information since I think it would do no good to disclose these on the floor of the House. If the Minister wants, I would give him the particulars of the case, the one I talked about, and this refers to the relationship between the houseman, registrar and consultant.

In general, only recently, a senior patient was referred to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, by an outside consultant, with a letter recommending her immediate acceptance because of the diagnosis of the consultant. This was one in which the outside consultant was of the opinion that the lady had a topic pregnancy.

The registrar, on this occasion, took it upon himself to discharge the lady without any consultation with his consultant. It so happened that, within a couple of hours, the lady relapsed and had to be rushed to the St. Joseph Hospital, and it took all the skills of that particular consultant to save that lady's life.

Another case that I am even more familiar with, concerned a young man who worked for the Sanitation Department and died from what was believed to have been leptospirosis, I am not certain if this was the final

thing. But the point, Mr. Chairman, in this instance is that it is my certain knowledge that that young man's case was never drawn to the attention of the consultant in charge of the team.

As a matter of fact, it is only when I, myself, in my own layman's way saw that the man was in a very bad state took it upon myself to inform the consultant. And I asked him if, as a matter of course in his next visit, even if it were a matter of funds or anything, if he would check this young man, since I was very close to the young man.

When the consultant visited the young man, unfortunately he was already at the stage where he could not be saved. He was rushed immediately to the ICU and he collapsed and died within a couple of hours of reaching the ICU. The consultant was very hurt that nobody in his team saw it fit to bring it to his attention that there was, in existence at the hospital, a person in need of this specialist care.

I would think that this is an area in which the Minister needs to make sure that the line of communication is very clear, and that people realising that they are dealing with human beings do not take it upon themselves to feel that they are the last word if there is somebody better equipped, and professionally educated, to do it. They should pass it up the line so that we could be sure that every single person that goes into that hospital gets the very best care that is available to them, and made available to them by the Government of Barbados.

I would like the Minister, through whatever channel he needs to do it, to check that the lines of communication are very clear and that the teams are functioning as they are expected to function. (*Asides*).

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to ask the Minister a few questions concerning a few of these Heads, Sir. First the Psychiatric Hospital, Subhead 10.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall, Sir, that sometime ago there was a expose of certain conditions at the Psychiatric Hospital relating to the possibility, or the probability, of diminished health for the persons working in that institution. I should like to ask the Minister whether he is in a position to shed any light on that.

I am talking about the open sewer, *et cetera*. An open sewer was published in the newspaper. I wish to ask the Minister whether he is able to inform the House as to what steps have been taken and what is the present state

at the Psychiatric Hospital, the physical conditions of that hospital?

I also recall, the Minister, himself, indicating that in his opinion, the hospital needed to be raised and replaced. I would like to know how far he has got in his thinking on this matter, when we might expect some outline of the new arrangements for a new Psychiatric Hospital.

On the Geriatric Hospital, Sir, Subhead 11, the previous Minister had announced a policy concerning the care of geriatric patients. If I recall correctly, she had determined to re-arrange the system for geriatric patients. I wish to know if the present Minister is continuing that policy or if he has varied it any. I believe, based on a statement I saw emanating from him not so long ago, that he did not seem to share the same concept about the transfer of persons from, say the St. Michael Geriatric Hospital to the out hospitals, with a view to re-arranging the whole concept of indigenous care.

I would also like to ask him to what extent, under Subhead 12, any consideration has been given to assistance to the St. Joseph Hospital in St. Peter where, because of its location, it provides the only hospital care available in the north. I believe again that the Minister in his early rounds had signalled his intention to give some additional assistance to that institution.

Subhead 14, Sir, Public Health Service, Food Sampling and Food Quality Control. I wonder if the Minister is aware of a certain scandal between Australia and the United States where Kangaroo meat, and other meats, were substituted for beef? (*Aside*) Is the Minister able to assure this country that the same exporters of meat in the Australian Commonwealth, who, in fact, are exporters to Barbados, did not at the same time they were sending Kangaroo and other similar non-beef meat in the guise of beef to the United States — and for which there was a substantial statement made by the Hon. Peter Nixon, the Minister for Primary Industry in Australia — I wonder if the Minister can assure this country that we have not been eating Kangaroo or some other substitute for beef during the last few months. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You look like a Kangaroo.)

11.45 a.m.

I wonder if he could, at the same time, assure this Hon. House that recent reports or reports last year, about foreign matter in corned beef, if he could give us an assurance. I recall that when we had raised this matter the Minister had undertaken to take a look at the matter. I am not saying that anything is wrong, I am just asking him to let us know what his findings were.

I wish to draw to his attention, under Subhead 16, that the environmental sanitation units which are very well written up in the Estimates Explanatory Notes are,

in fact, very uncomfortable where a full unit is provided. The units that are provided are completely made of galvanise. I can think of nothing more inconvenient than a completely galvanised sanitation unit. Mr. Chairman, in the day time it performs the function of a sauna, and at night it performs the function of a freezer, and bearing in mind that these are usually provided for persons over 65, I believe that the Minister might wish to consider changing the material from which they are made.

I should like to ask the Minister, in the interest of the community, also to make a statement on the incidence of leptospirosis in the community. There is a feeling out there that there is an unusually high incidence of leptospirosis. I know that we have had some explanation from this side of the House as to why leptospirosis would increase as the cane fires increase, but I am asking the Minister if he is in a position to give us the latest information on the number of cases of leptospirosis, the extent to which the disease is showing any creeping inflation in Barbados, and the steps being taken to eradicate, or at least to preclude, any spread of leptospirosis.

One last question, Mr. Chairman. Under Subhead 19 — Animal Control — I believe this is the Head under which the Dogs Act is put into effect, and I would like the Minister to give us some information on the performance of this area. I believe that the previous Minister of Health made it one of her major thrusts to remove stray dogs from the community. I do not know to what extent this Minister considers it a worthwhile exercise, but I wonder if he could give us some indication, because in recent times I have been seeing some stray dogs in the City area, the Bridgetown area, and while there may have been a reduction in the number of animals destroyed by stray dogs, I believe that the kinds of diseases which can be spread in the urban and sub-urban areas by these animals should excite the examination of the Minister.

With those few queries, I believe that I can await the response of the Minister, Sir.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, it is possible that, in my absence, the matters that I intend to raise now may have been raised by other Members, but I will raise them just the same.

The first matter relates to the closure of certain services at some of the clinics. I am raising this matter under Subhead 5 — Community Health Services. The polyclinics identified in a Government Information Service release are the Warrens Clinic, the Maurice Byer Polyclinic, and the polyclinic in Black Rock. Of course, Sir, no mention was made of the polyclinic — if that is the correct term for it — in Wildey, but I assume that there will be no need to close that service because that service has not yet been put into operation, so I assume that the same applies to the Wildey clinic.

Now, I can perceive certain difficulties here, and I am speaking particularly now, Sir, for my constituents.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Member will give way, I just want to raise a point which is more in the form of a point of order. The speech that the honourable Member is making, while he is not repeating himself, is repeating all that has gone on before. He quite clearly indicated that he was not here. The penalty of being late is that you would not know what has gone before and, therefore, you should not be excused for that.

I can understand that he would want his constituents to know that he was saying something for them, but it is not our fault, we have been hearing it. How many spokesmen really are there on Health? I have refused to intervene because I know it is my right to reply, but I have heard so much on these matters that there is hardly more that I can say than what I am going to say to your spokesman, the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. I gather that the honourable Member who is on his feet now is questioning the closure of the polyclinics. I do not think that has been directly dealt with.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I am raising the difficulty which, I can see, will attend the closure of the polyclinics and will also affect my constituents. In fact, what affects my constituents in this regard will affect everybody else.

Before I left home yesterday morning, I got a call from a constituent who asked me to raise this matter, and I would like to hear the Minister on this. It is a question of when a patient — if I can call a person a patient — a person who attends a polyclinic on a regular basis — when that person attends one of the alternative services suggested, in other words, the Out-Patients Clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a private doctor, as well as the Medical Officer of Health for the area, what is going to happen to the notes of those persons who are regular visitors and are patients — if that is the correct term — of these various polyclinics? Are those notes going to be transferred from the polyclinic to the Out-Patients Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Are they going to be transferred to a medical doctor, whether it be the Medical Officer of Health or a private doctor of that individual?

Point two. As I understand it, the services provided at these polyclinics are free. That is my understanding. They are not charged for and no payment is made for those services. What is the Government planning to do, and what will happen when persons of humble means, who attend those polyclinics because they are close to

them, if those persons elect to go to a private individual, as has been directed in the release from the Government Information Service? Will the Government pay for that service? These are things I would like to have answered. I do not know if they have been raised before, but if they have not, then certainly I would like to get answers to those questions.

Another point I would want to raise in connection with those polyclinics is that they are, in fact, what they are set out here in the Estimates to be — that is community services.

11.55 a.m.

It is my belief that they should be staffed with persons, including doctors, who understand the individual problems of the respective communities. I do not think, Sir, that these clinics are best served by having non-Barbadians or non-West Indians who are staffing at the level of doctors and whatever else.

I would accept a West Indian doctor, but not a non-West Indian doctor. I believe, Sir, it is better for a person who can understand those problems to be dealing with community services, because it might be necessary for the doctors to go into the total background of that patient and his environment. I am putting this forward to the Government to pay some attention to this aspect of the service as well.

Finally, Sir, I want to say a word about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I go there from time to time, Mr. Chairman. There is always some kind of physical work going on at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a wall being built here, a partition being removed there and so on. That is all well and good, but what strikes me, Sir, is that not enough attention is paid to the maintenance of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

If we are not careful, we will be adding a little wing here and a little room there, but the other rooms you have, probably next door, might be getting run down because there is not enough money, or there is not enough attention being paid to the physical plant of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am suggesting to the Government to pay some attention to what they have and make sure that in doing something, we do not lose what we have already got.

Mr. M. A. KING: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the debate under this Head unusually, but whilst we are on it, I would like to raise a few questions and seek a few assurances on one or two points.

Firstly, under Subhead 4 in relation to the Emergency Ambulance Service, I understand that, at one point in time, it may have been Government's policy — and he

may correct me on that — to integrate the Emergency Ambulance Service with the Fire Service and that there should be a proper, fully organised emergency unit to deal with the whole problem of emergencies and sicknesses — illnesses which may be the result of emergencies whether they are connected with fire or any other accident.

I wonder if the Minister could expand on what is Government's policy in relation to any proposal to develop a fully integrated emergency service which would deal not only with hospital cases — cases where people have illnesses as such, but where they might become disabled as a result of some critical problem. In other words, what I am enquiring about is whether there are any proposals to establish a full scale emergency service which would take care of not only what we have traditionally come to know as the ambulance cases.

The second point on this question of the Ambulance Service, as a whole, is that I understand that the ambulance services do not have, when they go to pick up people who are ill, trained nurses accompanying the ambulance. I believe this may have been a result of some problem which may have come about as a result of some accident involving personnel. I wonder if the Minister could inform the Hon. House whether, in fact, nurses do accompany the ambulances when they go out to pick up people who are in need of ambulance services.

Could he perhaps inform us whether there is the facility of oxygen available in ambulances in case anybody who has been picked up suffers some relapse on the way, some respiratory problem, because I understand that oxygen is not available in the ambulance service. In essence, I would like to know what serious proposals the Government has for developing the ambulance services into a real effective and efficient operation to cater to the needs of Barbadians as a whole.

The third point on which I would like some comment, and assurance from the Minister, is in relation to the problems of ensuring that the vital services in the hospital, and in the other areas which provide for health care, provide that there is no circumstance which would interrupt the continual flow and delivery of vital services.

Recently, it has been reported that some of the vital services, I believe at the Enmore Health Centre, have had to be curtailed because electricity services had been cut off by the Light and Power Company due to the failure of Government to pay the electricity bill.

I would like to have some assurance from the Minister that this state of affairs will never again exist, and that all practical steps, by way of proper planning, will be taken to ensure that these problems do not bedevil

the community, particularly where vital services are concerned.

Under Subhead 17, in relation to the Aedes Aegypti control programme, I would be grateful, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could, perhaps, inform the House what has been the success, if any of the recent programme which the Government has embarked on with the units which they have had along the streets — spraying fumes along the road as they go along.

Comments, which I have heard, tended to indicate that that programme may not have been as entirely as successful as anticipated, but I would like to know if the Minister could give the House some information on the results of that programme, and what is being done in relation to the overall control of the Aedes Aegypti mosquito.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the medical and health care of the people of Barbados are of very vital importance and concern to all Barbadians. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN directed that certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I must make this point. We have Hansard Reporters in here. They have been in here consistently for about five weeks and it is almost impossible for them to carry on and function properly with the type of conduct, behaviour and noise we have been having just a minute ago. I am asking honourable Members to please contain themselves and make it possible for the Reporters to do their work.
12.05 p.m.

Mr L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are concerned about the medical and health care, generally, of the people of Barbados and I think the Minister is, in duty, bound to tell this Hon. Chamber and the nation what effects the present provisions for the Ministry of Health will have on cut-backs, what will it result? What services will be cut back as a result of the provisions he has in the budget here. Will there be cut-backs at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Will there be cut-backs in the Community Health Service Programme?

We see substantial reductions in Other Personal Emoluments and sometimes for Plant, Furniture and Equipment and in other areas, and we want to know what effect these slashes and cuts in vital services are likely to mean for the health and well-being of the people of Barbados. I think the Minister should be in a position to give some projection as far as that is concerned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution? The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister certain serious problems developing within the health services.

About 12 years ago, there was a programme initiated whereby specific persons who were diagnosed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and who had diseases of a kind, which could be managed by people who were not specialists in a given field, were transferred out to peripheral clinics on the clear understanding that they would attend the hospital once a year for re-evaluation. *(Asides)* I am speaking under the Hospital. I am speaking under the Subhead, Community Care and Primary Care, the whole lot, and you are not going to create any confusion for me today.

Now, what, Sir, is happening, in anticipation of developments in the polyclinic area, is that many persons with serious disorders were transferred from the Out-Patient Clinics of the hospital to the various Health Centres, on the one hand, and in anticipation of a general practitioner participation in an extended primary care programme, many patients had been told to go and see a private doctor and have been discharged from the Out-Patients Clinics of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Now, Sir, what has happened? The polyclinic programmes are not working satisfactory — there is evidence of closures — and many of these patients have to go back to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The anticipated general practitioner involvement in the health programme has not yet taken place, and, as a consequence, many of these chronically-ill patients are today stranded in Barbados.

The only access to medical care which they have will be through the private general practitioner or the practitioner who is practising privately as a specialist or, alternatively, to go back to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital — either through the casualty system to be referred again back to the Medical Out-Patients or to be referred again by the General Practitioner or the specialist whom they see in private practice.

This has been a very serious problem because, quite clearly, in the interim, those patients have been given the run around and what would have happened, Sir, is that they would have, because of the failure at polyclinic level and because of the failure to integrate them into an office based primary health care programme as envisaged by the Government, I thought it was highly premature to have taken that step in discharging those patients from the Hospital Clinics.

A second area that I would like to bring to the Minister's attention is the role of the Geriatric Hospital in the delivery of health service care in Barbados. We have the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is intended to

provide secondary and tertiary care; we have the Community Service Health Centre and we have the Geriatric Service Hospital. It seems to me, Sir, that there is no proper integration of these aspects of the health service.

I recall, Sir, about ten years ago myself and the Chief Engineer in the Ministry of Health, we, ourselves, went up to the District Hospital in Beckles Road, the Geriatric Hospital, and we ourselves drew up the plans — he drew the plans, I just gave the ideas — for the renovations of part of that hospital. I believe that at least four wards were recommended. I also believe that an Occupational Therapy Section was added on to that hospital.

That was done, Sir, in a conceptual framework whereby there would be a gradual transformation of that hospital into a Convalescent Care Institution in order to reduce the cost of maintaining patients within the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because the cost of convalescence would be considerably less if those patients were transferred there. It was also linked to another programme, Sir, whereby many of the patients in that institution, who are even there now, are kept at a much even greater cost to Government than if they were looked after in a domiciliary care situation.

I hope that honourable Members will see the linkages and they will be able to see how this entire thing has completely broken down. I would like to know whether there has been any change of policy in that area. Whether or not a programme of upgrading of that institution will be continued in the future?

And let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman — in many ways I think that the Geriatric Hospital there in Beckles Road is a better physical plant than the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, in many ways.
12.15 p.m.

It is very interesting what upgrading can do there, and the impact on cost at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, if you have a properly integrated plan. I know that plant very well.

Another area, Sir, is that of maintenance and the honourable Member for St. Michael North has raised a very interesting question. There is no doubt that the maintenance at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has deteriorated considerably over the years. Money needs to be pumped into that area to maintain that physical plant.

But a very interesting thing has happened over the years, Sir — I myself, may have been party to making recommendations at some time for additions within the institution — that hospital was one of the coolest institutions in Barbados. There was not a single part of the QEH that needed air conditioning, apart from the

Medical Out-Patients Department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, in 1967 or 1968.

What has happened is that by building and blocking the flow of air, by building offices and adding here and there over the years, you have disturbed what was a fundamental and important architectural concept in relation to keeping the hospital cool. So now your current cost of energy in the hospital would have rocketted considerably by the need to have more and more air conditioning in the hospital, when, in fact, a decision taken to provide offices and other space outside the main building would have been much cheaper in the long run, and would only involve a fraction of the cost.

There are so many areas in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that one could deal with and I think I will wait a little while until the Minister's response and, as it were, come behind him. But he will not be making any winding up speech at this stage. This will be an interim, because we have a lot of other questions to ask.

We do not only want to know leptospirosis, we want to know again what is happening in the area of tetanus. This is under the area of Public Health. We want to know whether there has been a programme to immunize those who are more susceptible to tetanus in this country. A serious point about tetanus is that I have only seen one or two middle class people, in all the years I have been practising medicine in Barbados, with tetanus. (*Asides*) I am not even so sure if I am immunized — I must check that.

But it is a very funny thing. Many of the people that you find developing tetanus often are people working in agriculture, agriculture workers — a high percentage, not all — and people in the lower income group who do not respond rapidly to punctures by rusty nails and so on.

I have always argued that for \$10 000 or \$20 000 you can eliminate the whole question of tetanus in Barbados, you should not be having cases of tetanus in this country which may cost \$100 000 sometimes — to look after one case of tetanus and nurse them back from the grave, when, in fact, for an expenditure of \$10 000 to \$20 000 we could immunize the entire population.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Just a point of interest, Sir. I am seeking and trying to follow the honourable Member very closely on a close Second Reading speech. I think you should stick to the Health problem and I have not heard whether it is too high, or if there is too much money voted — not a single thing about money. However, I would like to find out from the honourable Member and distinguished physician can you tell this Committee if this advice was made available to any administration outside of this administration. (*Asides*) What do you mean don't

answer? He has not got to answer. I want to find out if this advice was made available to any other administration.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member would have a chance to speak. Please, please, please. Have your chance to speak.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes the advice was made to the last Barbados Labour Party Administration. Anyhow, I think I would pause at this point to return again. This is just a warming up, and I tell you something too — the Hon. Leader of this House cannot determine what is a Second Reading speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please, take your seat. It is nothing to do with the debate. Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution to this debate? I am calling on honourable Members who may wish to make a contribution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of order. I am seeking the Chair's guidance in this matter. We are in Committee of Supply, a number of questions have been asked of the Minister, I am presuming that the Minister would give us some kind of indication and some of the answers, and after some of those answers, we would proceed to ask other questions.

When Your Honour asked, "does any other honourable Member wish to make a contribution," I wish to make it very clear that I, and I believe my colleagues, have other contributions to make, but it is dependant on the Minister's response. I need your guidance in this matter because I would not like, after the Minister gets up, to hear that he has done a winding up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was only yesterday that I reminded honourable Members that no honourable Member can compel a Minister to answer a question. The Minister knows his duty. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: He should) The Rules state that an honourable Member can speak for 15 minutes at any one time. The Hon. Leader of the House..

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would like to draw to Your Honour's and this Committee's attention that under Standing Order No. 36 that a Minister may move the closure of the debate. I only warn you, so don't think that you can get up for 15 minutes because I will move the closure of the debate. Don't think that I am sitting here wasting anybody's time. You are not going to have any relay race.

When I am satisfied with his replies, I will move the closure. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. Order please! Does any other honourable Member wish to make a contri-

bution? If no other honourable Member wishes to make any other further contribution to this debate, I will call on the Minister to reply and wind up the debate.

I will now ask the Hon. Minister to wind up and close this debate.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have something to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My eyes have caught the honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I will give way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member has given way.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be involved in any game of hide and seek. The question on the Ministry of Health was the subject of an indepth analysis not long ago and we in Health have nothing to hide.
12.25 p.m.

The corner stone of the Government's health service is projected on the basis of the new polyclinics and the National Health Service which will be embodied therein, and I want the country to be aware that there is no departure from that approach with respect to the Government's policy on health.

A lot of questions have been asked and I am prepared to reply to all the questions that I regard deserve a reply.

I must confess that on listening to the other side, I had a great amount of sympathy for the honourable Member for St. Michael North West. If I were him, acting in the capacity as spokesman on Health, I would immediately resign. I thought that he had done a reasonably good job for his side and I did not think, on listening to him last night, that the case could have been better put.

What I do deplore in this Hon. House, is this that there are some people who believe that it is their divine right to speak on everything and that they have knowledge of everything. But the public is sufficiently scientific as to know who to repose their confidence in, and despite the noise you get, the people still quietly sit down and analyse the issues when they have to make decisions.

It is true that a notice went out from the Ministry of Health, having as its object the enlightening of the

public with respect to the services which would be given at the polyclinics, and advising the public, generally, the alternative sources from which those services can be given. It is not, as the Opposition is trying to portray, that the service will come to an end and this is the end of life for the people in Barbados who have grown accustomed to a very good medical health service in this country.

Only a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to take part in the 25th anniversary of the Six Roads Health Clinic and I, in participating, look back with pleasure on the fact that that service was provided in the time of the Barbados Labour Party. And we have seen, as a follow-up to what the party did then, that the party has been doing quite a lot more in terms of service to the community.

The Democratic Labour Party is certainly out of court in trying to tell us about health matters. When we left office in 1961, we were able to accomplish many things in the area of health. You only came along and tried to carry on but you could not have touched the services which we had given at the time.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West talked about the cutting back of expenditure in health but I am going to enlighten you on a number of things today. Since we came into office we built the Wildey polyclinic which, at the moment, is operating. We constructed on an area that was much abused and desecrated by you in trying to build a crematorium at Warrens a modern polyclinic.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North West was at pains to point out that he had given services at that point in the past. I do not know if the services were based upon his political conviction, or upon a desire to help his fellow man, or to serve the Government, or all Governments or whether he was partisan with respect to his professional services.

He has never sought to make that clear but I do not believe that he worked during the time of this Government. I hope he would actually correct me — he is bowing his head to say that he has.

We have also built the polyclinic at Oistins, a monument of which I am sure the people in Barbados will be justly proud. We have built the Maurice Byer polyclinic in that lovely area of St. Peter just outside of Speightstown, and further, Mr. Chairman, the Black Rock polyclinic.

The Government has projected to build in a very short time — and tender notices, I understand, will be out towards the end of April — a new, modern and very up-to-date polyclinic at Ladymeade. The cost of that

polyclinic is going to be in the region of \$6 million to build, equip and probably to landscape. There might be, in terms of the present nature of things in the world, the question of cost overruns.

The Government would have expended in the region of \$13 million in plant between 1976 when it came into office and when Ladymeade is completed. Therefore, it can be clearly seen that this Government continued, from the point where it left off in 1961, to give Barbados a good health service. I do not think that we in this Government need to be ashamed of anything which is being done.

With respect to the question of staff, the GPs who work in the polyclinics on the reference now, were working on a sessional basis and it was thought that since the service can be given at other areas, there would be no point in fighting to maintain the services where they are in the light of the present prevailing circumstances.

The situation with respect to the polyclinics, and the reopening of the services which are now channelled to other areas, will be monitored, and a decision will be taken in a very short time as to the ability of the Ministry to open back the services. But I want to assure honourable Members that the services now offered, while it might not be within the area of the people who formerly went to those clinics for service will be available nonetheless.

12.35 p.m.

Barbados continues to enjoy a very high standard of health in the world, and is regarded throughout the Caribbean as a model, in terms of its health services. Many people are looking to us to see how well we will be able to carry on and function as we have functioned in the past. The Drug Service, as well, is being looked forward to — a service which is much abused but which has rendered quite a lot of assistance to the people in this country by way of cheaper drugs.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, as well as the Shadow Minister, the honourable Member for St. Michael North West, dwelt on the question of the increased cost of the service rendered, but honestly, if you are expanding a service which is good, and the people are utilising the service, the cost must, of necessity, increase. Further than that, there is the question of inflation throughout the world. We have no control over that, that is something which we all have got to live with, but this Government has always tried to see how best it can relieve the poor and suffering as far as medical care is concerned.

We have heard a lot about people going away from these important and vital institutions, like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and we are made to believe

that this wicked Government is going to remove all the staff there is in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am not aware of that. As far as I am concerned, the Queen Elizabeth has a very vital role to play, and it has always played a very vital role.

What I would like to say, however, is this — that at this time of stress and strain in the country's economy, that the Government must cut out, and off, all the waste and fat. There can be no longer a question of joyriding, there can be no question of doubling. We are concerned with patient care and we feel that adequate manpower must be available to provide that care, but, at the same time, Government has got to look critically at the areas of waste.

Now, in 1976, there were 923 people on the Established staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 90 unestablished staff, 326 on its temporary staff, and 25 on the casual staff, making a total of 1 364. In 1982 — this is April — and in 1976 April as well — there were 1 040 people, 117 additional people on the established staff, a considerable amount of people being put on to the established staff. There are 19 on the unestablished staff, 284 on the temporary staff — it is likely that some of those could have gone on to the established staff — 25 on the casual staff, making a total of 1,439 — 75 more people employed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This is to the end of the financial year 1981–82, but yet you will hear the cries about no service.

A lot of interesting and provocative points were made here today to do with the question of getting GPs to carry on this service, and I think it was the honourable Member for St. Michael North who talked about if you brought people from abroad, outside the Caribbean, or even in the Caribbean, it might be difficult for them to relate.

I do not find that. I will tell you what I find, and I challenge anybody in here to say that they are more patriotic than I am. Some of the best people to perform can be found among expatriates who come to Barbados, have a love for the country and decide to work in the interest of this country.

Let me pull a name out of a hat — Dr. Vaughn Wells. There are very few people who have done more for preventative medicine and health in this country than that distinguished gentleman. He is not a Barbadian, he is a West Indian. We have a Dr. Rao who is, at the moment, carrying out a very important function in terms of leprosy and tuberculosis.

Are we to say that we are so rich in terms of talent that we can exclude people who have got abilities to assist us and to say that there are questions of barriers? There are no barriers among men, we are all of one instrument, of the making of man. Whatever be our colour, we are the same people nonetheless, and I will never agree, never subscribe, to the view, when this country reaches a stage of feeling, that nothing can be offered from outside.

We still send our people abroad to be educated. There are still a lot of people in this country who are going to Cave Hill and feel that they should be going to Oxford and Cambridge. That is an attitude you will always find, and therefore I do not subscribe to the view that if you cannot get the doctors locally you should not seek to get them from abroad. As a matter of fact, I will tell you that in terms of public health it is difficult to get a doctor anyhow. They are not there, just available.

I feel that this Government, and certainly this Ministry, will look towards the offering of scholarships to people who are interested in public health and who will come back to give the service to this country, because we are badly in need of such a service, and we will look with sympathy on any such recommendation. As a matter of fact, it does not have to be a recommendation, the Ministry will initiate such a practice.

Mr. Chairman, the Government is totally aware of the problems which beset, and will beset us, in terms of the National Health Service. We are looking at it, we are deeply involved in it, we are committed to it and we believe in it. There is no argument from the other side, no matter how cogently argued, that can turn our thoughts away from the course which we have set ourselves.

The service will come on stream, and there can be no question about it, because the Government, by virtue of the Helath Levy, must implement it, because it is for that service and the Barbados Drug Service as well. My understanding is that we are going to need for the initial stages of the National Health Service, the Group A model, between 40 and 50 GPs, and that when the total service comes into being we will need about 80 GPs. I have appealed already from this Hon. Chamber to people of goodwill to do nothing which would tend to jeopardise the smooth implementation of the service. It is here to stay, and there is nothing which will stop it from going ahead.

12.45 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West, as is his wont, raised a number of questions and I will try to answer a few of them. All of them do not have to do with my Ministry, but what he likes to do is to parade himself as a very knowledgeable man, and therefore he likes to ask a lot of questions — sometimes very silly questions, but questions nonetheless.

The question of leptospirosis was also dealt with and at a later stage I will say something on that, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Member for St. Michael West asked a question about an open sewer at the Psychiatric Hospital.

Now there is no such thing as “an open sewer at the Psychiatric Hospital.” Investigations revealed that patients — and we are talking about psychiatric patients — patients who are not known — apparently threw some piece of cloth or something and blocked up the whole sewage area, and therefore that problem had to be put right.

The newspaper, in its usual sensational fashion, set about to give the impression that everything was going wrong in terms of sewer down there. It is not true. I am happy to report however that that matter is settled and corrective measures, with respect to the hospital, have been implemented.

I want also to state that not only has the sewer been fixed, but I am sure the honourable Member for St. Michael West will be shocked to realise, although he was not the Minister responsible, that for the first time in the history of the Psychiatric Hospital, machines to wash clothes were put in during our time last year. Three new washing machines have been installed to wash the patients' clothing, and there are three new electric irons to press the clothing. They used to be washed by hand, a very disgraceful and despicable form of service given to the people. As a matter of fact, this was put into the Estimates by my predecessor in office. She saw the need for it and we saw the need for upgrading it.

Mr. Chairman, a number of measures have been taken to make the Psychiatric Hospital much better than it used to be. A number of repairs were carried out during the last year and we will continue to progressively improve the existing conditions until the economic climate permits the building of a new Psychiatric Hospital.

I remain convinced and unrepentant over the statement that I made that the building is not conducive to a Psychiatric Hospital, or to any hospital at all for that matter. It should be pushed down to make the site available for other things. A new and more attractive site should be found, somewhere not too far out of Bridgetown so that it might be convenient for people to travel, and a climate more conducive to the type of patients that the hospital caters to.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West also asked a question about a statement I made with respect to the St. Joseph Hospital. I am to announce that I have set up a task force, under the Chairmanship of the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health, to look with the persons, of course, from the St. Joseph Hospital at the implications of any involvement with the Government in activities within the hospital.

The reason why I have to do it that way is because the hospital, as you know, is run by, I think, the Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother.

It is a Catholic hospital. They do not want to have a situation where they have to report to any Government agency, and I would not want that either, so we are looking at the total implications of the service and the hospital's involvement vis-a-vis the Ministry's health service. When a decision is finally made, I will let the House, and finally the public, know what is taking place.

I think I should just inform the honourable Member that with respect to kangaroo meat being found in tins of beef, that is not a matter for the Ministry of Health except for the fact that if it is brought to the Ministry of Health, the Ministry will involve itself.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, if the honourable Member would give way, I am a little concerned here. Perhaps, he could help me by letting me know which Ministry would be responsible. I believe the Consumer Affairs Ministry has some broad responsibility, but under Subhead 14 it says “carrying out the provisions of the Health Services Act relating to the enforcement of regulations on environmental sanitation, food sampling and food quality control.” I was not dealing with the importation aspects so much as the concern.

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

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2 p.m. today.

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.

12.55 p.m.

On Resumption

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply. The Hon. Minister may continue his winding up address.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was dealing when the suspension was taken with the question raised by the honourable Member for St. Michael West with respect to kangaroo meat which was substituted for beef and being sent to Barbados. I told the honourable Member that it was not exactly a matter for my Ministry. On the other hand, I think it is totally a matter for the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs with responsibility for BNSI as well, and also for the Government Analyst.

As far as health is concerned and the inspectorate dealing with Public Health matters, we are involved in so far as we consider a matter to be a health hazard. We come in at that stage. If we had gone somewhere and we had seen a problem which could constitute a health hazard, then the Ministry is entitled to intervene but it would be extremely difficult if, for argument's sake, a product was coming into Barbados, and unless we had heard it, from say the FAO or some International Agency, it would be difficult for the Ministry of Health really to intervene.

As a matter of fact, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs has a very careful eye on all of these matters. When it comes to corned beef, when it comes to meat coming in, if the area has foot and mouth diseases, the Ministry will ban the product coming from there. This is a matter that is kept closely under focus and there is no problem in respect to this. We pick up these matters and we are always informed as to where the problems are in the world with respect to foot and mouth diseases. Barbados has been kept relatively free of exotic diseases, and I would hope that it continues to do so.

The honourable Member for St. Michael North raised a question of the notes on patients. If a patient were going, say, at the Warrens Clinic — and I am sure that that is the one he is concerned with — and that patient then had to go to Enmore or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, what would be the position with respect to the notes?

The notes are the notes of the Government as such, Doctor/Patient understanding of the keeping of notes and files with respect to patients, and there should be no problem with that. The mere fact that the notes are the Government's and that a service will not be taking place at, say, the Warrens Polyclinic, but will be transferred to Enmore, or any place for that matter, means that the files will be sent there as long as the person is going to become a patient of that institution and therefore as far as that institution is concerned, there should be no problem.

A point was raised by the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central on the Emergency Ambulance Service and also the question of the cutting off of electricity at Enmore. I am not aware, or was not aware until that was said, that the electricity was cut off at Enmore.

But it might not have been a bad thing that it happened, in the sense that it is so much abroad in the Opposition's rank that there is some special relationship with the Barbados Light and Power Company. Of course, there should be, because we are part owners. Barbadian people have a 51 percent share in the outlay. There should not be any question about that.

Be that as it may, I was not aware. I suppose you have to do things in an efficient manner and if there was even a question of lack of funds to pay, I am sure that if the correct word had gotten over to the Barbados Light and Power Co. that they would probably have been sympathetic, and as long as the money was forth-coming, they would not have created a problem.

At least, I am going to investigate that matter very thoroughly with a view to having the situation rectified, because I would hate to think that a person was under a critical piece of instrument to do with their kidneys, or what have you, at the time that power was taken off, although you might have emergency stand-by. I would take a very serious view of a situation where current can be cut off willy-nilly.

The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central also adverted to the question of the Aedes Aegypti. Now, with respect to the Aedes Aegypti, and the programme which was carried on with the fogging of the area, it has been extremely successful. All you would have had to do was to witness the CARIFESTA arrangement.

Everybody in the country thought we would have had to close CARIFESTA. We could not. We decided 'well, no', we were not going to call it off. CARIFESTA would go forth based on the best possible advice that was available to me and the Government, and we decided

that we could carry on. The defogging process was done and we have had no epidemic as a result of the *Aedes Aegypti*.

As a matter of fact, we have not done badly in respect to that. Mr. Chairman you have intimated that I have two more minutes? It is unfortunate that in these exercises that the Minister has to reply to all of these questions and his time is limited in these replies. Be that as it may.

The question of leptospirosis was raised as well and I just want briefly to advert to that. Leptospirosis is a disease that is common to animal and man, easily transferred from one to the other — rather, from animal to man. My understanding is that you get quite a lot of cases of this nature when you have plenty of rain, and especially when you have a lot of canes left back in the canefields.

In the past, after the crop, the rats would go to the country during the crop season and after the canes are reaped they would return to the City. But now-a-days you find a situation where they continue to have food to eat in the country and they remain up there.

There is no significant increase in the question of leptospirosis, neither is there any significance in death as a result of leptospirosis and I.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. I wonder if the Minister can tell us how many rats there are in Barbados this year and how many rats there were last year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Out of order.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Well, I have a feeling that there could be, Mr. Chairman, a rat to every person possibly in Barbados and if the population is, say, 5 000 less today than it was last year, or 5 000 more, it might be the equivalent of rats. I would hazard the guess that they might be 200 000 rats in Barbados.
2.10 p.m.

Since time is not my friend, and I am sure that the Opposition is glad that time is not my friend, I will take my seat subject to the moving of this Head with amendments.

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE — HEAD 78 — MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Head 78 — Ministry of Health — was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$6,726,773, under Capital Expenditure — Head 78 — Ministry of Health — as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: 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

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

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, you would recall that last night when we got to the Heads dealing with Agriculture, we did pass the ones dealing in relation to Meteorology and Co-operatives. It was then made clear that it was the wish of the House that we should have some discussion on Agriculture. So I thought I could do no better in asking that Head 25 stand part to share some of the Ministry's thoughts with the Committee.

Before, however, I do so in relation to general policy initiatives, new emphasis and amendments to existing areas etc., I just thought I would say that the expenditure being provided under Head 25 \$15.8 million is marginally higher than what was provided last year — \$14.3 million. From that you would see, Sir, that the major components of the Estimates this year remains essentially the same as the components last year.

The largest amount for any one individual item is \$4.7 million which is in respect to Crop Research, and other majority areas of expenditure are Soil Conservation, \$2.4 million. Meteorology Services \$1.4 million, which we have already passed — a large portion of that is to do with subscriptions to international organizations, and Livestock \$2.3 million.

Over the past several months, Mr. Chairman, the Ministry has been reviewing its operations and looking at its programmes. It has embarked on a few new initiatives and has attempted to put some emphasis on certain directions with regard to Statutory Corporations. And the first point which I want to make today relates to Statutory Corporations.

We will observe that for the first time in its history, there is no subvention provided for the Barbados Marketing Corporation. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: You will have to bring a supplementary.) I am hearing a *sotto voce* from the honourable Member for St. Michael West to the effect that we will have to seek a supplementary, but I am fairly confident, Sir, that we will go the year without having to

seek a supplementary for the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

The new Board, as you are aware, has been appointed and has been active in reorganizing and restructuring the Barbados Marketing Corporation so as to make it a viable commercial entity. Thus far, we have been successful in recruiting top management staff and we have put systems into operation which will allow us to monitor effectively, and control too, the financial direction of the corporation.

Of some significance is the fact that we have been able to reorganize the Abattoir services, particularly as a result of the training which was provided to the slaughterers by the Canadians, with the assistance of the Canadian aid agency CIDA.

The BMC's role Sir, in the 1980s will be quite different from the BMC's role of the last 20 years, or so, of its existence. Currently, we are looking at the new BMC's role — I reckon that in a few months we will be able to make a statement with respect to the new emphasis of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. For now, Sir, it sees itself as having an important role to play in the co-ordination of the Crop Information System, which it is undertaking in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Barbados Agricultural Society.

With respect to the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, Sir, the ADC, as you know, is the second major agency for which the Ministry of Agriculture has responsibility. That agency, Sir, is continuing its programme of bringing unused land back into production. Over the last year it has succeeded in bring Spencers back into cane production, and over the last few years it was successful in bringing Bath Plantation back into production.

In addition Sir, the ADC continues to undertake trials in peanuts and other crops and it is also paying much attention to the implementation of the two rural development schemes which fall under it, and which are being funded by international agencies.

2.20 p.m.

As you are aware, the Spring Hall Land Lease Project has got off the ground. Only last week, I handed over 11 conveyances to farmers. We are in the process of selecting the other 11 farmers and we very much hope, Sir, that the houses will be put on the lands and that in another few months, Sir, the scheme will be fully operational in addition, Sir.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I draw to Your Honour's attention, Sir, that the honourable Member is anticipating a Head. The Capital Head is coming and he will have an opportunity to talk about the development schemes and all that sort of thing. The Head

he is introducing is not the appropriate Head for that, and this is beginning to sound like a Second Reading speech and he is starting to anticipate the Head to follow, Sir. Take it in time, Sir.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Much as I am grateful for what the honourable Member has said, Sir, I think I want to tell the House, quite frankly that there are two ways of doing this.

A Minister either makes his speech, in which he sets out his thoughts as reflected in the Estimates on Current and Capital, and allow the debate to go, or he deals Head by Head, Sir, in which case he is interrupted at every stage, and you never get a Minister setting forth in any detail, what he wishes to say.

If he prefers me to deal with it that way, it will be dealt with that way, Sir, in which case we will ask that Head 25 do now stand part.

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

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

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say that I find it very encouraging to see that the Hon. Minister spent a very long time speaking about the BMC, taking into consideration that he said that there was no money in the Estimates put aside for the BMC. But he still felt it was that important that he should speak on it for a fairly long time.

Mr. Chairman, it is known by everyone that there is a dependence on the importation of foodstuffs, and that sort of thing, for developing countries like Barbados.

This dependence has increased quite a bit over the last ten years as a result of the increasing population, the raising of the standard of living of the people in the country — (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Oh yes, you can see that.) I hear what the Hon. Minister is saying — but I said the last ten years, you would recall — and also by the changing food habits of inhabitants.

Now this, Mr. Chairman, in itself is not a very bad thing. But developing countries, and Barbados is foremost among these countries which I am speaking about, do not have the resources, nor the export potential, to lure the amount of imports that we need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, countries like Barbados are saddled with two inter-related problems.

The first of these problems is how to increase our domestic output in order to keep our imports at a reasonable level, and the second is how to safeguard our interests in the face of fluctuations in domestic output,

and also in domestic and international demand and supply.

Mr. Chairman, my idea of Estimates, is that it is a chance to look at how money is being spent. It is also a chance to look back, Mr. Chairman. The fact that you look at how money is being spent does not preclude one from looking back to see how money was spent in the previous year.

Now I have come to realise, Mr. Chairman, that if a suggestion is made, honourable Members tend to take the suggestion as though you are getting at someone, or something like that, which is quite far from my idea of it.

My personal view of the present Minister is that he is a very hard working person, and that he is a person who, whenever he puts his hand to the plough, works hard at it. That is my idea of the present Minister. (Aside) That is my idea of the present Minister, so I just want to get that position very clear. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Reactionary too.)

Before I proceed, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment. I would say that since the present Minister of Agriculture has taken over, his public pronouncements have been giving the population of Barbados the impression that everything is looking very rosy in the Ministry of Agriculture, and I believe that the Hon. Minister is honest in what he is saying and that he really means what he is saying. But the pronouncements, Mr. Chairman, coming from the agricultural bodies in this country do not seem to share the same view of the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say — I am sure the Hon. Minister would allow me to advance this point, because as I said already I am not getting at anyone — is that over the past couple of weeks, we have been hearing reports from the dairy farmers that if the Minister does not do something soon, the dairy industry will disintegrate. You have also heard other agricultural organisations speaking in this same vein.

I am just trying to discover from the Minister, what is the difference between the two views — his and the view of these organisations.

I would also like to say Mr. Chairman, that recently agriculture has been in the news a lot, I believe that because of the economic situation in the country today, people have just come to realise how important agriculture is and this is not a bad thing. It is only sad that we did not realise, for the longest time, how important agriculture is. Later on, Mr. Chairman, I will get back to the separate Heads, the subheads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And you will get down to the meat of it.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Right, to the meat of it. But I just wanted to make some general comments and I believe that my colleagues will follow. I have quite a few questions to ask the Hon. Minister as time goes on.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I speak so often on the subject of the imports of food that I had not intended to contribute. But I am glad the honourable Member, who has just sat down, has raised the question of the agricultural institutions in the country, because it gives me an opportunity to say something.

I believe that Mr. Gladstone once, when being pressed in the House of Commons on the question of railway expansion in the 1860's, and on being told that certain directors of railway companies held views that were contrary to his and it was being suggested to him that the views of the railway companies should be accepted by the Government, he said, "I would as soon listen to an owner of railways on the subject of railways as I would the Gracchi on sedition."

And I would as soon listen to some of the representatives of the agricultural bodies in this country as I would to a director of a railway company on the desirability of a railway. We have to understand that, in many cases, these bodies are pressure groups and lobbies, pure and simple.

I happen to believe that if there is one area in agriculture and manufacturing where we should accept that we must pay a high price in order to maintain the continued production of an item in Barbados, it is the area of milk. I just happen to believe that fresh milk is a desirable commodity to have in your country and that a substantial dairy herd in a desirable thing for any country, even one like Barbados that is fundamentally not suitable for the keeping of cows.

The grasses that grow in Barbados both of them militate against successful dairy or beef farming. You have to take special measures that you would not have to take in colder countries and countries with a different quality of grass
2.30 p.m.

I am therefore not in any way prejudiced against the dairy farmers, I think that Barbadians must become accustomed to paying a high price for milk. After all, we have over the ages, and we must try and get people into a habit of better quality milk than milk which comes out of tins. We are definitely a tinned milk country, like so many poor tropical countries, and I think we should make an effort to get away from that.

I also believe that during the tourist season, the demand for fresh milk picks up so sharply that it is worth having the cows for the purpose of satisfying the fresh milk demand. Milk is one of the areas, in fact, where tourists consume more of the local product than locals do — very, very much more in fact.

In the case of milk, probably the disparity, which is well known among those that study it, between the amount of local food the tourists eat and the amount of local food the locals eat is greatest. But if the honourable Member is taking his general facts about the dependence of local food having increased in the last ten years, he is wrong.

The percentage of food in our imports is less now — not more. It only went up by 3 per cent last year, as you will see in the Economic Report when it is laid in the House next week. We are producing more food locally, and a greater percentage of the food which we consume.

I have been able — I have a fairly extensive library of books about tourism in the Caribbean — to find the report to which the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central referred when he said that tourists eat 65 per cent of the food imported into Barbados, and I think I have identified the honourable Member's mistake, which I am now convinced is an honest mistake.

The 65 per cent is not the percentage of imported food which the tourists eat. The honourable Member misread the statement, I think. That 65 per cent of the food the tourists eat is imported, as in the statement, "The tourists eat 65 per cent of the imported food". I hope the honourable Member now understands the difference. If he had studied that report carefully.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If the honourable Member would give way, Mr. Chairman. I do not have the figures in front of me now, but I did issue a clarification. My clarification was to the effect that tourism accounted for a given percentage of the cost of imported food. I was talking about the cost, not the volume.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member is a stubborn and determined person. It is untrue, and I have given the honourable Member the explanation of his mistake, and he is still insisting on a wrong explanation. It is untrue that tourists account for any more than five or six per cent, either by value or volume, of imported food.

The study, which is Doxie's Study in 1969 of the Barbados tourist industry, examined the food

consumed at hotels in different parts of Barbados — East Coast, South Coast, luxury and West Coast hotels — and examined Barbados' own diet. There was a paper by Graham Gooding on the imported component in Barbados' diet, which is about 70 per cent. Even at that time, the tourists were eating a little more local food than the locals, and I think the trend has continued.

If honourable Members work on the arithmetic, because people who do not in the slightest wish the Barbados Labour Party ill have questioned me about the figure of 5 per cent of the food imported into this country being eaten by tourists, you only have to remember that tourists, on average, spend nine days in Barbados, Barbadians on average spend 360 days in Barbados, so in the ordinary way any given Barbadian is going to eat 40 times as much food in a year as a tourist, as any given tourist. It is a matter of common sense. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Get off that now, it is not going to help). The honourable Member for St. Michael West is asking me not to drive the nails into the coffin of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central any harder, so I will get off that subject now.

But I wanted to deal particularly with a statement attributed to Mr. Haynesley Benn of the Barbados Agricultural Society. I am not reflecting on him, Sir, I am only saying that he is wrong when he says that there are policies which can be followed which will cause Barbados not to import any more food.

I want to ask Mr. Benn where he is going to grow the rice that Barbadians eat. I want to ask Mr. Benn where he is going to grow the \$8 million worth of wheat that we import every year. I even want to ask him where is he going to grow the cows to produce \$15 million of beef, the \$3 million of corned beef and the \$2 million of salt beef that are imported into Barbados every year.

It is one thing to say that you are going to get them from a different source overseas than from where you now get them from, but it is a different thing altogether to say that you are going to get them in Barbados.

It does the agricultural industry no good, no good at all, to suggest that this island will ever be able to produce all the food it eats. We could only do that if we stop eating rice, stop eating English potatoes, cut down on the consumption of beef and stop eating bread.

If you want us to stop eating bread, no doubt we can reduce food imports, but as a matter of common sense, let us for goodness sake understand that we do not have a soil that holds water, and therefore it would be

very difficult to grow rice, that we do not have a soil that has regular frosts every year during which wheat can rest.

Indeed, we do not have the 15 or 16 hours of daylight at some times and 15 or 16 hours of darkness at others, and therefore we find it difficult to grow onions for more than a few months of the year, and would find it very difficult to grow a great range of northern fruits.

In the same way that you will not expect the Vale of Evesham to produce many mangoes, but an abundance of plums, English cherries and apples, you do not expect Barbados to produce English apples or English plums that are essentially northern fruit. In the same way that they do not grow sugar cane in Alberta, we do not grow wheat in Barbados.

It is no doubt possible to find a strain of wheat which, at enormous expense, could be grown in Barbados. But it is a lot better, I would suggest to the Editor of the Nation who wrote an article about canes, to grow the product for which tropical soils, especially in this hemisphere, are peculiarly well suited — which is sugar cane, which also happens to be the crop that has the greatest capacity to turn solar energy into food energy, of any. Of all crops it is the most efficient in converting the energy of the sun into a useable product.

It is better to grow the crop in which you are efficient and sell it to buy the crops that you cannot grow. We understand that we are a trading country and live by trade, that if we did not import things we would all be poorer and that we must try to export.

Running through the somewhat confused threads of the speech of the honourable Member for St. Philip South, there was an understanding that it is necessary to export in order to maintain imports.
2.40 p.m.

If we do not try to maximise exports, and therefore continue to be in a position to enjoy the good things of life, we will not get anywhere, and we have not done too badly by trying it. That is what the honourable Member was saying.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: If the honourable Member would give way. I wonder if the Prime Minister realises that the difference is not between himself and the Shadow Minister over here or indeed with Mr. Haynesley Benn, but between himself and his Minister of Agriculture. There are clearly two different policies being enunciated here.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The honourable Member obviously does not know the Minister of Agriculture as well as I know him, and he is mistaken if he thinks that the Minister of Agriculture could be guilty

of the intellectual heresies, I think "intellectual" is a rather strong word there for Mr. Haynesley Benn.

It is well nigh impossible to get it out of the public consciousness and out of the Press, and out of the general public opinion, that this is a country where a whole set of food is imported and we could do something different.

We are a little tiny country — it is only 480 or 479 square kilometres. Countries of 479 square kilometres with a quarter of a million people in them are never going to be self-sufficient in food except at such a low level as is quite unacceptable to Barbados.

Even in times when there was a labour force that cost nothing, and any crop that was usable for food could be planted at no more than the whims of the planters, in times of slavery food had to be imported into this island. You did not have to take the taste of the slaves into account. They had to eat whatever they were given and they had to plant it, and yet food was imported into this island even then when the standard of living was much much lower.

I would be glad to think that we will get away from these heresies of believing (a) that agriculture is going nowhere — we have gone a long way in import substitution and production of local food or (b) that the import of food is a particularly crippling item: in Barbados' general economic profile. The import of food occupies only 10 per cent of the GDP and it is a falling percentage.

We are importing other things as we get richer and richer, and I am glad, and proud, to think that I live on an island where people come from all around to go in the supermarkets to shop, and where our people have access to a wide range of foods — the same range of foods that they would have access to if they went to live in much larger countries that have a range of climates that can produce anything.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be associated with the remarks of the last speaker, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

The policy of the Barbados Labour Party Administration is separate and quite distinct from that of the Democratic Labour Party. The history of agriculture in this country dictates that the policy, on this side certainly, be to increase food production, reduce food imports and do as much as possible in terms of food substitution programme.

Sir, between 1971 and 1976 it has been proven that over 12 000 acres of good agricultural land were taken out of agricultural production.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, the honourable Member is misleading this House. That is a heresy. It is a statement which has been repeated over and over again. Unless he is able to indicate where the acreage was taken out, to make that statement constantly is misleading this House. It is simply not true.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, it is quite all right. The honourable Member for St. Michael West.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The honourable Member for St. Michael West is accustomed to getting up on no point of order, but to get on with the point, Sir, if he would check with the Ministry of Agriculture I am quite sure that the Ministry of Agriculture will produce the very same figures which were produced to me — that 122 000 tons of sugar were lost as a result of.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, I wonder if the honourable Member realises that I asked a specific question on these acres that were taken out of agriculture and those which were brought back in, and up to now the Ministry of Agriculture has not been able to produce the answer.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I am not the Minister. He should take that up with the Hon. Minister on the front bench, not with me. I am not aware of any question which the honourable Member would have asked, because I am not a Minister. I am a back-bencher putting the case for agriculture for the back bench in here, and for the Government in power.

Sir, we as a party have stamped out the practice of taking good agricultural land and sub-dividing it and selling it for house spots. I really did not want to say that Mr. Chairman. I did not want to reduce the level of my speech to that, but if I am interrupted by the other side, I will have to produce these facts. Good agricultural land was purchased and divided and sold to Democratic Labour Party supporters so that they got rich and the country got poorer.

Idle agricultural land is a double loss for Barbados. The first loss is, of course, that the land produced nothing, and the second loss is because no Barbadians are working the land and no wages are paid. And in a small country like Barbados, when one is cognisant of the fact that food imports are high and food production is low, at a time like this when one should be putting more land into agricultural production, the Democratic Labour Party was notorious for taking land out of production. I just wanted to set the records straight.

This party has, from time to time, made an appeal to people who own land, and I am again making that appeal, to put it back into agricultural production.

The four main objectives of this Government from the time we took office on September 2, 1976, was firstly, to ensure that we in Barbados were able to produce enough to feed the public of Barbados as cheaply as possible. The second objective of this Government was to ensure that the producers of the agricultural products receive a fair price and just reward. The third objective, Sir, was to try to ensure that the small farmer had available to him the technical data and know-how, and the fourth was to ensure that the small farmer had credit available through the Barbados National Bank and other banking institutions set up for that purpose.

Those were the principles upon which we launched our Manifesto in 1976 and they are still the principles of this Government today. Our aim has always been to get agriculture on the move again in this country and our purpose has been to produce enough to feed Barbadians.

The honourable Member for St. Philip South, Mr. Chairman, talked about reducing food imports when, in truth and in fact, food imports have been reduced, particularly in the area of agricultural production. Dependence on food imports has been reduced. Vegetable production has reached a height in Barbados that it has never reached for six or seven years.

Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to get down to any statistical data today, but I am forced to, because the honourable Member for St. Philip South is talking about reducing food imports. He should not be talking to us about that. We have already accomplished that, and what we hope to do is to reduce it even further. Now if he said that he would like this Government to try and ensure that it is reduced even further, that would be a different point. On that I would be in full agreement.

Let us take sweet potatoes and yams. In 1974 under the Democratic Labour Party they produced 2 000 tons of sweet potatoes, we produced last year 4 600 tons. In 1974 they produced 5 000 tons of yams and we produced 7 700 tons last year.
2.50 p.m.

They are going to talk to us, Sir, about production of agriculture in this country? Read the reports. Sir, in 1975, the DLP was able to produce 269,000 kilos in beets. We produced 507,000 last year. They produced 718,000 kilos of cabbage. We produced 1,000,716 kilos last year by bringing more agricultural land back into production. It is estimated that between 1976 and last

year we brought back into agricultural production over 4,500 acres of the total 12,000 that they took out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Cucumbers, Sir. They produced 908,000 kilos of cucumbers in 1975 and we produced 1,808,000 kilos last year. I can give them more, Sir. I did not plan to talk about this, but if they want to hear about it, I will tell them. Eggplant, lettuce, pumpkin, tomato — we have out-performed them in every area possible, Sir. In 1975 they were able to produce over 444,000 kilos of tomatoes and we produced 1,636,000 kilos. I can go on. Fish — you talk about proteins — fish, Sir. When the Democratic Labour Party was in power, they never had the facilities available to fishermen that the Barbados Labour Party has made available to fishermen today in Barbados.

The total tonnes of fish produced in 1974 was 2,623 tonnes. We produced last year 4,294 tonnes and for this year, 1982, as the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central will tell you, we will produce over 5,000 tonnes of fish this year, Sir. This is why we can get 7 and 8 flying fish for one dollar. You could not get that in 1974 or, in fact, 1970. These are the facts, Sir. I can make it a document of the House. These are the facts.

They talk about beef production. We understand and accept, Mr. Chairman, that there is limited space in Barbados for the production of beef. We have the same land available to us and they had available to them and they produced 181,000 kilos of beef in 1975 and we produced 409,000 kilos last year.

With regard to poultry, we have the same facilities, in terms of physical space available to Barbados in 1981, that they had, Sir, when they were in power, and in poultry production they produced 2.8 million kilos of poultry meat. We produced 6 million kilos last year and still turned around, Sir, and, in addition to that, imported another \$5 million in poultry for eating. We only consumed 2.8 million kilos in 1974 and we consumed 11 million kilos of poultry last year, Sir. These are the facts, Sir.

To add further to the comments made by the Prime Minister about food importation and Mr. Benn, and with reference to the comments made by the honourable Member for St. Philip South, it is unfortunate that we in Barbados have to produce as much food as we have to, Sir. It is unfortunate. But this, in itself, proves — I mean, I have just outlined the fact that we have trebled and quadrupled agricultural production since we were in power and, in addition to that, we are still importing more and more food.

The Prime Minister talked about beef but, Sir, we imported \$3.5 million in mutton last year, \$6.3 million in chicken, \$2.5 million in pork. The Prime Minister talked about milk, but in addition to all of the milk we produced last year, Sir, we still imported some \$7 million in powdered milk. The Prime Minister called the figure of \$8 million for wheat, but the figure for rice is \$9.5 million. That is what we are eating. We are eating good. We are eating the best. Nothing is too good for us, Sir, under this Administration. Nothing is too good for us. We even imported \$8.6 million in maize last year.

Potatoes, Sir, English potatoes. Apart from the fact that we produce our own English potatoes, over one million kilos last year, we imported \$5 million of English potatoes last year. I can go on. Orange juice. Mr. Chairman, Sir, even tomato catsup. We imported \$1.5 million of catsup last year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have clearly put the case for the back bench because the front bench is yet to talk. This is the Second Eleven, Sir. The First Eleven have not started to bat yet. We will leave the First Eleven to play last and make the final runs.

In closing, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute.

Mr. A. TRUSS: There are still items in Barbados that were available in January, 1981 that are still available in March, 1982 and the prices have not changed. English potatoes in January 1981 cost 42c a pound. Today, Sir, English potatoes are selling at 42c a pound. Rice, not the packaged kind — if you want to say the poor people's rice, Sir — I do not particularly like that expression, Sir — the rice that is not packaged sold for 57c a pound last year January, and 15 months later non-packaged rice is still selling for 57c.

Chicken, Sir, were \$2.52 a pound last year January. Today March 1982, gracious man, the same \$2.52, Mr. Chairman. This Government has gone a long way in keeping the price of food down. When the Prime Minister said that prices were actually dropping, people on that side were laughing. These are the facts, Sir. Poultry feed, animal feed have remained the same. Salted Fish \$2.08 a pound January last year. Today, it is \$2.08 a pound. Onions is \$1.32 a kilo. Today, \$1.32 a kilo. Those are the facts, Mr. Chairman, Thank you.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a lot of figures. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if you were to check back the Hansard, you would

realise that the imports, that the Honourable Member, has outlined outstrip the amount of local production that he was gloating about.

In fact, when he was calling out, when he was speaking about the number of imports that he was bringing in, the \$8 million here and the \$9 million for this, and the \$3 million for Catsup, after a while I thought that he was producing them here. I did not believe that he was bringing them in.

But I will say this as well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the honourable Member's speech is concerned — every single person knows that because you produce more in a country, it does not necessarily mean that you did not import more. That is basic commonsense, Mr. Chairman. Because you have produced more in a country, it does not mean that you did not import more because I am saying, and this is precisely what I am saying,.....

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir. The point which the honourable Member is making is a nonsensical point, Sir. I withdraw that remark, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, I at no time gave the indication that because we were producing more, we were importing less.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point taken.

Mr. A. TRUSS: No, No. Total revenue imports have trebled in five years so we must be importing more. The people are better off.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if you recall my statement when I began my speech once,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Because of the increase in population....because of the rising standard of living, the rising incomes, and also because of the changes food habits, that we are importing more. That is what I began my statement with in the first place. So when the honourable Member got up and started to speak about all of these local productions, one got the impression that he was trying to say that what I said was wrong. Furthermore, I will not deal with the honourable Member, I will leave him for other honourable Members on this side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I was not trying to give the impression that he was wrong. I am stating emphatically that he was wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member will have his chance to speak again and rebut his argument, please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: The honourable Member does not even recall what he has said because the Honourable Member just got up and said, of course, they are imported, and now he gets up and says that he does not think that I am wrong, but he knows that I am wrong. But he is criticizing himself each time.

There is one more thing I will have to say, Mr. Chairman. The honourable Prime Minister has gone on record, in here, as saying that we are not importing too much. That is on record. Every single person in Barbados knows that we are importing too much. But the Hon. Prime Minister said that we are not.

What the Hon. Prime Minister has gone on record in here as saying is that we have to export enough to pay for the imports, it is not that we are importing too much. Now this statement, Mr. Chairman, is diametrically opposite to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture's statements. Every chance the Hon. Minister of Agriculture gets to make a speech, he says that we are importing too much. But the Prime Minister says that we are not importing too much so which one is wrong, Mr. Chairman? Both of them cannot be right. So, why do we not get some kind of cohesion. How are we to understand what is happening? With that, Mr. Chairman, I sit for a while.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the context of arguments between groups of persons, there are certain accepted modes and methods, and intellectual honesty requires that comparisons that are going to be done be done like with like.

We have heard the honourable Member trotting out statistics which, if the uninitiated heard them, would be inclined to suggest that there was some vast improvement. I am going to take the Reports of the Central Bank, Sir. He sought to compare 1974 with 1982. That is intellectually dishonest. Intellectually, Sir. That is Parliamentary Language.
3.00 p.m.

I am just going to read a few excerpts from the Central Bank Report and you can choose between the honourable Member's gleaned statistics or the statistics of the Central Bank.

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of elucidation....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not giving way yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member does not give way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: In 1977, the Central Bank at page 10, states "The cotton crop was a disaster." Under the same Agriculture in 1977, "but other livestock products remained depressed, the quantity of fish caught this year declined sharply." I am coming again, Sir. In 1977, page 10 — you may have it.

The honourable Member sought to give the impression that fisheries improved in this country beyond the time the Democratic Labour Party was in power. (Mr. A. TRUSS: That is a known fact.) What is a known fact?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, no cross talking. Please address the Chair.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Cotton experienced another disappointing year. (Mr. A. TRUSS: I didn't deal with cotton) I am coming at you, take it easy. "The Fishing industry recovered from the severe crop in 1977, but still fell far short of the 1976 out-put" still fell far short of the 1976 output. I am a teacher and I have to teach you and others.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. Please address the Chair.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Michael West were ordered to be expunged from the record by the Chairman at this stage.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, I am saying that I never compared anything with 1982. The figures which I gave were for 1980, not 1982 as the honourable Member indicated. 1980, the base year of this party and 1974 and some cases 1975 in the base year of their party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to let the Committee understand we are not discussing the Report of the Central Bank. While we do refer to it, I certainly do not intend that we do discuss the Report of the Central Bank at this time.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am not discussing.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. Honourable members, do not interrupt the Chair, when the Chair is speaking.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What foolishness is this?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Surely you can make reference to them. But I have said that I would not permit a debate on that, so I am asking the honourable Members to bear that in mind. Please continue.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member just got up and said he was discussing 1980, so I will discuss 1980 with him. Page 10 of the Central Bank Report, under Agriculture, "Onion production declined to 472.332 kilos from 543.535 kilos."

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir. I never talked about onions. I never said whether onions did, or did not, decline. I am hearing about onions for the first time and it is not fair to me.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Some fish now, and some milk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Let us get back to the Estimates.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am discussing the Estimates. I am discussing the amount of money which has been put into this vote for the Ministry of Agriculture and I am showing the performance of the Ministry of Agriculture in the light of information which was purported to be given to us.

Only 1.12 million kilos of fish were landed during the year, one fifth less than in 1979. And I have already given information to show that between 1976 and the period in which he sought to give information, there had already been a depression.

I am quoting from the Official Information given out in Barbados as the correct information for Barbados. I am suggesting that if these Estimates are to be discussed in the context of statistical information, that information must be grounded in solidly acceptable bases. We cannot have people coming in here....

Mr. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir. I have no argument of what the honourable Member has said. It is true that between 1979 and 1980 that the actual amount of fish caught had declined but I gave him the provisional figures for 1981 — 4,294 tonnes.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I now dismiss the honourable Member as an unworthy opponent. He is an unworthy opponent in this matter. I will return to the higher division so I can deal with the Minister.

I am finished with the honourable Member and so we have got the matter straightened out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, order please! (*Asides*) Will the honourable Member let us get on with the Estimates.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I am beginning to feel a little pressure from the Chair. I am not saying that you are putting it on, Sir, I am saying that I am beginning to feel so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And that is very much in order. (*Laughter*).

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, to get back to the debate. The Rt. Hon. Member for St. Thomas has made some points concerning the development of agriculture in the country and the need for us to import into Barbados, if we are to continue as the viable country.

It is very interesting that he continues to take that tact while the Minister of Agriculture is following in the vein of previous Ministers of Agriculture at least in his Administration, and I wish to make this point.
3.10 p.m.

A long time ago — probably just over ten years ago, Sir — when the honourable Member for St. Joseph was the Shadow Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House, I believe that that kind of attitude — that Barbados could, in fact, produce enough food to feed itself — was promulgated from this side of the House from the time when the honourable Member for St. Joseph, whom I do not now see in his place, and I am sorry he is not there, Sir, was Shadow Minister of Agriculture. He continued, for a substantial amount of time, to give people the impression that all of the gains which were being made by the Democratic Labour Party, were not, in fact, gains.

The result is that all of the research and development which had been done in that Ministry throughout the 1960s and the early 1970s, which we have seen the result of in the milk plant, was derided.

The milk plant is the best milk plant there is in the Caribbean — with the whole milk industry, the dairy milk industry, and some people might say it is the best you could find almost anywhere.

The whole approach to the development of the dairy milk industry, by the Democratic Labour Party, was met with a lot of unnecessary and childish criticism and the whole idea of substitution of crops, import substitution by the planting and the expansion of crops.

When we introduced onions on an experimental basis, if one reads the debate that took place in this Hon. Chamber at that time, one would see that the seeds of distrust, the seeds of confusion, were sown in those days,

when the efforts of the Ministry of Agriculture were always being undermined by the then Opposition.

It is, therefore a little difficult for them now that they have the reins of Government, and now that they are discovering that much of the ground to be covered has already been covered, and that the new areas are not presenting themselves as easily as they might have thought, now that they have these difficulties, we find that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is seeking solace in a new — not for him, but to the rest of us — philosophy — that countries of this kind ought to become, as it were, shopping centres — we should create some kind of attitude, and atmosphere, where a richer country, such as Trinidad and Tobago, would use us as a way station where they can come in and shop in the magnificent supermarkets and go back out, and were the value added is only by way of any profit which might accrue from their incidental stay in the country.

I believe that that is not in keeping with the kind of attitude we should have as a developing country.

I remember that when I left the Government, in 1976, this country was self-sufficient in poultry, this country was self sufficient in eggs, this country was self sufficient in pork — those are three fundamentals — and it was self-sufficient, to the extent that that made sense, in the dairy industry, it was self-sufficient in milk. Those are four fundamental food areas in which we, in Barbados, were proud, and should be proud, to have reached the stage of self-sufficiency.

And I go further. We had formed, as part of our development programme, the concept of a regional development agricultural programme to discuss agricultural development in the Caribbean *in vacuo*, that is to say the agricultural development of Barbados without reference to something, for example, like the Caribbean Food Plan, is really to have an exercise in word utterance, because for the Prime Minister to talk in terms of rice from Guyana as large imports, it would do no justice to the concept that we have been discussing for the last 20 years.

When rice is purchased from Guyana, it is not quite the same as when corned beef is purchased from Argentina, because the rice from Guyana is not paid for in hard currency. We, in the Caribbean, have an understanding.

I am sure when I say, "in hard currency", that the honourable Members would understand that I am talking about the way in which payments can be transferred *intra* Caribbean, as opposed to outside of the Caribbean. I do not wish anybody to get up and ask me if we pay them in Barbados dollars. I hope no one would get up and accuse me of saying that we pay for it in Barbados

dollars. I think that intelligent people know what I am talking about.

It has always been accepted that Caribbean Community trade was the objective of the integration movement and, therefore, it was envisaged, for example, that the beef which it now imports from Australia would eventually have been imported from Belize and Guyana.

I need not go into a long dissertation, my colleague, the Shadow Minister, will spend some time on this, if necessary. But I think we need to give the lie, or if not quite the lie, the heave-ho, to the kind of arrant nonsense which the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister is now trotting out, and which he is not prepared to say is policy. He always speaks as if, suddenly in that regard, the Minister of Agriculture is adumbrating the policy, but he is speaking in his capacity as himself, whatever that means. It is arrant nonsense.

The fact is, Sir, that if iceberg lettuce is imported from Miami to feed the tourists, that is a leakage in our economy. If we have to import onions from somewhere else to feed tourists, that is a leakage in our economy. If we have to import lamb — and I can go on and list a number of things — when, in fact, we envisage Black Belly sheep as part and parcel of the protein development in the community, then, Sir, that is a leakage in our economy.

In essence, what I am saying is that the Ministry of Agriculture — and we are going to look at the Heads in a little more detail — has got to be seen in a much broader sense. We have got to look to find out whether it has been successful in the task which was set for it some time ago.

The people of Barbados set a task for the Ministry of Agriculture. It was to get on, to the extent that it was at all possible, in substituting importation from elsewhere by the growing of the same products here. We are fully aware that we do not have the land size to produce as much food as the United States, but the Prime Minister could go on to make the point that there are only two or three countries in the world that are capable of producing all of the food that they need. There are no other countries capable of doing that, so to make that point is to make a non point.

I will finally end this segment by saying that the honourable Member talked about the removal of land from... (Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I want to deal with that) My colleague is going to deal with that. I will just deal with the 12 000 acres.

There is a law in Barbados which requires farmers to grow a certain amount of food. The law was amended at one point along the way, and it was subsequently changed again.

The Minister of Agriculture determines that to a large extent, so to the extent that he shifts to one position, or the other, he expects, and the country expects, that food production would move in that direction. That particular food production would take care of such things as potatoes and yams. I do not think that that is anything for us to argue about.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time. The honourable Member for St. Michael South.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have a brief intervention to make in this debate, and in a sense I regret that my neophyte colleague, the Member for St. Michael Central, has introduced this question of comparative statistics and so on. He has quoted his statistics and we will make sure that the record is set straight. That is what will happen, you will get the statistics about production figures and so on, but I do not really wish to talk about that at this stage.

What I want to talk about is the broad sweep of agricultural policy and the direction into which we are heading, because I think agriculture is too fundamental a question to be sidetracked by that kind of speech from the Member for St. Michael Central, and we may very well get lost and not consider the main issues at stake.

When we talk about agriculture, we are talking basically about food and other commodities which may be necessary for existence and for the development of man, animals and so on. In almost every country agriculture is considered as a basic industry, necessary not only as food, but also as part of national security. Unless we put this topic at that kind of level, we will be unable to appreciate the broad strands of approach to policies which may be necessary in this country, and we have got to ask ourselves, from the outset, what are the major approaches that a country such as Barbados can approach in this particular matter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the honourable Member would just give way, Sir, or if he could just assist me by telling us what subhead he is talking under, I may be able to follow him. Just indicate which subhead, I want to be able to follow him.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I did not hear any subhead called, I heard a Head called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is only a matter of being courteous. I mean, we work that way.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Courteous? All right. General Administration (a) "Initiation and review of agricultural policy affecting all projects and programmes of the Ministry and its related departments." That is

opposite page 29, Explanatory Notes. I am just being courteous.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I take it therefore, Sir, he is dealing with Other Personal Emoluments, National Insurance contributions, Health Service contributions, Transport Levy, Travel, Utilities, Library, Supplies and Materials, Maintenance of Property, Operating Expenses...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have risen to have clarified what subhead he is under, Sir. I would like to know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to take it, Sir, after I finish make my point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member please take his seat?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am just trying to ascertain which item he is speaking about.

Certain remarks made by the Hon. L. S. CRAIG were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN at this stage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will report progress and report to the Speaker as to the incidents for his reporting progress and seeking leave to sit again.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 15 minutes. (The Chairman needs additional time? I recognise that, Sir). For 20 minutes, Sir. I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 20 minutes, Sir. (*Asides*).

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion I had made for 15 minutes, and I now beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 20 minutes.

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

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

On resumption:

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House 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 may continue.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that we have got to ask ourselves some fundamental questions as far as agricultural policy is concerned, and we have perhaps got to make at least a basic premise and to enunciate that from the start.

First of all, if we are to start from first cost, we may very well have to say that the question of feeding Barbados is a matter of protein, fat and carbohydrate basically. That is the basis of all food, with some vitamins and so on.

I am maintaining that Barbados is capable of producing, from its own resources, the protein, fat and carbohydrate necessary to feed this population. What we are not capable of doing is satisfying, or catering to, the food and nutritional habits that we have inherited.

Therefore, if we are talking about Barbados being self-sufficient in agriculture, it is not merely a question of food production, but also, hand in hand with that, there must be a significant change in nutritional habits.

Now this is not something that can occur overnight. It calls for a fundamental amount of education and training, and other kinds of inputs, at both formal, and perhaps even more important, informal levels.

It is clear that this cannot take place under the current Estimates which we are debating because the amount of money for training for nutritional activities and so forth, have been severely cut, and the Ministry does not have at its disposal the resources to embark on such a programme. So any talk about self-sufficiency or working towards that kind of development is a non-starter, because the Ministry is really not in that kind of league at all.

What we have to understand also, is that if we are talking about food production or the availability of

food, you have two basic approaches to that. Either you produce the food yourself — from your resources, or you import it.

I have heard the Minister of Agriculture on occasions and I agree with his general enunciation of agricultural policy. He is in favour of the development of a broad-based agriculture, based, not only on sugar production, but in all of the other areas, hoping that these could be stimulated so that you could grow both for local needs and for export. That is from an agricultural point of view and from a national security point of view.

I believe his party produced a document called "Promises and Performances" or something like that. That is the same title that comes from one of the textbooks that I use. They are always copying names. But they have this thing called "Promises and Performances" in which it was said or they enunciated that they would produce a variety of products, and from the sale of those, they hoped to pay for the imports of the food that they did not produce.

But you have another approach to this question of the availability of food in a country which is more finance-based, and that base says, look at your comparative advantage, or whatever the economic jargon may be. You look at those crops which you can produce in terms of comparative advantage, and if sugar cane is the crop that we can produce best, you put all or almost all your resources into the production of the sugar cane and you export that, and with the proceeds from your exports, you purchase the imports that you need.

That, as I said, is from a finance-based approach. It is one that I, myself, do not feel is the answer to our problems, and it is one which must come into conflict with the approaches of any Minister of Agriculture who has his head screwed on the right way, and I make bold to say that this present Minister of Agriculture has his head screwed on the right way. (*Asides*)

I warned the Minister about this from the start, that he would run into conflict with the Ministry of Finance.

I am sorry. We are talking at policy level, not Ministry — I am talking about the Minister of Finance — and that is clear, not only from what has been said here this afternoon, but in speeches before, and this is the basic problem. So we must get this matter sorted out at the policy level before agriculture can go anywhere, and Heaven knows that before these two diametrically opposed approaches to agriculture were introduced, agriculture itself was having major problems.

Having put these considerations out of the way, we have got to ask ourselves — is everything right with

agriculture today in Barbados? Or maybe we should put it another way, is anything right with agriculture today in Barbados?

Let me start from the top, the roof. As I understand it, there are problems of a constructional nature. I do not know what are the problems with the building in which you are housed at Graeme Hall, but I understand there are problems, structurally, with the roof and other parts of the building, and the very Estimates you are bringing here before us cannot solve that problem.

I understand that something is wrong with the air-conditioning solar, or whatever you call it. It probably is working 100 per cent now, I do not know. But there are problems there at that level.

There are problems at the level of the morale of the staff of the Ministry of Agriculture — not of this Minister's doings — but if these officials do not have the tools to do the job, the job cannot be done, and there is so much chopping and changing, so much confusion about goals and objectives and implementations at all levels of staff in the Ministry of Agriculture, that there is bound to be major confusion.

They were talking about developing greater fruit production, let us say — and the production of fruit would be an important facet or part of this drive towards a greater measure of self-sufficiency of food in this country — but I believe that recently, there was an increase in the price of seedling.

I do not know if this is an extra budgetary measure or what, because we have had all kinds of measures introduced outside of Budget time which will have the effect of cushioning, in some way, the Budgetary Proposals which will come down shortly, because if outside of Budget time you bring about all kinds of increases in all kinds of services, you are bound to say then that you have not introduced many new measures in this Budget, and if a lot of new measures are introduced, there would be more.

I would like the Minister either to confirm, or to deny, that the cost of seedlings, citrus and oranges, are \$7. What were they before? One dollar? Mr. Chairman, what percentage increase is that?
4.05 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable Member is directing his question to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Through you, Mr. Chairman. My colleagues here are giving me some information that is really shocking. How long ago did that happen

though? Six hundred per cent increase in the cost of seedlings which they want to encourage the production of in Barbados. Something else too?

What about spray? These seedlings have to be sprayed? I do not know. It is good agricultural practice that they should be sprayed from time to time. If you have to spray them, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what is the cost of spraying the seedlings by the Ministry of Agriculture, and whether there has been an increase in that.

If you send up the seedlings by 600 per cent or 700 per cent I believe that they would go up by over 300 percent. This is a kind of a class work that Permanent Secretaries may know about. From 75¢ to \$3 per plant for spraying and if you have a number of these seedlings around, or you are trying to develop any kind major output, you can see how costs are going up, and if the cost of production is going up how the cost of the fruit at the end will be up in the air.

Mr. Chairman, I really do not wish to go into these matters. I want to get the Minister of Agriculture back in the picture, because the debate has kept him out. He has been down in the wing while somebody from the back bench has taken over and he has been effectively sidelined. But we have got to deal with these fundamental questions in agriculture.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute more.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: When we talk about the dairy producers or the poultry producers, or whatever other sector of the agricultural community we talk about, you cannot just dismiss them as pressure groups. Of course they are pressure groups and democracy is based on pressure groups. Each particular interest expresses its needs as it sees it, and then it is the function of a Government to try to bring about some compromise or some understanding as far as those pressure groups are concerned.

If you have legislation on agriculture, you send it to the groups for their response. That is their function. And if they have a question, we have to ask ourselves, do these people have legitimate grievances. Are the dairy farmers happy? Are the poultry producers happy? Are those who are in vegetable production happy? Are those who are in sugar happy? Are those who produce the onions happy? If you can answer "Yes" to those questions, then we can say all is well in agriculture.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: But you gave the Prime Minister an additional half hour. I am winding up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. The honourable Member's time is up. Please be seated.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: All right. All right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can come again.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, in my opening address, I mentioned that there are complaints from certain agricultural groups in Barbados and the Hon. Prime Minister proceeded to, in his own way, dismiss the protest of these groups in an off-hand manner. Now, I do not believe that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture can dismiss the statements from these groups in an off-hand manner, because he has to deal with these groups directly, and if these groups are complaining, he will have to take their complaints into consideration, so the Prime Minister is in his right to dismiss them off-hand.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the pig farmers are complaining about BARPAC or something — they do not have enough facilities down there for the number of pigs that they have. The BAS President is complaining every-time he makes a statement in Barbados. I do not want to call any names.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Are you saying that there is nothing to complain about? Mr. Chairman, I am saying that these people have a legitimate grouse when they complain. I am saying this. I am not saying that in all organizations you do not have persons who, for personal reasons or otherwise, might seek to make mischief.

But what concerns me is that every single one of these organizations are speaking with the same voice, and the voice they are speaking with is not in agreement with what we understand the Minister is saying.
4.15 p.m.

We have got the impression that everything is going well, but when we hear the reports we recognize that they are not going well. But I will go from that, because I believe the Hon. Minister will reply to that in his own time.

I would like to turn, Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes on the question of the increased production of crops in Barbados. You can only increase crops, Mr. Chairman, when you bring more land into production, by enhancing the yield per unit land area or by increasing the number of crops you produce per year. I will deal with the first one first — bringing more land into production.

The Barbados Labour Party has made a lot of song and dance about bringing more land into production.

They have accused the Democratic Labour Party of cutting up good agricultural land for rental purposes, or for sale for people to build houses and this sort of thing, and they brag that they are bringing back these thousands of acres into food production.

But every day, I pass by Fairy Valley, Mr. Chairman and when I pass by Spencers, and almost all of the Government agricultural units, I see empty land all over the place. So what is the sense of bringing back land into production and leaving all the land you bring back without anything on it. What is the sense?

I am saying that there is no reason to bloat and gloat about bringing back land into production and have nothing on it. It is just as well you leave it as they say the Democratic Labour Party had it. That is what I am saying.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they say how the number of crops produced per year have increased. I have no quarrel with this. They have to produce the facts and the honourable Member for St. Michael Central seems to have all the facts, so I believe he will come with the facts about the increasing number of crops that have been produced. But my honourable colleague here, reading from the Central Bank's Report, has also come up with a lot of crops, many crops, that have gone out of production and the hon. Minister over there said that we don't need that crop.

But I recall in 1975 there were glowing reports in Barbados about our cotton industry. We had reports that Barbados has the best cotton in the world but suddenly we hear that we do not need cotton anymore. Mr. Chairman, this Government will have to come and spell out its policy. We want to know the policy of this Government. This Government has to spell out its policy, because we do not understand how one day you are hearing things increasing and the next day you are hearing they are decreasing.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have to rise again and draw to Your Honour's attention that Second Reading speeches are being made in this Committee. Under General Administration Subhead 1, it does not deal with policy direction. And for the honourable Member to be asking what is the policy of the Government is nothing else but a Second Reading speech, Sir. I am submitting this and asking for Your Honour's Ruling. I was in Mr. Speaker's Chamber and I was horrified at yet another Second Reading speech by the honourable Member for St. Philip South, Sir. I seek Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Most, if not all, of the honourable Members in this debate today have been dealing with the Second Reading speeches. I must tell

you, however, that here we are dealing with the initiation and review of agricultural policy, and I believe it is only fair to honourable Members, even if they go over board at some point, to give them a chance to lay their complaints with respect to the agricultural policy of this Government.

I would ask the honourable Member to be a little more definitive in their arguments. But I must let the Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs know and understand that I sit here as Chairman of this Committee, and if, at all, there is anything in his view to which the Chairman's conduct should be called into account, there is a proper time and place to do it. I will now hear from the honourable Member for St. Philip South.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to you, Sir, I have never questioned your conduct in here or outside of this august House of Assembly. I know very well that if this Chair is not in keeping, I know there is a substantive motion which I can bring and deal with you effectively.

It is, however, as Leader of Government's business that I cannot sit here and repeatedly hear what I consider Second Reading speeches being made by Members on both sides without drawing it to Your Honour's attention for a ruling, which you have already given — that you are prepared to give them the opportunity to make Second Reading speeches. I bow, Sir, to your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me point out here for the benefit of the Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He is in no position to question the discretion of the Chair. Please continue.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not questioning it, Sir. I have never and will not question the Chair. I simply made a comment and drew it to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I just want to draw to the Hon. Leader of the House's attention that the description of Sub-head 1, General Administration, goes like this (a) Initiation and review of agricultural policy affecting all projects and programmes of the Ministry and its related departments.

If they did not wish us to roam far and wide they should not have put that there. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have these interruptions. The honourable Member still has a few more minutes..... Does any other Member wish to make a contribution?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to look at Subhead 5 — Sugar Cane Variety Testing. The function of this subhead concerns the testing and selecting of new sugar cane varieties.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to be extremely difficult this year for the Ministry to continue its programme of testing and providing sugar cane varieties for the planting programme of the local sugar cane industry.

I believe that the sugar cane industry in Barbados needs the input of some new and fresh thinking. I believe that although the industry has been in this country since 1645, and although it is touted, by most everyone who speaks about affairs in Barbados, as one of the most important crops, when one looks into the amount of planning which goes into the sugar cane industry as a whole, one can only be amazed at the planning.

Mr. Chairman, it comes to those of us who are involved in the science of management as a terrible shock and a disappointment — if not a disgrace — when one looks at what must have been a total lack of forward planning on the part of the sugar cane industry in Barbados, where we could have at this point in the crop season a mere 65 per cent grinding capacity available.
4.25 p.m.

Portvale is a factory, which I am told, is going to be a new dimension in sugar cane production. But it is axiomatic that if you are going to bring in a new model, or if you are going to improve your plant, that you schedule your production in such a way, or conversely you arrange your plant replacement in such a way, as not to disrupt your normal production.

Mr. Chairman, that is so fundamental and so elementary, that one would not expect to find, at any time, that an industry, which has had the benefit of more than 200 years experience, falling into the trap of failure at so elementary a level.

I think that the sugar industry has done Barbados a terrible wrong to allow us to be in the condition where the new factory is not yet on stream in the middle of a sugar crop which, it is agreed on all sides, is one of the most crucial crops in the history of Barbados, and for the continued development of the country.

I should like to ask of the Minister, in the context of his involvement and the Government's involvement in the sugar industry at the developmental stage, whether the Minister, himself, or his Ministry, has any opportunity to put the vast research facilities and planning capability, which I know is available in the Ministry of Agriculture, at the disposal of the sugar industry, let me put it that way, since it is an industry which we are agreed is important to the entire country and cannot be left to a few who may not be able, or may not be capable of doing the necessary forward planning for this industry.

Mr. Chairman, in the context of Subhead 5, Sir, there is, and has been a philosophical question as to the desirability of having sugar cane or not. I do not propose to engage in that question at this point. But I believe — since even if it were decided to disband the sugar cane industry, it will take some time — that while we have the industry it is important, it is necessary, that we have forward planning, which was the basis for this Subhead 5 — that is the testing and the planning of varieties so that we could produce the best sugar cane in Barbados, so we could get the best yield. This has been going on for some considerable time.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have had the misfortune to have to negotiate on behalf of Barbados, especially sugar in the international arena, have been struck — as I have no doubt the honourable gentleman on the other side have been — by the amount of forward planning which one can see evident in the European areas of production.

When one looks, for example, at the sugar beet production in Europe, one sees that they are able, with a certain amount of accuracy, to determine, not only the quantity of sugar beet that will be grown, not only the varieties of sugar beet that will be grown, but they are able to take into account varying weather conditions, the environment and other associated factors which might be prevalent at any given time.

So if sleet and similar weather conditions happens to come in a particular year, they can, by use of their planning mechanisms, have some idea of what shortfalls there will be. These things are necessary, for example, so that the price support system, which we all know is prevalent in the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, in the United States, can function.

And so, it is unthinkable that when a factory in France, for example, is about to be reconditioned, that they could willy-nilly-to use the favourite phrase of my friend, the Hon. Minister of Health — just decide to drag out equipment from a particular factory and replace that equipment as it suits them, without some reference to the governmental authority responsible for productivity in that field.

No factory in France, where there are dependent on the skills of the Ministry of Agriculture in France to carry their marketing forward, would risk to make those kinds of decisions without first acquainting the Government, and, secondly, getting assistance from the Government in their planning.

I refuse to believe that the Government had any part in the planning of the fiasco, with which we are faced in Barbados now, as a result of the closing down of two sugar factories before they were ready with the

third sugar factory. And the argument that they were going to be bastardising the two factories to be closed down in order to develop the new factory is not sufficient, because I am sure that if that had been put to the test, they would have received inputs from other people in the society, who might have been able to show them the danger of attempting that particular feat in 1982, bearing in mind the kind of crop which we had had in 1981 and 1980.

I am saying, Sir, that it is — to put it no higher at this point — a grave disappointment that we can see, after so many years in the sugar industry, no better planning. And this is not surprising when one examines the structure of the directorate, the structure of those who direct the biggest industry in Barbados.

We require of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the highest possible quality of management. We require of the Barbados National Bank, the highest possible level of management. We require of all of our institutions qualifications that sometimes boggle the mind. But in the most important industry in this country or the second most important, depending on your point of view we are still at the hands of a management structure which cannot be described as modern by anyone who has spent any time examining such matters.

I cast no aspersions on the character of any of the willing and able people who try their best in their respective capacities in this field. But I am saying that if we are going to be looking at a review of agricultural policy, it is time as the Democratic Labour Party's Government determined in the Seventies that it was necessary to take over the marketing of this crop because of its importance that a Government of the day must take a look at examining the structure of the management of that industry — the total management, the planning, the organisation, the development of that industry — in 1982.

Mr. Chairman, I would have a lot more to say but time does not permit. At another time and another place, I will wish to expand on those views, Sir. I believe the Minister wishes to respond.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, at this point winding up, I simply want to respond, at this point, to the comments made by the honourable speaker.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister does not at this time intend to wind up the debate?

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: No, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: He was making a good point but, as often happens with the last honourable speaker, Mr. Chairman, I think he lost his sense of proportion along the way. I think he wanted to say, and indeed did say, that it was a matter of deep regret that at this point in the reaping of this year's sugar crop, we still have only got some 60 per cent to 65 per cent grinding capacity. In that respect, Sir, I think we can agree with him.

I was, myself, concerned around the turn of last year about when the new factory would have been ready, I made enquiries from week to week and was told in mid-January, or a little earlier, that the factory would have been ready towards the end of February.

It now looks as though it would not be ready before the middle to the end of April. I think what that means is that the reaping season will run, perhaps, as far down as July, August, and I agree with him that it is a horrible judgment on the part of the planners that the factory was not ready in time.

But having made that point with which we are all in agreement, he then went on to suggest that there was need for radical, new thinking in the sugar industry and that there was, perhaps, need even for a new management structure.

With respect to the need for new thinking in the industry, I think that it must be said that considerable new thinking has gone into the sugar industry in the last three to five years.

We started with the McGregor Study which produced the McGregor report. As a result of that, we have witnessed the sugar industry in Barbados becoming a national industry without, at the same time, having been nationalised.

The Government, on behalf of the people now owns a considerable amount of the equity in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited. They have got two distinguished gentlemen on the Board of Directors, and the people of Barbados, through the Government, are now, for the first time, having a major say in the direction of the sugar industry.

In addition to that, Sir, we have had a look at the levy structure in the sugar industry, we have had a reform of the levy system, a revolutionary new concept has recently come into the thinking of the sugar industry — the notion of income equalisation, which will take effect this crop. We will have much more to say about that when the new Sugar Industry Act is introduced.

In addition to that, Sir, we are now concentrating more and more on research and development in the sugar industry.

So it is not fair to say, Sir, that no new thinking has gone into the sugar industry. In a very quiet way, a considerable amount of restructuring is being done in the sugar industry and a considerable amount of new thinking has been injected into the industry.

Like most industries, Sir, which have been dominated in the way that that industry has been dominated — with a very narrow class of control for several centuries, there is perhaps, too much in-breeding at the top and there may be a good case for an injection of new management. I have no doubt that, at a very soon date, all of that would be looked at.

But the impression must not be given, Sir, that Barbados has lost too much of its reputation in the breeding of new varieties or in the area of sugar technology. A lot of countries still look to Barbados for guidance and leadership in relation to sugar and the station at Groves continues to do a good job. The breeding of new varieties, Mr. Chairman, is a very long and difficult process — it sometimes takes 10, 20 or more years before you can come up with a new and viable variety.

4.35 p.m.

Having used Subhead 5 to make the useful point with which I think we are all in agreement — that the management of the sugar industry made an error of judgment by not having the new factory at Portvale ready before, he then proceeded to give the impression that there is nothing new going on in the sugar industry and that there is need for this radical new thinking. In truth and in fact, Sir, a considerable amount of reorganisation, a considerable amount of new thinking has been injected into the industry, and all under the direction of this Government.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is just one question I have to ask with regard to Subhead 5, the sugar cane variety testing. Since we consider that the Estimates provide us an opportunity to decide whether the money is being spent in what we consider right or wrong ways, and since we are here to learn what are the right ways, I would like to ask the Minister — who I am sure knows more about these things than I do — and I believe his researchers are very good as well — a question on this subject. The Minister, I believe, knows that there are improvements in the yields of agronomic crops which are prompted by the use of chemical ripeners, and it is said that they enhance the sugar yield of the sugar cane by 10 per cent. Now, when I take this into consideration, I am trying to discover whether the Minister and his researchers have come to the conclusion that it is cheaper

to go into looking at the different varieties of cane as opposed to trying these chemical ripeners, as they call them, that enhance the sugar yield by over 10 per cent. That is my question on this.

— Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under Subhead 1(a), "Initiation and review of agricultural policy, etc. etc.," to the bottom of that subhead you will see that there the staff structures is shown on page 32 in the Personal Emoluments. When I look at page 32 in the Personal Emoluments I see the Permanent Secretary, the Deputy Permanent Secretary, Senior Administrative Officer, etc. etc.

What is amazing to me, from a management point of view, is that nowhere in that subhead under "Initiation and review of agricultural policy," is the chief technocrat in the Agricultural Department, the Chief Agricultural Officer. I am wondering if this is just a printing error or if this is the procedural arrangement at the Agricultural Department, because when I look further I see that the Chief Agricultural Officer comes under Subhead 4 — Crop Research and Extension.

What I would like to find out from the Minister is whether or not the chief technical person available to him is excluded from policy matters — if it is by design or if it is a conscious decision, and if so, under proper and modern management technique, if this is right for the Ministry today to have the Minister's chief advisers on policy matters as a set of laymen, and his chief professional officer pushed away at research. I await the Minister's reply on that particular one.

Under Subhead 4 (c), "local farmers training, etc." I want to use this subhead to ask the Minister a fundamental question that I want to find out about Barbados with respect to this present Government's policy.

The honourable Member for St. Michael Central was very aroused and very annoyed that 12 000 acres of land should have passed into the hands of the non-plantation class in Barbados. He was very annoyed that, as he was saying, we were destroying the plantation lands. He then went on to quote the non-sugar agricultural statistics, Mr. Chairman — and it is a known fact that until recently peasant farmers in Barbados were 80 per cent responsible for non-sugar statistics — but keeping with the philosophy of the Member for St. Michael Central, the large plantations have now gone into this area, and have taken it over almost completely from the small peasant farmers in this country.

We have two very serious things happening in Barbados. It is agreed that the target of the Ministry of Agriculture is 150 000 tonnes of sugar. That was because, as the Hon. Prime Minister explained, the sugar cane is

still one of the best crops for Barbados, being a grass, as well as we need the foreign exchange from it. It is also a fact that we are going towards the mechanisation of the sugar industry. It is also a fact that the labour force in the sugar industry is moving out. I want to know if it is this Government's policy that my brothers and sisters, who have worked in that labour force for years and are being moved out now for mechanical things, should not be able to own some of this land in Barbados to go into non-sugar agriculture.

I know the Springhall Land Lease Scheme is going on, but I would want to know if it is the intention of this Government to continue this type of plan, because in my opinion it is a total and absolute waste of agricultural land in Barbados to put it in the hands of the ADC. What has happened with ADC is that all you have done is to remove one set of plantation type mentality and introduced a second set of the same mentality.

Certain remarks made by the honourable Member for St. Philip North were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN at this stage.

There are certain historical connections which have a lot to do with the attitudes of people which will interplay if that same thing goes on in the Government sector. The colour of the person has nothing to do with me, Mr. Chairman. I am one of those persons who is responsible, and I am just thinking of the historical connections and the psychological off-spin of that continuing.
4.45 p.m.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that if it is the intention, or the philosophy of the honourable Member for St. Michael Central, that there must be no agrarian reform in Barbados, I would hate to believe that this is the policy of this Government. If that is the policy of this Government, we are going down a very wrong road.

Some time ago, during the War, it was proven in the United Kingdom that even a small thing as backyard agriculture could produce, because of the intensity of the production, a lot more than a single commensurate acreage. It is not true, Mr. Chairman, that the people in Barbados are going away from agriculture because they do not like agriculture. It is true that they are going away because the people who were involved in agriculture have not yet been able to own their parcel of land to work for themselves, and I think that when we started that situation that was not a bad policy.

Where the error was made in the cutting up of the land was that the machinery was not implemented to follow through the planning permission, because the planning permission given on every one of those parcels of land was that it was to be used for agricultural purposes, with the chance of putting one house on it. And the Town

Planner was even particular to make sure that the position of the house was such that it would not interfere with the use of the rest of the land.

Where I am saying that we went wrong is that the machinery, and the necessary aids and back-up facilities, were not available for the people to use them. What was also wrong is that the pricing of it, at that time, was such that it denied the true agriculturist the facility of buying it, because he did not have the facility, bank-wise or otherwise, which had got into the hands of a few people who were not genuine agriculturists at heart. I am certain that Government can come up with some type of machinery in a legislative way to get this done.

But it would be a very serious decision by this Government, or any other Government in Barbados, if we give the impression to our fellow Barbadians that they are destined to live all the days of their lives and the only part of this resource that they would own is the little 2 x 3 house spot in the back, somewhere, of a plantation that they are now getting — that cannot even grow a bed of carrots. So I am saying you must take a proper mix.

The honourable Member for St. Michael Central read a lot of statistics. He read the non-sugar statistics, but I want to read the sugar statistics. The sugar statistics, somewhere here, show that in 1964 we produced 200 000 tons and we are producing 90 000 tons today. In other words, Mr. Chairman, you must have a balanced look when you are debating. You cannot just take your side and put forward that.

However, the aims are very clear. We are targeting towards 150 000 tonnes of sugar for obvious reasons. The lands necessary for that 150 000 tonnes should be put aside, and everything humanly possible, by way of programmes, must be initiated to allow Barbadians to take part in the non-sugar agriculture on the rest of lands not being used for sugar.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I enter this debate with a measure of reluctance. I have set myself certain disciplines and I do not easily want to depart from them — when I have left a Ministry not wanting to become too involved in it.

But I want to take this opportunity to in the first place reply to the honourable Member for St. Philip North in connection with his charge about the use of agricultural lands, and to let him know that these lands were cut up long before the Labour Party came into power in 1976, and they were cut up with your permission.

The purpose, as we know it, was not to have agricultural land then. It is true you said there should

be one house spot, but you never set out to have it as an agricultural unit. It was purely a large housespot.

It is unfortunate that you entered into this debate and, honestly, you should not have dealt with it, because you have opened up a whole kettle of worms for which we are going to reply and it is unfortunate that you are the person who raised the matter. I refer to the honourable Member for St. Philip North who was, at the time, the Chief Valuation Officer of the Government in this country.

These matters, with respect to the cutting up of the plantation lands, were purely speculation matters. As a matter of fact, I would like to read the files to show exactly what advice you could have given Government at the time if you had the power to do so. Of course, you should have made your comments there, and the problems which we seek to address at the moment would not be before us today.

What the honourable Member for St. Michael Central was dealing with is the question of the amount of lands put out of production. This Government had to introduce special measures to have these lands worked. You never had any intention to follow through. Do not come up here and like sour grapes and talk about not following through. You had the opportunity to follow through — and did not follow through. This Government has now imposed a levy on those people who have not been cultivating their acreage.

As far as the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation is concerned, that agency is performing a very good and noble task. The lands are better worked today than they have ever been worked before. Since this Government came into being, we were able to see several hectares of land put back into production at Bath Plantation from which some 5 000 tons of canes were reaped last crop. We have also seen the intensive working of lands in the St. Andrew area, which we did not see before, and it is not a question that people are not provided with lands, and therefore they are moving away from agriculture.

People were taught by the people on the other side to believe that agriculture was a bad thing and it was an area to be shunned. The famous cane blade speech, Mr. Chairman, is well known to all of us in here — “We hope to live to see the day when there will not be a single cane blade”. Those were the words of the Rt. Hon. Member for St. John and Leader of the Opposition in this House.

We are now hearing from honourable Members on the Opposition benches that sugar is a valuable crop and we certainly need to have it as a foreign exchange earner. With some interest, I listened to the honourable Member for St. Michael West holding forth on the question of

sugar cane vis-a-vis beet sugar, and the type of scientific projections that can be done to tell you when to plant and when not to plant beets.

I was told by the honourable Member for St. Philip North that sugar is a grass, and it is one of the best and most certain products to grow in Barbados.
4.55 p.m.

It does not need a lot of rainfall, and a limited amount of rainfall, well scattered throughout the island, can produce you a reasonable crop and, therefore, Barbados as it stands, with a limited rainfall, has got to, for a very long time, concentrate on the growing of sugar.

As far as beet is concerned, beet is a European crop and it does well in European and cold countries. Sugar cane is a tropical product and does very well in the tropics and, therefore, there is no question of Barbados moving away, as the idea was advanced — that it might well be considered for Barbados to move and get away from sugar cane. I do not think we will see that in a hurry.

Barbados has a proud record in the area of sugar, and sugar cane, and the honourable Member for Agriculture who has given an intermediary reply has done so very ably and well, and he has pointed out that Barbados supplies a number of countries throughout the world with sugar cane varieties.

It is not only the question of the sucrose content of sugar that we have to be concerned with, but it is the question of the ability of the sugar cane to withstand the type of weather. Research is also being carried out into the type of variety that is the most upright in order that we can have proper mechanical cutting. Those are the types of things which are being looked at.

Let us deal for a moment at the question of Portvale and the view is expressed from the honourable Member for St. Michael West with respect to the historical ownership of the plantations and factories of this country. This attitude reminds me very much of what was said by two honourable Members of this House at that time.

In Boscobel, St. Peter, and in other parts of the island as well, on March 16, 1980, Dr. Ramases Caddle told the people in Boscobel — and he told them at Redman's Village as well — that, in his view, the people who own the lands, the plantations and the factories should come out and cut the canes. That is the attitude that has caused people to look away.

People in Barbados, since this party has come into office, has been going back to the production of food and

sugar crops in this island, and if you would go through the country, you would see that there is a new faith in agriculture. There is a new faith in agriculture. There is a greater feeling of security as far as agriculture is concerned under this Government, than under your Government because it was felt to have no love for it. I can tell you that. If you do not want to believe that, it is a matter for you. Certainly you are living in Mars and I think there are people in Mars with some judgment and some wisdom, and you have none as far as I know.

It has been my understanding — and I, like other Members on the other side, raised the question of Portvale — that no matter what you had done, you would still have a situation where Portvale would not have been able to come on stream at a very early time. I am not making any apologies for the owners of Portvale. I will tell you what I know is a fact.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North raised the question of people not having their canes reaped and, also made the point that there were certain people who were working for less than \$50 a week — and I entirely supported him on that, and I questioned the owners of Portvale.

But the worrying factor, as far as Portvale is concerned, or the reaping of the crop, was not only the delay of the completion of Portvale, but the failure of the owners to put Andrews into production. If Andrews had come on stream at a very early time, the problems which we encountered, we would not have encountered — at least, not to that extent.

Portvale, I am made to understand, is going to cost the owner in the region of \$24 million to \$25 million. If you had to construct a totally new factory without utilising the existing machinery of Porters and Vacluse, you would have to look for over \$100 million to construct a new factory — monies, which the Sugar Producers, I am told, cannot afford.

We have been looking very carefully at all of the problems with respect to sugar and the reaping of the canes in this island. With that in view, Government has taken a number of decisions to help the small farmers in this island reap their crop, mechanically and otherwise, to help them to cultivate their lands and to help them, even at the time when we had a threat of smut disease, to give them a new stock of canes to put back in without cost to them. All of that this Government has been doing.

But you see, this Government does not wear a placard on its back to say what it has done. In a quiet way, the Government has been revolutionising the entire sugar industry in this country. We do things in this country that if any other Caribbean country had done them, they would declare a bank holiday for the things

that we have done. As a matter of fact, there would be by now over 365 bank holidays in this country, in commemoration of the good works that the Barbados Labour Party has done.

One honourable Member talked about the question of the Government having a law to impose sanctions on plantations and to call upon them to plant a certain acreage in food. That is a hangover from the period of the War, and in those days the Director of Agriculture had quite a lot of power. I think the power is still vested in the Chief Agricultural Officer, as he now is styled.

I have had some difficulties, when I was then the Minister, with respect to having some plantings done in certain areas of the country, and there was resistance to the fact that planting had to be done, especially at Apes Hill in St. James. And when I insisted that planting must be done, I heard that the owner then quickly sold the plantation. There is always resistance to these things.

I am sure that the honourable Member will try to satisfy you as to the position with respect to the place which the Chief Agricultural Officer holds within the Ministry and that is certainly not my province. What I thought I would not have heard, and what the honourable Member did say, was that he saw his name somewhere, and he is still the Chief Agricultural Officer. It is no question of where he is.

When you come into my office I do not sit at the head of a table. I sit anywhere. Wherever the Minister sits, he is still the Minister. Wherever the Chief Agricultural Officer sits he is the Chief Agricultural Officer. Why does he have to be somewhere special? There is nothing wrong with that. Is he there? The mere fact that he is there is all that matters.

5.05 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South raised the question of fruit seedlings. I do not know how many people are aware, but it is costing the country something like \$10 or \$11 to grow a fruit tree. I was looking at this matter before the Minister came. As a matter of fact, he has inherited a legacy, if it is a bad legacy — I had made that decision long ago — that the price should go up.

The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is because the tree was sold at a very cheap price, the people thought... (*Asides*).... I am not the Minister, but I have a seat in here, you have one too. Whenever I speak as Minister of Health, I speak for the Ministry of Health. When I speak otherwise, I speak with the conscience for the people of St. Andrew — the same seat as you. You are not going to stop me from speaking, they sent me here, Mr. Chairman, with a comfortable majority to put the case. I speak with

the authority of my seat and the solid support of the people from St. Andrew.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have two minutes to go.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I don't even want two minutes, two seconds will suffice. I thought it was appropriate at this moment to make an intervention. The Opposition feels that it is their right at Estimates to come in and speak, one after the other, and that the Minister alone should reply. Now this is not only a question of the Minister alone involved, but this is a question of collective responsibility.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: With respect to the Hon. Minister of Health who just said that the people in Barbados have a lot of confidence in agriculture now, I would just like to let the Hon. Minister know what the feelings are — and I speak for St. Philip, and I believe he has this problem in St. Andrew as well.

What is going on in this country today, Mr. Chairman, is that small farmers — I am speaking about small farmers now — are sending canes to factories, and when they look on weekends for money for the canes sent to the factories, they are getting letters saying that there is no money there — Sugar Factories Ltd., has taken out money owed to them last year.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the Government stands on this question, but I am saying that only on Sunday afternoon, about six small farmers came to me at a funeral and addressed me on this question. They said it is going to lead to chaos in this country — that is what I was told last Sunday — because they cannot get their money.

I want to know where the Government and the Minister of Agriculture stand on this issue. There are small farmers looking for money and they cannot get any. I believe you have this problem in your constituency as well. (*Asides*) I will go ahead, because I am sure I am going to get a reply from the Minister on where he stands on this.

Under Subhead 4 (b) the functions of this subhead are "to provide the dissemination of agricultural news, pamphlets...and relative public relation duties undertaken by the Ministry's Information Unit." I am very glad for this section here, because I am wondering if there is ample dissemination of agriculture news and pamphlets and all of these things. Why are there so many complaints from farmers in Barbados about gluts and shortages and untimely imports? Why, every now and then, do you see in the paper that this Government agency or Government corporation has imported this when there was ample amount here?

I am contending that if communication was as it should be, as set out in this section here, this sort of thing would not come about, and I welcome this section here where they have spoken about agriculture news and pamphlets.

I am going further to section (c) — local farmers' training, conferences, seminars, demonstrations, institutional work carried out with the Extension Service. I am not getting at any particular Minister, I am not getting at any Minister, but within the last five years, Mr. Chairman — and the present Hon. Minister of Agriculture at his first public interview, at one of the Government agricultural stations — I think it was at Sedge Pond or at Bullens — I don't remember — he spoke about it — why was there over the past five years virtual abandonment of all the agricultural stations? I said virtually — I did not say they went to pieces. I am saying there was virtual abandonment of the agricultural stations — Sayers Court, Bullens, Jerusalem, and the consequence of this was that there was an absence of many useful services which were originally carried out by the Extension Services.

I go further and under this Head, I am dealing with (e) — subsidy to the Barbados Agricultural Society and to farmers for the purpose of supplying equipment, fertilizers, pesticides and insecticides. Last year, Mr. Chairman, — with regards to pesticides — a certain chemical was used on a farm in St. John and a farmer, whose land was next door to the farm on which the pesticide was used, complained that all of his crops were destroyed because of the pesticide that was used. The farmer said that, at the time, he had warned the Ministry of Agriculture not to use that particular insecticide. What has been done about this?

Mr. Chairman, as far as the subsidies of fertilizers, pesticides and insecticides are concerned, I am in total agreement. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that in 1973 and 1974, those countries who manufacture the chemicals and pesticides stopped the exportation of pesticides, or curtailed the export to a certain extent. Not only did they do that, but they ensured that their own farmers had access to the pesticides and all that — even to the extent of breaking contracts to developing countries. Because of this, I will always agree with mini-subsidies which is there for added research in fertilizer, because I realize the importance of fertilizer, pesticides, insecticides and things like that to the agricultural industry in Barbados.

There is just one more thing I would like to get at. It is under Subhead 8 — Land and Water Use Research. Mr. Chairman, our irrigation system, in Barbados today, is mainly a system of flooding, sprinkling and what the scientist call flowering. I would like to ask the appropriate Minister, how far have we gone

with what the scientists call the drip and trickle irrigation?

It has been proven in most of the other countries that the type of irrigation we are doing here — the flooding and sprinkling — wash away most of the land and it causes the water to settle in one spot. But the scientists — and you don't have to be a scientist to know this — say that with the drip and trickle method, the washing away of the land will not come about because you don't have that amount of water at any one time, neither do you have that storage of water in one place.

I would like to ask the appropriate Minister, what is the Government doing about the irrigation system in Barbados and whether there is any sort of intention of going towards the drip and trickle method of irrigation, instead of the flooding and sprinkling which cause a lot of wastage and washing away of the land? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I will start by replying to the honourable Member for St. Philip South.

I have the same trouble in the parish of St. Lucy with people coming to me asking me what to do. I received one of those same letters also but I know, year after year, we receive money for sugar cane on account, and when the sugar producers, or Sugar Factories Limited, sell the sugar to England and they get a good price, we expect that we would get more money.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come now when we all hear that the price of sugar dropped this year, so as far as that is concerned, I explained that to my people and I know what I am going to do.

If I had heard that the price in England had gone up, I would expect to get more money. But now I hear that the price has dropped down, as a religious person, I believe my conscience would tell me what I should do.

I am not here to tell the honourable Member for St. Philip South what he should tell his people, but I know what I am telling mine and I know what my people are doing, because I always know that honesty is the best policy. *(Laughter)*

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Barbados Labour Party has done so much for agriculture from 1976 to now

that any dead person would wake up and tell you about the movements of this Party since 1976 up to now. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Miracle workers.) I always say, Mr. Chairman — and I was thinking here very, very seriously — the Lord moves in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform. Now, when I was thinking here about that honourable Member for St. Philip South as the Shadow Minister of Agriculture, it made me feel so sad. But I am glad that the Lord does not work in the way he would work — he would be quite willing to make the same mistake that the Democratic Labour Party made from 1971 right down to 1976.

You all know that the Democratic Labour Party was the first party that took over all the estates like the Spring Hall Development, Spencers and all those many places, and the first thing the Democratic Labour Party tells us to do was — you know the famous speech — “Not a cane blade”, and they really went about implementing that.

In the parish of St. Lucy, which has the Springhall group of estates, no cane at all whatsoever — all of the place was in cotton. You spent thousands of dollars up there at Spencers on a cotton ginny, and up to now it is no use to this country. It is wastage, because nobody wants to work with cotton.

In the parish where I am from, the last cotton we had there, stopped there, and just blew away. The people in Barbados are not interested in that kind of stuff nowadays. I agree that the cotton price is good but I am wondering about having the cotton price and nobody to reap the cotton — what is the use of having it?

Another Member — the honourable Member for St. Philip North, I think — asked about Portvale. This is nothing new. I spoke to one of those gentlemen early last year, Sir, and he told me, “Brathwaite, we did the same work in Africa, we got through with the factory on time.”

Now we have a little delay in Barbados, but that is nothing for the members of the Opposition to jump up and say anything about, because the Democratic Labour Party took over the island in 1961.....

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of elucidation. I spoke about the Portvale factory, I said it was a terrible decision and the Minister agreed with me on that — so it is not a question of the Opposition. He disagrees with both of us. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: He is entitled to disagree with both of us)

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is nothing new. When the Democratic Labour Party took over this Government in 1961, it found two sugar factories in the parish of St. Lucy and they went all out

— they really did it with a difference — they took over half of St. Lucy actually — the Spring Hall group — and they stopped planting canes, and after they stopped planting canes, the factories had to close down because they had nothing to do.

So the case is this, Mr. Chairman — as you can see — two factories were closed down by the Democratic Labour Party in one parish, and between a span of about two or three years. We had it rough down there to get our canes to factories, the same way that we are having it this year with Portvale. This is nothing new, Mr. Chairman.

But I would like to touch a few points this afternoon. I would not go back into poultry and eggs and these things, because we have the statistics here for us, I am going directly into sugar, because we all know in 1976, Mr. Chairman, that we had the best sugar price for a long time in that year.

I would say that if we had more sugar that particular year, this place would be a little New York, because that year we had money for sugar but we had no sugar to sell to the people. And, Mr. Chairman, one of the chief offenders, I would say, was the Democratic Labour Party. Why? — because you have to set an example. They were one of the biggest land owners in the island of Barbados and they scrapped sugar completely, they scrapped sugar.

I am going to give you statistics of the kind of movement we have had in sugar. In 1974, the ADC plantations reaped 14 236 tonnes of cane. Listen now, Mr. Chairman, and you would see the movement, from 1975–76 it was 28 646 tonnes. From 1976–77, you found 33 719 tonnes, 1977–78, you had a small drop in crop, it was 30 692 tonnes. But listen now, Mr. Chairman, 1978–79, 41 924 tonnes and 1979–80, 57 200 tonnes. That is twice as much, Mr. Chairman, as the amount of canes that were reaped on those same estates, and we did not have any more estates — it was the same estates, but we are interested in agriculture.

I heard an honourable Member speak about the small man but, Mr. Chairman, you cannot fool the small man nowadays — the small man knows the difference when people are trying to fool him.

We had a subsidy to help the small man in this country and from the time the Democratic Labour Party came into power in 1961, they removed that subsidy. But I am glad to hear the honourable Member from St. Philip South now saying that he is glad they brought back the subsidy to help small farmers with manure and things like that. This is a Party of that quality, we always try to improve agriculture. So, Mr. Chairman, you can see the movements.

Mr. Chairman, they talk about the prices of certain commodities in this country. I remember in 1974, when a working woman used to draw \$11 per day, sweet potatoes reached the height of 75¢ per pound and you know, up to now, Mr. Chairman, up to 1982 — this was 1974 when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, 75¢ a pound — from 1976 now to 1982 potatoes have never reached that price again. We now have to pay a lady \$21 a day, and yet the price of potatoes has not reached that price yet.

So you can see, from every side, that the Barbados Labour Party is trying to improve the standards of everybody. When you look at the working class, you have never seen the wages of the working class man in this country increase as fast as in the last six years. Everybody is quite satisfied, and yet the prices of food still remain down.
5.25 p.m.

You spoke about the planting of food. I remember the year 1978 when the Barbados Labour Party insisted, and we had an influx of food. I know that in the parish I come from, the Plantations called all the people around to dig out the yams free, as well as the potatoes, because there was too much of an influx of food in this country. In that year the price of yams was 25¢ per pound, so you can see the movement of this party and how it is trying its best. When was the last time, Mr. Chairman, you heard that carrots were being thrown about the streets? (Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Some were ploughed back in the ground three weeks ago). This is a party with a difference, Mr. Chairman. I really did not see that, but I was just trying to say that I saw in the papers, in the Sixties and the Seventies, when Mr. Williams or someone else drove all through Broad Street and threw the carrots all over the street. (Asides). I don't know about last week.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we are now exporting such commodities. Last week it made my heart feel very happy, when I heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture introducing to the folks that he will be sending food to Trinidad, and he got a very nice moderate rate of 15 cents per pound. That was a very, very good idea. So we have agriculture leading out in front, we have a Minister with a difference.

Yams are being sold in Trinidad now at \$5 per pound, tomatoes \$8 per pound, and here in Barbados we can still get potatoes and yams at 45 cents per pound, it might reach 50 cents. The planters are very happy and satisfied, because this is a party with a difference which takes care of the working class man and it takes care of the farmer at the same time. Farming is a very hard job. I am a small farmer, so I know the meaning to it, and I

will tell you that in the days of the Democratic Labour Party, I nearly went out of existence.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Labour Party is scoring on — they are telling you about this cane issue and the small farmer. The big farmer gets the same price as we get for cane nowadays, but before it was not so. In the Democratic Labour Party's regime we had the big farmers getting one price and the small farmers getting another price, but today small and big are drawing the same money from the factory. I believe — and I heard — that it will end up around 65–65, and the small and big will get the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend this Government again for the step it has taken, especially in the parish of St. Lucy, at Friendship Plantation where it divided 402 acres of land between 22 small farmers. I am very impressed, and as I can see those small farmers in action, I can see they are happy people and we are going all out. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this would just be the beginning, because I am sure, and I know, that this project will succeed, and when this project succeeds I am sure we will move into places like Wildey, Fairy Valley and all around, where people will go back to agriculture and try to encourage them to help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I definitely believe that people do not like the idea of people driving them, they really like to work for themselves. I feel that this party will do all that lies in its power to help the small man and to encourage agriculture in this country again.

Mr. Chairman, I will not try to tell you any more this afternoon. I hope that we will continue to try to move and support agriculture so that this island will go from strength to strength as far as food is concerned. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it seems as if the Labour Party has decided that they will use the two gentlemen to deal with these matters and recite the same thing again.

I wish to turn to Subhead 16, Sir, the subhead on which all Barbados would like to focus. It is described here as price control. I should like to ask the Minister if he has a price control policy at all. If he has such a policy, how is it being implemented? Where can we see any evidence of its implementation? The people of Barbados are concerned, they have reached the point where they have been bludgeoned with high prices to the point where they cannot even understand the phenomenon of the daily rise in prices.

I hear some statistics being trotted out by some persons who are obviously living in another world, and I really do not believe that these same persons, these

honourable gentlemen on the other side, live in Barbados. (*Asides*). Have you spoken to your constituents about how hard it is to live out there? Life is almost impossible in Barbados as a result of the high prices. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You were talking about the teenage pregnancies. You see how good the girls look? That is good food, that is agriculture). Mr. Chairman, are you going to protect me from this irascible Leader of the House? I do not think that the way how the girls look has anything to do with this debate, I think it is quite irrelevant how the girls look. (*Aside*). There are marasmus babies in Barbados, Sir, why does he not talk about that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on with the debate. (*Asides*) Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: As soon as we start to touch on these sensitive sore spots, that kind of reaction always follows. But the truth is you do not need an expert in Barbados to know that the cost of living in this country is virtually impossible for ordinary people. Any housewife who goes to the supermarket on a weekly basis — indeed on a daily basis, but I am going to take the weekly basis — any housewife who goes to the supermarket on a weekly basis finds that her prices are increasing on the average of 15 per cent per week. What is happening in this country is that the Government continues to put out statistics that include an across-the-board information.

When you take those items which the people use, and I am suggesting to the Minister that he needs a new basket of goods, a completely new basket of goods, because the basket of goods which is being used for statistical purposes in Barbados is totally irrelevant in 1982. I believe that it is necessary for us to restructure the whole approach to finding out what is happening in the market-place. I do not think it is a debate I wish to get in about high prices. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Burger Bee selling a lot of kangaroo meat). What a bad behaved Leader of the House we have, Sir! An utterly bad behaved person. Why do you not behave yourself like the old gentleman you are?

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that one does not have to get into a price control debate, but what we need to do, so that we do not confuse ourselves, or fool ourselves, of the reality of the pressures on the ordinary man out there, we re-examine the bases. I recall that the Ministry of Finance or the Minister of Finance, brought a new index recently. I think in 1980 he went to zero again, 1980 is now 100, I believe. I believe that is what happened, and if you look at the cost of living index in the Central Bank figures you will see that 1980 is equalled to 100 — I am correct, Sir — and it has moved from 98.4 in December 1979 to 124.5 at the end of 1981.

This is page 78 of the February 1982 Economic and Financial Statistics of the Central Bank.
5.35 p.m.

Now when one looks at these figures, one can get a picture of the movement of prices on a monthly basis, but this is not a complete picture for a person who is living in a household, because what I am saying to the Minister — and I believe the Minister can appreciate this — is that there are a number of items which are now, for want of a better term, statutory items in a household, which do not find their way into the basket of goods which we now use for preparation of these statistics, so that these statistics are not really meaningful.

One has therefore to depend to a large extent on one's visual contact. You know, Sir, when you are flying an aeroplane, you can either fly by instrument or use the pilot himself, and he uses his own senses to determine what is happening in the environment in which he is flying. And I am suggesting that using one's senses in the market-place in Barbados today, the pressure can be felt.

I do not wish to trot out information on the movement of certain items, I do not think it is necessary. But, Mr. Chairman, there was a time in this country when some measure of consumer protection, even if it was by way of a psychological reaction to the vendor, brought about by the aura in that particular area of Government activity. Persons were afraid to take certain steps, to let certain things happen, for fear that the Ministry of Trade would interfere with them.

Today, it seems as if by hiding this whole area of consumer affairs within the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Minister highlighting the areas of pure agriculture, that people in this country do not have the feeling that anybody is looking after them. And I had always said, and I continue to maintain, that in a society where the people are still in transformation from an agricultural society to an industrial or modern society, and where the persons who do the buying and selling — the persons who are in charge of the economy are still relatively small in number, the Government has a special responsibility to bring along the population in the area of consumer protection and consumer education.

I am saying that under this Head — Consumer Affairs, by 1982 there should have been a much more vigorous approach to the whole question, especially in tight economic circumstances. There should have been a much more vigorous approach to the question of existence in this financial and economic environment.

Mr. Chairman, even on the question of what interest rates people are paying when they get what consumer credit is now available, many people in Barbados are un-

aware of the fact that in some cases they could be paying as high as 36 percent or 40 percent interest on credit.

I am looking at these Estimates under Subhead 16 and I believe that the Ministry's thrust in this regard, if it does exist, is being kept a secret from most of us. Perhaps, the Minister has new information which he would vouchsafe to us.

But I really do not believe that when somebody goes to a store in Bridgetown and buys a piece of cloth at \$5 a metre on a Wednesday, and somebody else goes back on the following Friday — a week and two days later, and the same piece of cloth has moved to \$5.50 or \$6 a metre, that there can be any genuine explanation of that, because the movement....(*Asides*).....I do not want you to control cloth, but I wish you would control something.

You do not control anything. You control rice and a few other things for which, if you move them, somebody would probably assassinate the whole Government. So you hold those and you do not worry to move them — but you do not control anything. (*Aside*) I do not believe that that Minister shares the view.

But the truth is that that Government is afraid of the economic sector. They are afraid to deal with the question of the economic magnates in this country. (*Asides*). They and the magnates — not the Minister, but he has to take the blame — I have not heard it said that the Minister himself is in this category, but he falls prey to a system — he is a very careful man and he is not prepared to rock the boat yet — but the fact is that the higher decision makers in your Government are one and the same with the economic magnates. They have the same mentality — I heard it in the agricultural pronouncements — the same approaches, the sort of laissez-faire attitude which really belongs to the old 17th century and 18th century liberals.

But we in Barbados, in 1982, are in tight economic circumstances and when the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is making it extremely difficult — to say nothing of the Governor of the Central Bank — for anybody to be able to enjoy the normal, reasonable, no longer luxury items of life, he ought, when he is talking about wage restraint, to pay some attention to what it is costing the people to exist in this society.

Mr. Chairman, simple every day pleasures are now being attacked with price, and no one seems to be concerned about this. One is not asking the Minister to bring in price controls on every single item there is in the community, but even one of his predecessors used to do something that, believe it or not, had some effect in the community. (*Asides*). He did it badly, because he too was afraid — he had his reasons. (Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: What you did had no effect and

what he did had none.) If you allow yourself to believe that what I did had no effect.....(Asides) There was a scarcity and there was corruption. There is always corruption in the private sector, and if you believe that nothing happened, that is a matter for you. We can debate that — I do not think this evening is the time for it — but I assure you that while I was there, I saw evidence that something was happening, and those persons whose duty and responsibility it was to inform me, were always willing to demonstrate that something was happening. I do not know if you are getting new demonstrations and you may therefore have a different approach.

I am saying that you should ask the ordinary people outside what is their feeling on the matter, and if the Prime Minister's position is right — if the people tell him that they prefer your Prime Minister's position, then you continue to sail that boat. But I will tell you this: as a result of the pressure which is being placed on the people in this area of consumer affairs, in the whole area of commerce in Barbados, the Government has lost a considerable amount of its credibility, to say nothing of what respect it held.

And to the everlasting credit of the Minister, there are people in this community who are looking to this particular Minister of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs to bring some measure of justice into the market-place. You may not wish to follow the route of price control, but you have a duty, and a responsibility, to let the people of the country feel that justice is reigning in the market-place. I do not think that people feel that way at the moment.

Mr. Chairman, if you say that price control is not the answer, then tell us what your answer is and demonstrate to us that it is functional and that it is working. But at the moment people believe, and they have good reason to believe, that they are being ripped off left and right. People believe that no one cares and that they have no one to complain to.

You know, there was a time when people could be prosecuted in the courts. I put it to you that for the last six years there has not been a single prosecution by the Government in the Courts. Do you mean we have a nation of no wrong doers at all in the commercial activity for the last six years? There is something wrong. Ask yourself that question and answer it.

I have a few more things I can say, but I do not think that it is necessary now. We have a budget coming up and we are going to have to discuss some of these matters. I think my colleagues wish to raise a few questions in this regard, so I will give way to them at this point.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Chairman, I really must respond to the honourable Member. To say that food prices increase 15 per cent per week is an irresponsible statement when it is already a known fact, as stated by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, that inflation last year was 14.6 per cent on a year to year basis. It is therefore not at all correct for the honourable Member for St. Michael West to state that food prices are going up at 15 per cent per week. That is an irresponsible statement, Sir.

5.45 p.m.

Domestic prices are based heavily on or determined by what is imported from overseas, and retained imports last year amounted to 60 percent of GDP. It is therefore obvious from that that some imported inflation will come into Barbados. We import goods from overseas, we import from North America, we import from Europe, and it is expected that a percentage of the increases that are felt in these countries must be felt by Barbados. Barbados is a small island. We are part and parcel of the entire world, Sir.

I would like to read a passage, Sir, page 59 of a document that has already been laid in this House — the Barbados Economic Report, 1980, presented to the Legislature by the Minister of Finance and Planning, March, 1981. In Chapter 12, Wages and Prices, Sir, Page 59 — this is already a document of the House — it is said:

"The average increase in wages for 1980 was 23.9 percent compared to 13.9 percent and 14.3 percent for 1978 and 1979 respectively, while the average index of retail price was 14.4 percent."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I was careful to point out — and I think the Minister of Agriculture understood the point I was making — that the information on which such indices, as are now being indicated by the honourable gentleman, are based on a particular system and methodology, and I was calling for a change in the system and methodology. It therefore is not useful to use the information which is being trotted out as a rebuttal to my argument, because I argue that there are some food products which you can find in the supermarket and those are the ones which are moving at 15 percent per week — those are the ones I am talking about.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, I gave way in good faith but he was trying to make another speech. The point is, Sir, that he stated that food prices increased 15 percent per week and I am trying to prove, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that that statement is not true. That statement is irresponsible and I would hate to see the Press pick it up tomorrow —

that the honourable Member for St. Michael West states emphatically that food prices go up 15 percent per week.

I go on, Sir. "The average real wage for workers is therefore estimated to an increase by 9.5 percent during 1980." Sir, that means that, over and above inflation, the workers were better off by 9.5 percent than they were over 1979.

It goes on to say Sir, in its final paragraph "All wage agreements concluded in 1980 were for increases between 28.1 percent and 34.7 percent, considerably higher than the 12 month rate of inflation which was 14.4 percent." He cannot get away with that, Sir. Food prices do not increase at 15 percent per week.

Sir, he talked about restrictions and import controls and so on. There are perhaps fewer import controls now than there were in 1976 but there is a reason for that. In 1976, Mr. Chairman, there were 24 restrictions, 24 different licences for the importation of corned beef.

If you wanted to import corned beef into this country, there were 24 different categories of corned beef. We only have one. We have one category of corned beef and, as the honourable Member for Christ Church East is pointing out, we could not even get the corned beef in 1975/76. So although they might have had more in terms of quantitative restrictions, that does not have anything to do with the quality of life in Barbados. They had 24 restrictions for corned beef. We have one, Sir, but the point is that corned beef is still under restriction.

Price controls still exist, Mr. Chairman, on chicken, milk, butter, corn meal, salt fish, macaroni, rice, sugar, bottled gas, other petroleum products and a whole host of products. The honourable Member for St. Michael West was trying to give the impression that this Government has removed price controls and that is not true.

The licensing system, Sir, prior to 1976, created a situation where a dishonest person in Government could have accepted bribes, could be corrupted, because Ministerial responsibility dictated that only the Minister had the right to give certain licences to certain people, Sir, and the honourable Member for St. Michael West should know, because he was the Minister responsible during the period I am talking about.

I want to make it very clear — I am not insinuating that he was dishonest. I am not insinuating that he would have accepted any sort of bribe or that he was involved in any corruption. That is not the point at all that I am making.

The point that I am making is that when you take a situation out of the hands of the Import Licence

Review Committee, as we have it now, and put it in the hands of one person, be that the Minister, the Permanent Secretary or somebody within the Import Licence Review Committee, it means that that person is susceptible to corruption.

Mr. Chairman, in 1976, when the honourable Member for St. Michael West was in power, between January and September 1 of 1976, some 9 226 licences were submitted and processed by the Ministry for which the honourable Member for St. Michael West had the honour to represent. Sir, I will give you an example of the breakdown as to how many were passed and how many were refused in order to prove the point that I was making.

Beef, Sir. You had 752 licences to import beef. None of them were refused, not one. The Minister went through 752 licences and approved all.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable Member give way?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the honourable Member would give way for a moment. I think it has been explained before, but I will explain to the honourable Member, that in that category of licences was also information gathering for the Ministry of Finance in order to know the amount of money which was being spent on certain items such as pork in barrels and beef and that sort of thing. The licences were used as a system of monitoring because that was the easier thing. The information is there. You can find it if you want.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir, if the honourable Member would give way. The Ministry of Finance has a computerized system of estimating all imports into the island. Before the computerized system, the Ministry of Finance, working through the Customs Department, and before there was a Ministry of Finance, the Customs Department from perhaps, at least, Sir, I would say the year 1742 or 1743, has had a system of monitoring imports into this island.

And all the honourable Member has to do is to go upstairs and look at a set of blue books, which I presented to Parliament that belonged to my father. He will see that as far back as those blue books go, into the 19th Century, that the Customs Department has been in the habit of publishing how much beef, pork, whatever you like, is imported into this island.

It has to pass through the Customs, whether it pays duty or not, and a warrant is passed — it is recorded and totalled, and it has been so for several hundred years. 5.55 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, further to that point of order, you can do that, it is Parliamentary procedure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member rose on a point of order. It is fitting to change and say on a matter of explanation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am returning further to the Prime Minister's point of order, Sir. You can do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am sure you would be able to come back to it. I know it is hot on the brain right now, but please.....

Mr. A. TRUSS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to continue. I was talking about the licencing system that existed when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, I was talking about a specific period between January 1 and September 1 1976.

There were 435 applications for the importation of salt beef and pork. None were turned down, not one — now he comments. Some 2 275 applications were made to the Licencing Authority under the very Ministry which the Member for St. Michael West had the honour to serve on, and not one was turned down. For retail food 150 applications were made, and not one turned down. I can go on and on. The sum total of my contribution, Sir, is that the 9 226 applications that were made to import food into this country, 44 were turned down. That is a fact, Sir. They had a system where the Minister sat down and went through 9 226 applications to refuse 44.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is misleading the House. To say that the Minister used to sit down and go through 9 000 applications is simply not true. They were civil servants who had the power to grant or not grant licences and did. It is not true for him to give the House that information.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The point is that the Minister presided over the policy to allow high paid civil servants to waste their time. It is the same thing. It is not meant as a reflection on he, himself, sitting down and going through these licences. The point is that the Minister allowed high paid civil servants to go through 9 226 licences to refuse only 44.

We said when we came into power — and rightly so — that is foolishness, high paid civil servants have more important things to do — and we set up an Import Licencing Review Committee to deal with that and we removed the import restrictions from these commodities which surely did not necessitate in the first place, having a licencing system. If you want to argue, Sir, that we have fewer things on restrictions than they had, no one

is going to argue that point — it is a matter of fact. But there are reasons behind it. We feel our system is far more efficient than the one the Democratic Labour Party.

It is not fair to give the impression that prices are rising 15 per cent per week because we no longer allow restrictions — we let the private sector, the fellows on Roebuck Street, sell their goods as they like. It is not true and, time and time again, the Minister of Finance have stated exactly what the position is in relation to inflation and wages. I have repeated these statements and I cannot sit here and listen to the Member for St. Michael West making these irresponsible statements — that food prices are going up 15 percent per week. I cannot sit here while he makes these statements, because it is not true.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have the opportunity at this point to respond to many points that have been made and to the numerous queries. I just want to say that I am deeply indebted to all honourable Members who have spoken, and I particularly enjoyed the speeches of my immediate predecessor in office, the honourable Member for St. Michael Central and, indeed, the honourable Member for St. Lucy, too.

Just let me say that it really is very difficult for any Minister to respond to questions which are informed by hearsay and second hand stories at funerals and so on. Some of the questions raised by the Shadow Minister of Agriculture are so rooted in misinformation representing the woes and complaints of one individual in an isolated case, for example, the question about the pesticide drift that caused damage to the farmers crop. In truth and in fact it was a herbicide, and we all know that any herbicide, incorrectly used, can cause damage downwind. He suggested that the chemical should be banned. But the chemical used was the standard one, and is the standard one, used in the sugar industry, and to ban it because of one isolated instance, would result in considerable inconvenience and a general disadvantage.

With respect to his question of the drip and trickle method of irrigation, his criticism of the over head sprinkler is unfounded. We in Barbados have really been investigated for the use of all methods of irrigation. The trickle irrigation system is operated in Gibbons Boggs and is being considered for use in other areas. But not every area is suited to the trickle system, the sprinkler system, still has its place — it is the cheapest system — and if properly used, it is a very effective system. You are not to give yourself the impression I don't think you have given anyone else — that it is not known to Barbados, or that we are lagging behind, or that it is not in use here.

I am concerned about some of the questions insofar as the basis of fact have been missing. I heard of several stations in Barbados that have not been offering any service to the agriculture community and have been

closed down. The truth of the matter is that I only know of Sayers Court. He mentioned Jerusalem and Bullens — both stations are in existence, giving the same range and quality of service, as far as I know that they have been giving in the past years. Yet he talks about stations, including Jerusalem and Bullens, where the services have been cut back. I know of no cutting back of these stations. The only one to be closed down recently is Sayers Court which is now being converted into a Skills Training Centre.

In the usual manner of overstating his case I think he is a student of the honourable Member for St. Michael West — he mentioned the several complaints of the many farmer organizations falling under the umbrella of BAS.

Before I came here, I only knew that one Mr. Andy Dowding had given an interview on television saying he wanted to see me and could not see me, they were not courteous enough to ask me if that was true, but nevertheless they proceeded to give him considerable coverage. But that is a commentary on the people who work at the television station rather than anything else.

I would just like to tell Mr. Andy Dowding that he will not conduct relations with this Minister of Agriculture by way of the television. If he continues to perform like that I might see the dairy farmers, excluding him. His wife has a habit of sending me messages by way of the telephone to tell me how she is going to close down her dairy and so on. I ignore that and my message to her is that if she wants to close it down, then close it down. 6.05 p.m.

That would be a matter for her. But they will have to learn to respect Ministers, you just do not conduct relations with Ministers that way. And that is the simple answer to Andy Dowding and Mrs. Dowding.

I think the question in relation to the pig farmers is really a question of over-production without, at the same time, making any provision for their markets. The BARPAC takes approximately 120 pigs, I believe, a week from the pig rearing community of this country and I have learnt from BARPAC that they have not departed from that arrangement.

The position is, however, that in recent months in Barbados there has been an over production of pork and unless some agency takes the pork and put it on cold storage, we can appreciate that the farmers would have reason to complain. But that is no fault of the Ministry of Agriculture.

In several areas, there is an over production in Barbados because there is no proper market information system in existence. And that is why, in my opening remarks, I made mention of the role of the Barbados

Marketing Corporation, working hand in hand with the BAS and the Ministry of Agriculture in developing, in particular, a crop information system so that farmers will know who else is planting at a particular time, what the market is likely to look like in March, in April, in December and avoid these peaks and valleys. That is the importance of the crop information system which the Barbados Marketing Corporation has responsibility for working out, along with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Barbados Agricultural Society.

General questions were raised, Sir, such as whether or not there is a price control policy in existence and whether, in particular, impliedly so, the price control policy of this Party is different from the price control policy of the Democratic Labour Party.

I really think, Sir, that the honourable Member for St. Michael Central did deal quite effectively with the Member for St. Michael West who spoke on this matter. Nevertheless, I think there are additional points to be made.

We agree, in principle, that there is need for some form of price control. I think we share this view with the Democratic Labour Party. But even the best friends of the Democratic Labour Party admit that the system which they had in existence up to 1976 was an utter disaster, as has been clearly demonstrated by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central.

The gentleman who used to chair the Price Control Board, he himself, would tell you, as he said openly on several occasions, that it was a disastrous policy. Frank Alleyne, a gentleman for whom I have little or no regard, but he was nevertheless a member of the Democratic Labour Party, at the time wrote an article, in his capacity as a professional economist, saying that the Price Control Policy of the Democratic Labour Party Administration contributed to the economic chaos that existed up to 1976, that is what Frank Alleyne wrote in his professional capacity. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: He got fired.) Whether that is after he got fired or before he got fired, that might be a reflection on the integrity of Frank Alleyne, but that is what he wrote. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: And you still quote it after you got all the facts?)

And it is a fact that we had exceptionally high price increases in the years leading up to 1976 — in 1975, over 40 percent. It is a fact that the shops were empty as far as these goods were concerned. There was everywhere talk of scandal and corruption about the Civil Service, and of others, in relation to the administration of the price control policy — it never worked — and it was an absolute illusion to give people the impression that there was any effective price control policy in this country up to 1976.

At present, there are 30 items under price control, representing some of the basic goods in any food basket. Many of them have been identified by the honourable Member for St. Michael Central, and to those, I would just like to add petroleum products, gasoline, kerosene, liquefied petroleum, potatoes, chicken — whole chicken, chicken cut in quarters, backs and necks — parboiled rice, spaghetti, brown sugar, yellow crystals, fish.....(Asides) cement — all of these items are price controlled.

The impression that you were trying to create is that the standard of living now, is lower than when you were in office. We know that it is much higher than when you were in office, and we know that prices are relatively stable in food items. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: Quality of life has not.) In fact, the evidence is that in the last three months the moving average has demonstrated that the cost of living has actually gone down.

So there can be no case made out that there is not some form of price control in this country. But along with the 30 items that are on price control, there are a lot of other items that are under a system of what I call 'informal price control', whereby the producers — those who are responsible for marketing those items, cannot raise the price, except with reference to the Ministry. These are items such as biscuits, bread and soft drinks, and the Ministry quite often refuses price increases for up to a year. So there is a form of price control in existence and it has been, by contrast, to the one that you had, the more effective policy.

The position, Mr. Chairman, is that we take the view that a broad based basket of goods, representing what we may loosely call essential items, should be price controlled. At any one time, we may argue that that basket is in need of revision, and I share the view of the honourable Member for St. Michael West that that basket is in need of revision. Indeed, I have asked for that revision and I would hope, in a matter of weeks, to get a submission on a new basket of goods.

Outside of that, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be unwise for Government to be into the detailed system of licences and price control which did not work, and which the Democratic Labour Party, in office, practised. So one ought not to get the impression, Sir, that there is not a system of price control in existence and, on the evidence, it is not effective and working.

With respect to the question, Sir, of the Government's policy in relation to rural development — and this is the specific question raised by the honourable Member for St. Philip North — when the question was asked, it gave the impression that this Administration is somehow opposed to the so-called small man, the peasant farmer,

getting a piece of land and owning a part of the patrimony.

6.15 p.m.

The Opposition really, Mr. Chairman, are poor debaters, because the record of this Administration in relation to land, whether it be house spot land or land for farming purposes, really ought to be applauded, and it has been applauded by everyone who knows anything about it.

We took the revolutionary step, two years or so ago, to make sure that all the people in this country, who lived on the plantation tenancies, were able to get their house spots — and the process of transferring the titles is still going on — for 10 cents per square foot and a price not exceeding \$300.

The whole question of how you treat the people on the plantation tenancies has been a problem that existed ever since emancipation, and it took this Barbados Labour Party Administration to use its imagination and its resourcefulness to come up with the solution to that problem. You know, Mr. Chairman, as well as I do, the political impact that that had throughout Barbados.

We have taken a further step, Mr. Chairman, and we have decided, in relation to the Rural Development Scheme, that those who used to work, and who work, agricultural land belonging to the plantations, must have the land transferred to them at a reasonable price under the Rural Development Scheme.

In addition, Sir, we took a step, which was a historic step in this country, and we gave to the 26 members of the farming community who had no land before, so-called landless farmers, 402 acres at Springhall in the Springhall Land Lease Scheme. And that is a scheme which we hope will be repeated in other areas, and that is the answer, effectively, to the question raised by the honourable Member for St. Philip North.

I do not think that we can leave the honourable Member for St. Philip North without referring briefly to the policy of the years preceding 1976 — the years of the Democratic Labour Party in relation to the reckless taking of agricultural land out of agriculture into commercial and housing development. We are still battling with that problem, and indeed I am concerned that unless we get some of the idle lands back into production soon, we will not be able, particularly with sugar, to realise the 150,000 tonnes which we have set ourselves as a target.

We have identified in recent weeks ten major problems affecting the sugar industry. The fact that there are still large tracks of idle land is one of them, and I have recently set up an Idle Lands Committee which is

already at work trying to identify the major tracts of idle land in the country, and trying to use moral suasion on the owners to try to get them back into production.

A specific question was asked in relation to the Chief Agricultural Officer — why is the Chief Agricultural Officer, and indeed other officers too, not now shown with other officers under Subhead 1. The answer, I am advised, is that the Chief Agricultural Officer used to be under Subhead 1 — General Administration, but he has now been shifted to Subhead 4. This has been done to reflect all technical officers under Projects. I am advised that this arrangement of putting all the technical officers under Projects is not new, and it was in existence for about three years. I can assure you that there is no reflection on the Chief Agricultural Officer, nor is it an indication of the fact that he is doing work other than what he has traditionally done.

I did try, Mr. Chairman, to make some notes on the several points which were raised. The only one remaining unanswered, according to my notes relates to the ADC. Some very harsh and unsubstantiated charges were made against the Agricultural Development Corporation. I just wish to say that the Corporation has 2 200 hectares of land, and some of them are among the worst lands that we have in Barbados. The arable acreage is 58 per cent or 1 271 hectares. Under cane we have 33.7 per cent of the arable, 739 hectares; under food and vegetables 96 hectares, and in the last year — 1981, we harvested 760 tonnes of sugar which made for a yield, per hectare, of 58 tonnes.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the ADC, like the BMC, is trying its best. The basic material with which the ADC has got to work is not the best, as I indicated, because the estates are not in the good rainfall producing areas, but the ADC has taken many initiatives in new directions — for example, in the small farmer harvesting and cultivation scheme, and I think the organisation ought to be given the opportunity to see precisely what it will realise. Right now, Sir, I think we can all agree that it is getting extremely high marks from the farming community, particularly in St. Philip and Christ Church, in relation to the reaping assistance which it is giving, and I have great hope for an improvement in the performance of that organisation.

Returning finally, Sir, to the testing of varieties of sugar cane, I just want to make the point, in conclusion, that nowadays we try to realise several ends by the testing of varieties. For example, we try to get varieties that are best suited for mechanisation, we try to get varieties that are resistant to smut disease and to rust, and varieties that grow with little or no trash. That work, which goes on at Groves, is important work in the sugar industry, and work for which Barbados got high marks over many years in many parts of the world.

At this stage, I beg to move that the sum of \$10 880 137 under Head 25 — Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs — stands part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 25 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
6.25 p.m.

CAPITAL

HEAD 74 — MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Head 74 — Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs — was called.

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$14 278 812 under Capital Head 74 — Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 37 — MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Head 37 — Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, I wish to make a few comments, bearing in mind that there is very little time left for what I consider a full debate on Housing. I wish to say that the policy in Housing has already been enunciated and I have already stated what is Government's policy in respect of future housing in Barbados.

The Government, in its Manifesto of 1981, spoke about a National Housing Plan, and I am happy to reveal to this Hon. Chamber that steps are underway to effect this part of the Manifesto. So far, a survey has been started and officers are already in the field soliciting information in order to achieve our National Housing Plan.

There has been lots of debate on this particular subject before, and I do not intend on this occasion to repeat what has already been said or what is already known about housing.

Earlier this week, I heard from an honourable Member, on the other side, something to the effect that Government was cutting back on the allocation for housing, but I wish to give that honourable Member and this Hon. Chamber the assurance that there has not been any cut-back in terms of Housing, and one will see that the amount differs by \$50 000 from what was allocated in the last financial year. As has already been stated by the Hon. Prime Minister, housing will be boosted by some funds from an outside agency, and I am sure that these funds when placed at the disposal of the Ministry for housing, we will see an acceleration in the housing stock in the country.

I would like to say that in respect of the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act, which will see many tenants owning the lots on which they now live, or lived on over a period of years, a Committee has now been appointed and by next week the names of this Committee will be known. There are some \$400 000 that has already been placed in the Barbados National Bank on lending to potential purchasers of these lots and the application is pretty simple — all those potential purchaser will be required to make application, by way of an application form, to the Barbados National Bank.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is much more I would wish to say on this particular Head. I will give honourable Members from the other side an opportunity to raise any matters which may be of concern to them and I would be quite happy to give them the appropriate explanations.

I would also like, Mr. Chairman, in moving this Head to move an amendment to the title as set out here. It is headed "Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment". I would wish to move that the Head be amended to read "Ministry of Housing and Lands".

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$7,748,488 under Head 37 — Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment — as amended — stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chairman, under this particular Head I would just like to make a few observations. Time is short so I will try to get to them as quickly as possible, and I want to deal specifically with Subhead 2 — National Housing Corporation. Mr. Chairman, this corporation under the Ministry of Housing and Lands has a few specific functions: housing development for public purposes, building maintenance etc. of 4 000 units, construction of houses for sale in a commercial programme. I want to start with that particular one.

In this particular section, Mr. Chairman, the National Housing Corporation must do two things in this area. If they enter the commercial sector for the provision of houses, they must be able to assure Barbadians that they are competitive with the private enterprise people for two main reasons, namely, (1) — and this is substantial — that the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation reserves a considerable amount of their funds for the purchase of houses from the National Housing Corporation in their commercial venture. The moment that you are tailoring a specific amount of mortgage funds towards one particular area, one has to be very sure that these mortgage funds are producing the maximum amount of units that are available to them. In this particular area I would like to turn my attention more specifically to the ones they are now working on and make some observations about that, and that is the project at West Terrace.

This is a project, Mr. Chairman, that all of us are very aware of. There has been a lot of projections about the prices of the project — the last price I heard is that the houses are to be between \$110 000 and \$120 000. But that is not what bothers me, particularly, on this project. What is my greatest worry about the project is the technical advice that was made available to the Corporation or the Minister — I believe it was to the Corporation.

I am somewhat at a loss to find out why such a beautiful site like West Terrace was taken and turned, in my opinion, into one of the most depressing sites you can see now at this particular moment in time. If you go to West Terrace at this moment it is like a quarry that has been pushed off and is ready for quarrying. It is very depressing to the eye for lots of reasons and I will tell you why.
6.35 p.m.

Those who are acquainted with that site know that it was a beautiful rolling site sloping from the east to the west with a lovely scenery over the west coast. And the terrain was ideally suitable with a little bit of site preparation for the type of structures that would allow a basement in those houses down there thereby making it a lot more valuable to the people and giving the National Housing Corporation the opportunity to get a few more dollars for it.

But what has been done? The whole site has been bulldozed to a level at a considerable sum of money. My information is that the site preparation for those houses — 96, plus the playing area and 24 with houses, the contract is somewhere in the vicinity of \$1.65 million — I would like the Minister, if this is not correct information, to correct me — and if this is so, Mr. Chairman, a quick calculation would show you that in the preparation of

that site, at least \$13,000 has to be put to every unit to pay for the preparation of the site, you have to start with \$13,000.

It is also my information, that despite the fact that the site was so prepared, that the foundation work still had to be done and it was still done in the normal method strip footing was taken out, and in some cases the strip footing was also deep because of the pitch, so there was also very little saving by way of foundation work.

Even more expensive is that on the completion of those houses, Mr. Chairman, in order for the people to landscape those houses and put back some type of greenery and shrubbery and lovely flowers, that top soil which was removed had to be brought back. I would like the Minister to tell me if the people who are purchasing those houses at West Terrace now have to pay to bring back the top soil in order to landscape around the houses because it would be the most distressing thing in Barbados if that West Terrace housing area remained as it is after it is completed.

I am positive that some type of landscaping has to be done at West Terrace, and if the people have to do it themselves, it is going to cost them not less than \$8,000 to \$10,000 per house to landscape those houses that they buy, including bringing back the top soil to put around those houses.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think is very bad, technical and professional advice to the corporation and it has ended up in the cost of the houses with the result that the houses are now outside the limit of the people that they were intended for, because under the Public Housing Officers' Loan the maximum loan is now \$100,000.

Let us take the houses that are costing \$120,000. If you are getting a 90 per cent loan on those, that is a mortgage of \$108,000 and the criteria is that to qualify and your maximum entitlement is three times your maximum gross salary at that time so for people to qualify for 90 per cent mortgage of \$108,000, they would have to be getting in the salary range of about \$36,000 a year and when you look at the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, those people in the Public Service getting \$36,000 a year stop at B — Chief Parliamentary Counsel, Solicitor General, Auditor General, Permanent Secretary, Chief Personnel Officer, etc.

So you have moved those houses, Mr. Chairman, out of the reach of the people that they were intended for, and I would only say that in the commercial venture maximum efficiency must be gone into in order that people must have a fair deal because if it can be demonstrated that they are at a disadvantage in comparison with units of similar quality in other areas, it is not fair.

Back to the National Housing. I would like to suggest, and I think the time is ripe, that the corporation should consider providing shell houses in its working class areas. By shell houses I mean Mr. Chairman, when you put a house out of concrete blocks and put your enclosed toilet inside and then provide the facilities for the people to partition it according to their needs.

There are two advantages in this. The first advantage is that it will keep the initial price of the unit down. The second advantage is that it would allow the purchasers, themselves, to put some labour into the house because that is very important. In the construction industry now the labour content is anywhere between 45 per cent and 50 per cent of the finished product and therefore if you pass on the product to the persons who, themselves, can put in some input thereby cutting down that cost of labour and, not only that — giving them the opportunity to be part and parcel of their own house.

Let them paint the house, provide the facility whereby they can get the material for the partitioning and they would be able to partition the house how they want it depending on the size of their family. Some people might decide to put in two bedrooms. Some might decide to put in three bedrooms and some might decide to put in one bedroom. I have seen this here and it has been very successful in New Zealand.

The other important part about this is that if you do a comparative cost of this type of structure *vis-a-vis* wood, you will find that the unit price now for six inch block walls, plastered both sides, is in the vicinity of about \$22 per square yard. If you take the equivalent in wood at the cost of wood, there is not very much difference, and I believe the wood might even be more expensive. Therefore, you should seriously, in your working class areas, have a look at some shell houses.

I would also like to suggest, and I know there is a small vote to the Ministry for experimental houses. There are lots of new techniques coming on the market, but in the absence of being assured that a private developer will get a substantial number of houses to make it profitable for him to go into the initial outlay, they might be reluctant to go into it. I think the Ministry of Housing should, under a particular vote, experiment into some of the new technology of spray concrete system houses etc. to see what is the best thing they could come up on.

Quickly under this Head, under the Lands and Surveys Department, I must say that I am a little bit surprised that more progress has not been made in the Land Registry. I would really invite the Minister to take back up the files and see what can be done to get that project

going since there are innumerable advantages to be had for a proper functioning Ministry.
6.45 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, time is running out, Sir, I would only need five minutes to ask the Minister a few questions. First of all, Sir, he got up and asked for the amendment of the name. What is going to happen to the environment? Are we not going to be dealing with the environment? Is another Minister going to deal with the environment or is that just a stylistic thing? Is it a de-emphasis of the environment? I cannot believe that the Government, under this distinguished Minister, is going to shift away from the environment. I remember his colleague, the Hon. Leader of the House, spent a lot of time in this House and I believe the environment was the thrust of the forward movement. I don't really understand what is happening, but maybe the Government is confused — I don't know — I would like some answers on that.

Secondly, under this Head, Housing, the Minister is only getting \$50,000 less, which seems to suggest that the Prime Minister has faith in the Minister. I applaud him on that, but I would like to ask him what did they do for the \$6,050,000 last year? I wish you to give us, in as short a time as possible, an accounting of your stewardship. I cannot see any new housing. I don't know where it is — what did you do on housing? What did we spend this \$6 million on? You are getting \$6 million more, and, if you are only going to do this year what you did last year, it means that, again, that would be \$12 million for which we cannot see anything.

I have no doubt that the honourable Members on that side know what happened to the money, Sir, but we in the public would like to know what has been done. Tell us, show us where the housing is. My colleague has already dealt with West Terrace, so I am not going to try to deal with that.

Mr. Chairman, I see, also, that we are spending, I am certain from the figure of \$5,153,000, — I cannot seem to find where Cave Authority, which has now been disbanded, is located, because I saw a notice somewhere which said that all matters relating to the cave must be dealt with at the cave site. Will the cave be removed from the new National Conservation Commission? Is the cave still included in that? Where is the expenditure for the cave? Are you satisfied with the fact that the Cave is making money? I saw a report that the cave is losing money at the rate of is that \$400 or \$4,000 a day?

I would like to know the position on the cave. I think it is a national monument which ought not to be left to chance. (Asides) What is the Member for St. Thomas whispering? He knows about the money at the cave? Well I will give way for him to tell us what is

happening with the money at the cave. It seems to me that on the Cave Authority, which has been merged into the National Conservation Commission, there ought to be some policy statement from the Minister, as quickly as possible, as to what is happening.

There are a few things which I am very sorry that time does not permit us to deal with, but I do want the Minister to tell us what he is doing. I believe he said they are doing a survey. Well it cannot cost \$6 million to do a survey. I want to hear from you what happened to that money, where have we invested, it, what sites we have acquired, where we are going to build, and what kind of houses are we going to build? I believe one of my other colleagues want to ask some questions, so perhaps I had better stop at this point.

But one last question. The Minister of Transport fired his Board. I have reason to believe that the Minister of Housing is firing, has fired, or will fire, his Board. Has the Minister appointed a new Board? (Asides) There is a new National Housing Corporation Board? (Asides) A new Board? Would the Minister let us know who..... (Aside)

How do you mean read it from the Official Gazette? You want to be Prime Minister and Minister of Housing too? Get up and answer if you know the answers and tell us how you....(Aside) No, he is the Prime Minister and he has to know what is going on, he is a proper Prime Minister, so maybe he can tell me what qualifications he was using for the appointment of these people to the Board.

Certain remarks made by Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I should like to hear from the Minister what criteria he is using for the appointment of his Board. We wish to know precisely what the Minister is thinking of, so that he can go in the direction he is going.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the honourable Member for St. Philip North spoke on the commercial houses at West Terrace. I want to ask a few questions under the same head of commercial houses, about low income houses. Now the West Terrace houses are certainly not for low income earners; they are probably not even for high income earners. I want to know if the Government still has a policy of continuing to provide houses for purchase by low income earners. I would like to know the position on that, Sir.

I found, Sir, that one of the things is that the provision of those houses can relieve some of the pressures on

the houses for rental, because there are several people who are living in rentals who are in a position to probably purchase one of those houses.

From my own experience, I found that it was more difficult for them to build their own houses, because the mortgages were readily available from the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company and they had a ready package — a house and a mortgage, and, as long as their salaries or wages were right, they were able then to pay for those houses. I would really want to know if the policy is still the same — to continue the provision of low income houses for persons to purchase.

The other matter is the question of what used to be called landing schemes. A number of persons have approached me about land on which to put their own houses. I think this has been a problem — not only now, it has been a problem in the Democratic Labour Party Administration.

I know the Minister has given some kind of indication, if not in here — I think that I may have read it in the Press — that they are providing what they call sites and services. Sites and services need not be landing schemes, but it could very well be part of a landing scheme policy. I would like to know from the Minister the policy on the question of landing schemes, which may not necessarily be the same as sites and services.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I will reply to a couple of the enquiries made by the honourable Members on the other side. I am not prepared to answer any charges based on rumour and gossip. I have learned what rumour and gossip mean in this society, so what I would like to say is that there is no truth in the allegation that the caves are losing any \$400 per day.

I am on record, I have made repeated statements and they were carried in the news media on several occasions, about Government's policy in relation to low income housing and need not, on this occasion, restate that policy.

All I would like to say is that the Government is very mindful and conscious of the fact that the lower income earners deserve to have houses priced within their reach and, to this end, Government is committed to making such houses available.

We are looking at a house cost between \$50 000 to \$60 000, and even less. We are exploring every possibility of introducing new systems and new techniques in order to lessen the rather high cost of building.

As far as the West Terrace is concerned, I have already made statements in that respect and I do not want to go into that here. All I would like to state on this

occasion is that the National Housing Corporation was guided by consultants and the best technical advice. It was recommended that the area be regraded because there are pockets in the foundation, and, based on that technical advice, the removal of the top soil was done. I am not going to question the professional integrity of those persons but I am sure that neither one of us in this Chamber is competent or qualified enough to question their advice.

The houses at West Terrace is not \$110 000 to \$120 000, but rather \$103 000 to \$120 000, so I would like you to correct that.
6.55 p.m.

I do not need to go into the participation of persons in the building of their homes. This is a policy which has found favour with me, and I am sure that wherever possible we would encourage this. We know that in order to reduce the cost of houses, it is necessary to get people to understand that they should participate in the actual building.

I have looked at the system of putting up the shells and allowing the potential purchasers to do some of the finishing like the partitions, *et cetera*. We have also looked at the possibility of a house with two bedrooms, with some provision for the addition of an extra room as the economic situation is bettered.

I think I have shared some thoughts on housing with honourable Members on that side, and I have not really seen any drastic changes or any difference in the concept of housing. All I would have to say on this occasion is that some policies have already been implemented, the commercial programme has been geared to meet commercial practices, and I have always said that I will be guided by the very best policies that will see us correcting, or helping to alleviate the housing problem which now confronts us.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: The Hon. Minister has given away. Just one point. Would the Hon. Minister let me know please, what is happening with the connection bridge so that you would have more than one access to West Terrace? There was supposed to be a bridge so that you can get to West Terrace through Paradise heights. This is very important because in an emergency, the people at West Terrace only have one access to West Terrace and this could be dangerous. There is supposed to be a bridge so you can get into West Terrace through Paradise Heights. I wonder if this is still on the programme.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Well, the bridge has been an idea mooted around and I have been looking at the cost. It will have a cost to the National Housing Corporation and with the limited finances, I am sure that one

would not expect me to build a bridge in preference to building houses. It will cost well over \$2 million, maybe \$3 million, to construct a bridge based on the building cost and the appropriate type of bridge. You would have to be guided by the very best engineering advice in building this bridge because it is running in a natural water course.

As I said, there is a priority here. I am sure the honourable Member has always invited the Government, surely he has advised me, to be guided by what I consider to be matters of top priority. In this instance, I think that the building of houses and making way for proper and adequate drainage would be of fundamental priority rather than thinking in terms of a bridge.

But I think that the Ministry of Communications and Works, as they see fit, when money is available, will think in terms of providing the bridge. I take the point raised by the honourable Member. (Mr. B. M. TAITT: How many houses you built?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question.....

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are about two or three minutes left and in that time I could probably say a few words.

There is another aspect which I think, concerns this Ministry. It is a question of re-designing some areas which are very, very badly laid out. Traditionally, some persons have gone and put their homes in some of the most impossible places, but that is where they have lived for years and years and years, and their families have then come and joined houses behind them, beside them and in front them, and so on and so forth.

I am suggesting, Sir, that in these cases — and I would like to recommend a few to you, in my constituency particularly, like Johnson's Land in White Hall, I could suggest an area off Hinds Hill, St. Michael; an area off Well Gap, also in St. Michael — I think it would not be a bad thing if one were to get probably some officers from the Town Planning Department to do a new layout.

Sir, those people are, in a sense, deprived of services, and they probably would be further deprived of the services because of the bad layout of those areas, and if something could be done about those areas — I know it would cost some money, I do not expect it to be done in a day or two — if the professional officers in the Town Planning Department could pay a visit to those areas and do some work there, do another layout — it would cause probably for some shifting and moving of houses and so on and so forth — that is where, probably, the cost will be — it will enable some services, Sir, probably to be brought in.

Some of those houses are situated where at times, it is almost impossible for a road to wind its way in between those houses. And I am inviting the Minister to have a look at this aspect of the matter, at least do a layout. In time to come, probably one or two or three areas can be done on an annual basis. I am sure that the residents would be most grateful.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This brings an end to the debate on this matter.

The question that Head 37 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 79 — CAPITAL — MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS — \$11 MILLION

Head 79 — Ministry of Housing and Lands — was called.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Head 79, Capital do now stand part.

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

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

HEAD 38 AS AMENDED — MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE — \$3 068 277.

Head 38 as amended — Ministry of Information and Culture was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Head 38, as amended, do now stand part.

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

The question that Head 38 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 80 AS AMENDED — MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE \$5 182 662

Head 80 as amended — Ministry of Information and Culture was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 80, as amended, do now stand part.

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

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

HEAD 39 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL
SECURITY AND SPORT – \$6 812 674

Head 39 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 39 do now stand part.

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

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

The question that Head 39 be recommitted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 39 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL
SECURITY AND SPORT – \$13 015 515

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move, Sir, that Head 39 do now stand part.

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

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

HEAD 81 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL
SECURITY AND SPORT – \$500 000

Head 81 – Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Head 81 do now stand part.

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

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

HEAD 40 AS AMENDED – MINISTRY OF TRADE
AND INDUSTRY – \$4 049 393

Head 40 as amended – Ministry of Trade and Industry – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that Head 40, as amended, do now stand part.

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

The question that Head 40 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
7.05 p.m.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 82 – MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Head 82 – Capital – Ministry of Trade and Industry – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$6 500 000 under Head 82 – Ministry of Trade and Industry – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 41 – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM
DIVISION

Head 41 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$15 057 342 under Head 41 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 83 – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM
DIVISION

Head 83 – Capital – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$23 388 599 under Head 83 – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 42 – MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Head 42 – Ministry of Transport and Works – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$38 054 061 under Head 42 – Ministry

of Transport and Works — as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 84 — MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Head 84 — Capital — Ministry of Transport and Works — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$20 919 250 under Head 84 — Ministry of Transport and Works — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 43 — COMMUNITY SERVICES

Head 43 — Community Services — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$10 981 251 under Head 43 — Community Services — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 85 — COMMUNITY SERVICES

Head 85 — Capital — Community Services — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$1 000 000 under Head 85 — Community Services — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 50 — POST OFFICE

Head 50 — Post Office — was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of \$3 469 391 under Head 50 — Post Office — stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 as amended was called and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

The Schedule as amended was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, 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. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the Appropriation Act, 1982.
7.15 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there was a measure which came back from the Other Place and I have given notice that I would like to deal with it. There was an amendment to the Caribbean Community Loans Guarantee Act, 1982, and the amendments were circulated to honourable Members.

I beg to move that this House concur in the amendments from the Other Place.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of Government Business. We have had our regular debates on the Estimates. I think the cut and thrust with those young honourable Members who, for the first time have had the experience of being involved in the Estimates would be, for them, a very good experience. I feel particularly proud of the Members on my side, especially those young back-benchers who gave sterling performances. On the other side, I think that would be the duty of the various leaders of the Opposition Party to consider how well they have done. I can say I have

enjoyed the debates once again, and I sincerely hope that we will be spared to come in and debate the Estimates in the coming year.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not thank the entire Staff of Parliament for these very long hours, and the Reporters, who, we know, work under very trying conditions especially when the debate is heated, and the Chair for its tolerance, rulings and guidance to each and everyone of us, and to you, Mr. Speaker, for what contribution you have been able to make from your very high office. I know you probably may be a bit frustrated when you hear the cut and thrust of debate and know that you yourself cannot get involved after ten years of supporting us on this side.

I sincerely hope that for each and everyone of us everything goes well.

I beg to move that this House do now stand adjourned until Wednesday March 31, 1982, at 4 p.m. when the Minister of Finance and Prime Minister will be delivering his Budgetary Proposals to this country. I do not know what is in the Budget.

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

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, just a few words at this point. I would like to concur in the words spoken by the Leader of the House, the honourable Member for St. James North, in respect of these Estimates debates. I can only say that we have had a very good understanding over these five days as far as the arrangements were concerned, and they have gone relatively smoothly.

I concur in his comments as far as the staff of Parliament is concerned. And I should like to thank the Chairman of Committees for the stamina and the very even keel on which he kept the debate going, and I think he did a very splendid job over these five days. I would like to pay a tribute to him.

On my side, of course, we do not have the numbers as the Government, but we performed in a very sterling manner, and the Government now knows that — if I may quote a phrase — “to outnumber is not to out-argue,” and I would say that on this occasion there is no doubt that the Opposition out-argued the Government, and we await the Budgetary Proposals on March 31.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion for the adjournment, I too, would like to add my words of thanks to the staff of Parliament and the Chairman of Committees.

I would ask honourable Members to give some thought to the shape of the Budget debate. The

Government is setting aside the three days Wednesday, Thursday and Friday for this debate. On one occasion in the past, it was possible to work out a programme by which all Members of the House would have an opportunity to speak according to a formula predetermined by the then Leader of the House, and I think it must have been the honourable Member for St. Michael South acting as *de facto* Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

I would be glad if the honourable Member really believes what he has just said — that the Opposition put up a creditable performance on the Estimates, because it would mean that the Opposition has got rid of the inferiority complex which the last television debate engendered in its ranks. And certainly, I was very glad to see the honourable Member for St. Michael West cheering the words of self praise that were flowing from the lips of the Acting Leader of the Opposition, and I hope that those words, and his own thumpings on the Table, will give him courage to overcome the feelings which he had after his unfortunate experience the last time he appeared on television in a broadcast from Parliament.
7.25 p.m.

I think that it is undignified when the television cameras are turned on in the House and the Opposition is seen sitting in their chairs and unwilling to say anything. It is not for me to tell the Opposition how to do its business. We have been beneficiaries from the Opposition's catastrophic public posture in Parliament, even more than out of Parliament, during the last session.

Unfortunately, the pitiful performances in Parliament, perhaps led to some of the confrontational activities that so marked the bitter years of 1978 — 1981 when politics plunged to the depths of hostility that I had never before known in the country.

We on this side have nothing to fear from a televised debate and we hold it out. If the Opposition are fearful of another fiasco, they are free to refuse the Government's offer, challenge, whatever noun you use to characterise it.

But I would hope that we would know beforehand whether we are going to be treated to another tantrum from the likes of “Sleepy” Smith — I must say the only candidate who I think could possibly behave like Mr. Smith is the honourable Member for St. Michael West — or whether we are going to have a dignified debate in which we will all put our best foot forward and have a debate that will take place over the three days.

The form which we would propose is the same. The Minister of Finance would speak for an unlimited time. The person who replies, and speaks first, on behalf

of the Opposition would speak for the same time — the period not exceeding the time of the Minister of Finance, on the second evening, that is on the Thursday. The House would then adjourn for dinner and there would be a number of speeches after dinner up to 10.00 o'clock. It would normally be four speeches of half an hour each.

On the succeeding day, the remaining Members of the House would speak, starting at 12.00 o'clock, with a wind-up speech, which we would suggest, by agreement, is limited to one hour, on behalf of the Opposition and the final reply after dinner of one hour by the Minister of Finance.

It is obvious to all concerned, that it will not be tolerable, for either side, to have all its speakers speak and then have the other side reply. It is equally obvious that some speakers will have to take what they may see as the unfashionable hours between 2.00 o'clock in the afternoon or 4 p.m. or 4.30 p.m., because I do not think the House seriously expects the Government to on this debate only in prime time.

These points, I would hope, would be worked out between the Leader of the House and the Leader or the Acting Leader of the Opposition. And I would very much hope, Mr. Speaker, that the convention by which the Chair sees speakers from each side in alternation, according to the numbers available to speak, would be a convention that we can adopt in this case.

I know that Your Honour is only too anxious to enforce that convention and I have seen Your Honour sitting down in the Chair, back resolutely turned to the Government, eyes fixed on the Opposition benches, and not one could be found to arise from the Opposition benches to answer the call of the country or Parliament for contribution to so vital a debate. So, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we can have a well organized and ordered debate.

There is one, not a major innovation, but it is a slight innovation, that I would mention. The debate will proceed on the moving of the Second Reading of a Bill, or Bills, of which I will give notice at the end of the Budget.

There are a number of Bills which relate to proposals that will be included in the Budget and I will give notice of them on the Wednesday evening, March 31, since the proposals contained therein will come into effect the next day, April 1, and in one case, in particular, which requires a Bill rather than an Order, it is desirable that it be in the hands of the public at the earliest possible opportunity.

It will not therefore be necessary to deal with a Resolution and an amendment to a Resolution. Of course,

this does not preclude the Opposition, in the fullness of time, moving a Resolution if it so wishes. But I am suggesting that the convenience of the House may be perfectly adequately served by debating the Budget on one of the Budgetary measures. It is a well known Parliamentary convention and I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that you will restrict anyone to the framework of a particular Bill in dealing with the entire framework of the Budget.

If, on the other hand, it is thought that this might be inappropriate, I am perfectly willing to move a Resolution. But the necessity for the Bill will remain. At some stage we would have to come and debate the different Bills. In any case, I propose to move the First Readings of all the Bills which relate to the Budgetary measures, of which I intend to give notice on Wednesday evening.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Just a word, Mr. Speaker. This particular provision, the innovation to which the Prime Minister referred, we would, of course, have to give some consideration to this, because it means that if a major debate is to take place on a Bill, the Opposition may feel it necessary to move an amendment to that Bill as is done in the House of Commons.

I do not know how this will relate in terms of notice and so on, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter for which consideration will have to be given. We would dispense of the necessary notice so that the debate can take place on the Bill, if that is to be the major debate, but, no doubt, these are matters which will have to be sorted out in due course. I just raise that as one of the problems.

Mr. SPEAKER: It certainly ought never to be sorted out in the people's time, like tonight.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Well, it was thrown out tonight.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, a very brief word on the adjournment and what followed. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that, in due course, the Leader of the Opposition, or the Deputy Leader, will iron out all of these matters, not in the people's time, and that we would have all of those matters cleared up.

But it is unfortunate that the Prime Minister always appears to be able to conveniently forget, on the one hand, and so he seems to have forgotten that the last televised debate was, in fact, the mini Budget debate and not the previous Budget debate.

And I don't see how anyone who had watched that debate could attribute the words which he attributed to that debate.

7.35 p.m.

Secondly, Sir, I find it rather unfortunate, that whenever he is advancing information and suggestions concerning the dignified manner in which we should do things, he finds it necessary to include in his dignified approach, perhaps a quite dignified, but unnecessary tendency towards sarcasm and towards offering what, if one was sensitive enough to absorb to absorb it, would be seen as an insult.

Mr. Chairman, to have conveniently forgotten that the behaviour which he alludes to was induced by a certain other behaviour, which we need not explain and go into in great detail, is really not to do full justice of the behaviour of that gentleman on the occasion. I believe, Sir, that there are very few persons in the history of Parliamentary democracy who have ever found themselves in the position where, having been given a commitment that they could make what had been described as an apology to their House, and in the full knowledge in the belief that in so doing, they suddenly discover that they are broadcasting to the world at large. (*Asides*) I am not defending anybody.

I think that when these matters are being re-opened, or brought back up, they tend to cast a pall on what could otherwise be a very cooperative and enlightening occasion. There is really no need for the Prime Minister, or anyone else, in the course of discussing the future, to necessarily have to hark back to the past and do it in the manner in which he characteristically does it.

I would like to add to what he has said, especially about the reporters. I believe that they worked, within the last few weeks, under the most trying circumstances, and I don't think any praise would be too high for them when we, on both sides of the House, speak of their sterling commitment to their duty.

I hope that we in the Hon. Chamber will not take the utterance of words such as these I am uttering, to be the only manner in which we can demonstrate our thanks and acceptance of commitment like that displayed by these ladies and gentlemen who do duty for us.

The Clerks continue to be of extreme assistance to us. The Leader of the House — irascible as ever — has already been praised by my colleague and I, therefore, need not add anything, except to say that we on this side have enjoyed the debate as well. I cannot say that this is the most outstanding Estimates of my 11 times at bat, but I think that since each occasion has something to teach, it was a learning experience as well as the ten which have gone before. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Wednesday March 31, 1982 at 4.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
7.45 p.m.